

Third Day

Sunday 11 July 2004

THE CHAIR *The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (Ven. Clive Mansell)* took the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

The Chairman: Good afternoon and welcome back, members of Synod. I hope that you had a good Sunday lunch. I call on the chairman of the Business Committee to address Synod.

Revd Dr Richard Turnbull (Winchester): Before I move a variation in the order of business for this afternoon, I need to say a word about security and about the disruption at York Minster this morning.

As the Clerk reminded Synod on Friday evening, we and the Minster authorities have been aware of an increased risk throughout this group of sessions. As a result, additional precautions have been put in place. However, it remains very important that in the event of a disturbance while Synod is sitting, members respond promptly to directions from the Chair. Without taking wholly disproportionate steps, you will of course understand that it will be impossible to prevent incursions by those who are prepared to use violence and, as happened this morning, cause injury.

After this morning's incident, the Dean of York issued the following statement:

‘We deeply regret this violent intrusion into an act of Christian worship and witness. That intrusion should not have happened. No doubt there are real issues at stake for those who intruded and they have been given an opportunity to share their concerns with the congregation here, but there has also been personal injury and damage to this ancient centre of witness to the gospel, with its eternal message of healing, justice and compassion for all, and that has to be deplored strongly.’

That is the end of the statement. Our prayers and concerns are with the Dean and Chapter and all those who have been affected in any way by the action this morning. Before we continue, I suggest that we have a few moments of quiet reflection for personal prayer. (*Synod stood in silent prayer*)

Variation in the Order of Business

Revd Dr Richard Turnbull: Synod will be aware that yesterday we were unable to debate the issues relating to the *Alternative Sources of Funding* report, part of the Hind follow up. The Business Committee is clear that we are both required to do so during this group of sessions and that it is a matter of importance to do so.

Therefore, we propose first to remove from this afternoon's agenda the rubric 'not later than 4.00 p.m.' and to remove the Liturgical Business, Item 600 – Weekday Lectionary. I will come back to what we propose to do with it. Secondly, after the Private Member's Motion, Item 700 – Stipend Differentials, insert the rubric 'not later than 4.45 p.m.' and, after that, the business *Alternative Sources of Funding*. That will give a minimum of one-and-a-half hours for that item. The order paper remains the same as was issued yesterday and further copies are available if needed.

On Tuesday morning, insert the first item of business on the Agenda, Liturgical Business, Item 600 – Weekday Lectionary. Also on Tuesday morning, before the Diocesan Synod Motion, Item 806 – Drug Misuse, insert the rubric 'not later than 12 noon.' That will ensure a timed debate on drug misuse.

The Chairman: Those proposals have my consent. Do they have the consent of Synod: (Agreed)

Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. We have been asked to consider what happened this morning. I was very sorry that we were not asked to pray for the men who demonstrated, which seems to me to be what Jesus would have done had he been interrupted in such a way. In addition, I think that many of us feel extremely uncomfortable, even with the lighter level of security from which we are now suffering, about the possibility that we might for example be asked to endure a search on our way into Central Hall in order to carry out our duties as members of the Synod.

It seems to me that the appropriate Christian response to what happened this morning is to say that, however unfortunate the way in which it was carried out, it was an encounter with the world that the Church needs and needs to recognize, and, furthermore, that by maintaining the level of security that we have (which I suspect is now completely unnecessary) we are actually doing something that is contrary to what we should be doing in an assembly of this kind. It seems to me that when people feel the need to demonstrate to such an extent, we should be prepared to accept that fact.

The Chairman: Mr Sutcliffe, your words have been heard. Thank you.

Rethinking Sentencing: Report by the Mission and Public Affairs Council (GS 1536 and GS Misc 749)

The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Peter Selby): I beg to move:

'That this Synod:

- (a) commend the report *Rethinking Sentencing* as a valuable contribution to the debate over penal policy;
- (b) welcome Her Majesty's Government's proposals to promote and develop restorative justice as a significant feature of its strategy to limit reoffending;
- (c) express dismay at the ever-rising prison population, which limits the effectiveness of programmes to reduce reoffending, to rehabilitate offenders, and provide healing for victims of crime;
- (d) reaffirm the ministry of Christians within the criminal justice system, especially those in Prison Service Chaplaincy, the Churches' Criminal Justice Forum (CCJF) and the many voluntary Christian organizations working with offenders and victims; and
- (e) encourage Church members to embrace criminal justice as a cause for prayer and Christian concern and – where able – to involve themselves in practical initiatives.⁷

It gives me great pleasure to introduce this matter. I am grateful to those who have arranged the business in such a way as to allow it to happen and I am very glad to be able to present to you this book and the report of the Mission and Public Affairs Council over the signature of the Bishop of Southwark.

I want to say that this material and this debate rest on certain pillars. They are human pillars and they arise from the fact that we have a reason for being able to and desiring to speak about this matter.

The first pillar on which the debate rests is the actual work that has gone into the production of this book, which was the final piece of staff work done by Peter Sedgwick, who has served the Church of England national institutions in a very distinguished way by having the best possible relationships and contacts with people and by bringing a very valuable critical theological mind to bear on this area of the Church's concern. He is here and I would like on your behalf to express the deep thanks of the Church for all that his work has given to us. (*Applause*) We are in the fortunate position that he has been succeeded in this work by Christopher Jones, who sits behind me. We welcome him to that task and support him with our prayers in representing us in a crucial piece of endeavour.

Staff work is not the only pillar on which this kind of work and this kind of debate rests. Fundamentally, it rests on our involvement with the criminal justice system. It is an involvement that we as the Church have, by providing for example the largest pool of any organization of voluntary assistance. If the churches of this land withdrew their concern from the criminal justice system, the amount of money that it would cost to

fund the extra staff to replace that voluntary work would be quite unmanageable and unaffordable.

Some of that work is not particularly glamorous and does not go by any high sounding names. It consists of such matters as staffing visitor centres, making tea for people who have travelled long distances and exchanging a piece of humanity in an otherwise very depressing situation, and we must never make light of that. People who do this kind of voluntary work, and some that is more in the direct area of rehabilitation, very quickly find that they are drawn as though by God directly, but certainly through the faces and lives of the people they encounter, into a deeper involvement.

Of course, the Church, particularly the Church of England, has a long and honourable history of involvement in the criminal justice system and specifically in the area of prisons. From the very beginning of the modern Prison Service, when prisons were required to have an Anglican priest on their staff in order to be a prison, the principle of rehabilitation and the faith content to the rehabilitative exercise has been accepted and honoured, and we have nothing to apologize for in the distinguished record of people who have made relationships with offenders in such a way that they have been able to lead reconstructed lives.

We have now moved on, of course, into a more plural society and, under the leadership of the Chaplain General, from whom I hope we may hear later, have moved into an area in which the faith contribution can be made in our society by the representatives of faiths other than the Christian faith and in which the ascendancy of the Church of England as an established Church has been modified by allowing coordinating chaplains and area chaplains from other denominations and faiths; and that is an excellent measure.

We therefore have a basis of authority. It is an authority that comes from a deep involvement by many hundreds of people. The issue for us this afternoon is how we use that authority. I want to suggest that we have a responsibility to use that authority to play the fullest part in the current debate about sentencing and in particular to bring into it our Christian perception of the way in which human beings are to be dealt with, particularly if they transgress.

It is a very good thing, therefore, that we have a booklet to present to you, which we hope will be of value to the Church. It is the product of people who have reflected long and hard on this matter and are therefore in a position to ask the deepest questions. Sir John Laws is a sentencer of experience and it is his current work. David Faulkner has years of experience in the Home Office and in other areas in which he has been able to really assess the value of the things that we do. Tim Newell is in contact with restorative justice initiatives, about which he can speak with a great deal of experience. Stephen Pryor asks that most radical question, 'Why prison? Do we need prison to do the things that we want to do for people who have offended?' It is a useful booklet, which I believe will contribute to people's reflection on these matters, and I therefore hope that Synod will commend it.

Secondly, I hope that Synod will give real support to Her Majesty's Government's concern for restorative justice. At a meeting yesterday, Her Majesty's Principal Inspector of Prisons for Scotland said that he was clear that it was an idea whose time had come. Throughout the world, initiatives are being taken in this area that will allow people to move on. One of the real threats to serious restorative work is that people imagine that victims of crime – to be a victim of crime is a horrible thing – are somehow supported by headlines describing longer sentences. In fact, victims of crime are supported when they are enabled to move on. Sometimes that can be done with the person who perpetrated the crime and, if that happens, both move on in a way that we as Christians should find not in the least surprising. Our contribution as a result of our theological understanding, as a result of our faith, should lead us to play a very prominent part in supporting that kind of initiative. I therefore hope that the Synod will express support for the Government in this area, because the Government, for reasons that I am sure we well understand, very frequently finds itself under pressure to abandon such initiatives.

I also hope that we shall express some dismay at prison numbers. There is now in the House of Bishops a bishop who was a colleague of mine in London many years ago when we used to worry about 41,000 people being in prison. There are now 76,000 in prison and there is every indication that the number will continue to rise. For me, it is a brilliant picture of original sin. As the Apostle said, that which we all would not do we do, and that which we would we do not. We all know that we want prison numbers reduced. We all know that it is necessary. Every time there is a serious crime, especially a public and notorious crime, the number in prison goes up. That is because it is too easy to resort to the instant reaction, 'Lock 'em up.' In particular, and most seriously, we are locking up far too many people for short periods in which any rehabilitative potential of prison life is completely undermined. So we really have to address this matter very strongly.

When I visit prisons in my own diocese, the most searing aspect of it for me is the increasing number of women that we are locking up. We are locking up women – we should really choke on saying that – and not just women but children. I am sure that it is very important to debate whether it is right for parents to slap children, but, by comparison, locking up children in prison accommodation cannot be acceptable. We must therefore express our very strong dismay about it.

We also need to reaffirm the authority base from which we speak. It rests, as I say, on the substantial number of churchpeople who are engaged in this work. We have listed some of those who give you an opportunity to become involved, and the journal *What Can I Do?* is absolutely relevant to that. It is not, of course, an exhaustive list, and later I shall fully accept the amendment that is to be moved. We have people in the judiciary, in the magistracy, in our police forces and, very importantly, prison officers who do not only the well-understood Christian things but also the hard cutting-edge things where it is really important to hold on to what it is you are trying to do.

I therefore hope that we shall commend that level of involvement and that we shall encourage church members generally to read Tim Gorringer's book on crime, which is on the bookstall downstairs, to pray for people who are charged with keeping the peace in our neighbourhoods and to pray for the victims of crime. The fact is that we know that it is realistic to speak of restoration because we know that that is the human need, the human situation, with which Christ identified himself. That is what leads us to acknowledge that in prison we find people in the same boat, exposing for us what is the human condition, that restoration is the deepest of human needs.

When Jesus is described as numbering himself with the transgressors, when he is described as leading captivity captive, when the writer to the Hebrews asks us to remember those in prison as though we were with them, they are drawing attention to the fact that we, the Church, are the possessors of and charged with a deep wisdom about how human beings are to be treated, about the best way of responding to them and especially about the best way of dealing with offenders. That is why with great pleasure I commend these reports to the Synod.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Chaplain General, Prisons (Ven. William Noblett): Rethinking Sentencing is a welcome contribution to the wider debate on the purpose of imprisonment. Leaving aside the cover, which some may say reinforces the traditional image of the dispenser of justice as being white and male, it goes some way to remind us of the necessity for Christian involvement, and I would say the involvement of people from different faith traditions, in the criminal justice system.

The report argues that the Christian faith provides a new vision for the future of criminal justice. I would suggest using Timothy Gorringer's words, that what is needed is a reversioning and a reappropriation of our Christian tradition. Redemption, reconciliation and the restoration of the individual within the community are not new concepts. We know this from the teachings of Christ, and it is reflected in some words from the 1564 Scottish *Book of Common Order*. In it, the congregation is reminded of the need for offenders to be reconciled to God and to the Church after repentance and the offering of satisfaction or reparation to the victim and to the Church. The congregation is asked to embrace the offender as a brother, identifying with his situation. In addressing the penitent, the minister says:

‘We all repute your fall to be our own. We accuse ourselves no less than we accuse you. Now finally we join our prayers with yours, that we may obtain mercy.’

‘We join our prayers with yours.’ The identification, perhaps with reluctance and pain, of our humanity and fallenness with that of the offender is deeply rooted in our Christian tradition and here, given formal liturgical expression, it conveys a deep theological truth about our need to identify with offenders and to respond in Christ's name.

We need to provide an alternative provision of what is possible, rooted in the dignity and respect exemplified by Christ and implicit in our understanding of people created *imago Dei*. As the bishop said, nowhere is this more evident than in our prisons, with almost 76,000 people being held, of whom 4,500 are women.

I just want to share with you some of the facts around those 4,500 women. Since 1992, the number of men in prison has risen by 50 per cent, the number of women by 173 per cent. The use of custody for women offenders has increased from 4 to 11 per cent in the magistrates' courts and from 30 to 43 per cent in the Crown courts. Almost six out of ten women held in prison on remand do not receive a custodial sentence. Over 8,000 children per year, 26 every day, have their living arrangements disrupted by their mothers going to prison. Over 2,500 of those women in custody suffer from two mental health disorders, 35 times higher than among females in the general population. Sadly, last year 14 women in prison committed suicide.

Against that background, I welcome the cross-Government action plan to tackle women's offending and to reduce the number of women in prison. However, to succeed, it will need to involve a revisioning of the purpose of imprisonment and to draw on restorative justice principles. In January this year, the Home Secretary produced a report, *Reducing Crime – Changing Lives*. That report contains the Government's plans for transforming the management of offenders, which will place a greater emphasis on the use of community sentences for low risk offenders, reserving custody only for serious, dangerous and highly persistent offenders.

The Government is to be commended for its efforts to introduce restorative justice concepts. However, as David Faulkner and Tim Newell point out in their essays, more can be done. 'Christians, and all people of good will, can affect how that choice is made', says Faulkner. I believe that part of our response as Synod is to influence those choices but also, and more crucially, to make things happen.

Mrs Mary Johnston (London): Some time ago we learnt that an extensive construction programme to build numbers of new prisons was well under way, some of them nearing completion. A few days ago in London, just before I came here to York, it was announced that a successful recruitment drive had resulted in a record number of police officers in the Metropolitan force – 'more than ever before', said Sir John Stevens, but still not enough.

Although those two developments bring obvious benefits, particularly to our dreadfully overcrowded prisons, they surely point to our failure as a society to deal with criminal behaviour. There is no way of avoiding the fact that our present criminal justice system is deficient. Fortunately, we know from this report that there is a totally different approach to dealing with offending behaviour. It is restorative justice, already tested and practised abroad and in some parts of this country.

A key factor of crime reduction is the prevention of reoffending, to stop that slide into

repeated offences and eventually prison. Here, restorative justice scores by enabling the offender to face up to the damage done, the hurt inflicted and the distress caused by his behaviour, and to make reparation for it rather than simply acting as a detached bystander in adversarial court proceedings, as happens now.

However, restorative justice is not a soft option. Dangerous murderers and rapists will still have to be locked up for the safety of the public, but, with fewer prisoners, the Prison Service can devote more time and more of its undoubted expertise to rehabilitation. Neither is restorative justice a cheap alternative to prison. A saving of £37,000 per annum per prisoner is a powerful incentive, but equipping panels of facilitators through which offenders, their victims and representatives of the community might address the offence and remedy will obviously require highly specialized – which means expensive – training.

The potential benefits for society are huge. The offender has to confront his behaviour, take responsibility for his actions, perhaps apologize, seek forgiveness and make amends. Instead of being ignored, the victim would be involved in the process, if he so wished, able to question and find closure. I imagine that few of us here have not been touched by crime. We all know the hurt and distress that it causes. While angry and bewildered victims remain isolated from the judicial process, I believe that they contribute to a reservoir of resentment in society, which fuels the ‘lock ’em up and throw away the key’ philosophy. The community in restorative justice acknowledges the offender as still a member of society to be restored and reconciled – healed, if you like – still our neighbour, not banished to prison, to borrow Stephen Pryor’s graphic phrase.

From all this, it is not difficult to see that restorative justice represents a more Christian response to criminal behaviour. It is the story of the Prodigal Son writ large on the national screen. It is a way of acknowledging offending behaviour, repentance, reparation, forgiveness and reconciliation. These are bedrock Christian principles. Restorative justice presents us with a method to which we all can respond and which we should commend to our parishes, our communities and our friends. Crime crops up so often in discussions and conversations that there are frequent opportunities for all of us to explain that there is another, better way; there is restorative justice.

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Tim Stevens): I want to draw Synod’s attention to David Faulkner’s statement in his essay, in which he says ‘Britain is deeply ambivalent in its attitude towards children and young people.’ As President of the Children’s Society, I am all too aware of the suffering and injustice that is meted out to children who find themselves in trouble with the law.

Let me remind Synod members that in England and Wales children are held to be criminally responsible from the age of ten and in Scotland from the age of eight, the youngest ages of criminal responsibility in Europe. The rates of child imprisonment have almost doubled over the past decade. This increase in child imprisonment has

occurred during a period when recorded crime by children has been in decline. At any one time, approximately 3,000 children are locked up in England and Wales, and the Government has recently suggested that that situation will of necessity remain stable.

The number of vulnerable children either remanded or sentenced to prison service custody in 2003–2004 was over 3,300, a massive increase in the number for 2000–2001, when it was just 432. The youth justice system, including the sentencing of children, has been the subject of criticism by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, successive reports from Her Majesty's Inspector of Prisons, and more recently the Joint Committee on Human Rights.

Therefore, any test of the effectiveness of the policy on juvenile sentencing must take account of the number of children locked up and, on that test, it is absolutely clear that we are failing. Treating children separately from adults, recognizing their welfare and safeguarding their needs is essential to ensure that sentencing policy is effective. As David Faulkner highlights in his essay, despite the recent reforms and the progress made by the Youth Justice Board, the current response to children is confusing, ambivalent and deeply contradictory. On the one hand, we have a welfare and protection system that is based on ensuring that children are safeguarded and that their needs are met, an approach that is currently being strengthened through the Children Bill. However, as soon as the same children cross the line into criminal activity, the approach immediately becomes one of punishment and retribution.

The purpose of the youth justice system is to prevent reoffending and, as a result, there is inadequate consideration of the welfare of the child, resulting in vulnerable children being placed in prison settings. Think for a moment of the tragic case of Joseph Scholes, who died in custody on 24 March 2002, when he was found hanged in his cell. Joseph had lived an unsettled childhood, became a disturbed young boy, exhibiting clear signs of depression and periodic suicidal thoughts, and had begun to harm himself. Two weeks before his court appearance, he slashed his face 30 times with a knife. He was clearly extremely vulnerable and in need of the utmost care and attention. However, the fact that Joseph and many others like him find themselves in prison custody at all is a testament to the current problem.

Children are not being treated as children, they are not being given help and support to address their welfare needs and the underlying problems that lead to their engagement with a criminal justice system that is no place for them. It is no use tinkering around with the edges. We need a fundamental review of the way in which we treat children in trouble with the law.

Let me quote to Synod from a book by Caroline Castle, which puts simply into words and pictures the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, signed by the United Kingdom in 1991. Article 3 of the Convention states that in all actions concerning children their best interests should be a paramount consideration, and it is put in this way in the book:

‘Understand that all children are precious. Pick us up if we fall down and if we are lost lend us your hand. Give us the things we need to make us happy and strong, and always do your best for us whenever we are in your care.’

In our attitude to sentencing policy, we must do no more and no less than that.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): Now is a very good time for this debate to happen in Synod. We not only have a series of coherent and imaginative initiatives from the Government, we also have the makings of – I say no more than the makings of – a cross-party consensus on this matter. In private, and increasingly in public, members of all the main political parties are prepared to agree that the situation we currently face in our penal policy is simply scandalous – there is no other word for it – and I have heard no serious person in public life deny that.

All the more important then for all of us in the times ahead, if we are looking towards a General Election in the next 18 months to 2 years, to hold up that cross-party consensus before those who are seeking election. This is the last issue that should be allowed to become an area for political points scoring, though it has frequently been so in the past.

That it is a scandal has already been set out and explained in some detail to Synod. However, I will just pick up one or two points that may be worth noting here. As has been said, a Christian ought to regard punishment in this setting as something that brings about change. We currently have a situation in which the expectation of the system is fundamentally that change does not happen to the offender, to the victim or more widely in society.

One of the reasons it does not happen to the offender is flagged up in the very helpful paper GS Misc 749, that is, that programmes of rehabilitation and education within the system are consistently frustrated by the abnormal mobility of prison populations, itself a direct consequence of overcrowding. If people are moved from one prison to another after three months or so, or even shorter periods, to a prison where there is no programme of education comparable with what they may have had in their first place of custody, then no effect can be looked for.

That is increasingly a problem in the system, a problem that flags up the lack of consistency and lack of national policy about education and rehabilitation within custodial institutions. These programmes are frustrated and are not likely to be helped by some of the ideas for further privatized involvement in this area, but that is another matter, and a sensitive one, which I guess Synod will like to bear in mind as they reflect on these issues.

There are other areas in which we can speak of scandal. We have heard an eloquent testimony from the Bishop of Leicester to the outrageous character of the treatment of

children in the system, we have read here and heard elsewhere about the problems for women in prison and the disruption to family life, and I strongly suspect that others in this Synod will be able to speak much more effectively and eloquently about the issues around the ethnic profile of our prisons.

However, I would not want to sit down without saying something about the positive side of the motion and actions commended. We are in a good position and, as I have said, at a good moment to say certain things and say them clearly as from the Church on this cluster of subjects. We are though, each of us in different ways, able to undertake some practical involvement at local church level, and I hope that we will also take that back from this meeting of Synod. Link parishes associated with local prisons can be a very significant penumbra of human contact for those in custody, which will help them on release. In many dioceses, the role of the Mothers' Union in prison visiting is exemplary. There is a huge resource there, which can be deployed with great effectiveness in this way. Of course, there are countless Christian charities of a formal and less formal kind that take up the cause of young offenders.

None of this is, as they say, rocket science, and I trust that those of us who go back to our parishes fired by the crisis and the scandal that we are discussing will be able very simply to put some of these practical proposals into effect in our local congregations.

Mrs Margaret Tilley (Canterbury): I speak as a trustee of Victim Support Kent and chair of its Canterbury branch.

The report refers to the work that Victim Support does. It involves volunteers working with not only victims but also with witnesses, supporting them when they appear in court. Part of the concept of restorative justice involves victims facing the people who have harmed them. That happens in court, it is very nerve-racking for witnesses and they need support. In particular, Kent has piloted work with children who are vulnerable witnesses. Victim Support also works with victims of domestic violence.

The reason I want to speak in this debate is to highlight the fact that although volunteers are trained to work with victims, increasingly we find that we have to raise funds because the Home Office admits that, without us, it could not afford to do the work, yet still it does not fully fund the provision of coordinating staff. Virtually all the work is done by volunteers, but there is a clear need for coordinating staff, and those staff are feeling the pinch. We have to raise funds to be able to afford to pay staff. As Christians, we want to be involved, but we do not want to be involved with fund raising for Victim Support. We want to be there to help victims.

Mr Colin Slater (Southwell): I am very grateful to the Bishop of Worcester for his kind intimation that he will not resist the modest amendment standing in my name.

I believe that it is important for Christians to consider seriously whether they are called to join the army of over 30,000 lay magistrates who serve in the courts of our country,

rendering an absolutely vital piece of voluntary work. Our courts simply could not operate without us. I speak as the chairman of the Nottingham bench of over 400 JPs giving their time in service to their community. Many are Christians but my bench, like all others, quite rightly has to mirror the community that it serves. We therefore work with those of other faiths – Buddhists, Muslims, Jews – and of none, and my amendment is not, of course, meant to discourage any from thinking about applying to become a justice of the peace, but affords a timely opportunity for Synod to affirm the contribution of lay magistrates.

Lay magistrates frequently impose community-based penalties. Community-based penalties make the kind of change to which the Archbishop of Canterbury has just referred in his speech. Sadly, the frequent public perception is that unless a defendant is sent to prison, he or she is being let off. It is a message that I frequently hear when attending public meetings called to consider crime and punishment, which are real issues in affluent suburbia and equally so in inner city housing estates.

Equally sadly, the media do not always help to dispel this myth, for that is what it is, when they report someone convicted of an offence as having ‘walked free from court’, when in reality he or she has been given a community penalty. There easily come to mind eight such penalties available to us in the adult courts as well as a whole raft of new orders available in the youth courts, where I also sit.

I should like to tell Synod two stories, both of which are, of course, true. The first is about Alison, though that is not her real name. She is 17 years old, found guilty of the serious offence of causing actual bodily harm to a nurse at the Queen’s Medical Centre, Nottingham. My colleagues on the bench in the youth court had only two options, custody or a referral order, giving them a very difficult decision to make. They imposed a 12-month referral order, including reparation and a programme dealing with anger management.

The immediate effect was to cause the staff in the accident and emergency department of the hospital to ask whether the magistrates knew what they were doing. They said that Alison had been let off and told us that it is largely because of such attacks that it is difficult for them to recruit and retain staff. Their policy is one of zero tolerance. However, move on and they now describe the referral order as having been a huge success. Alison has admitted that what she did was wrong. She has made a verbal apology to a member of the hospital board and a written one to the nurse, who asked for it to be done in that way. It is highly unlikely that we will ever see Alison in court again, which is the whole purpose of the referral order, to stop young people from reoffending.

The other story is from an adult court. It is about Debbie, a 22-year-old mother from Worksop. After more than a dozen convictions for shoplifting, she was jailed but, once released, her offending continued. It was not until she was handed a drug treatment and testing order by the court that she started to get her life back on track. She says:

‘I found the order a tough one. You have to be determined to get off drugs to be able to do it. At first I got nowhere. I carried on offending and taking heroin, but now I am clean of heroin and I have gone seven months without offending.’

She now hopes to get a job and, more importantly, regain the custody of her child.

These are not isolated cases. I could quote others from the Nottinghamshire courts. I am glad to say that restorative justice is working.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark): On page 62 of *Rethinking Sentencing* reference is made to the over-representation of black people among the prison population. Stuart Dew quotes a recent calculation showing that if white people were imprisoned at the same rate as black people, there would not be 74,000 but 500,000 people in the prisons of England and Wales.

Of course, several factors could contribute to this over-representation, but I was shocked to find no other reference to this issue in a Church publication on sentencing. My disappointment increased when I noted, as pointed out in GS Misc 749, that both of the two previous Synod debates on the criminal justice system had recorded concern about the disproportionate number of ethnic minority people in prison. The silence in *Rethinking Sentencing* on this matter inevitably raises the question whether we as a Church are going backwards in terms of racial awareness and whether we have already become forgetful of racial justice.

The latest Home Office report states that there is still a major gap in the information available on the way that black and ethnic minority groups are dealt with by the criminal justice system because of the lack of data concerning the prosecution and sentencing process. However, the Home Office report presents statistics for the year 2002 from the ethnic monitoring introduced into magistrates’ courts in ten police force areas. In the category described as ‘Violence against the person and sexual offences’, 28 per cent of black offenders were sentenced to immediate custody, compared with 13 per cent white and 11 per cent Asian.

Although sentencing may not be the only factor accounting for those statistics, there are clearly grounds for further investigation of the prima facie evidence of discrimination against black offenders. This is an important matter in terms of racial justice, but I think that it goes further. If the suggestion in these statistics is correct, it shows that those determining sentences are quite strongly influenced by their prejudices and assumptions, and it is likely that that will affect other groups of offenders as well as those with a visible black ethnicity. I wonder how many of our magistrates and judges declare themselves to be Christians. The persistent problem of the disproportionate number of

black people in prison is not a problem out there; it is a product of our own assumptions, prejudices and forgetfulness.

Chancellor Tom Coningsby (Vicar Genral of York): I wish to address the topic of restorative justice. My credentials for speaking are that I am a Crown Court Judge, I sit in Croydon Crown Court for part of each year, I try cases with juries and I am responsible for deciding the right sentence in each case.

Before I sentence, I give careful consideration to a pre-sentence report supplied by an independent probation officer. If the offence is a serious one for which a custodial sentence would be appropriate, the report will make suggestions for any non-custodial sentence, such as community service or a non-custodial drug treatment and testing order, coupled with conditions of attendance, training or counselling, that I should consider. Wherever possible, judges in the Crown Court will opt for non-custodial sentences. However, there are occasions when the degree of offending, the gravity of the offence, the habitual nature of the conduct or the failure of a previous non-custodial sentence make it inevitable that there has to be a custodial sentence.

I want to say to members of Synod that there is no 'lock them up' instinct on the part of Crown Court judges, nor on the part of magistrates. I say that with the utmost sincerity, and I do not believe that this debate should be conducted from the platform of a wrong understanding of what our judges and magistrates are doing. Every day I sit round a lunch table with eight judges who sit in the criminal courts; I hear the way in which they talk about their cases and the sentences that they impose, and I can assure you that they try, wherever possible, to avoid custodial sentences. I am the liaison judge in Croydon between the Crown Court and the Magistrates' Court, I am acquainted with about 300 magistrates, and I assure you that in their ordinary approach and attitudes to custody and how to deal with offenders they are just like everyone here in this room today. They have no preference for locking up people: indeed, they use every possible means to try to avoid it.

Where are we at the moment in relation to the Government's further proposals about restorative justice? All Crown Court judges accept the principle of a restorative element to sentencing. Judges attend periodic residential training sessions, at which restorative justice is currently on the agenda. We have all received the Government's literature about the new phase of restorative justice. The senior Crown Court judge at Croydon has been attending meetings about it in order to try to put some flesh on to the bones, so that we can see what practically is on offer. We need to know what particular programmes are available in the area of restorative justice so that we can take them on board in sentencing.

There is judicial support for the concept of restorative justice. This is not a new concept: it has always lain behind sentencing, including the community service orders that we have had for about 20 years. Therefore, there is plenty of support from the judges.

Revd Canon Clarence Hendrickse (Liverpool): I would like to share with you some insight that I have as a foster carer. I hope that you will read across from what I am about to say to you, which may at first sight seem not immediately relevant, and if I have the opportunity and the time at the end, I will make those connections explicit.

About a year ago, we were asked to have a nine-year-old boy who had been missing from school for six months, was hot-wiring and stealing cars and was very angry. He had watched his father beat up his mother, he was staying out all hours of the night with very much older lads and was being shown quite inappropriate videos. We were therefore asked to have him to see what we could do with him, because if some family such as ours did not take him, he would have been put into some kind of secure accommodation.

As we do on such occasions, we negotiated a contract. The contract was that we would give him a secure environment in which to live, do lots of fun things together – you will realize that the fun thing has to be pre-eminent – give him lots of new opportunities and experiences that he would not have if he continued along this line, in return for which he on his side would behave, that is to say, do what he was told when he was told, go to school and treat people and property with respect. We said, ‘If we can work within that framework, we will treat you with the utmost respect.’

How did we go about doing this? Within half an hour of meeting him, we took him to the Lakes just to get to know him and we dangled the carrot that if he behaved himself, we would take him with us on holiday to Spain. We said to him, ‘You have had a bad life but your behaviour has to change. Your behaviour is totally unacceptable, but you are a lovely lad. We can see all the potential in you, you are a highly intelligent lad, and we can see what the future could be for you if you give yourself half a chance. You are a very fine lad but your behaviour is totally unacceptable.’

That kind of approach worked. We modified his behaviour as a result of promising that we would take him to Spain if he behaved himself. We took him to Spain. It was the first time that he had been on a plane, the first time that he had been to the zoo, the first time that he had stayed in an hotel, the first time that he had been able to have meals whenever he wanted, the first time that he could have three helpings of ice cream at the end of meals, if he felt like it. All that helped him enormously.

What I am really pleading for is some kind of system that takes restoration much more seriously and treats the individual with great respect.

Mrs Isobel Burnley (Chester): A letter from prison, written a month ago by an alcoholic, a close member of my family. He says:

‘I was actually out for about five and a half hours legally. At the end of the court session I was out, I was free and straight to the first off-licence.’

We have been here before, dear readers, have we not? Oh! *sour déjà vu!* He then describes the cider, the mission to oblivion, and says 'I was arrested again at exactly 10.28.' He has been in the revolving door of prison and, as they say, 'on the out' since before Christmas. That episode meant the third time inside, and the fourth and current sentence was because the antisocial behaviour order had been broken yet again. No excuses, but the problem for addicts of any sort, apart from the addiction itself and the consequent problems affecting physical and mental health, is a return to the community.

This is also a great problem for the hundreds of women and young girls in prison, as you have heard. Lack of accommodation and aftercare means that they are likely to reoffend quite quickly. The prison sentence neither punishes nor prevents reoffending, nor rehabilitates. Good aftercare means effective health and social services, which may be costly but are vital.

Perhaps the brand new National Offender Management Service will stop many alcoholics, addicts and women going to prison at all and the ever-rising prison population will be halted. Its report states:

'The intention is to develop robust, intensive community programmes and intensive supervision monitoring to replace prison sentences for the increasing number of relatively low-risk and first-time offenders who have been given prison sentences in recent years.'

In the meantime, what can the Church do? What could you do? You could read *Rethinking Sentencing* and read *What Can I Do?* You could also do what the Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland at our fringe meeting yesterday urged us to do, that is, to pray. Pray for prisoners and pray for their families. After all, there but for the Grace of God!

The Chairman: After Mr Slater has formally moved his amendment, I shall invite the bishop to reply to it. I would then be grateful to test the mind of the Synod with regard to whether or not you would like to debate the amendment or simply to vote on it, in which case we will perhaps have a little more time to debate the main motion before closure.

Mr Colin Slater (Southwell): I beg to move as an amendment:

'In paragraph (d) after the word "(CCJF)" insert the words " , the lay magistracy".'

The Bishop of Worcester: I hope that everyone understands that the list was intended to be neither exhaustive nor exclusive. I willingly and gladly accept the amendment, on the understanding that I also hope that others will feel themselves included in the range of people involved in all kinds of different ways in the system of criminal justice.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The Chairman: That has my consent. Does it have the consent of Synod? (*Agreed*)

The amendment was put and carried.

The Chairman: The debate on the main motion, as amended, continues briefly.

Mrs Jane Bisson (Channel Islands): I stand before you as someone who is married to a once-upon-a-time young offender, who was incarcerated for his misdemeanours, who could tell you stories of his time inside that would make your toes curl, and who would also say that incarceration did him little good. ‘What’, you may ask, ‘is the relevance of these revelations?’ It is to point out that I have first-hand experience and knowledge of the effects of incarceration on the lives of those who find themselves in this position. It is from this standpoint that I want to address Synod this afternoon.

We all know that approved schools and borstals have been abolished, and I am sure that most of us would say, ‘a good thing too’. What have they been replaced with? There is new legislation on the statute book dealing with new sentencing for 10- to 17-year-olds who plead guilty and are convicted for the first time, but what about all the others? Supervision orders are used in some boroughs.

The report advises us that following the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, youth offending teams have been set up in each area of England and Wales, bringing together police, social workers, probation officers and health and education workers. However, I am concerned about the consistency of such groups and the reality that it has left to each individual youth offending team to find ways of implementing the provisions of the Act. Jersey has a very real problem with youth offenders. The magistrates’ courts are constantly trying to find ways of appeasing the public while trying to teach the young offender that reparation has to be made for the offence committed.

My feeling is that in days gone by we used to rely on communities, and perhaps that is what the Act, with its prescribed membership of youth offending teams, is trying to establish. The communities took care of not only young offenders but also their families. The communities were frequently Church-based. What has happened to them? Why is it that the youth offending teams have no Church representation? Has the Church no voice or concern about youth? Many churches have youth groups or cells, yet if one of their members crosses the line, do they abandon him or her? I think not.

I believe and hope that the Church should have a voice and a part to play in the rebuilding of that family and the young offender, to help him or her to stand before God as repentant and full of remorse, but these are Christian values and perhaps that is where we are going wrong. The Church should make its voice heard above the

probation officers, health and education workers, as a voice of support for reconciliation for the whole family. The Church cannot afford to lose these young people to the world. I would like to see evidence of the Church standing shoulder to shoulder with the young offender and to be a part of that community that helps to restore justice and reparation to the victims.

Mrs Joanna Monckton (Lichfield): I have recently become involved with the Shannon Trust, a scheme that helps illiterates prior to rehabilitation. The scheme was started with the use of royalties from a book entitled *The Invisible Crying Tree*, which made it to number six of the top ten books. *The Invisible Crying Tree* is a collection of letters from a lifer to his pen friend, and very illuminating they are.

The scheme is backed by the Prison Officers' Association and works differently in each prison according to its regime. The idea is that a mentor, a 'clever literate prisoner', spends 20 minutes every day on a one-to-one basis teaching an illiterate prisoner to read, using our special reading manual, *Toe by Toe*. If there are any teachers here today, you will probably know of *Toe by Toe*, which was designed to teach dyslexic children. We have found that many prisoners are in fact dyslexic in some way and, without parental help as small children, have absconded from school, which in turn has led to offending. Seventy per cent of young offenders are illiterate. We hope to get many of them literate before their release. We are working in many prisons with the new heads of learning and skills or education, as normal education in prison requires inmates to be literate to a degree.

If anyone here who works in prisons and comes across prisoners who they feel would either be good mentors or need to learn to read, perhaps they would contact me. We now have representatives of the Shannon Trust for every prison in the country. However, as I am sure you know, working in overcrowded prisons with very hardworking, overstretched staff is difficult, and we do not always hear of suitable people for the scheme.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

The Chairman: That has my consent. Does it have the consent of Synod? (*Dissent*)

This motion was put and carried.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Bishop of Worcester, in reply: I share the ambivalence, if that is the right expression, of members in relation to the closure of this debate. We could very usefully talk about this matter for a great deal longer, but I quite understand the priorities that we have before us.

I thank all those who have taken part in the debate. When we tackle social questions, the strength of the Synod lies in the wealth of experience on which we are able to draw. Some of it we might have guessed about, some of it we would have had no knowledge of. Some of the stories that have been presented are as moving as the arguments that have been presented are compelling. I am very grateful for all of those and I can assure you that they will be noted and thought about as we evaluate the debate.

In the very short time that I have at my disposal, I should like to take up two matters. First, I want to address the issue addressed by Vasantha Gnanadoss about the ethnic bias of our criminal justice system. I have to put it like that. I chair the race forum of the criminal and civil justice system in the West Mercia Constabulary area, where I live, and the police, although they have made remarkable progress, would be the last to deny that it is a struggle for them to tackle deeply entrenched attitudes in this matter. Other agencies, I dare say, are a bit further behind.

When we have meetings on this subject, I find that as a Church representative I am more than embarrassed because I think that we have made less of an issue of this than we should have done, both in our own lives and in the criminal justice system. The fact is that if you are black or Asian, you are several times more likely to encounter the criminal justice system than if you are a white person, and that is a very serious matter and should concern us all. It does not make it any less concerning that there are other biases in the system that assert themselves in all sorts of ways. If you are poor, if you are not educationally qualified, if you are mentally ill, all these biases occur in the system and need to be addressed very seriously.

That brings me to the point of saying that there is always a social dimension to Our Lord's miracles of healing. There was always a boomerang to his healing activity, that is to say, there is always something that reverberates on the society around him and around the person who happens to need healing. There is always a way in which restorative justice has to address the society that is complicit in the environment of crime. I hope that nothing that is said about restorative justice confines it to those who actually offend. We are all involved, we are all complicit, and if there is to be a serious reduction in crime, we all need restoration.

My last point relates to the Archbishop of Canterbury's comment about holding the cross-party consensus before the people in the forthcoming political debate. Before the last election, our local Deputy Chief Constable was very anxious about what he called 'the auction in toughness'. The issue of public perception is one of the principal reasons for bringing this matter to the Synod. Listening to the speeches that we have heard, we are well placed to address the public misperceptions of community sentences as soft, of restorative sentencing justice as letting people off. We are in a position to address our friends and neighbours about what criminal justice actually does to people.

We are in a position to say that there are better things to do with people, tougher things to do, more demanding and more creative things to do, than locking them in front of a

television for 20 hours and more a day. There are better things that we can do. God offers better possibilities and better opportunities for human beings who are charged with their restoration. I therefore commend this report and resolution to the Synod as our step along the way to moving towards those better things.

The Chairman: This is a matter of some public importance and I shall therefore order a count of Synod members. As the staff prepare for that, I express my thanks to those who have spoken and to those who have had to have their speeches shortened.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form, 275 voting in favour and none against:

‘That this Synod:

- (a) commend the report *Rethinking Sentencing* as a valuable contribution to the debate over penal policy;
- (b) welcome Her Majesty’s Government’s proposals to promote and develop restorative justice as a significant feature of its strategy to limit reoffending;
- (c) express dismay at the ever-rising prison population, which limits the effectiveness of programmes to reduce reoffending, to rehabilitate offenders, and provide healing for victims of crime;
- (d) reaffirm the ministry of Christians within the criminal justice system, especially those in Prison Service Chaplaincy, the Churches’ Criminal Justice Forum (CCJF), the lay magistracy and the many voluntary Christian organizations working with offenders and victims; and
- (e) encourage Church members to embrace criminal justice as a cause for prayer and Christian concern and – where able – to involve themselves in practical initiatives.’

THE CHAIR *Sister Anne Williams CA* took the Chair at 3.55 p.m.

Private Member’s Motion

Stipend Differentials

The Chairman: We now come to Item 700, Revd Chris Lilley’s Private Member’s Motion on Stipend Differentials. Members will require the papers GS Misc 738A and 738B by way of background papers. You will also require the third notice paper for the

amendment by Sallie Bassham and the sixth notice paper for a further amendment if the Bassham amendment is not carried. I just want to clarify that. On the sixth notice paper there is also an amendment in the name of Sallie Bassham. That has been incorrectly typed. Therefore, you will need the third notice paper, but I will come to that later.

Revd Chris Lilley (Lincoln): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod believe that differentials in stipend for dignitaries should be phased out and call for action to achieve this by freezing the stipend of dignitaries and other clergy receiving differentials at the present level until the National Stipend Benchmark for Incumbents (which is set at or close to the national average stipend) has reached the same level.’

Madam Chairman, I begin by congratulating you on your commissioning as an evangelist in the Church Army on Friday. (*Applause*)

This is essentially a simple, but perhaps not uncontroversial, motion. First, let me tell you what it is not about. It is not about bashing the bishops, it is not aimed at devastating the deans, it is not even intended to give angst to the archdeacons. I am well aware, as we all are, that all three groups are feeling under some pressure at the moment, perhaps particularly the House of Bishops, over other issues. Therefore, please understand that this motion arose out of an omission from the terms of reference of the Stipends Review and dates back over four years.

Let me say clearly that I want to affirm how hardworking and gifted are our bishops, deans and archdeacons, particularly those in Lincoln! We appreciate you and value the work that you do, and I want to say thank you. Why is it, therefore, that I wish to move the stipends on to a level playing field? First, it is because I find no support in the teaching of Jesus for differentials. The parable of the workers in the vineyards suggests that those working in the kingdom receive equal reward, not only in heaven but also on earth, whether they have toiled long and hard or have only recently bent their backs. The parable of the talents suggests that more is expected of those to whom God has given greater gifts.

Secondly, can we say on whom the burden of ministry falls most heavily? When reading *The Cracked Pot* and looking around my own deanery, I see men and women working to their very limits for the gospel. Some can work for longer hours each day; that is God’s gift to them to use in his service. Some can work more efficiently; that is God’s gift to them to use in his service. Some have gifts of management or leadership; those are God’s gifts to them to use in his service. Each one, regardless of the job of work that they do in the Church of England, tries to do his or her best with the time, energy and talents that God has given them. Can we say that the burden is greater on the bishop, the dean or the archdeacon than on the parish priest, faithfully living and working sacrificially in a seemingly impossible, deprived urban parish? Can we say that the burden is greater on

the bishop, the dean or the archdeacon than on the country parson, looking after up to a dozen tiny rural parishes that do not want to work together, yet apart never produce a congregation large enough to attract newcomers? Whatever our job title, whatever job we have been asked to do in the Church, we are working together as the body of Christ, using the gifts and talents that God has given us.

I do not underestimate the pressures and responsibilities on our senior clergy. They give of their very best in extremely demanding posts, but they are the people whom God has enabled to work under such pressures and in such circumstances. Undoubtedly, in purely commercial terms they would be paid salaries of perhaps five or ten times their present stipend, but then many of us could have pursued, or in some cases have given up, highly paid careers in order to respond to God's call on our lives and to serve his Church in the stipendiary ministry. I therefore thank God for the work that our senior clergy do, but they are enabled to carry it out by God, just as every parish priest is enabled by the same God. Indeed, during my years on the General Synod and in the diocese, I have observed that most of them seem to thrive on the additional responsibilities that they bear. They are especially gifted for these ministries but, like any priest, they have simply offered themselves to serve God.

Thirdly, we ought to ask ourselves what kind of Church we should be in this society and at this time. I confess to feeling some unease when I read the stipends review with its language of management and aspirations. Yes, we can go down that route, but I am sure that I am not alone in perceiving that that debate and the voting that followed it revealed a Church that does not really believe that following commercial trends and aping management structures is the way that God is leading his Church today. I believe that, as Christians, we need to behave in a more distinctive manner. We struggle always to avoid being absorbed by the standards of our society. Perhaps that will always be a risk for an Established Church. Now, as we realize that we need to tackle afresh our mission in our land in the era of the mission-shaped Church, I believe that we need to be more distinctively Christian and do things God's way, not the world's way.

One way of sending a signal to the people of this land is to say that all our full-time stipendiary clergy will be paid the same. That is the position in many denominations. It is a powerful symbol of a determination to be open to whatever costly changes we may yet be called to make for God, to win our nation to Christ. How can we do this? We cannot simply and immediately cut the stipends of our senior clergy. Like everyone else, they have probably learnt to spend up to their income. However, there is a recent precedent for us to follow. To achieve the modest rounding down of dignitaries' stipends agreed in November 2002, by a few hundredths of one per cent their stipend increases are now being limited to increases in the Retail Price Index.

I am grateful to Sallie Bassham for her amendment, which updates my original motion to the current legal position as we understand it. What it means is that all current holders of differentials will continue to receive their differential plus an annual inflation

adjustment each year. Often in cash terms the actual increase will exceed that paid to other clergy, even if in percentage terms their increase seems to be greater. I therefore hope that Synod will carry Sallie Bassham's amendment.

Where there is a new appointment to a senior post, after an agreed date the stipend will be limited to the stipend paid to clergy of incumbent status. However, if a person newly appointed to a senior post was already receiving an enhanced stipend in the previous post, say an existing suffragan becomes a diocesan bishop, he will retain his suffragan's differential with the annual RPI increase. In so far as these stipends are paid by the Church Commissioners, that will eventually mean that more funds would be available to help ministry and mission in the poorest parishes, and eventually, as we will hear, there will be an annual saving to the Church Commissioners or the dioceses of about £4 million, but it will take many years before we reach that full figure.

What objections might we have to such a self-evidently good idea? Perhaps people will not be willing to offer themselves for senior posts. I do not believe that that will be the case. Anyway, if money is the motive, perhaps people motivated thus are not the people we need as our senior clergy. Secondly – well actually I find it difficult to see any other significant objections.

At my very first Synod meeting in 1996 the debate, every word of which I have reread, appeared to be moving against differentials until, in a powerful and moving speech, the then Bishop of Chester spoke of the poverty that he and his wife suffered on his becoming a bishop. Because the issue of bishops' working costs is now a matter of public record in the Mellows report, I now know what I did not then know, namely, that these days bishops quite properly recover all their reasonable working costs and that the excess fuel costs incurred by a diocesan bishop required to live in an over-large and expensive-to-heat house are recovered. Indeed, it seems likely that some parish clergy are more likely than most dignitaries to face unrecoverable working costs, and that those parish clergy, and perhaps deans, who are still required to live in over-large houses, receive no help with their heating and fuel costs.

Finally, if you are not yet fully persuaded to vote for this motion, let us think about pensions. Is there any good reason why a retired dignitary needs a higher pension than any parish priest? There are arguably more opportunities for retired senior clergy to work, maybe for a fee or recovery of expenses, than arise for retired parochial clergy. If some of them are working virtually full-time, that is their choice, but that is no more than many retired parish priests who give so freely of their time to help out in the parishes.

I urge members to vote for my motion, which is based on sound biblical, practical and mission-oriented principles and will send out a powerful signal to our Church and nation that we are serious about our calling as priests and about our mission.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Archdeacon of Surrey (Ven. Robert Reiss): I rise to oppose this motion, not simply because I am an archdeacon with a differential to defend, but because I was a member of the Stipends Review Group that produced *Generosity and Sacrifice*, and the chairman of that group has asked me to speak on its behalf.

The Synod should be aware that in recent years the Church of England has had two working parties considering this matter, one in 1997 and then the *Generosity and Sacrifice* working party, which reported in 2001. Between those two, there was the debate in Synod in 1996 that Mr Lilley has mentioned. On all those occasions, and in the subsequent debates, the weight of the argument and the conclusions has been in favour of keeping differentials. The evidence from scripture, particularly 1 Timothy 5.17, has been taken seriously. That verse says that elders who do well as leaders should be worthy of a double stipend or honour. The weight of scholarly opinion is that the word there, sometimes translated as 'stipend' and sometimes as 'honour', has a financial element. The Church has generally concluded that there is nothing immoral or unbiblical in paying more to those who bear greater responsibility.

The Synod should also be aware that the Church pays differentials not only to clergy but to laity as well. We pay them to teachers who teach in Church schools; we pay them to the staff of this Synod; we do not pay the Secretary General's PA the same as we pay him. Interestingly enough, as we discovered in the working party, charities, including Christian charities, pay differentials to their executives. When other bodies such as health authorities, the prison service or the military wish to employ clergy, they, too, pay clergy depending on the level of responsibility that they bear. If this Synod were to adopt Mr Lilley's proposal, we would drive a huge wedge between laypeople's experience of the Church as an employer and the clergy's. Surely, what is sauce for the lay goose is sauce for the clerical gander? We would also drive a huge wedge between those clergy employed by the Church and those employed as clergy by other bodies.

What I believe matters most about differentials is not that we pay them, but the range that we pay. Differentials among clergy are modest, compared even with the differentials that we, the Church, pay to our laity. A diocesan bishop gets about twice as much as a curate gets when he or she starts in ministry. The headmaster of a medium-sized Church secondary school gets nearly three-and-a-half times the starting salary of a teacher. The chief executive of a charity gets, on average, just under three times what a trainee manager in that charity gets. The most senior staff of this Synod, at least in 2001 when we produced our report, got just over three-and-a-half times that of a higher executive officer, which is the lowest level at which a person employed here is likely to be appointed as a clergyperson. Against the background of what the Church itself pays to its lay staff, the differentials that we pay to clergy are very modest – a little too modest, in my view, but that is another debate for another time.

In his paper, Mr Lilley rightly raises the issue of giving an example to the wider world. However, if we follow his motion, I can tell you how the wider world will view it. It will see us as romantic, idealistic and naive, and I am told by those who know the City of

London well that we should be considered particularly naive if we were to suggest that the issue be dealt with by expense accounts. We live in a world in which differentials in some areas of life are astronomical and, in my view, quite indefensible. It is far better for us to explain the modest differentials that we pay to clergy as a realistic way of valuing people's worth and work. We actually set a very good example by our present structure, which is responsible, ethical – biblical, I believe, when we look at that passage from 1 Timothy – and certainly defensible. It is far better to do that than to appear as naive romantics.

I therefore hope that Synod, whatever it does with the amendment, will overwhelmingly reject Mr Lilley's motion.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): I very much hope that Synod will carry Mr Lilley's motion. I say that for a number of reasons. I have read *Generosity and Sacrifice* with care and I remain unconvinced. I know the verse from 1 Timothy about elders and a double stipend. However, it seems to me that if we take the swathe of the New Testament, that is not where we shall be led. It appears to me extraordinary to think that the Apostles might have been paid more than the Seventy, for example, because their ministry was greater or more profitable than that for the gospel ministry. When we look at 2 Corinthians and the discussion about the collection for the Church in Jerusalem, Paul is clear that he must not appear to gain from the gospel. It can look as though that is happening now, just as it could then in the first century.

We are today debating clergy and clergy stipends. I am just not sure whether my ministry now is of more value to the kingdom, or indeed to the Church, than it was as a parish priest. I very rarely take funerals these days, and I know of the value that that gives to a family in which bereavements have taken place. I do not know whether the interviews that I conduct are of more value to the kingdom than those funerals. We have different gifts, not greater or lesser gifts, to be used in the service of the kingdom.

Bob Reiss referred to the motion as 'romantic, idealistic and naive'. Other Christian traditions usually manage very well without differentials. Differentials between clergy are an oddity within the Christian Church. A number of my Methodist colleagues have raised this as an issue that needs to be considered in terms of going further in the direction of the covenant. I do not think that Methodists are romantic, idealistic and naive, nor do I believe that we shall be if we pass Mr Lilley's motion.

There is in the present system an undoubted discouragement from moving posts. Differentials inevitably look as though they refer to merit rather than responsibility. Therefore, moving from a post with a differential to one without appears to be a demotion. I know that some find it very difficult to make those moves in the cause of the gospel and are not helped by a differential system. I believe that the motion as it appears before us speaks of Christian values, and I hope that we shall pass it.

I want to make one further comment as the chair of DRACSC, which will be landed

with the result of this motion if it is carried either in its original form or amended by Sallie Bassham's helpful amendment. If we seek to abolish differentials, there will be serious and significant legal and moral issues to be tackled. We in DRACSC have just been through all that as a result of the 2002 debate, and we would happily do so again if that is the direction in which Synod pushes us. I hope that Synod will do so and I look forward to helping in the carrying out of that work.

The Chairman: Before Ms Bassham speaks to her amendment, I will read it for the benefit of those who do not have with them the third notice paper. It is lengthy. Please bear with me. It reads:

‘After the word “Synod” *insert* the letter (a), *leave out* all words after “dignitaries” where it first occurs and *insert* the words “and others who are paid above the level for incumbents should be phased out; (b) call for action to achieve this by ensuring that where a post at present carries such a differential, any new holder of the post is appointed on a stipend equivalent to those for clergy of incumbent status, and that the annual stipend increases for any existing holder of such a post are restricted to the increase in the Retail Price Index (or the increase in the National Minimum Stipend, if lower) until the differential has been removed; and (c) ask the Archbishops’ Council to arrange for its Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee to consider in detail the steps that should be taken to implement this”.’

The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Ian Brackley): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. On the sixth notice paper we have a different amendment from the one that you have just read out.

The Chairman: Bishop, at the beginning of the debate I said that the amendment published on the sixth notice paper was incorrect and that we would revert to the one on the third notice paper, which is why I have read it to everyone. We will hear what Ms Bassham has to say and then I shall invite people to speak only to the amendment.

Ms Sallie Bassham (Bradford): If you are confused by all that lot, think how I felt when I arrived at half past two this afternoon, picked up the sixth notice paper and discovered that it did not contain the words that I was expecting.

First, I would like to thank all the staff members of the various departments who have worked to try to find the right words for what is intended by the amendment. Secondly, to repeat what Chris Lilley has already said, this is not intended to be a wrecking amendment. I support what he is trying to do. The amendment is intended to recognize that things have changed since November 2000, when the motion was first tabled, and that some of the issues have changed in the past three years. Indeed, the words of the amendment on today's third notice paper have been through many drafts – hence the confusion.

Before I continue, I should like to respond briefly to the archdeacon. I am a layperson. I may indeed be a goose; I have been called far worse things in my time. I also happen to be a lay Reader and, of course, lay Readers offer that ministry to the Church without any payment. Perhaps I am naive but, if I am idealistic, I am proud to be called idealistic.

The overall intent of this amendment is the same: it has not changed. The principles are to implement stipend differentials fairly, reasonably and equitably. Part (a) reiterates those principles, for the reasons already given and in GS Misc 738A, that differentials be phased out. Part (b) follows from the legal advice that was described in section 19 of GS Misc 738B. Freezing stipends for those who currently receive differentials would be not only unfair but would require consultation with all those affected, and there might be a challenge from someone. In addition, there might be a challenge from someone who had a legitimate expectation that when they took on a post with an increased differential they would also receive the further increases. Therefore, part (b) of the amendment follows option 19(iii) on page 11. Increases will continue – this is the annual inflation adjustment – according to the increases in the Retail Price Index or the increase in the National Minimum Stipend.

Incidentally, if you think that the grammar in (b) is a little odd because it refers to ‘a stipend equivalent to those for clergy of incumbent status’, it is because stipends vary slightly between different dioceses or regions to take account of local differences. Stipends that are intended to have the same overall purchasing power result in slightly varying incomes in different parts of the country.

Not only should someone who now receives a differential continue to receive it, but they should also continue to receive it if they move to another post. That is why there was an earlier draft, which was mistakenly printed in the sixth notice paper. We thought at first that that had taken care of it, but the legal department said that it had not. So if a diocesan bishop moves to another diocese, an archdeacon becomes a suffragan, a dean becomes a bishop, and all the rest of it, to be fair to those who currently receive differentials, they should be able to take their differentials with them to a new post. That is the reason for part (c), which asks the Archbishops’ Council to refer the matter to DRACSC. That committee has said that it is prepared to do the work. It can work with the legal department to achieve exactly the right wording and make recommendations. DRACSC would have no authority to implement it. The recommendations would go to the paying bodies.

I am aware that stipend differentials have been discussed previously. I believe that the fact that this Private Member’s Motion has attracted so many signatures so soon after the 1996 debate is significant. Together with the decision about rounding down differentials – think of it as a principle rather than the actual numbers – it indicates a trend in the thinking within the Church. I could speak as a layperson, but I have only five minutes. There are hardworking parish clergy who never expect to be in a post with a differential, and in recent months I have listened to quite a number of them since my interest in this Private Member’s Motion has been known. Those having differentials

should remember that parish clergy tend not to express their feelings on this issue to those in authority in their dioceses, their line managers, those who receive differentials.

I turn to the final point in GS Misc 738A. Everyone should receive proper reimbursement for their working costs. This is another change in culture. Chris Lilley has already referred to the Mellows report. Bishops' working costs are now published annually. Those publications list overall categories and broad details. However, both Chris Lilley and I are members of the Bishops and Cathedrals Committee. As a result, we know much more about the details of bishops' working costs and we are convinced that extra costs can be fairly dealt with by means of expenses, which we believe is the correct method, rather than by means of differentials.

I hope that Synod will support my amendment and Chris Lilley's Private Member's Motion.

Revd Chris Lilley (Lincoln): I have already indicated that I support the amendment. I want only to say that, whichever way you intend to vote on the substantive motion, I would ask you to vote in favour of the amendment, because we then would have a sensible motion on which to make a final decision.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Kenneth Stevenson): I rise somewhat reluctantly because I am speaking in the presence of Chris Lilley, whose parents were parishioners of mine many years ago and because it is about money, about which some of my colleagues will say I am not a great expert. I shall therefore speak with a lay voice. It is good that money is discussed. However, I think that the focus of this debate is on the hierarchy rather than on the lay staff, where, as Archdeacon Reiss has said, the differentials in the Church are modest.

The question of differentials and expenses has been raised. I remain unconvinced that our working costs can be made up through expenses. This is a sensitive area, about which not only the House of Bishops is becoming slightly concerned in the public war of innuendo. I question what Chris Lilley said earlier about this. I do not think that it would be right to do it on the basis of working costs: it would be open to abuse. I think that Synod needs to realize that the Stipends Review Group was unanimous about retaining differentials.

Perhaps I may speak as a former parish priest about differentials. When I was a university chaplain in Manchester, the rates picked up the cost of the music teaching from which my children benefited. We then moved to Guildford and immediately got into debt because that music teaching carried on in an authority that did not pay for it. It seems to me that the cost of living in this country is increasing to such an extent that this motion and the amendment, though very well intentioned, will not actually address the issues that they are intended to address.

Finally, I question somewhat the way in which the adjective ‘biblical’ is bandied about. Some people use that adjective to support all manner of things. I do not find in the Bible 100 per cent support for what we are being asked to address. The amendment focuses too much on the hierarchy and not enough on the whole area, which includes laypeople and our lay staff.

The Chairman: After the next speaker, I would like to hear from Canon Baker, who has some financial information to present.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells): I find the amendment very helpful and I believe that it makes the motion sensible. However, unfortunately, I would like Synod to vote against the motion.

It is clear to me that different people do different things, which are valued to a greater or lesser extent by various members of the society in which we live. I have two people in mind. Most of you will be aware that my brother and I are remarkably different. A couple of years ago, some of our mutual friends in Synod nearly suffered apoplexy when on one occasion we were seen going through the same lobby door on a division. It was obviously one of those voting-against-sin motions that we have from time to time!

My brother is a priest and I am mathematician. Throughout the history of our respective callings, he has had the benefit of a stipend to release him to be what he can be, and I get nothing. Similarly, through the arrows of outrageous fortune, he gets a stipend when engaged as a stipendiary priest or bishop and I get a larger salary by virtue of being employed as an IT governance analyst. It is, of course, a game of great consequences. Over the years I have been blessed to pay for my own house out of my salary and he has to live in the modest accommodation to which the bishops of Chichester have become accustomed! (*Laughter*) Similarly, over the years both of us have moved into positions of different responsibility. Each time that I have been promoted, I have been granted a salary that is market driven. My firm does not pay a penny over what it has to for anything. I am paid the salary that I receive because that is what my company believes it has to pay to attract the right talent for the role.

As an aside, let us knock out the idea of pensions differentials being considered separately. Pension is deferred pay and, as such, should be linked to pay. When people retire, they have built a lifestyle based on that pay and it must be sustainable through retirement. Pension will be just a natural consequence. The question here is whether the Church should be any different.

Theologically, and politically for that matter, I have a great deal of sympathy for the motion. I believe that it would be a great idea for everyone to be provided for equally. It would be wonderful to think that everyone might be motivated to strive to do their best, with the only differential incentive being their own self-motivation or the accolade that they receive from their peers. However, life is not like that. Some people are self-motivated, others are lazy; some are obedient, some are reluctant.

I am not a great one for selective text ping-pong. We have already heard about 1 Timothy 5.17. What about Luke 10.4-7 and the Seventy, which Bishop John has already mentioned – ‘carry neither purse . . .’ and ‘the labourer is worthy of his hire’ – which seems to indicate that there should be no stipend at all? I think the 24 went out the week previously and also received the same.

Revd Canon Bob Baker (Norwich): I want to make a financial comment on behalf of the Archbishops’ Council. Before I do, the mover of the motion congratulated you on your commissioning but he might also have congratulated the legal officer on your left on her recent ordination to the diaconate. (*Applause*)

Under Standing Order 98, I need to refer members of Synod to the fifth notice paper, paragraphs 15–18. There are some very substantial financial implications, of the order of around £4 million. Whilst it would take many years for this amount to be realized in full, savings at this level need to be taken very seriously, whilst recognizing that there are of course also other arguments to be considered.

Mr Crocker’s amendment is not expected to give rise to any savings to the Church overall but would not either involve any increased cost to the Church as a whole.

I must urge Synod to reflect carefully on the financial implications when deciding how to vote on this motion.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The Chairman: We will progress then to a vote on the amendment and I hope that Synod does not require me to read it again.

The amendment was put and carried.

The Chairman: Mr Crocker’s amendment therefore falls. We continue to debate the main motion.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr John Higginbotham (Leicester): I think one of the oddities of this motion is the question ‘Is there any profession in which some differentials do not reflect seniority, responsibility and the pressures of office?’ These are very considerable.

It can be argued that the ministry of the Church should be unworldly, it should be the exception as its motivating factor is a sense of calling and not of material reward, but

surely this is reflected in the current state of affairs. I cannot think of any other profession which has a flatter structure, with the chief executive receiving £60,000 a year, area managers little more than half that sum, barely twice the amount of that received by the worker on the shop floor. I do not see any fat cat syndrome here. It can, of course, be argued that the Church is top heavy with administrators. Indeed, there is a widespread feeling that the real work is done by the parish priests on the ground and that too many are in specially created posts devoted to administering this, that or the other perceived need, but this is surely an argument for cutting down the number of top brass rather than their remuneration?

What it all amounts to is this, that in a world obsessed with material rewards in which people are too often rated by what they earn, the Church should seek the moral high ground of not being attracted purely by money. My contention is that this is already done. Bishops are not over-rewarded. Anyone who compares the standard of living of Dr Proudly with that of Mr Quiverful would be impressed by the chasm between the two, but differentials have been greatly eroded over the years. In 1835 a bishop received 16 times that of a parish priest. By 1939, a diocesan bishop's stipend was six times that of a parish priest. Now, as we have seen, the ratio is less than two to one.

The report *Resourcing Bishops* referred in its chairman's preface to increasing public criticism of bishops, much of which was ill-informed, and an awareness that 'there is only a partial understanding of what bishops do and of the present arrangement by which they are rewarded'.

I suggest that we revisit this document. It deserves further in-depth study before we revise the current stipend structures. Now is not the time.

Mr Richard Rand (Winchester): Madam Chairman, essentially I support the previous speaker but come from a slightly different angle. I would like to suggest that we should get real. The clergy here at General Synod by their very nature are probably the crème de la crème of the clergy of our parishes! Having said that, may I suggest that there are some hopelessly inadequate clergy across the land: I suggest that you should be realistic and think about that. I know there are some like that. I do suggest that the average man and woman in the ordinary pew of our parishes would be appalled to think that their bishop, their dean, their archdeacon, might be paid at the same rate, however inadequate that may be, as some of those hopeless local parsons. They will, I suggest, think it an insult, so I urge rejection of this afternoon's unrealistic motion.

Mrs Vivienne Goddard (Blackburn): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

The Chairman: We are very constrained for time and I would welcome this motion for closure. I ask Synod if they will accept that.

This motion was put and lost.

The Chairman: Thank you, Synod, for making my life very easy. I will try one more speech at least.

Revd Canon Peter Ballard (Blackburn): Chris Lilley said that we are looking for equality. May I just say that this proposal will not bring equality. First of all, it will take at least 20 years for it to work itself out of the system, by which time we will probably be forced by the Government to have employment legislation which is nearer to that for the laity, but by then someone would be able to go to an employment tribunal and say, 'You cannot pay somebody less for doing the same job', and they would win.

Secondly, dioceses fix stipends. There is no equality: we have one diocese that now pays well above the recommendations of the stipends authority. (I will not embarrass my training incumbent, who has already spoken.) Thirdly, why are we defaulting to the lowest common denominator? Why do we always have to look to go down? Is it because we are a Church managing decline and we cannot look the other way? Perhaps what we should be saying is that our aspiration is to pay everybody what we pay a diocesan bishop. (*Applause*)

There is, however, no equality in this because the conditions of appointment are different for so many posts. If you happen to be a diocesan residentiary canon, your settling-in allowance is that of an archdeacon and an incumbent. If you happen to be a dean or to be appointed by the Commissioners, it is four times that. There is no equality.

There is the question about wanting equality. At the moment, we publish bishops' expenses but presumably if bishops are paid the same as incumbents, everybody's expenses will have to be published so that we can see exactly what everybody is given. I expect there is a financial implication in that. It would not be fair just for bishops to have their expenses published.

Finally, as we live in the real world, what will happen if differentials are removed? Differentials actually protect the system. They allow us to advertise sector ministers' jobs as residentiary canons or as archdeacons and all at lay salaries. There will not be a sector minister in this land who would take an incumbent stipend when the equivalent lay stipend is £45,500. This protects us from that position. All that will happen if we remove differentials and make everybody the same is that we will end up like the rest of the world, including schools, and dioceses will be saying, 'If we offer you a bit more, will you come?' That is because we want the best person to do the job. It will be a complete free-for-all.

I urge the Synod to vote against this. I understand Chris Lilley's ideas and his sentiments but this will prove to be disastrous.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin (London): My daughter recently asked me how much I earned so that she could fill out her form for university, and I honestly could not tell her because it is not something that I look at. The paper comes and it goes into the file.

I am seriously concerned and disappointed that we have this motion before us at this time when we stopped an outward-looking motion earlier on to make time for this. I do not believe that we need to create differentials in order to make ourselves credible to society and the world. In order to do that, we must live the gospel and love all the people of God whom God has given us to serve.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

Revd Chris Lilley, in reply: I thank the Synod for a good, if short, debate. I only have time to respond to one or two of the speakers. I start with the Archdeacon of Surrey and the difficult question of 1 Timothy 5.17, which various translators treat in different ways. It is not only the question of whether it is double honour or double consideration or double stipend but who should be getting it. I think in these cases it should be all presbyters if there is a double stipend in there anywhere.

There were several comments about the question of working costs and the implication that working costs could be increased in order to compensate. I would strongly resist that. Working costs should be those that are incurred, genuine costs for everybody, whatever the issue.

Tim Hind touched on housing and the difficulty of buying a house once his brother moves out of his humble dwelling. Most clergy are going to be in that situation on retirement: it is no easier for parish clergy than it is for bishops.

Do we have a fat cat syndrome? I do not think anybody actually suggested that we do. I said myself that the stipend differentials are extremely modest by commercial standards, but I do not think that that should be our standard.

Revd David Griffiths (Manchester): Would it be in order to ask for this to be voted on by Houses?

The Chairman: I will need 25 members of Synod to stand if you require a vote by Houses. There are 25 members standing. We will therefore have a vote by Houses.

Revd Dr Simon Cox (Blackburn): On a point of order, Chairman, we are out of time.

The Chairman: We are not out of time, I am afraid. As long as the process begins, then we are able to continue. At least 30 seconds of the process has now begun.

Dr Yvonne Warren (Rochester): On a point of order, I would like to put on the record that most of our laypeople are extremely happy with their clergy who are back at home and we thank God for them.

The motion as amended was put and the chairman, pursuant to SO 36(c) ordered a division by Houses, with the following result:

| | Ayes | Noes |
|---------|------|------|
| Bishops | 5 | 14 |
| Clergy | 66 | 98 |
| Laity | 47 | 147 |

The motion was therefore lost.

THE CHAIR *The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (Ven. Clive Mansell)* took the Chair at 5.05 p.m.

Alternative Sources of Funding (GS 1541 and GS 1541A)

The Chairman: Members of Synod, GS 1541 was prepared by the Bishop of Chelmsford. There is no name in the document itself. The fifth notice paper, paragraphs 11–14, sets out the initial information on financial considerations.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd John Gladwin): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod, noting the recommendations summarized in Appendix A to GS 1541A and the concerns set out in GS 1541:

- (a) believe that a reduction of residential places for married ordinands requiring significant family support should not now be pursued;
- (b) affirm the value of the present arrangements for funding ordination training and decline to support the changes canvassed in GS 1451A;
- (c) affirm its support for an increase of £750,000 in the funding of CME 1–3 which will become an integral part of initial ministerial education and training; and
- (d) invite the Archbishops’ Council, after consultation with the dioceses and others, to bring further proposals to the February 2005 group of sessions for how the funds for this additional spending might best be raised and channelled from September 2006.’

We are here dealing with this issue this afternoon as a direct result of the motions passed last July. Let me remind Synod of the principle which lies behind the issue in front of us.

That is the one we accepted last year that formation for ministry and training within that is seen as one continuing reality from vocation through to the completion of CME 1–4.

The original report that we debated last summer wanted to see some shifting of resources on that one line towards CME1–4. To that end, it proposed reducing the numbers in colleges by 75 places and to use the funds so saved, which were estimated to be £1 million, into that work.

Last summer the Synod refused to endorse that part of the recommendation of the original report and asked for us to do further work to see how else the funding could be organized. As a result, Dr Turnbull was asked to produce alternative proposals, and these are before Synod in the report attached to GS 1541, namely GS 1541A.

The Archbishops' Council, when it discussed this report, was sympathetic to these proposals. When, however, they came to the College of Bishops in June, it is fair to say, using a D-Day image, that they ran into the Panzer division of the Bishops.

Many of the bishops who spoke with considerable concern about these proposals are people who have immediate responsibility for candidates and their families; they have considerable experience in theological training, many having run theological courses and colleges; and of course they work very closely with their DDOs. It was therefore, in the light of that discussion, thought unwise to come to Synod with these proposals on their own in the face of such deep anxiety.

That is not to say that there is not widespread appreciation, and my own personal appreciation, to Dr Turnbull and his team for the work that they have done. He has helped us clarify the issues and brought us to a key point where we do, this afternoon, have to make some decisions. I want to put on record, as chair of the Division, my real appreciation to Dr Turnbull for the work that he has done.

There are three things on which we need decisions. First, it is proposed in the motion that we remove at this Synod the idea of meeting these costs by reducing the number of residential places. That is bedrock to Dr Turnbull's proposals and I have to say that I hope the Synod will clearly endorse that principle. One of the outcomes which I, as chair of the Division, am looking for in establishing these new arrangements is more security for our colleges and courses enabling real, long-term development to take place.

The second thing on which we need to make a decision is this. The proposal before Synod this afternoon is that we do not alter the present system of funding students in ordination training. That is the meaning of the motion in front of us. That means that the Synod is being asked in this motion to resist the idea of adding in a voluntary contribution to the structure of the funding of students' training. It is for the Synod to decide that this afternoon. There are amendments which will help us to test Synod's mind.

If I may add a comment in relationship to the proposals in GS 1541A, every contribution made by parishes and individuals to support candidates in training and to help develop the resources of our theological colleges and courses is hugely welcome. There are some very welcome challenges in these proposals and also a challenge, if I may say so again, which we continually need to hear in our Church, to our stewardship. What is being resisted by the bishops is making those proposals part of the whole structure of the funding of students, and thus the formal provisions for student training have to take place without these considerations. That is the issue on which Synod must make a decision this afternoon.

Thirdly, as members will see from GS 1541, further work has indicated that, working on the same system as we have at present, there is an estimated funding gap in meeting the Church of England costs as a result of this of £450,000.

May I underline that it is not proposed to change the system? We have always taken into account, in working out maintenance costs, what students are entitled to from the public purse; there is nothing new in that part of the proposal. Child tax credits have meant a substantial increase in help to our students from the public purse, and we should be grateful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for that. We hold on to the principle that in addition to that we have to ensure that all students have what they need to meet their maintenance costs, and that remains the bedrock principle behind the structure of the way these arrangements have been administered thus far: that is where the extra £300,000 estimate comes from.

Because this does not impact until the last part of 2006, and only in a full year in 2007, we do not today have to settle how this gap is to be met either from the dioceses or from Vote 1. Indeed, we may find that with further work – and I shall comment on this later – we might be able to square this financial circle anyway. What we do have to do, if Synod agrees to the first two proposals, which are not to reduce the numbers and to hold to the present system of funding students in training, is to ask for work to be done on the detailed financial arrangements involved. I would ask the Synod this afternoon, please, not to box us in to any particular solution if members choose to support that approach. It is possible, with hard work and attention to detail, that we might get closer to squaring this financial circle than we are now. There is encouragement in these papers. We have done pretty well thus far in working on the detail, because over 50 per cent of the expected cost has been found in the work done in the last 12 months. We are asking for a little bit more time, to February 2005, to do some more work.

To sum up: one, we want to give our institutions security; two, we want to give our students clarity about our commitment to meet their training costs; and three, we want to give our financial people space to settle the matter by February 2005.

As chair of the Division, I am enormously grateful to everyone for the hard work, energy and commitment put into these matters. I ask the Synod now to help us make these decisions so that we can get on with the final tasks surrounding this matter.

The Chairman: Members of Synod, I ask for your help on this because we have a lot to try to get through. Please keep speeches focused on the topic of the main business today and not on the wider area of the Hind report. After the first couple of speeches, I shall be asking for a financial statement on behalf of the Archbishops' Council and then asking you to focus on the first group of amendments. If you look at the notice paper, you will find the amendments according to various groups. We will deal with the first group of amendments, and then we will move on to the second group of amendments, and then on to the later ones after that, and then back to the main motion.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mrs Margaret Cosh (Hereford): I am a representative of this House on the WMMTC Governors. I want to link what I have to say with the comments of the Bishop of Durham on Friday. I refer in particular to the recommendations 17, 18 and 24 of the report concerning funding implications for parishes. I am also a churchwarden and I cannot let the opportunity go by without flagging up what churchwardens might think about the parish partnerships, the Archbishops' letter to parishes and the contribution from the training parishes. I think this also needs to be linked with other financial implications which are not terribly clear yet, but they are in the Mawer report, which has not yet come before our House. The Mawer report was a prescriptive report which ties us into certain methods of working. I am concerned about the financial implications of that.

I was at a meeting of the WMMTC governors recently and it became very clear that the work that they have to do, even at this early stage, in implementing the report is taking extra hours on top of the hours that the administrative staff are already doing, some of them up to 70 hours a week.

Having flagged up those issues, I would also like to make a suggestion. The Church Commissioners are looking for mission projects. If they do manage to save some money without withdrawing more from the parish share or their contribution to the parishes, what better project than to help the implementation of our new training system?

Mr Philip Lovegrove (St Albans): May I take Synod back to the old time when 27 years ago a young member of this Synod had a dream. It was a green field and on the field were 43 paralyzed purple rabbits surrounded by ABM, ACCM and a financial crisis and we were looking for training funds of a further £100,000. The nightmare recurred last night except that it is £1 million and we seem to be in a terrible state about it. I cannot think why.

Never in my 34 years, now ceased, as a chairman of a diocesan board of finance – a good thing he has gone – has anybody ever in a treasurers' meeting complained about training costs; about dumbos on whom the money is spent who turn up in parishes maybe, but never about training costs. The parishes are prepared to find the money. Of course the money is piffling, about £12 million actually, half the General Synod budget, and that

pales into insignificance against pensions costs of £105 million that the Commissioners fund and £23 million on stipends. It is absolutely extraordinary that we get ourselves into such a muddle over such a pathetic sum of money, and suddenly the £1 million is halved because we found £0.5 million in a back pocket somewhere. What an extraordinary way to carry on a business!

May I say to my good friend John Gladwin, who is now Bishop of Chelmsford: is the jacuzzi all right? Sit in it a bit longer, Bishop, and we might get through this! We have £14 million in the Central Church Fund, which nets us about £500,000 per annum, of which this Synod gets £230,000 to keep the costs down. Why we do not use some of the capital, I have no idea. There ought to be a review of this CHARM £3 million which is going to be stood up by the dioceses for pensions. May I ask you to look in the Church Commissioners' accounts. The CHARM scheme was a loss leader for years, it is now a substantial profit earner in both capital and income terms. There is £3 million which should be charged to the CHARM scheme out of the profits of the scheme, which will allow the dioceses to have at least access to, or not to have to pay, that sort of money. They could all find £1 million out of £3 million because even in a jacuzzi you do not need rocket science to work it!

We have the Parish Mission Fund at £754,000. Some dioceses have not even used it all up yet. Salisbury even sent it back! I am not surprised. The bishop is retiring, is he not? They have offered us not £10 million over three years but another £4.5 million for mission projects. Surely a few bursaries to a few students going to college for training would not come amiss? It would hardly break the bank, would it? Here we are in the budget tomorrow with suddenly the dioceses having to find from the parishes £160,000 for regional training partnerships, another layer of bureaucracy that has arrived out of the blue, just like that. If you scrub that sort of stuff, there would be another £160,000 to help out. Have a look around at some of the capital sums held by dioceses on the sale of old colleges of higher education. Try Hockerill in St Albans: £6 million of capital assets, earns £300,000 per annum and that is frittered away on brilliant lectures from bishops in the centre of London or something. It is just absolutely amazing the money we have and find in our back pockets, the money we waste and the time now wasted pootling around for £1 million for training the future of the Church. (*Applause*)

Canon Bob Baker (Norwich), in reply: Calm down! You did not come here to enjoy yourselves!

Chairman, I have to make a financial comment under SO 98. I need to refer members of Synod to paragraphs 11–14 of the fifth notice paper. This points to a potential funding gap of up to £450,000 a year that would open up if the motion is passed with (a) and (b) as drafted. If it did not prove possible to find expenditure savings within Vote 1, this would represent an additional cost to the Church, and, if alternative funding was not found, then this amount would have to be added to Vote 1. The Archbishops' Council has turned out its back pockets: we have not got any more, I am afraid.

Revd John Cook (London): I want to thank those who produced *Alternative Sources of Funding*. The whole report is thorough-going in its analysis; it is wide in its consultation and research and undergirded by a vision for theological education. It was Tony Thiselton who said to us in an amendment 'do not reduce residential training by 75 places and make sure you keep the family support until alternative funding has been investigated'. We have now done that and what we have is very creative indeed.

As the Foreword says, it is essential that the Church articulates a clear vision for its theological training and then subsequently sets out with clarity the methods available for funding the vision. The problem is at 14(b) of the Bishop of Chelmsford's proposal. AOCM, the colleges and the Archbishops' Council are all in favour of this report. It picks up the challenges posed by the Archbishop of York on Saturday morning when he said, 'What can we do together to make things better?'

This report galvanizes the whole body of Christ to work together as one voice. I am left wondering why the House of Bishops is so reluctant about it. We have the other ways of funding laid out for us here. If the Synod declines to support the changes canvassed in GS 1541A, in effect what we are doing is to set the policy without the resources. That is quite an extraordinary way to go about things.

The partnership is a good way ahead. Already some dioceses are finding that useful in planning their mission and their work. I want to focus on self-contribution on page 19. This happens already with mission agencies and across the Anglican Communion. I think it is scaremongering to say, as GS 1451 does, that there is something which indicates a contract if people contribute. I asked a couple of very senior lawyers and they all said what nonsense that is. Apparently when the bishops met they were concerned about the links with the current English education system and funding for those from a poorer background to go on to further education. This report has a very important bit where it reminds us that those who are unable to find the £250 would have a way of doing it; they could appeal against it and other money could be found. We must not lose alternative ways of funding.

It seems to me that to try and put the money needed on to the national diocesan budget is untenable. Having asked for the work to be done and having a way ahead, we need to follow it through in some measure today. We have a lot of money. The problem and the challenge is that it is in people's pockets. I have yet to hear, as Philip Lovegrove said, the people in the parishes complain about the money for theological education and ministerial training.

The report is very careful, on page 3 at 2.12, to make sure there is a genuine hardship fund to sort out where there are problems. For ordinands to find, say, £250 a year is good preparation for the ordained ministry. Of course in Christian ministry there is costly service, there is giving, and not just in time and effort but in monetary terms. It was Jesus who said, in Luke 6.38, 'Give, and it shall be given to you; good measure, pressed down, overflowing'. It is also important to notice that this talks about equal

applicability of the alternative funding from various sources to non-residential and OLM ordinands as well as residential. That keeps a oneness and catholicity of the ordained ministry.

The House of Bishops, I am sorry to say, has really made no proposals to fund the £1 million required, except to put it on the national diocesan budget, which is the same thing. Without alternative funding, there are some dioceses which will inevitably need to put their resources long-term into non-residential training, and in some cases that will weaken their training. Someone described this to me the other day as death by salami tactics. Does the right hand really know what the left hand is doing?

Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I want to thank the legal department for arranging the amendments for me. This must be something of a record because I only submitted two and they gave me four: three to be debated now and one later. I really wish at this point I could change at least one of them to do what Mr Lovegrove says. I am sure the Bishop of Birmingham would approve but I do not want to give Ingrid apoplexy at this point. I think that is the thrust of what we have already decided.

My aim is clarity. Synod asked for this report. It is only right that it should comment on its conclusions and direct the Ministry Division in the implementation and funding of *Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church*, the artist formerly known as Hind.

My second aim is to save time and money. At (d) we request the Archbishops' Council to bring forward fresh proposals. This would mean another group covering the same ground. Let us keep the report and let the new group just concentrate on finding the cash. My fourth amendment gives such a group a big hint where else we might get it.

What do we have to do? If we vote for the amendment at paragraph 37, we will get the report but without self-contribution by ordinands. If we vote for 38, we will get the report but without the partnership schemes with parishes for CME 1–3. If we vote for 39, we will get the report but without both self-contribution and partnership schemes. I leave it to others to debate the merits of the two proposals. All my contacts are divided on the issue. Some think that self-contribution brings us into line with other training agencies like the Church Army, whereas others think that asking for £500 per year per ordinand is asking too much of those who are already making considerable sacrifices. Some think that parish partnership is essential for safeguarding CME 1–3 from being gobbled up by other things; yet others think that parish partnerships will lead to an inflexibility in placing curates in the right parishes for them.

Synod should decide and, in deciding, indicate what sort of funding is appropriate, fair and sustainable. The point is that Synod should decide.

The Chairman: We are trying to vote on this part of the main motion at paragraph (b) and the amendments addressing it. Please confine your remarks to that if possible.

Revd Simon Bessant (Blackburn): I want to say thank you to the House of Bishops for saying ‘No’ to this because I think it is a mistake in terms of funding. I want to speak further against recommendation 9, £500 per ordinand. My last parish was a UPA council estate on the outskirts of Blackburn. In seven years, we produced four ordinands for stipendiary ministry and that was costly to them. Amongst those, one was unemployed and two had non-working spouses with children at home. How would they have paid £500 or £250? I think it would have been quite inappropriate. Section 7.31 talks about supply teaching rapidly catching up with that. Not all our ordinands are professionals, nor should they be. Nor should we assume that it is normative for them to be professionals. It would have been very costly to them under this new system individually and to us as a church. We gave away four ordinands and we gave joyfully and gladly, but it cost us a lot, not financially but we were giving away some of our best people. We gave joyfully but to have to have paid for it would have been adding insult to injury.

Secondly, and I am Director for CME 1–4 in my diocese: as for recommendation 24 about the receiving training parishes helping to pay, under the new training regime (I will not call it ‘Hind’ because of Tim Hind’s earlier speech) training parishes will see far less of their curates than they do now. They will be in ongoing training; they will be going off on courses; they will be at home writing assignments. They are still in training, much more so than they have been in the past. To ask those parishes not only to lose their curates for quite a lot of the time but also to pay for that I think is unrealistic. Moreover, I think some parishes will turn round and say, ‘If we are paying for it, we will choose the courses they go on.’ That, too, would have its dangers.

When we train people for ordination, we train them for ministry to the whole Church, not just to parts of it. If their ministry is to the whole Church, then the whole Church should pay for the training.

Revd Prebendary John Brownsell (London): When I first read the report that Dr Turnbull had produced, my heart rose. I thought, ‘At last, some real proposals that will allow us as individuals and parishes to have a real connection with what is going on in our training institutes, to take some responsibility and to be part of it.’ Then I read what I have to describe as the very pusillanimous response from our bishops – not for the first time, as Mr Lovegrove reminded us – that we might frighten off potential candidates and so on, and my heart sank again.

I speak as the incumbent of a parish that is a training parish which has had many curates over the years. At present it is hosting a student in training on placement. I have sent many ordinands into training over the past 20 years. We long to have more involvement in what is going on, and we are happy to pay for it. We would like to pay for it and know where it is going, not just to have yet another amount added on to the general budget but to know that we can direct the money that is going to the cause to which we want it to go. Nobody ever complains about paying for training. Yes, they sometimes complain

about the results of what they have paid for but they do not complain about paying for it.

Secondly, from my discussions with those in training at the moment, I do not think it at all unreasonable to set a target for those who offer themselves for training, particularly if it is at the very modest level that the bishops now suggest would be necessary of only £250. That represents a real commitment by those who are going into training and, yes, the safety net will be there. In fact, it already is there because quite a lot of sources of funding are briefly mentioned as being available to ordinands now to relieve their hardship. If the Ministry Division, the bishops, even DDOs – and as a former DDO I know – think that all the money coming from those sources is declared in order that it can be taken off the grant that is given from central funds, then they are living in fantasy land – not because people are dishonest but because they know that the intention of those funds was to relieve hardship, to add extra funds to what is being provided as a basis. In any case, when the grant is calculated, the ordinands do not know what amount of money they are going to get. They have no guarantee that they are going to get anything, but they will apply and they will continue to apply. Those I have spoken to about this would be content if the £250 were to form part of that, if they were not required to declare all those other sources of income, like the gifts they get from families at the moment. £250 is a very modest amount. Nobody who cannot rise to that kind of challenge is going to be able to rise to many of the challenges that face us in ministry today.

I do urge Synod to vote for the report as it stands and not for the weak and lily-livered response of our bishops.

Revd John Cook (London): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out* paragraph (b) and *insert*:

“(b) approve the recommendations in the report *Alternative Sources of Funding* (GS 1541A), noting the possibility that the level of self-contribution could be set at £250 per annum”.’

The Chairman: Will the Bishop take the chance on this and include comments on the alternative amendments, if possible, in the event that they may come before the Synod?

The Bishop of Chelmsford: These amendments give the Synod the choice. Those who believe that it is the Church’s responsibility to fund the training of those who are entering into ordination out of its own funds and believe, with Mr Lovegrove, that it is our responsibility to find those, will vote against these amendments. Those who think the time has come to introduce a voluntary contribution from the student and the possibility of parish partnerships, will vote for whichever amendment attracts them. It is the view of the bishops that we should continue with the present arrangement and it is

our collective responsibility to fund our students in that way, but it is for the Synod now to decide.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd John Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I beg to move:

‘Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

“(b) approve the recommendations in the report *Alternative Sources of Funding* (GS 1541A) other than those summarized in Appendix A to the report as recommendations 9–12 (on self-contribution)”.’

The Chairman: The Bishop does not wish to make further comment on this. This item is now open to debate. I see nobody standing.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd John Alderton-Ford: I beg to move:

‘Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

“(b) approve the recommendations in the report *Alternative Sources of Funding* (GS 1541A) other than those summarized in Appendix A to the report as recommendations 13–18 (on partnership schemes with parishes)”.’

The Chairman: There is no comment from the Bishop.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd John Alderton-Ford: I beg to move:

‘Leave out paragraph (b) and insert:

“(b) approve the recommendations in the report *Alternative Sources of Funding* (GS 1541A) other than those summarized in Appendix A to the report as recommendations 9–12 (on self-contribution) and 13–18 (on partnership schemes with parishes)”.’

The Chairman: There is no comment from the Bishop.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman: We move to the next cluster of amendments, which relate to paragraphs (c) and (d) of the main motion. There was some conversation before the order paper was drawn up by those wishing to propose amendments to try and bring them together to assist the Synod, and I am grateful for that.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Salisbury): Mr Chairman, on the way back from York city centre this afternoon, I saw a very strange sight. It was a cart full of hay and instead of the horse being in front of it and pulling it, it was pushing from behind. Of course this caused some inconvenience because the poor horse and its driver could not actually see where they were going. It also caused some anxiety because the horse was not sure what was happening. It was getting very frustrated, and indeed it was beginning to look as though it was feeling rather angry. I asked the man driving the horse why he had done it this way and he explained to me, 'Well, I am afraid it is my neighbour who wanted the cart in the right place by a certain time. I did not have time to hitch the horse up in the front properly, and, besides, I wanted to eliminate any uncertainty as to where we were going.'

It seems to me that if we accept this recommendation with any financial figures in it we are doing exactly the same as that man: we are putting the cart before the horse. The reason for this is something we discovered in the *Alternative Sources of Funding* group, of which I was a member. I am disappointed that we have not had a chance properly to consider the report itself and debate it. One of the things we discovered was to do with the £1 million figure that was quoted in Hind. All the figures that we have before us – £750,000, £450,000 and its relationship with the £300,000 quoted – are based on the original figure of £1 million. We discovered at least two, and probably three, serious problems with that calculation. In the first place – and those who have the original report might like to look at it at paragraph 7.29 – the calculation is made specifically on the basis that all incumbents will need to have degrees in theology before being incumbents. You may remember that in July last year Synod specifically rescinded that proposal. Therefore, the calculation is based on a mistaken premise. Secondly, the figure was calculated on the basis of what it would cost to deliver training at the right level to enable those people to have degrees in theology. In the group we found that this figure too was ill-advised; it did not take proper account of training currently happening in dioceses at that kind of level and what the actual costs are.

Now, of course, as the process has continued, there is a third problem and that is that it makes no reference to discussions that are currently going on in the two groups that are considering curriculum. We have a figure, and all figures based on it, which has not properly been considered. Has Synod previously, I wonder, made decisions about the allocation of several hundreds of thousands of pounds without having a clear idea about

what the money is for? Philip Lovegrove would probably say that, yes, they do it all the time. I would like to think not.

It seems to me, Mr Chairman, that this is an extremely unwise way to go ahead. In fact, it is more than unwise; it is irresponsible. My amendment simply says that we should not put a figure on it. What we need to do before we can allocate the money to CME is to know what is being proposed. I am not suggesting here that we pick through the details of proposed curricula line by line. In the original report, the Hind report, a significant change is being proposed to the structure and ideology of training for the second part of initial ministry education. We need to know what that is going to look like before we know how we should fund it. I ask members please to vote for my amendment if they think we should know what we are doing before we decide how much money we spend to do it. Please vote for my amendment if they think that horses should go before carts and not push them from behind.

Mr Michael Chamberlain (Archbishops' Council, ex officio): Philip Lovegrove's amusing and disarmingly simple analysis and solution to the finances of the Church of England make me wonder what I have been doing since I have been chairman of the Finance Committee from 1999! Unfortunately, this is not related to the reality of the position in which we now find ourselves.

My amendment seeks to ground the consideration of funding and the possible options within the original and primary reason for the Hind exercise. Whatever its terms of reference may have said, the catalyst for the report was the increasingly articulated concern about the inexorable rise in Vote 1 at the time that the numbers coming forward for training were falling and a significant number of places at some theological colleges remained unfilled. Those financial concerns have not abated. Indeed, as Synod well knows from the press and will hear from me tomorrow, these concerns have increased, and there is a growing resistance to the level of apportionment.

I believe that the overriding objective achieved by Hind was to provide a model for first-class training within an acceptable financial framework. It allowed both for increased training as well as for some inefficiencies to be adjusted gradually for the sake of our theological institutions. It was all of a piece, carefully balanced.

The suggestion that the Commissioners' money might be used to cover the funding gap does not achieve anything except shuffling money around. In my view the motion before us this afternoon, if passed, could lead to the destruction of that balance: additional spending without corresponding savings or new funding, therefore increasing the per capita cost of training. That is not what was intended. If the way forward is perceived to be that there shall be no reduction in the particular area of residential places, then unless other sources of income can be found, other proposed areas of expenditure with Vote 1 should be revisited so that the original objectives are achieved. My amendment seeks to ensure that we go down that route.

Revd Dr Mike Parsons (Gloucester): Thank you very much for the opportunity to add to this. We should ask ourselves what we need to do. The Hind report initially wanted incumbents to be of graduate level before becoming an incumbent; that requirement was removed. However, it is still important that the form of training offered to our curates is consistent and delivers the value that we require. I speak as a director of ordinands and also as a director of curate training but I am happy to be able to tell you that not only do we not need the £1 million but we do not need £750,000 and we do not need £450,000 either because a number of dioceses are already delivering exactly that. At present, part of the outcome of CME 1–4 in various dioceses is that incumbents end up with a Masters’ level qualification, should they desire to put in the final bits of work to do that. That is delivered within their existing diocesan budget, and indeed in some cases with levered Higher Education Funding Council funding coming back through their higher education institution such that the library books and resources for it are provided by the HEI and not by the diocese.

We have to look into all these things before we can possibly ask what sort of funding we require, which is why this amendment is important. We do need some form of structure so that we can get away from the comments that were made about the funding working party. I found quite appalling the number of students in theological colleges who turned round and said, ‘We all know POT training is a waste of time.’ I am afraid that that is not true, but we cannot demonstrate that not to be true because there is no process of assessment. If you are delivering a Masters’ level course or one at graduate diploma level, then that will be validated and assessed and we need that. I beg Synod to support the amendment.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Salisbury): I beg to move:

‘*Leave out* paragraphs (c) and (d) and *insert*:

“(c) invite the Archbishops’ Council, after consultation with the dioceses and others, to bring to the February 2005 group of sessions proposals for CME 1–3 and, subject to paragraph (b) above, how such proposals might best be funded”.’

The Bishop of Chelmsford: I think the issue underlying this bunch of amendments and the choice before us is whether we are prepared, as we give new shape to our training and formational arrangements, to invest in them. As chair of the Division, I have to say that unless we are prepared to invest in training, we cannot expect people to go on delivering increasing excellence. Our courses, colleges and people who run CME in the dioceses are doing a wonderful job on remarkably little resource. It is very important that Synod does hear that.

I am actually quite relaxed about this. Following the meeting of the bishops, we have clearly been working on a moving staircase, so I am conscious that there is some more work to be done on the financial figures. That is entirely right. If the Synod was minded

to accept Ian Paul's amendment, I would be content with that, and I certainly think Michael Chamberlain's amendment to it ought to be accepted. He and I have had a very useful conversation. I do think, following Philip Lovegrove's contribution earlier, which I will comment about at the end of the debate, that it is possible for us to achieve these things, and without quite the fuss that sometimes we think is necessary. If the Synod did pass Ian Paul's amendment, I would support Michael Chamberlain's amendment. That then sets the work in hand. Provided we have the flexibility to ensure that CME under the new arrangements has the resources it needs to do the job, I shall be entirely satisfied.

The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Ian Cundy): I am sorry to detain the Synod but, as I read this amendment, it asks the Archbishops' Council to bring forward proposals for CME 1-3 as well as dealing with the financial issue. The whole point of Hind is that that is actually being done in the regional training partnerships. I think it is asking us to centralize the process again in a most unhelpful way.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Dr Paul Roberts (Bristol): I had not intended to speak in this debate. I had my chance last year when I put forward the official wrecking amendment in order to test the mind of the Synod over the proposals of the Hind report in general. However, I quite welcome both these amendments. As a process is developing here, we are starting to see the overall cost of implementing Hind.

This sort of process in Ian Paul's amendment and in Michael Chamberlain's amendment is helping us to start to see the emerging picture of the implications of implementing Hind as it goes through. However, I add one little rider to the proposals in Michael Chamberlain's amendment and that is that it would be quite nice to see some comparative figures in regard to what happens if these proposals are not fully implemented, so that we have an emerging picture of either/or. I know that has been very difficult to do up to this point, but I wonder whether we might not be getting towards that point now, and so I support both of these amendments.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr Michael Chamberlain (Archbishops' Council, ex officio): I beg to move:

‘At the end of paragraph (c) (as amended) *insert:*

“and to make every endeavour to accommodate any such proposals within the total overall level of Vote 1 expenditure currently forecast for 2006 and beyond in GS 1545”.

The Chairman: The Bishop does not wish to make further comment.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd David Stancliffe): I think it is quite important as we consider these amendments that we look to the overall costs of the Hind implementation. In a way, this is coming slightly too soon, which is why I am quite grateful for some of these amendments.

Regional training partnerships are only just being formed and getting going. It is our hope, is it not, that the regional training partnerships will not merely be concerned with the training for ordained ministry of people in the initial training stage? We expect them to have an input into CME 1–4: we expect them to have an input into the training of lay ministers and lay leaders as well. Undoubtedly we shall be back here looking at a wider package for all these training costs.

The whole of the debate up to now today has just been about training ordinands. We delude ourselves if we think that there is not going to be a much wider training picture to look at when we have done the work on the RTPs. We now need to take notice of the fact that we shall need a much wider financial provision for it all. I happen to think that it is all very worthwhile and that we ought to pay for it all. I do not want to confine our training budget merely to the training of ordained ministers but to extend it to the whole Church.

Dr Christina Baxter (Southwell): Mr Chairman, I apologize through you to Mr Chamberlain because I am going to oppose the amendments. I do that with some temerity, I expect, being a member of the finance committee.

I think that Synod ought to cease to run scared of money. I know that it is hard to raise it but I hope that one of the things the chairman of the Ministry Division will do is to have a serious talk to Philip Lovegrove after this meeting to discover the substance of some of the things he said.

I did not intervene in the debate about people making a self-contribution. I can tell you that everybody in the first year at St John's has raised, prayed in, £200 each in order to be able to go on the Soul Inner City Mission this summer in London. I think an important part of people's training is that they should learn how to raise money and how to use that money when they have received it. I believe that we ought to be investing in training. I am bound to say that as I am the principal of a college, but I was glad to hear what the previous speaker said about lay training. I do not think we invest anywhere near enough on training in the Church of England. I wish that we could be a

bit more positive about giving the right resources to make the training really excellent. I hope, therefore, that as a sign of that, we might not agree this amendment which closes in how we are going to fund what is a very important piece of work that has to be done in the next year or two.

I believe that if the Church is challenged with the opportunities that are going to come our way, it will indeed rise to the challenge. I just long that we might all say that to the people who give because I am quite convinced – I have said it before and I will say it again – that we are not giving to the level we should be in the Church of England and we are therefore not doing any honour to God in the way that we train people.
(Applause)

Mrs Rachel Moriarty (Chichester): I can cut my speech in half and simply say that I am following up carts before horses from Dr Paul's remarks.

A number of us come to Synod with expertise in training of ordinands and laypeople and a number of us represent the Synod on bodies like colleges and courses. This involves both responsibility for relaying the concerns that Margaret Cosh has mentioned but also some sort of responsibility for finance. There is an accountability, a to and fro, there. A number of us also, and probably the same people, are involved in our own dioceses with Church colleges or with DDOs and the structure and the implementation of the report actually on the ground in dioceses.

I am concerned that all these things require financial responsibility. We are not getting a chance to talk about the process of implementation because we are simply talking about raising the money. What money is spent, how the money is spent and what are the concerns of the people for whom the money is provided or not provided are just as important matters as the funding itself. I simply want to raise this point. I absolutely agree with the amendment but I want to say that we are bridges between the Synod and the institutions, bridges between the Synod and the dioceses. It is not simply what the money is but what it is spent on that is important to us, as well as the curriculum and these other issues.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman: The next amendment lapses. We now come to the Bishop of Ripon and Leeds' amendment.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (c), *leave out* “CME 1–3” and *insert* “CME 1–4”.’

My amendment, which now applies to Dr Paul’s amendment to this item, is to leave out the words “CME 1–3” in the middle of that amendment and replace that with the words “CME 1–4”.

This amendment seeks to remove what I think is a red herring from the motion and to ensure a continued commitment to four-year training curacies after ordination. The *Alternative Sources of Funding* book refers to CME 1–4, and indeed Dr Paul in his speech referred to CME 1–4, although his amendment says ‘1–3’.

We have in structure and funding very welcome proposals for greater coherence between pre- and post-ordination training, which will involve an enhanced CME programme, and there is already considerable fear, which we have heard about already this afternoon, that unless this is carefully handled, there will be considerably less time for those in curacies to immerse themselves in, benefit from and contribute to the lives of their parishes. The House of Bishops has long been committed to a norm of four-year curacies, including CME, over that whole period, and nothing that we do now should detract from that.

I am not opposed to the reduction in expenditure in this area. I think that constructive proposals can come, not least as a result of Dr Paul’s amendment, from the post-ordination training group, which will produce savings on those original estimates, but the whole thrust of the structure and funding proposals involves a significant period of CME training during curacies. I believe that four years should remain the norm, unless we have clear reasons for a reduction. There are no such reasons given anywhere in the papers for this afternoon and I think we should retain ‘CME 1–4’ in our proposals.

The Bishop of Chelmsford: I am entirely content to accept this amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I beg to move:

‘After paragraph (d) (or (c) as the case may be) insert:

“(e) (or (d)) request the Church Commissioners to consider using some of their allocations to fund these proposals”.’

It seems that this whole debate centres on one issue and that is the issue of faith. If we are going forward with God and we are doing what he asks, surely he will provide? We have heard from the very first speaker in this debate that there are pots of money somewhere to be dug up and accessed. I also believe that it is God who gives the increase to the Church Commissioners’ investments, and he has blessed us. I always learned at St

John's College that there was only one Church and one part of the Church should give to the other part of the Church when it is in need.

I have a shrewd suspicion that this House has discerned that we already have the money and it is just a question of transferring it from one set of pockets to another. I also detect that there is a huge amount of good will for that transfer to take place. All I am asking is for the Church Commissioners, along with others, to look into their pockets and bring out their loose change so that our theological education for once can be properly funded. It is a shame that we spend less than 5 per cent of our GNP on one of our most important activities, the training of our people, both lay and ordained, to serve God in this generation and for the next.

The Bishop of Chelmsford: Chairman, I would ask the Synod to resist this amendment. We have done the work. We do not need this extra amendment as it will only muddy the financial waters.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Canon Alan Cooper (Manchester): I hope most sincerely that we will resist this amendment. It will wreck all the plans that have been carefully laid by the Commissioners and the Archbishops' finance committee, the forum to make sure that the dioceses which are in need of allocation, those in desperate need, 23 of them, get money to pay their stipends. It is not a matter of moving things out of the back pocket. I have never been able to get anything out of anyone's back pocket, so I do not think we should be too taken by that. Please, support the bishop and resist this amendment.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Rev'd Dr Francis Bridger (Bristol): I want to say a few words on behalf of my fellow college principals whose biennial meeting I currently chair. We recently wrote to all the diocesan bishops expressing a number of concerns in relation to the unfolding of the Hind process, and the Bishop of Chelmsford has helpfully had a conversation with me about which I can reassure my colleagues, I believe.

I began this debate with some degree of concern as to the direction which Synod might take and the kind of sense that it would be possible to gain from Synod as to its attitudes to residential training. I am glad that Synod has affirmed the value of residential training, alongside non-residential training. The sense of Synod that I detect is that there is now a mood to affirm going forward with the process that we set in motion last year. Some of us were uneasy about that.

I say to the House of Bishops: please will you bring back to us in February well thought through proposals for achieving the objective of finding alternative sources of funding?

For the sake of both colleges and courses, we need a very clear and secure framework in order to operate. We have in fact been engaged in intensive discussions, all of us, whichever part of the sector we come from, for the past year, in trying to begin the process of developing regional training partnerships, but at present the whole of the cost of that is being borne by the providers. We can bear that for some time, even if it means running a deficit budget, which I am sure Michael Chamberlain would be extremely uneasy about on professional grounds. The reality is, that if Synod wants us to do the job which currently we are financing, it must then finance us in the medium and long term. Please, bishops, having resisted Richard Turnbull's proposals, come back to us in February as a Synod and offer us realistic proposals that will give us the tools to do the job. Even those of us who were uneasy about the report last year recognize that the terrain has changed. We recognize that we are now in a new situation: we want to make it work. The worst possible context for both colleges and courses is for Synod or the House of Bishops to will the end but not the means. May I ask, on behalf of my colleagues in both colleges and courses, that in February Synod give us the tools to do the job and let us move this process forward.

Revd Prebendary David Houlding (London): I trust we can all take it for granted that what we are seeking in this debate is to find the very best form of training and formation for all those who offer themselves for the sacred ministry.

We should be very grateful for the work that Dr Turnbull has done for us because here is a real affirmation of residential training. To take away 75 places from theological colleges for married ordinands is indeed a very drastic step. I hope that we can send out a very clear signal to our residential institutions about how much their work is valued and appreciated by all of us. Dr Turnbull's report has that vision for residential training. I know that it is not entirely fashionable to say this in the present climate: courses have their places, and many people benefit from them and for many they are more appropriate, but there is still no substitute for residential training. If we are going to have it in the Church and value it, then we do indeed have to find ways of paying for it. I hope that in actual fact we will not lose sight of the possibility of some self-contribution, because I am sure that is still an option that may well have a place within the overall training that we provide for those coming forward for ordination.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Chelmsford, in reply: I am hugely grateful to Synod this afternoon. I think the whole of the Ministry Division is grateful. It is really important that the sense of support and encouragement for the task of forming people for ministry, lay and ordained, in the Church comes from this place. We have picked that up this afternoon,

so thank you very much, and thank you to everyone who has contributed to what has proved to be an extremely good debate.

May I say just a number of brief things? I have a huge deal of sympathy with what Philip Lovegrove says about finance. We do need imagination and a broader brush sometimes in tackling these matters. Certain aspects of his speech touched upon my personal provisions, and this is the second time in this Synod because Mrs Brown commented on the financial consequences of my blessing yesterday. I do have to say to Synod that I look forward to having the jacuzzi provided in Chelmsford and, to Mrs Brown, the £2,000 does not always follow from my blessing, if I may say so.

Apart from that, the first point is this: if we could grasp the imaginative and broad breadth of the way in which Synod has addressed the financial issues and the sense that we want to fund it properly and to encourage vocations for the future, a huge lot of good will come out of all of this.

Secondly, I am conscious that there have been anxieties around this process. Synod needs to be congratulated. In tackling these issues, and I have been associated with Synod in one shape or form for many years, this is the first time we have put our hands to the plough and continued. Time and again in the past we have looked at the issues and run away from them. It is not going to be easy and I am conscious of the demands being made on a lot of people as we make these transitions. It is absolutely vital that we keep this plough moving and plough a straight furrow to a new situation, which if I may say to Dr Bridger, must include a greater sense of security around the extraordinary resources contained in our colleges and on our courses. I see my stewardship in the Ministry Division as doing everything I can to preserve those resources, to adapt them to the future needs of the Church and to stop the long history we have had over many years of closing them down and losing them to our training circumstances. We are jointly in this business to do that. Hear it from me that the Ministry Division is committed to that. Let us get on with this task together. I would be hugely grateful if the motion were to be passed this afternoon.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

‘That this Synod, noting the recommendations summarized in Appendix A to GS 1541A and the concerns set out in GS 1541:

- (a) believe that a reduction of residential places for married ordinands requiring significant family support should not now be pursued;
- (b) affirm the value of the present arrangements for funding ordination training and decline to support the changes canvassed in GS 1541A; and
- (c) invite the Archbishops’ Council, after consultation with the dioceses and others, to bring to the February 2005 group of sessions

proposals for CME 1–4 and, subject to paragraph (b) above, how such proposals might best be funded’.

The Sitting was adjourned at 6.21 p.m.

THE CHAIR *Mr James Humphery (Salisbury)* took the Chair at 8.30 p.m.

Enabling a World of Difference: Report by the Partnership for World Mission (GS 1544)

Presentation under SO 97

The Chairman: We turn our attention now to the Church of England’s mission agencies. Representatives from the mission agencies are in the public gallery. I will not name them all but they are all very welcome and I hope that they will enjoy their evening with us. *(Applause)*

In a moment there will be a presentation by Sue Parks, Director of SPCK Worldwide, and Reg Bailey, Chief Executive of the Mothers’ Union. After that, the Bishop of Coventry, as Chairman of Partnership for World Mission, will move the motion at Item 18.

In order to accommodate as many speakers as possible – and I have had an enormous number of requests to speak in the debate – there will be a speech limit of five minutes from the outset.

Mr Reg Bailey: Can we thank you, on behalf of all the PWM mission agencies, for the opportunity to make a contribution to this debate on our involvement in God’s Mission? We hope that what we offer this evening will help to stimulate our thinking together.

Ms Sue Parks: The General Synod of the Church of England has always held its mission agencies in high esteem. At least, that is the conclusion one can draw if one looks at GS 1544 and the numerous resolutions following recent international development and mission-oriented debates where, as mission agencies, we have been affirmed in what we do.

Our track record is impressive. For example, St Stephen’s Hospital in New Delhi is one of the two main hospitals for that vast city. Its centenary celebration brochure begins:

‘The story of St Stephen’s Hospital began over a century ago, when a hospital for women and children was opened in 1885 by a group of missionary women, the first institution of its kind in Delhi.’

Those women were SPG missionaries. However, this kind of story can be replicated in many parts of the world.

Mr Reg Bailey: So is this debate simply an opportunity for the mission agencies and their supporters to make claims, all with a certain truthfulness about them, of just how many provinces, dioceses, churches, hospitals, schools and other institutions we have brought to birth? Such claims, if made, would possibly sound to early twenty-first-century ears to have a touch of imperialism and paternalism about them. With hindsight, the agencies could be said to have been guilty of both.

Perhaps instead we should just give thanks for the privilege of being involved with a missionary God in the changing pattern of the growth of his people worldwide: a pattern that sees a numerical shift in the Church from north to south; a pattern that sees the Church severely persecuted in certain places yet faithful to its calling; a pattern that sees the Church in many places seeking to become self-supporting, self-sustaining and self-financing.

Ms Sue Parks: So what is this debate about? What is the story that we, the mission agencies, want to tell members of Synod in this setting?

Mr Reg Bailey: We want to tell a story of how eleven of the PWM mission agencies are seeking to work today: agencies with their specific histories that, today, give them both some unfortunate baggage as well as a rich and proud heritage to live out; agencies that still believe God is calling them to work with and on behalf of the Church out of which they came.

Ms Sue Parks: So what is this story? It is a story of how what motivated us as we began still motivates us today; of how the changes we have all experienced, especially over the past five to ten years, have challenged our focus. It is a story which, in its sharing, might inspire and challenge the Church that bore us.

Mission agencies were not, in human terms, a planned phenomenon. Their history is one of individuals, seeing a series of mission challenges and creating a number of voluntary societies to seek to meet them. They do, however, have some common motivational roots that still inspire what the agencies do today.

Mr Reg Bailey: They were set up in the main to enable the Church to reach beyond its safe and comfortable frontiers. These were the frontiers of geographical remoteness; of forgotten, neglected or failed peoples; those created by different languages, and the frontiers of going to those living outside their own environment. They were frontiers for which, if these voluntary movements of people had not crossed them, the gospel might have had to find a different entry point.

Ms Sue Parks: They were set up in a way that embodied a spirituality of sacrifice and vulnerability. Lives were lost for the sake of the venture and the gospel. Lives were given

to ensure work became established and rooted. Enough time was given to ensure that the familiar was allowed to fade and what was unknown could be embraced. Enough time was given so that relationships were established, to the point where real partnership is possible.

Mr Reg Bailey: The agencies provided the support, the sustenance and the assistance to enable people to 'do gospel' in a variety of settings, both within Britain and overseas.

While this motivation is deeply rooted in each of the agencies, the same vision provides the focus for their work today. However, are they simply the motivations for those working in mission agencies, or are they motivations for mission at any time and in any place?

Ms Sue Parks: The mission agencies, in common with the denominational expressions of Church, have had to respond to constantly changing circumstances. In their recent history – the past five to ten years – three themes characterize this change.

Mr Reg Bailey: First, the need to change externally. The effects of globalization have deeply affected what the mission agencies look like from outside. We are employing a greater diversity of staff. We are organizing ourselves in such a way as to ensure that some staff are nearer to those areas of the world which they have a responsibility for. Our governance and consultation processes acknowledge the international responsibilities we hold. However, the agencies are also encouraging those from other parts of the world to be involved in global mission by facilitating the exchange of personnel.

Ms Sue Parks: These changes have not come without a struggle. They have often required considerable effort in changing the mindset of staff, trustees and supporters, in Britain and overseas. If, however, we are seeking to model in ourselves a way of being and working that is appropriate for our present world context, they are vital, or we will become an anachronism.

Mr Reg Bailey: The second consequence is that dwindling support, a growth in other specialized Christian agencies, and hard questions about whether we are needed at all have contributed to probably the greatest upheaval and reassessment of the mission agencies ever.

Nothing has been counted out, as governance, structure, finance, communication, purpose and policy have been put under the microscope to be reviewed, reordered, reinvented and revamped. What drives and focuses these changes?

Ms Sue Parks: We have needed to refocus on the core reasons that brought us into being. We need to live to them as well as we can within all the constraints that face us.

We are seeking for operational clarity, determined by these changed circumstances and a

high level of professionalism. Evidence of this professionalism is the fact that, last month, *Restoring Hope in our Church*, a project involving many of the mission agencies, won the best video category at the prestigious Churches' Media Council awards. I am not sure what that kind of endorsement might mean to some of you, as the presenters' award also went to Aled Jones!

We are seeking to become centres of excellence for mission and movements of mission, while not forgetting those aspects of our work that will remain constant, no matter how much external or internal change occurs.

Mr Reg Bailey: So how might our story challenge us, the Church in this country?

Ms Sue Parks: Our story is a reminder that our understanding of Christ, the gospel, and 'being Church' is incomplete without the insights of our sisters and brothers throughout the world.

We need their help to hold a vision of Christ as head of the whole Church. As Lesslie Newbigin wrote:

'The content of the Gospel is Jesus Christ in the fullness of his ministry, death and resurrection. The Gospel is this and not anything else . . . our perceptions of Him will be shaped by our own situation. Our need is to see Him as He truly is. That is why we have to listen to the witness of the whole Church in all places and all ages.'

However, it is not just the difference such a vision brings to 'being Church' that the agency story might assist with. In many parts of the world the inherited model is alive, kicking and relevant in mission.

Mr Reg Bailey: Our story is a reminder that, in our incompleteness, we need to listen carefully to those who differ from us, even at a depth that seems irreconcilable.

The mission agencies were instrumental in bringing to birth many parts of the Anglican Communion. They continue to work closely with many of its leaders who, at this present time, are angry and bewildered by what is happening within the worldwide family. Can we use these historic relationships to ensure that we do not minimize the depth of the hurt being felt on all sides? Can we draw on the joy and the pain that brought them into being, to ensure that we remain in relationship without denying the truths that those on all sides struggle to discover?

Ms Sue Parks: Our story is a reminder of what the Church is called to be but has often failed to live up to.

The Archbishop of Wales in 2001 asked, 'What is it about the Church that requires

mission agencies to exist to remind the Church what the Church is?'. The answer is something to do with the fact that we all lose sight of the missionary God from time to time, and need others to point us back into the right direction. The agencies carry between them a corporate history of this struggle to keep cooperating with the missionary God. They see part of their role as that of challenging the Church in this responsibility by acting as an irritant. They also see part of their role, however, as supporting the Church in this responsibility in a variety of ways.

Mr Reg Bailey: In all we do we are deeply committed to the Church 'for the sake of the Gospel'.

The Chairman: On behalf of the Synod, I would like to thank Sue Parks and Reg Bailey for that presentation.

Now for more esoteric matters. I invite the Bishop of Coventry to move the motion.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Colin Bennetts): I beg to move:

'That this Synod, in reaffirming its continuing commitment to the work of the mission agencies:

- (a) acknowledge its responsibility to cooperate in God's global mission with other partners and especially the mission agencies;
- (b) endorse a vision of mission that is made more complete by acknowledging our part in, and what is offered by, the global Church;
- (c) encourage each diocese and deanery to explore the challenges of our involvement in God's mission offered by the mission agencies with the help of resources produced by PWM; and
- (d) request PCCs to review their financial and prayer support of the mission agencies in the light of the 1996 General Synod motion "that all PCCs seek to commit at least five per cent of their annual income to the support of . . . the agencies" and the contribution they make to God's mission.'

Time was when Sunday evening was a time of relaxation. After a day of hard worship, the family would gather together round the harmonium; they would sing Moody and Sankey hymns and they would tell each other improving stories. It is very much in that spirit that the agenda for Sunday evening at General Synod is put together. It is meant to be a fairly gentle, if not genteel, affair. Out of respect for the Sabbath, nothing too vigorous or controversial is put on the agenda. That is what we are doing tonight: we are continuing that tradition.

In one sense, that is true. I doubt whether we shall see much violence breaking out in the House tonight. I fully expect a warm endorsement of the motion before us. However, to assume that the story that we are engaged in somehow lacks vigour, or even controversy, would be seriously to misunderstand the history and nature of Anglican mission agencies.

The Anglican Communion, and perhaps particularly the Church of England, owes a debt of gratitude to its mission agencies: not only because their founders channelled their passion for a global understanding of mission into the practical outcomes we have just witnessed; not only because, by their life and witness, they encouraged the Church in England to lift its eyes beyond those concerns simply within its own borders; but also because, as Archbishop Rowan said when he was still in Wales, 'They remind the Church what the Church is', that is, a people called to cooperate with a missionary God.

The mission agencies throughout their history have borne witness to the wider Church that mission is an essential and not an optional extra. It is God's high calling to his people and not an embarrassing add-on.

The story of the mission agencies is therefore not just a gripping yarn; it is also a window through which we can view our own participation in mission, wherever that may be. It is a window to reassess what motivates us in this task; a window to evaluate how we are handling the immense changes in our mission context, both inside and outside the Church; and a window that looks out on some major challenges facing us at this present time. My hope is that in the debate which now follows we may throw that window wide open and accept the challenging vista that is opened up to us.

This motion seeks to offer Synod the opportunity to take a lead in three specific ways. First, to endorse again a vision of God's mission, which is incomplete without a global understanding of the context in which it takes place and the task to which we are called. That global understanding is becoming more complex as we encounter 'the other' in global terms, not only through a visit from our companion diocese but also by a visit to the local shops.

Second, to affirm our commitment to the work of the mission agencies. We seem to do this with some regularity here in Synod, as can be seen from section 3 of GS 1544. So why again tonight? I suppose the best answer is simply, 'lest we forget'. Lest we forget that the mission agencies are the Church of England working in a different mode and in different places. They are part of who *we* are and part of what *we* do.

One of the most frequent theological errors of Christians and that of course includes Anglicans – is to change the personal pronoun when it suits us. *We* are the Body of Christ but *they*, the diocese, are after our money. *We* are the Body of Christ but *they*, the PCC, have changed the date of the bring-and-buy sale. *We* are the Body of Christ, but

they, the clergy, have changed the tune to my favourite hymn. By analogy, *we* are the Church of England, but *they* are the mission agencies.

My third hope is that, tonight, we will encourage dioceses, deaneries and parishes to review the practical outcomes from this vision and this affirmation that we are making. A commitment to and affirmation of the mission agencies need more than the General Synod to carry this motion, even if unanimously. If asked, the mission agencies would say that what they really want is our interest, our faithful prayers, and sacrificial giving on the part of our congregations – and probably in that order.

The Partnership for World Mission is that part of the Archbishops' Council that works with the Church of England mission agencies and with the Companion Links Networks. It has prepared a CD, with resources to help in exploring these commitments. It includes the opening illustrated speech from this debate and is freely available to members of General Synod.

Perhaps the most contentious part of this motion is the request that PCCs review their giving in the light of the 1996 General Synod motion that called on them to commit at least five per cent of their annual income to support the mission agencies. 'Be realistic', I hear somebody say. That is precisely what we need to be. The realistic situation is that, without sufficient ongoing financial support from congregations, all the mission agencies will find themselves cutting back on what they do. This is perhaps where the vision of mission that we may well enthusiastically endorse in theory is most challenged in practice.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Bishop of Stockport (Rt Revd Nigel Stock): If the Bishop of Coventry would like warm support, he certainly has it from me. I hope that the Synod will reaffirm its continuing commitment to the work of all the mission agencies, but I feel that it is incumbent on me to draw the attention of Synod to Appendix 3 of GS 1544, where one sees the list of associate members of PWM.

I have been associated with one of those small organizations, the Papua New Guinea Church Partnership, for 25 years and in recent times, because of the link of our Diocese of Chester with the Solomon Islands, with members of the Melanesian Mission, whose chairman, the Bishop of Exeter, is with us tonight.

These smaller agencies have also played their part, and some have been very innovative in their thinking. The Papua New Guinea Church Partnership changed to a partnership from the New Guinea Mission, probably before it became fashionable to talk in those terms. They too are feeling the cold wind of change and, as our parishes have moved so successfully to self-sufficiency and to covering costs, so they have struggled to be generous beyond themselves.

I warmly endorse all that has been said about how the agencies can maintain, strengthen and develop our relationships with the Anglican Communion, whose opinions we are increasingly feeling the weight of. I also hope that we will be able to support Simon Bessant when he asks us to acknowledge the distinctive ministry of mission partners from across the world who are serving in England.

We are very fortunate in the Diocese of Chester to have one such mission partner: the retired Bishop of Malaita is rector of that quintessentially English parish, the parish of Gawsforth. He manages to keep the editor of *Cheshire Life* going by appearing in every edition, but brings a warmth and a sense of the worldwide nature of our Church to central Cheshire in a way that nobody else can.

Recently, we did a double act at our clergy conference. I said what it was like to go as someone from these islands to work in Papua New Guinea, in a Melanesian society; he said what it was like to come as a Melanesian to work in England. One of the striking things he said was, 'When you English celebrate, your idea of a good party in the parish is to bring a sausage roll. In Melanesia, we bring the pig!'

I hope that we can warmly endorse everything that has been said tonight, and encourage our parishes to think in terms of giving the pig rather than a sausage roll.

Revd Simon Pothen (London): In any relationship there has to be a sense of openness and honesty. In any partnership with the worldwide Church, those principles have to be maintained. I find quite troubling some of the contortions that the Church of England manages to get into in our relationships with our partners overseas. I want to call for a spirit of honesty and openness in our dealings with our partner Churches overseas.

I say this out of love. I say this because I am a child of the Anglican Communion rather than a child of the Church of England. In our dealings with partners there can be a tendency to walk on eggshells, because of the guilt we feel over our colonial legacy. This can lead us to maintaining a dignified silence while our overseas partners label the Church of the west anything from 'decadent' to 'wrong'. Guilt is not a healthy emotion to carry into any dialogue with partners, let alone our overseas partners. There has to be a sense of vigour; there has to be a sense of our trying to engage in dialogue with openness and honesty, and not maintaining our silence as a result, I perceive, of guilt.

As a result of this, certain elements of the Church in this country selectively take on, in their relationships, what they perceive as strong points in our Church overseas. They say, 'If only we could be as certain as they are. If only we could be as faithful. If only we could be as biblical' – and the Bishop of Portsmouth very kindly pointed out what a slippery word that is – based on our partner Churches abroad, and 'If only we could be like them'. This tends to magnify our guilt. It magnifies a lack of joy and, dare I say it, a lack of self-esteem in our relationships.

My grandfather was an evangelist in the Church of South India. He had to found a

Church that was specially built for the Untouchables of the village, because the Church would not cater for untouchability. In that sense, what he was doing was what we ought to be doing. We should criticize untouchability, whenever and wherever it occurs, regardless of cultural niceties. That is the point we have to make about our own sense of justice and our own sense of vigour.

In any relationship with partner Churches abroad we are equal. Our insights, our values – because they come from the well-springs of our own experience – are what make us what we are and who we are. So we ought to stand proud, be honest, be open, and tell it how it is. Of course our history is littered with the colonial legacy and colonial mistakes. Of course it is. Interspersed with that, however, are wonderful tales of heroism, of service, and of love. They come together, but that is what makes us what we are. We ought to be proud of that, as well as acknowledging our mistakes.

I am not sure whether the time has come when the Church of England has become a bit lily-livered and pusillanimous about our history. We ought to be a little more honest and open, and to say things from our own perspective and from our own well-springs, without fear of causing offence.

Revd Robert Key (Oxford): Let me declare an interest as General Director of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, but it is not about CPAS I wish to speak this evening. Why should I and my colleagues have left perfectly good parish jobs – I was vicar of St Andrew's in Oxford, which is large, lively, 14 on the staff, and so on – to take on what some may have regarded as being the slightly poisoned chalice of running a mission agency? The agenda was very clearly to be a surgeon – I was asked three times at interviews, 'Can you take tough decisions?' – rather than a loving physician.

In my case, the answer is because I owe my conversion to a mission agency – the one I now try and run – putting a new clergyman into a parish church in south London, who made Jesus accessible, talked the language of my south London, working class upbringing, so that I could understand the gospel enough to respond to Jesus Christ. It therefore seemed to me to be a worthwhile task.

I want Synod to know that mission agencies work very much in partnership with each other. In any other debate when I sit here, I always ask the question, 'Are we getting value for kingdom bucks?' I really believe that, in mission agencies, we are getting value for kingdom bucks. We do not have any agenda, do we, as priests, bishops or laypeople, to waste the money that God has entrusted to us? Mission agencies do not do anything independently that they can do together. It is why increasingly there are mission tours with more than one agency badge on them. It is why we increasingly employ staff not just for one agency but perhaps for two, across denominations. For example, our worker in Scotland works jointly with the Baptist Union, as an ecumenical venture in inspiring mission across that country.

When the general directors get together, we know that we meet as colleagues who are in

exactly the same place, for we were all put into our agencies at roughly the same time and with roughly the same job description. Here are wonderful grand old ladies of the Church of England. Please, under God, so pray and so work that they have a future as well as an illustrious past. We want to encourage members of Synod to be more and more committed with us, in the knowledge that the money is used for the sake of the gospel and, whether in this country or the farthest part of the world, it is about people coming to know and to love the Lord Jesus Christ.

Having said something about partnership, may I say something about mission? I do not normally go to the Oval Office in the United States for my inspiration, but I am reminded of that story, 'It's the economy, stupid!'. It seems to me that one of the things that mission agencies are called to be are as a constant reminder to all of us that, 'It's evangelism, stupid!'. That is what we are about. I do not mean that in any narrow sense; I mean it totally holistically. Everything else is so much easier, is it not? A really important part of what mission agencies are all about, therefore, is to have them as those who constantly call us back to doing the one thing Jesus gave us to do.

I also want to assure the Synod that we have had our share of pain. Managing change has to be – or so every management textbook I have read tells me – one of the most difficult things in which we are involved. Sitting in an office, making people redundant, is the hardest thing that I have ever done. Give me a 20-sermon series on Ezekiel and I will have it tomorrow. Make people redundant? However, we have had to do it – not to manage decline but to change for growth. What we have seen illustrated is not a collection of icons, but vision-driven mission agencies who have changed in order to enable growth. In that, perhaps, there are models for the rest of the Church of England.

I want to leave Synod with this thought. Mission agencies are not an 'it' which we invite members to support, but an 'us' of which we invite members to be an integral part.

Revd Canon Cynthia Dowdle (Liverpool): I welcome the report and wish to pay tribute to the valuable contribution made to the mission of the Church and the mission of God by the work of mission agencies.

I am noted in Liverpool for going round and speaking about our link diocese, Akure, and the way in which we have developed this link. I can talk for quite a long time without stopping, but I promise to finish within the time tonight! I speak from my own experience as coordinator of our diocesan link between Liverpool and Akure in Nigeria. We have ten guests in our diocese at the moment – the bishop, the provost and a team – who have come to help us celebrate our cathedral's centenary.

I am sorry that some people see the development of diocese-to-diocese links as distracting our thoughts, prayers and financial support from mission agencies. It may be so but, rather, I see it as a possible way of working in cooperation, one with another, between diocese and mission agencies; a way of drawing on and learning from their expertise in the field of cultural difference and culture shock.

In the year 2000, Bishop James and I led a party of 35 young people and adults to Akure. The then CMS area representative worked alongside the team in areas of preparation, reflection, and debrief. I pay tribute to her and the work she did with us.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Mothers' Union who, from the very beginning of our link with Akure, have played an active role in visits both ways, with members of the Mothers' Union from Liverpool going to Akure and members of the Mothers' Union in Akure coming to Liverpool. The Mothers' Union has also acted as welcomer to our guests arriving from Akure, with warm clothes and food parcels for them.

Last October, we undertook a review of our link, and we invited our Christian Aid area representative to join us on the journey to Akure to carry out the review. The insights into trade justice, HIV/AIDS, and the role of women in the culture were very helpful to us.

Mission agencies and PIM should not be seen as being in competition, but as co-partners in furthering our understanding of those issues which affect our relationships with areas of the Anglican Communion outside the Church of England. Let us use every means possible to build up trust and to develop understanding as partners, so that when we face thorny issues we can face them with mutual respect and love, recognizing Jesus Christ in each other. Then we can see Christ as the head of the whole Church.

Revd Jonathan Frais (Europe): Whereas a previous speaker said that he declared an interest yet wanted to speak more widely, I want to declare an interest but speak very personally.

I am Anglican chaplain in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, and we have had a bit of success. The Lord has given us a great time in the last five years I have been there. We turned up in 1999 and inherited a prayer group of 12. Five years later, we attract 100 Sunday by Sunday, and we are nearer full financial self-sufficiency than I thought we ever could be.

The mission agency which sponsors me is the Intercontinental Church Society. I am therefore a big fan, because they have given me the time of my life. It does help that I met my now wife, got married, had a child, and number two is expected – all during this five-year period. It has all been quite an emotional and happy time for me. There was a funny thing that happened at my wedding in London. The rumour went round that my wife was going to be a sort of 'Olga the shot-putter' figure, because so few people knew her. She is stronger than I, but a very beautiful lady!

We do relate to two other mission agencies, one of which is CMS. I was recently able to help their worker in Crimea when she could not get her exit visa. I happened to know the consulate, and we needed a little help with the bureaucracy. There is also the Mission to Seafarers' representative in Odessa, to whom we can give accommodation when he comes to ask the Orthodox Church in Kiev to help with the port authority and

the corruption there, to get him a licence to work again. So sometimes we can help others.

Teachers, charity workers, orphan workers, street children workers, students – all sorts of people make up our congregation, not many of them able to give much money if at all. However, we are there to make a difference and I believe that we can do that and are doing it.

I do not want to hide the truth from you, as we have been called to honesty. We said goodbye to 50 people this summer, so our congregation has been halved. A lot of the work of mission agencies is permanently fragile. We are feeling that, and we pray very much that the Lord will send us some replacements. However, as we say hellos and goodbyes month by month, it has been a great joy to see the work of the Lord grow, as we preach the historic Jesus and minister the Christ of the Scriptures.

The Intercontinental Church Society, in my two placements over the eight years I have been in eastern Europe, has either planted a new church or, in partnership with the Diocese in Europe, reinvigorated struggling work. One or two have been much greater success stories – if I am allowed to use the word ‘success’ – than we are. One or two have struggled significantly. However, it is great to be involved with a mission agency because one finds, complementing one’s diocesan interest, something else that is going from strength to strength and which one sees the Lord working at in a clearer and more helpful way than it might sometimes seem.

New ways of doing things – a theme of our quinquennium, it seems. We have to work hard at new ways of doing things. We meet on a Sunday afternoon. We meet in someone else’s building. We work hard at teaching. We make copies of sermons available at the end, for those who struggle with the English language. There is a growing email list on Monday morning over what I claim that I said the day before – and usually it is much better! We work hard at fellowship with photo directories, with fellowship parties, with testimonies in newsletters. We work hard at mutual accountability. I have become good friends with the United Methodists and my German Lutheran host. In all of these things we are trying to do mission in a place that we had not thought of before.

In conclusion, I draw Synod’s attention to Appendix 4 in GS 1544, ‘Common Mission: A Covenant’. Under the subheading, ‘A Common Vision’, it talks of the voluntary principle as a proven model for mobilizing and encouraging effective engagement. I have had a tremendous experience of mission agencies and being involved, and I think that tonight is a time to celebrate. My own experience has provided so much to talk about, but it is a joy that all eleven have been blessed by the Lord. We, as a Synod, need to celebrate this and say, as others have said, ‘It is us. It is not them.’

Dr Elaine Storkey (London): I am feeling rather gloomy, because I am going to sound like a wet rag after all this euphoria and enthusiasm for the report in the debate tonight.

I know that the Bishop of Coventry does not want anything too vigorous or controversial but, I am sorry, I feel as if I have to sound that note.

I am sorry to rock the boat but if we are going to turn out on a very wet Sunday night to a debate, rather than staying behind and singing Moody and Sankey round our harmoniums in these wonderful residences that we are in, then I really want something a bit more challenging and demanding than this report offers us – or, with enormous respect, even the presentation.

The report talks a lot about change and about challenge, as did the presentation, but what it gives us in terms of the shape of those changes and challenges is rather weak and slim. Globalization is mentioned twice, but the most significant and slight coverages of globalization have just passed us by. Globalization seems to mean internationalization – you have a few more African faces on a group, or you have more partners doing the work in a particular region.

When in section 5 of the report we are told about changes in the world mission scene, the changes are the following. We have had changes in companion links; sending congregations are now doing things direct; we need to internationalize because of globalization; and there are some financial changes. Frankly, this is horrific. It is not just because I am a sociologist and therefore it matters to me how we see the whole world. If this is our thinking behind mission and in the way we advise mission partners, we cannot do much out there. We will not be able to engage with what is going on globally in our culture now. This barely scrapes the surface, therefore.

In reality, we are in the midst of such enormous changes in the world mission scene that it is absolutely vital that our mission agencies do some radical thinking, reappraisal, analysis, reshaping, re-imagining, and so on, so that the communication of the gospel of Jesus Christ can continue into the world of the twenty-first century in a way that is meaningful, informed and relevant.

I happen to know that the mission agencies are doing that. They are doing this radical rethinking. So why are we not hearing about it tonight? Why are we not hearing about some of the thinking that is going on, some of the heart-searching that is there, some of the plans that they have, and so on? Instead, we are given this rather vacuous and chummy report, on an evening when there is to be no controversy – but no Moody and Sankey either.

I want to list some of the changes that I think we need to look at in terms of the global picture today. First, the issue and the meaning of mission and missionary, and those terms themselves. ‘Missionary’ is not a term that can be used any more. I have worked with so many mission agencies whose overseas workers can no longer get a visa if on their visa application is even the smell of the word ‘missionary’: even the faint whiff of the idea that they might be activated by and actively engaged in overseas mission. They have to present themselves as something else, because the whole baggage of mission

comes with suspicion, misunderstandings, misappropriation, and a whole range of things that we have to recognize.

Second, globalization means far more than the need to internationalize. Globalization taps into great issues of global change, global economics, global trading, education, communication patterns, economy, climate change, ecology, the poor-rich divides that are there in every culture in our world.

Third, the end of colonialization as a mentality is absolutely vital. There is a resistance to paternalism; a resistance to white westerners who know best, who go round explaining how to do things – and quite rightly. This is why our mission agencies are in such key partnerships, where we are listening as well as advising.

Then there is the decline of Christian spirituality in the West, which we have looked at. There is the spread of the English language in countries which are already multilingual, many people speaking four languages and English very proficiently. There are more English language newspapers in India than there are in any other country in the world. There is also this huge growth of the highly mobile, professional classes in many of the countries where we are sending missionaries. Our mission agencies very often do not have the expertise or experience to begin to reach the young people in these professional classes who know a great deal, and very often far more than we do in the West in our own cultures.

Those are some of the changes out there. We have already looked at some of the changes from inside: the DIY mission trips; the short-term contracts; short-term activities; culturally unaware groups often going to culturally sensitive areas, coming out and leaving our resident brethren, often our orthodox brethren, with a tab to pick up. All of this, and much more, clouds and queries our own activity as mission agents.

I have a lot more to say, but I have to stop. I simply want to say that communication of the gospel is so key today that, in partnership, in engagement, and in listening, it is vital that we get out there. I know that we are doing it. Let us be overt about it and do it with every ounce of energy that we have.

Mr David Mills (Carlisle): If I asked members of Synod what was the best thing that had happened to them because they have been in Synod, I wonder what the reply would be. I see some smiles; I see some glum faces – maybe because of having to attend debates like this, late at night.

Mine was being asked by General Synod, some time ago, to be General Synod's lay representative at BCMS Crosslinks. Why? As a young man in service life, I was in Germany. We had no chaplain, and a few of us were praying for quite a long time for a chaplain. Sure enough, a bod came along with a dog collar – an RAF dog collar – and he said, 'My name's Sam'. So we all stood to attention, as you are supposed to do, and he said, 'Don't call me Sir: call me Sam. I have been sent to you'. He was a BCMS

missionary who had served in Burma and, for the next two and a half years, he taught me the Scriptures. So when I was asked by Synod if I would be a lay representative at BCMS, I more than willingly said Yes, because I had gained so much from a missionary – or, as we would call him now, a mission partner. In his introduction, the Bishop of Coventry said, ‘Lest we forget’. Often we can forget and not be thankful to the Lord for those who have led us.

What is the motivation to mission? On page 12 of the report we read, ‘What the agencies offer to the ministry and mission of the Church worldwide’. I want to tell you a little about Crosslinks. I was elected to Crosslinks in my own right and, last year, I was asked to be chairman of Crosslinks, which is a great privilege for me. It is a relatively small society. Some of you may know about it, some may not. However, its smallness is an advantage. It is flexible and light on its feet, and it is able to respond relatively quickly to new opportunities. We have been asked, ‘What are mission agencies doing?’. There is a strong feeling of family within our small community.

For many years now, we have not had regional offices round the world to control the work of our mission partners. Mission partners have long been under the pastoral care of indigenous Churches to which they were seconded. That is very important. It balances the power relationship between the western mission partners and the non-western Church.

Crosslinks does not define itself geographically, but by reference to a particular people group. It does not define itself denominationally, but rather by an old-fashioned and somewhat awkward method which we call its doctrinal position. However, our robust basis of faith, with its focus on the importance of Scripture and the centrality of the Cross, believe it or not, has proved to be an important aspect in Crosslinks in everyday mission.

May I look briefly at three widely differing groups which I believe have benefited during my time with Crosslinks, in its uncompromising doctrinal position? First, Christians here in the UK and Ireland whom God is calling into service overseas. Many say, ‘Who are you coming to and what is your agency all about?’ – and I am sure that this will apply to other mission agencies. Such potential mission partners often have a Christian faith which has the same characteristics as those of the Crosslinks’ basis of faith, that is, biblical and Cross-centred. They are attracted by a mission agency which shares their values and priorities.

Second, Anglican leaders in the majority world. In the present climate of controversy – of which Synod is well aware – some Anglican leaders worldwide are suspicious that Anglicans from the north and west have abandoned their obedience to Christ. They are reassured to find that Crosslinks is a mission agency which unambiguously holds the same beliefs that they do. I believe that Crosslinks has unique opportunities to build bridges between the Church of England and the worldwide Anglican Communion.

Third, the mission agency Crosslinks itself is liberated by its doctrinal clarity. There is little tension within Crosslinks about what we believe and what we should have as our main priorities. We share a common basis of faith in discussion, in forming strategies.

The most obvious case in point is the longstanding work with the Ethiopian Church. I wish that I could bring a mission partner called Jenny Merritt here. She is currently in Nekemte in western Ethiopia, where she has been for 16 years. We have been there as a mission agency for 70 years, labouring to make the Bible an open book in the Ethiopian Church. However, we have steadfastly refused to make our own Churches or draw Christians away from their own Church. Scripture is what we wish to share with all who will listen. Crosslinks stands for God's Word for God's world, and this is our motivation for mission.

Dr Peter May (Winchester): I rise to speak, provoked by some of the things that Elaine was saying and wanting to build on them, because I think that she was hitting on some very important issues. It is a concern that is being substantially overlooked in this country and we need to face the opportunity we are being presented with.

I am talking about the result of the increasingly small world in which we are living: what it is doing to the traffic of people, particularly in the student world. Vast numbers of students from all over the world are now coming to study in this country. The Chinese are coming over in the Boeing-full. Some universities have phenomenal proportions of overseas students, and many churches have a rather low profile in relation to their engagement with student work.

My own commitment to it is as Chairman of the Board of the Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship. This mission agency started some 76 years ago, with the vision of setting up a student-led Christian Union in every university in the country. The work has grown steadily. We now have 56 field staff and about 66 young graduates who find enough finance to finance themselves. There is no difficulty in getting people to give money to people – reference to an earlier debate – and our own staff find 25 per cent of their own salaries. It is a small army of about 122 people, covering universities and colleges in England, Scotland and Wales.

The groups that we nurture are student-led. That is a fundamental principle to the work. We can only stand on the touchlines, therefore, and wait until we are invited to advise and to help. Sometimes we see them behaving naively, doing things badly; sometimes they come to us and ask, 'Have you got some good ideas? Can you help us form a programme? Can you introduce us to some speakers who will really make an impact for the gospel on the campus, in this particular subject or that?'. It really is a tremendously open field and the possibilities are vast, not just for the overseas students but for our own home-grown students where, before the year 2010, the Government are wanting up to 50 per cent of young people to go to college or university.

It is the biggest mission field in Britain today. The Universities and Colleges Christian

Fellowship is the biggest agency in that area, but of course there are others. What I am pleading for is that all our churches, as well as looking at overseas situations, support the university work in this country one way or another, because it is our greatest challenge today.

Revd Dr Philip Thomas (Durham): We should be very grateful to Dr Storkey for her critique of the report and of the debate so far. It draws our attention back to how central this particular topic is.

It is right for the mission agencies and PWM to have an opportunity to beat their own particular drums and to tell us about their work, which we are grateful to hear. Yet I believe that the substance of the debate is really about the sorts of issue with which we, as a Synod and as a Church, are concerned in our wider agenda. I am therefore grateful not only to Dr Storkey but also for the opportunity of this debate, for the nature of the report, and for the presentation tonight.

I believe that it does give a proper emphasis on that changing world mission scene. It draws our attention to it – and indeed there are many ways in which we can expand and enlarge upon it – and also reminds us of the mutuality of mission, affirming that the Church of England is both a participant and a recipient of the Christian world mission. I believe that those are the particularly important emphases.

May I draw attention to three areas where I think that this debate touches on so many of the other concerns which we would want to take up? There is the whole way in which our agenda is shaped by the pursuit of a mission-shaped Church. The later amendment stresses one way in which the world Church is assisting us to understand our own situation in mission, and to come to a deeper understanding of our own calling and vocation at this time. In addition, we discover that, in this relationship that there is between PWM and the Synod, there is also the question of the Church-shaped mission and how the mission of God can be taken up, into the life of the Anglican Churches, including our own.

There is a second area, already alluded to, which is the way in which the centre of gravity, as it were, of the Christian movement has moved south. An important, perhaps slightly overstated, book by Philip Jenkins called *The Next Christendom* draws out a number of the implications there are in the fact that, numerically and spiritually, the centre of the Christian movement has moved south. He remarks at one stage that perhaps in a generation or two the phrase ‘Western Christian’ may sound as strange as the phrase ‘Scandinavian Buddhists’ does now. ‘One knows it is possible’, he says, ‘but not altogether very likely’.

There is this very real question as to how we in the north, in our Church, in our own situation, relate to the rest of the world Christian movement. The mission societies are people who have built up a great heritage of trust and respect in global links. It is perhaps particularly important for us to understand where God is moving in the world

and how we too are a part of it – because we are participants. We have something to offer as well as much to receive.

The third point that I would want to make alludes to the title of the debate, about ‘enabling difference’. We know – and I think that it was suggested in the presentation – that the Anglican Communion, indeed our own Church, is not very good at enabling difference. It is perhaps important to ask ourselves how well the mission societies can assist us with that. I would draw attention to the fact that the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission, in its working document which it is distributing at the moment, is raising the question as to ways in which mission societies, companionship links, religious orders – the sort of person-to-person links that we have been hearing about tonight – become important as instruments of unity within the Anglican Communion, and perhaps an increasingly important link in the future.

While the drums are being beaten, while the stories are being told – and we welcome them all – it is naturally appropriate that the motion should also suggest that we look for ways in which we are able to offer financial and prayer support. However, in thinking about that, I believe that this debate asks us even more to say not just what we will give but what we will gain. There may be limitations in the report, but if it were not here, we would have to invent something very much like it – as we would the mission societies and the PWM – as we look to the way in which the Church of God and the gospel of God are held together in the mission of Christ and his Lordship.

Revd Stephen Coles (London): Perhaps I may pick up on three things which have been said. First, I wish to elaborate slightly on what Simon Pothen has said about the need to be less defensive in the way in which we deal with people from other provinces and countries. Second, to pick up on something that Elaine Storkey said about the word ‘missionary’, which is also a very difficult word to use in this country, not just overseas. Third, to refer to something in the presentation which talked about the deep hurt that is felt on all sides.

I want to ask a question, to which I really do not know the answer: to what extent are the mission agencies able to help us in what we need to have – which is a very robust conversation with people when cultures and theologies clash? One of the things from which we have suffered is very immoderate language, from many different directions. I think that people do not know what it sounds like to the other side, and I wonder if the mission agencies can help us. The speaker from Liverpool said that she felt it might be possible for that to be developed by building up relationships.

There was a rather surprising moment in our PCC meeting recently, which I had not been expecting. Someone had sent us an appeal – I think it was from the SPCK – to help with sponsoring some theological education. I raised it and, much to my amazement, somebody said, ‘Not until they actually say that they are prepared to take us seriously and to listen to us’. I was very taken aback, because I had not realized that it could have

been received by people at that level. I think that there is a lot of anxiety round that sort of thing. It is not that the PCC and the parish in north London that I come from are unwilling to help and support people in different situations abroad, because we have a relationship with a parish in Mozambique. However, that is a direct link through the diocese and not through a mission agency.

I am therefore asking a question at this point. Somebody has to do some work to try to facilitate the relationship again, because I do not think that we should underestimate how difficult it will be to encourage PCCs, in the words of the motion, to commit five per cent of their money to the work of mission agencies. We must not underestimate the difficulty of doing that, in the current climate.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Simon Bessant (Blackburn): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After paragraph (b) *insert* as a new paragraph:

“(c) affirm the distinctive ministry of mission partners from across the world who are serving in England, enriching the work of God’s mission to our country;”

and re-letter the remaining paragraphs accordingly.’

I wish to support the motion as a whole. However, my amendment aims to make explicit what is already implicit in the motion, which is to affirm the role of the mission partners through the agencies – 3.4.1 on page 8 of the report.

Just as England was evangelized centuries ago by Christians from beyond our shores, so we played our part in sharing the gospel overseas. Most of this was the work of Christlike missionaries, who risked and often lost their lives for the sake of the gospel. Some of it, though, dishonoured the name of Christ. Nevertheless, we played our part in birthing the world Church. Now, however, Churches round the world are themselves turning their missional vision back to the countries of Europe. They see us as a mission field, just as we saw them as a mission field. It is now, as the Bishop of Rochester puts it, ‘From everywhere to everywhere’.

This therefore makes the role of our mission agencies absolutely vital. Yes, still sending people from this country to work with the Churches overseas in partnership, but also enabling Christians from those countries to come here, to act as go-betweens and to help place them in a mission context here, within our own Anglican family, to work as mission partners in this country. They may be few but they are growing. I was told tonight that there are now 38 such mission partners – CMS alone, plus other organizations. They are playing a significant role in ministering, with us, the work of God’s mission to our country.

They are distinctive because they bring to us an experience of poverty, oppression, often the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and environmental degradation, but they also bring vibrant faith, joyful worship and infectious evangelistic love for people. They are enriching, because their presence adds a dynamic energy and missiological insights to our Church, for which we should thank God.

As far as I know, Synod has never overtly acknowledged, let alone affirmed, the ministry of our mission partners from elsewhere in God's global Church. This amendment gives a chance for Synod to do so today.

The Bishop of Coventry: I believe that it is a very important point that has been made, and I am very happy to accept the amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr Ian Smith (York): I thank Elaine Storkey for raising the issue of the radical reshaping that the mission agencies are facing and which they need to do. I can speak from the point of view of CMS and would say, 'Watch this space'. Details cannot be revealed tonight but, certainly by early September, you will be hearing all sorts of things which will radically affect the way CMS relates to the Church in England.

I would like to commend the report and to emphasize the relevance of a global view of mission within the local situation here in Britain. It is sometimes referred to in the trade as being 'globally local'. It relates to point (b) in the motion. Many British churches relate to mission agencies because, like apple pie and motherhood, they see them as a good thing. You enter a church building and see a notice saying how much they gave to such-and-such an agency last year. That is good, because at least it recognizes that there is a world beyond the parish and that we recognize that we have sisters and brothers in Christ in other countries. However, there is so much more.

The Church in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and other places is certainly blessed by our funding and by our prayers; but if we are to grow beyond the paternalistic view that we merely send money and people to poor people, then we have to become more relational. It means that we need to see that what God is doing worldwide he wants to do here too. The best way we can do that is to experience the life of the Church across the world and to allow it to affect the way that we are Church in England. It means, for example, visiting for ourselves: it means writing, phoning, emailing people who are there. It means trying to help them to visit us.

In the last half-century we have looked to the USA and continental Europe for theological insights and ideas for church growth. We have rarely considered learning from the growing churches in the two-thirds world, but it is from there that so many ideas that Synod endorsed in February under the theme of *Mission-shaped Church* originated. Fresh expressions are mainstream in many places that we think of rather charitably.

In many respects we are already a globally local society. Much of the food members of Synod have eaten today has been sourced from different parts of the world. Yet our God sent Jesus to die for the sins of the whole world, so how much more must we, as Christians, relate to the whole world?

The PWM societies need your funding as much as they ever did. We still need to facilitate people to go into all the world with the gospel. However, we also need to recognize that, in our mission within England today, the world Church, via the PWM agencies, is a vast and largely untapped resource. So let us not just support the agencies: let us use them as a lifeline for our own mission here in Britain.

Mr Guy Milner (Chester): Thinking of two speakers whom we have heard, one has referred to some difficulties but the other has referred particularly to the universities. I think that, as Anglicans, we ought to realize that a very large number of young Christians are no longer interested in denomination. I have not heard any mention in our debate this evening of to what extent the Anglican mission agencies are working with other denominational agencies. Some members will be well aware of the difficulties of competitive work in parts of the world in previous generations, and some may be aware of the wonderful work that is done from a ship which is fitted out as a hospital ship and which is working, for example, down the coast of Africa. I know one of the young people who was working on that ship some years ago. They would not claim to be Anglican; they would claim to be nurses, doctors, or other medical practitioners, but also Christians. In serving people through medicine – and it is the same with agronomists and other skilled people who go out into the world – they go out first of all as skilled people, secondly as Christians and, because of that faith, others have joined them. I simply wanted to put that perspective into this debate.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): On a point of order, I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The Bishop of Coventry, in reply: May I begin by thanking very sincerely those who have taken part in the debate tonight? It is one of those debates that is not easy to summarize because many of the points, if not identical, certainly overlapped and, without then forming a seamless whole, it nevertheless had a cohesion to it.

I will try to draw out three or four of the major points as I found them tonight, and hope that they will provide an adequate summary of the debate for Synod. Before I do that, could I wave in front of the Synod the CD which I mentioned earlier? This is available free to any members of Synod who would like to take it, to be found on the SPCK bookstall. It is entitled *Enabling a World of Difference*, which of course is the title of GS 1544.

May I say a word about collaboration? A number of speakers have either used the word 'self', or talked about examples of how different mission agencies have worked together, or individuals within those agencies have worked together. It is a blessed word, 'collaboration', and I think that we need to be very honest about what this means in terms not simply of the mission agencies but of much of our Church life. Is it not the case that collaboration often comes when we are forced into it rather than because we choose it as a theological principle? It reminds me of Malcolm Muggeridge's description of the ecumenical movement in the early 1960s, when he compared it to turning-out time at the pub. He said that it was not clear whether the way in which people clung to each other was out of affection or out of need! There is, of course, a sense in which we have been forced to work together. The smaller we are, the more vulnerable we become, and then we turn to the resources that our neighbours can perhaps share with us and us with them. There is certainly an element of this in the way in which the mission agencies have been drawn together in recent years, particularly over the last decade or so.

Most of the mission agencies started, and to some extent continued, with a very clear basis of faith. They represented something. Those of us who know anything about the history of the split, for example, between CMS and BCMS in the 1920s will understand how strong those differences could be and, from time to time, still are.

We are in a very interesting and perhaps quite hopeful phase in terms of the mission agencies at the moment. You will see that Appendix 4 in this report refers to a covenant, a covenant which was signed by all eleven mission agencies on 24 November last year. This covenant is significant because it represents a willingness on the part of these agencies, with their different backgrounds and to some extent with their variations in theology, to commit themselves to the primary task of mission and, in doing that, to recognize, *pace* the last speaker, that this is actually about being Anglican and it is in the presence of the Archbishop, who is the head of the Anglican Communion. I believe that this is a very important step forward in our understanding of collaboration.

The second thing that I would like to mention is the concept of interchange, whether that be visits from us to countries overseas or vice versa. Again, a number of speakers mentioned this. I would simply point out that, amongst other things, as well as the excitement and all the immediate and perhaps rather superficial stuff that can flow from such exchanges, this is an ideal way of beginning – and I stress 'beginning' – to understand some of the great issues. What does HIV/AIDS look like in a country that is devastated by it? We can debate it here in Synod, we can read about it, but actually to visit some of the countries of Africa, for example, where the scourge has really taken root, is to change us almost unrecognizably. To encounter people who are suffering in that way, families who are decimated and devastated by it, is to change our whole perception on what is happening. The same is true of issues like trade justice, and so on. The big ideas, the big concepts, that we talk about so easily actually take root in human lives, as we visit places and meet people.

I would love Synod not simply to acknowledge that this is a possibility, but to encourage

dioceses to continue to develop their companion links and to develop them in such a way as will enable that kind of exchange to take place. It is a life-changing experience and I believe that the more we can do this, either by visiting or by receiving visitors, the more our horizons will be enlarged and our understanding will be deepened.

Third, Simon Bessant's amendment, which I welcomed, develops this theme of exchange and interchange. It reminds us that we are in a missionary situation ourselves in this country. The now famous phrase from the Bishop of Rochester, himself a former General Secretary of CMS, 'From everywhere to everywhere' is as good a soundbite – he will not like the word 'soundbite'! – as I can think of to express what this interchange and exchange might be about.

As we recognize people in our midst who bring to us different understandings of how the gospel is to be lived, then we come to that question, which was raised by one of the speakers, about how the mission agencies can help us understand what happens when cultures clash. This is not the prerogative of the agencies, of course, but something which emerges, quite frequently if not very frequently, from this bringing together of people from different cultures. It is only when we recognize that the culture clashes are people as well as principles that we recognize the pain that is involved. That pain has been very clear to us in recent years over the gay issue, and the terrible anxieties there are in many parts of the Anglican Communion about how this will be resolved. What will the Eames Commission say? Is God going to lead us into some kind of new unity, or will it lead to schism within the Anglican Communion? These are issues which make far more sense when we know and have met people who represent something different from the position that we take. That happens within our own culture within this country, but even more so and on a much greater scale when this interchange between cultures takes place.

I think that the simple answer to the question, 'Can the mission agencies help?' is Yes. There have been a number of fairly low-key and rather small attempts at setting up debates of this kind: I am sure that the mission agencies could do more on this. If dioceses or parishes would like some help or stimulus towards those debates, then please do approach the mission agencies.

The points made by Guy Milner and Peter May are very interesting. It is certainly true, is it not, that for many young people denominations mean very little? I am sure that this is true of most students within UCCF and other Christian bodies, including those students who come from overseas. Many will come from cultures where the mission agencies have been active in the past. For example, they may come from East Africa with a CMS or a USPG label but nevertheless, when they come to this country, they will find that being Christian is the primary thing and that denominational labels are of much less importance.

There are examples of the mission agencies working interdenominationally – not many perhaps and perhaps there need to be more. For example, in eastern Europe, in some

parts of the Middle East, and indeed in some parts of Africa, I am personally aware of that mix of denominations which is concerned with the primary purpose of why they are there and denominational labels are of secondary importance.

The final thing I would like to say is how grateful I am in particular to two speakers who brought challenges. Elaine Storkey challenged, frankly, the superficiality of what she called a vacuous, chummy report. That to some extent is true. If I had to try and justify it, I would say that we were trying to be fairly general about some of these things, but that is no excuse for not tackling the major issues that she raised. It almost certainly is the case that the mission agencies themselves are not unaware of these issues and, in a variety of different ways, will be tackling them. However, perhaps PWM can do something to bring together that kind of thinking, and it could well result in an invitation to Dr Storkey herself to come and do some work with us – but we shall see about that!

The other speaker to whom I am particularly grateful is Simon Pothen and his plea for openness and honesty. There are many aspects where that is needed and it is a challenge that we must never forget. We must be open and honest in our relationships.

To encapsulate that, I will tell you a story of an African bishop who was in discussion with an English bishop about whether their two dioceses might form a link. The African bishop said to the English bishop, ‘What you’re really looking for is an affair. What we want is a marriage.’ The English bishop was saying, ‘Let’s see how it works; let’s go along and we’ll review it after a few years. If it doesn’t work, then we’ll call it a day.’ The African bishop was saying, ‘That’s not good enough for us. If you want this kind of relationship, let’s go for it from the outset.’ That represents a cultural difference, but it also represents a challenge to us to ask what we really want in our relationships with the Church overseas. What are we prepared to give, as well as to receive from them? I believe that giving is reflected in this motion by the five per cent, but of course that five per cent represents far more than just money: it represents a lasting and a deep commitment to God’s work, with his people, globally. It is that glorious work to which he calls us, and which I believe this motion seeks to encapsulate.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

‘That this Synod, in reaffirming its continuing commitment to the work of the mission agencies:

- (a) acknowledge its responsibility to cooperate in God’s global mission with other partners and especially the mission agencies;
- (b) endorse a vision of mission that is made more complete by acknowledging our part in, and what is offered by, the global Church;

- (c) affirm the distinctive ministry of mission partners from across the world who are serving in England, enriching the work of God's mission to our country;
- (d) encourage each diocese and deanery to explore the challenges of our involvement in God's mission offered by the mission agencies with the help of resources produced by PWM; and
- (e) request PCCs to review their financial and prayer support of the mission agencies in the light of the 1996 General Synod motion "that all PCCs seek to commit at least five per cent of their annual income to the support of . . . the agencies" and the contribution they make to God's mission.'

The Session was adjourned at 10.05 p.m.