

# Full Synod: First Day

## Monday 14 February 2005

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams)* took the Chair at 5.00 p.m.

*The Chairman* led the Synod in prayer.

### **Introduction of New Members**

*The Chairman:* I introduce and welcome the Bishop of Croydon (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines); the Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent); the Bishop of Basingstoke (Rt Revd Trevor Wilmott); the Dean of Portsmouth (Very Revd David Brindley); the Dean of York (Very Revd Keith Jones); the Dean of Salisbury (Very Revd June Osborne); Revd Elizabeth Dyke (Coventry); Revd Canon Dr Christopher Hardwick (Worcester); the Archdeacon of Taunton (Ven. John Reed); Revd Priscilla White (Exeter); Mr Joseph Brookfield (Blackburn); Mr Julian Hall (Coventry); Mrs Rosemary Lording (Hereford); Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester); Mr Keith Malcouronne (Guildford); and Dr Terry Slater (Birmingham).

Our new ecumenical representatives on this occasion are Revd Michael Bochenski (Baptist Union); Revd Dr John McPake (Church of Scotland); and Revd Anthony Milner (Roman Catholic Church).

We also have with us representatives of the Church of England Youth Council, attending on the same basis as our ecumenical representatives: Mr Tom Belshaw, Mr Simon Butterworth and Miss Laura Pickering.

We also have a new member of the senior staff to welcome: Mrs Gill Laver, Director of Finance and Central Services to the Archbishops' Council.

We greet all these new members. (*Applause*)

### **Progress of Measures and Statutory Instruments**

*The Chairman:* I report to Synod that the Stipends (Cessation of Special Payments) Measure, the Care of Cathedrals (Amendment) Measure and the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure have each been found expedient by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and have been laid before Parliament, and that the Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2004 and the Parochial Fees Order 2004 have both been laid before Parliament and came into force on 1 January 2005.

THE CHAIR *Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin (London)* took the Chair at 5.08 p.m.

## **Report by the Business Committee (GS 1560)**

*Revd Dr Richard Turnbull*: I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

In preparing for introducing this debate, I looked back over some previous debates on the agenda, hoping to find a common style for the opening speech but, alas, there was none. I want to begin with a verse from Psalm 46, and I want to leave that verse with the Synod for the duration of these sessions: ‘Be still, and know that I am God.’

There are three particular areas that I wish to draw to the Synod’s attention: those concerning debates affecting the structure and shape of the Church, debates on matters of public policy, and debates concerning mission and young people. However, before dealing with those matters it is important that I deal at once with the requests which have been received for a synodical debate on matters related to the marriage of Prince Charles and Mrs Camilla Parker Bowles.

First of all, I note for the Synod that the power to agree to a change in the synodical agenda to permit an emergency debate on any subject is a power which rests with the Presidents alone. The Presidents have received requests from a small number of Synod members for such a debate. It is the clear view of the Presidents that to disturb the full and demanding agenda that we already have for this week would be quite wrong. If there are members who have points that they wish to make about Church/State relations more generally, there are a number of ways in which they can seek to bring these concerns to the floor of Synod in an ordered and considered way in the future; now is not the moment for such a debate.

So let me turn to the content of our agenda. First, we have a number of debates of high profile and public importance concerning the nature and future shape of the Church. The work of the Rochester commission on women in the episcopate has been widely welcomed as a significant foundation on which the Church can debate the ordination of women to the episcopate. It is an example of the quality of both the theology and the practical reflection which this Synod has increasingly seen in the reports before us and for which we can be very grateful indeed. It gives us an opportunity to demonstrate in our debate a serious engagement with the quality of the material before us. The critical aspect is a thorough, iterative, engaging and honest debate on the scriptural and theological basis before proceeding further. We have provided significant time for this debate.

We recognize, of course, that there is a reasonable and responsible body of opinion that also seeks to move the process forward as well as debating the theological principles: we have five Diocesan Synod Motions on the subject. Hence on Wednesday afternoon, after

the morning debate on the Rochester report, the Archbishop of Canterbury will introduce a short debate on a report from the House of Bishops setting out the future process. The motion that the Archbishop will move invites the Business Committee to make available time in the July 2005 group of sessions for the Synod to vote on whether it wishes to set the process in train for removing the legal obstacles to the ordination of women to the episcopate. If the motion on Wednesday afternoon is passed, the Business Committee will indeed ensure that there is a vote in July on the principle of introducing legislation.

On Thursday we have a major debate, to be introduced by the Bishop of Durham, on the Windsor report. Members will have both the report itself and the accompanying report from the House of Bishops (GS 1570). This debate also is one of high public interest and importance. Members will be aware of the forthcoming meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and will want in this debate to ensure that the Archbishop of Canterbury is aware of synodical opinion on the central issues as he prepares for that meeting. It is important for a high-quality debate that we ensure that, as well as making points of detail, we concentrate our minds on the significant issues of authority, communion and unity as we seek to explore how we may be an effective, apostolic and united Church and Communion without diminishing differences or tensions between us. The motion itself, in part (c), asks the Synod to assure the Archbishop of Canterbury of its prayerful support. I would like to suggest that prayer for our Church, our Communion and our Archbishop should be a priority for us, both corporately and individually, during these sessions and in the weeks to come.

On Friday [*sic*] afternoon, we will debate Anthony Archer's Private Member's Motion on senior Church appointments. This motion heads the Private Members' Motions list with 159 signatures; it is therefore the clear will of Synod that the motion be debated. The motion before the Synod – and there are also some amendments which have been submitted – deals with the process for the appointment to certain senior offices other than diocesan bishops and the possibility of a review. It is, of course, important for the clarity of the debate that we concentrate in our contributions on the process of appointment and the nature of any possible review.

In addition to all those things, we have a major debate on the second part of Professor McClean's working party on clergy terms of service, dealing with, among other things, the application of common tenure to the beneficed clergy. There is also the revision stage of the Ordinal, a vitally important piece of liturgical business.

These are all major debates which will require concentration, attention and prayer. 'Be still, and know that I am God.'

The second area of the agenda is a major, high-profile and important debate on public policy, concerned with the global environment in which we live. Global issues of economics, trade, climate and other related matters will affect our agenda both in these sessions and in July. It is right that this is so. This is the year in which the United

Kingdom will assume the presidency of both the G8 group of nations, meeting at Gleneagles in July, and also, in the second half of the year, the presidency of the European Union. What is the Spirit saying to the Church and to the international community? In July we may return to the issue of trade justice, but for this group of sessions we are concentrating on the environment more widely; this is particularly important given the Government's declared intention of making climate change their keynote theme for their two international presidencies of this year. It is an important opportunity for the Church to debate the complex issues surrounding the environment in all its facets, a global issue of global importance for humanity and a critical issue for Christians.

The third major aspect of the agenda is a debate on the continuing and renewed commitment of the Church to its historic mission, especially among young people. We have over the years debated mission to and involvement of young people in the Church, and we have also debated Church schools with the Dearing report. Building on these debates, we will be debating this week the wider question of the relationship between the Church and higher education. This is an opportunity to explore the areas of values and purpose in higher education and to encourage and engage with those involved with chaplaincy in this part of Christ's mission to the world.

This is a packed agenda, with a number of items of depth and significance. I want to draw attention to opportunities for prayer and for worship. A summary of worship services is listed at the front of the agenda. I know also that there will be groups and individuals meeting daily for prayer. On Wednesday morning we will meet together in the Assembly Hall for Holy Communion at which the Archbishop of Canterbury will both preside and preach. I want to encourage Synod members to take advantage in the midst of this busy week of the opportunities for us as Christians to pray together and worship together.

Members will note that the Synod will conclude on Thursday evening. When a possible debate for Friday morning was moved to July, it seemed to us to be sensible to complete the business on the Thursday evening when that could be achieved by starting 30 minutes earlier on the other days. That enables the majority of members (though of course not all) to return home on Thursday evening, which seemed to us to be the best and most cost-effective use of our resources, human as well as financial. There are still a number of places in the agenda where gaps could open up. Given the intensity of some of the debates, if this does happen I will use my discretion in advising, if appropriate, early adjournments for breaks; but we will have to see how things go and consider things as they arise.

Members will note the strange place, compared with our usual practice, for Farewells, at 2.30 p.m. on Thursday. Members will realize, of course, that we will be bidding farewell to, among others, the Archbishop of York. The timing may indeed be strange but his natural modesty means that it was hard work to persuade him to come at all, simply to hear good things said of him! So maybe we should blame GNER timetables.

‘Be still and know that I am God.’

*Revd Sarah Chapman (Winchester)*: Thank you for this agenda which I would describe as ‘brave’ or maybe ‘dangerous’ because it will certainly test our ability to survive emotionally, physically and spiritually. The common theme seems to me to be one of giving up or perhaps letting go: giving up our clergy freehold, whether we should have chaplains in education, what we should do with our rubbish, or even our sexuality, or certain words in the Ordinal or the single-gender domination in the Upper House. The media could have a field day, and I am sure that we have all written the headlines without their needing to do so, headlines which will do nothing to help me or any of us to encourage the communities or parishes that we come from to engage with the gospel and to tell people of the Kingdom. So I urge myself and all of us to proceed with care, showing a real desire to listen to one another, seeking God’s grace to receive from the other, giving each other the space so that the media, in spite of the issues debated, may report at the end that all they could say was ‘See how these Christians love one another’.

*The Archdeacon of Coventry (Ven. Mark Bryant)*: I want to raise a question as to whether we have the agenda in the right order. As it stands, the agenda has our discussion of the Windsor report coming after our discussion about women in the episcopate. What the Windsor report is about is to help us to think together about how we live together when we disagree. It is likely that when we come to the debate about women in the episcopate we may indeed find that we disagree. Might it not therefore have made more sense for us to discuss the Windsor report first and to give some thought as to how we live together when we disagree before moving on to another subject on which I think we clearly shall disagree? I am sure that the Business Committee will tell us that it is utterly impossible to change the order of business, but I would be grateful if, for those reasons, it could be given some consideration.

*Mr Philip Gore (Manchester)*: My concern is with the frequency of the groups of sessions, or the infrequency of them. Some years ago, when it was decided that we should normally revert to having two groups of sessions instead of three, I was very much against it. I know that there are financial implications, and I would be the first to say that we have to save money; however, we have found in recent years that the Synod agenda is becoming increasingly crowded, overloaded, so we keep moving the starting time earlier and the finishing time later. A lot of people find that they cannot keep up the pressure. When I first joined the Synod nearly 20 years ago, I was 20 years younger than I am now; but even people of my youthful age find it difficult.

Alluding to what Dr Turnbull said in his speech, I was unaware that people could ask to have an item put on the agenda. Certainly, had I known, I too would have asked for the matter of the forthcoming marriage of HRH The Prince of Wales to be included. I know that one of the functions of the Synod, as defined by section 6(b) of its Constitution, is ‘to consider and express their opinion on any other matters of religious or public interest’. I believe that that issue now is of religious and public interest. I ask that other members of the Synod will lobby the Presidents in that regard.

*Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield)*: Two points. I am disappointed that, although we debated the length of speeches, amendments and reduction of Questions from three to two at the July group of sessions, this has not improved the opportunity for folk to contribute. I am not alone in this view, as is shown by the correspondence to the Business Committee. After counting – yes, I know it is sad – how many times individuals spoke in the last sessions, I see that one person spoke at least five times. Some of us wanted to speak just once, and were not called. I have not spoken in the past two groups of sessions. My contribution would not have altered the outcome of the debate, but it would have marked the continuation of our Church schools, something not mentioned at all in July yet still, I hope, at the centre of the mission to this nation, and something not mentioned in this group of sessions, unless you allow my amendment in the environment debate (although Richard Turnbull mentioned, in passing, the Dearing report).

My second disappointment is that a major debate, so-called earlier, is the last thing on our agenda. The environment debate comes after the farewells, and if it is a major debate that is a poor place to put it. It is already on the curriculum of many of our primary schools, but here it is at the end of our agenda. Some people will have gone home. Surely a case of God's creation and what we do with it has to be further up the agenda? It has been on the news. It is of public interest with the Kyoto agreement. Should the Church not be leading the way, rather than appearing to add it as a PS? The Business Committee says that the debate is an opportunity to express views and to affirm what can be done: motherhood and apple pie. Let us get some teeth into an important major debate.

To end on a positive note, I would like to thank Richard Turnbull for his verse from the Psalms: 'Be still, and know that I am God', and his emphasis on the importance of prayer for these sessions.

*Mr Allan Jones (Liverpool)*: I have heard what has been said about Charles and Camilla. However, I really believe that we should have found time at these sessions to have a debate about this subject. It has grave consequences for the future of the Church and for the future of this nation. Those of us who watched *Panorama* last night now realize that there is a question over the civil wedding ceremony that is being proposed. Before I came here, people in Liverpool were asking if this matter was going to come on, and I was having to reply that I did not think it was. Now I know that it is not. However, the Church of England is the established Church of this realm. The people out there are looking to us to say something: either 'No, it is wrong' or 'Yes, we want to congratulate the couple'. We are not doing either. We are not doing anything about it. Can this really be right? I do not think that it can be.

*Canon Ian Garden (Blackburn)*: I do not know if it was just a slip of the tongue – I suspect that it may well have been – but I am very relieved to hear that Anthony Archer's motion has been moved by Dr Turnbull to Friday afternoon! By moving it to Friday, I think that he, for the first time, creates an opportunity in this agenda for us to be still

and to know that God is here. I think I know what his retaliation will be to the point that I am about to make. He is going to say, 'Ian, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' Let me continue the culinary metaphor. We have a light hors d'oeuvre this evening; we have plenty of jam tomorrow; we have lots of cake on Wednesday and we have cream on Thursday; it is a high-cholesterol diet. That may be because we are where we are in the life of this Synod, coming towards the end of a quinquennium, where a whole variety of work has bubbled to the surface and is ready to be taken out of the oven. However, the simple fact remains that, certainly in my experience, which goes back over the past 10 years (and there are many who have been here for longer than I have), this is probably one of the heaviest Synod agendas we have encountered in recent years, and there is no let-up at all from this moment until seven o'clock on Thursday evening. Where, I have to ask, is the space in our agenda for reflection? Where is the space in our agenda for prayer? I hear what Dr Turnbull says about opportunities being made available, but where is the opportunity for the corporate prayer of the Synod? Where is the space for us to breathe as a Synod? I have taken one big gulp of breath and I will expire at seven o'clock on Thursday evening. Where is the space? Where is the space for us to be still and to know that God is here?

One of the things that we really do have to do as members of the Synod is to concentrate. It is no accident at all that in the Crown Court a jury, which is asked to sit there and say nothing, is asked to concentrate for no more than four and three-quarter hours in a day. There is a very good reason for that. We are being asked to sit here for eight and a half hours a day, to concentrate, to listen and to participate in that way. So I have a question: can we be sure that in the way that this agenda has been put together we will effectively discharge our responsibilities as those who are involved at the heart of synodical government in our Church and at the heart of very big questions which, amongst others, relate to the very nature of our Church?

So there it is: I have a very great unease about the pressure that we are all being put under in the course of these three days, and I know that I am not alone. While I think about it, I would like to pay tribute at this stage to the hard-working staff who do not start work at nine in the morning – heaven knows what time they start work in order to get us up and running by nine – and who, I have no doubt at all, go home much later than we do.

I conclude with one bigger question. We have slimmed down Synod now to 500 members. Having done that, I think that the time has come to ask very serious questions as to how we do our business as a Synod. The point has already been made by Mr Gore as to whether we should be going back to three groups of sessions, which might give us that little bit more space to be still and to know that God is with us. There will be a heavy agenda over the course of the next five years, a heavy legislative agenda and a heavy deliberative agenda. May I suggest that we look, for example, at the way in which the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum works, when the financiers come together on a day basis? Could we not have day meetings of the Synod in order, for example, to go through those rather boring revision stages of Measures and the like? That is just one

idea, but I suggest that the time has come for a very careful review of how we can most effectively do our work as a Church which has at its heart, whether we like it or not, synodical government.

*Dr Susan Atkin (Chelmsford):* A relatively minor matter of Synod housekeeping, I am afraid: paragraph 45 of the report refers to the review of constitutions of bodies answerable through the Archbishops' Council, and I just want to commend that process of quinquennial review that we will be looking at later. I note at paragraph 10 of that review that the Business Committee is going to be asking Synod in July to agree new terms of reference for the Doctrine Commission and for the Liturgical Commission. Could we not have a full review of all those bodies that are answerable directly to Synod, once every five years, alongside the review of those answerable through the Archbishops' Council? I would hate us to get too immersed in this sort of detail, but I do think that it is important that we regularly review the number of these bodies, their terms of reference and their membership.

*Mrs Carol Smith (York):* I am delighted that we are having a debate on women bishops, and I can see that this is the beginning of a process. With regard to selecting candidates for ordination, and without getting into the content of that now, may I ask the Business Committee when we can discuss how as a Church we begin to ordain only those who acknowledge the ordination of both men and women?

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

‘That the question be now put.’

*This motion was put and carried.*

*Revd Dr Richard Turnbull, in reply:* The topics that were raised seemed to me to fall into three categories: first, a series of observations and comments on the shape of the agenda, which is of course right and proper in a debate like this; second, a group of comments to do with the workings of the Synod, how we conduct ourselves and how we do our business; and third, some comments on the particular matter concerning the request for emergency debates. If we could just keep those three areas in mind, I will briefly review some of those observations.

I am very grateful to Sarah Chapman for her reminder to us of the need to proceed with our ears open to God and to be willing to receive from him. That, of course, links to some of the later comments, particularly from Ian Garden, about how, in a crowded agenda, you can create that possibility, and where the opportunities for worship and for prayer are. There are four services in the chapel, on Tuesday and Thursday; there is Holy Communion in the Assembly Hall for us all together on Wednesday; I certainly know of one group that will be meeting at eight o'clock every morning for prayer, and there are probably many other groups doing similar things that I do not know about. We have tried to make as many opportunities available for prayer and reflection as we can, and it

is up to each of us to take advantage of those as we are able. It is also worth saying that, although we do indeed have a heavy agenda with some major debates, we have sought in those debates to ensure that sufficient length of time is given in each debate to allow for reflection within the context of the debate. They are not going to be rushed; there is going to be plenty of time within those debates.

Picking up what was said by the Archdeacon of Coventry, Mark Bryant, on the order of the agenda, we did consider the order, and it seems to me that both the Windsor report and the Rochester report are concerned with some very substantive issues of authority themselves; it is not that one is concerned with how we live together and where authority comes from and the other is concerned with practical matters and other things; they are both substantive items concerned with the nature and shape of our Church and our Communion.

In answer to Philip Gore, yes, I hear these observations about pressure on the agenda. It is a balance to be achieved between our responsibility, as members of this Synod, to despatch the business as carefully and efficiently as we can with those wider issues of the need for space and for breathing.

Let me pick up the question from Mary Judkins about members speaking and about Church schools. The speaking of members in debates is monitored by the staff. The Chairs of debates have information available to them about the number of times that people have spoken. That is not the same as saying that we have strict rules about how many times people can contribute or speak. I do not accept that because something is placed last on the agenda its position reflects its importance. We need to keep ourselves quite aware of our responsibility, as members of the Synod, for the wholeness of what is before us. That means looking at the balance of debates, looking at the balance of the agenda, and it also means not going home early; it means recognizing that we are here to do a responsible job and to take part in as many of those debates as we can.

Susan Atkin spoke about the review of the Doctrine and Liturgical Commissions and other bodies directly answerable to the Synod. The Business Committee had some discussion about that, and the discussion will continue. The plan is for some form of report to be made in the July group of sessions on those bodies, but I will take that back to the Business Committee for further discussion and reflection.

I have to say to Carol Smith that the issue of ordaining those who accept both men and women really is not an issue for this debate on the shape of the agenda; it is a matter that can be brought before the Synod in a number of debates that we are yet to have. It is not an issue for us for now.

I want to finish by reflecting again on those requests for an emergency debate. The most important thing I want to say on that is that something which is of interest to the public is not the same as being in the public interest. If something is to be debated because it is a matter of public interest, as opposed to being of interest to the public, we have to have

very clear ground rules for why we are doing it. It is of course appropriate that this Synod concerns itself with matters of Church/State relations and all the implications for both the nation and the Church, but to do so at this point would entrap us in a debate which was of interest to the public but of doubtful public interest. That public interest may yet come before the Synod, but this would not be the time to do it. That is why, as I understand it, the Presidents have made quite clear that there will be no such debate in these sessions.

I am very grateful for the whole range of contributions. Some of them require further discussion and further reflection by the Business Committee and, as has been said before from this platform, the Business Committee very much takes the view that our relationship with the wider membership of Synod in looking at the workings of Synod and how we do our business is an ongoing process. It is not something that just happens in this debate. So whatever questions, queries or concerns you have, do please write in to me or to David Williams and we will reflect on all correspondence that comes before us.

*The motion was put and carried.*

*Prebendary David Houlding (London):* On a point of order, Madam Chairman. Despite what has been said this afternoon about the forthcoming Royal wedding, I hope that we can now send, through the very traditional way of applause, our greetings and the assurance of our prayers to the Prince of Wales and the new Duchess of Cornwall, and express to them our total and loyal support. (*Applause*)

## **Appointed Member of the Archbishops' Council (GS 1565)**

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams):* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod endorse this Report and approve the recommendation contained in paragraph 7.’

Incidentally, Madam Chairman, I hope that it is in order for me to congratulate you on your first occupancy of the Chair of this Synod. (*Applause*)

It falls to the Archbishop of York and me to make an appointment to fill the vacancy on the Archbishops' Council created by the end of Jayne Ozanne's term of office. You will recall that Jayne was one of the founder members of the Council and has served it with great commitment for six years; she has brought a huge amount of energy and fresh thinking and challenge to the Archbishops' Council over that period, and I hope that members will join me in sending her the assurance of our prayers and best wishes in the very important new work that she is undertaking as international director of the Humanitarian Aid Relief Trust. (*Applause*)

If members have looked at the background paper for this item, they will have noted that an undertaking was given that no new appointment would be made to the Council for

less than three years; and Synod will notice that the Presidents are proposing a five-year term of appointment for the new nominee, until 31 December 2009. This is important in helping us to create some stability and continuity in the work of the Archbishops' Council, and it is particularly important as we approach a period of change not only in the Council and the Synod but in the NCIs and the Church more widely.

Before the Archbishop of York and I can make an appointment to the Council and Synod can approve it, we are required under the National Institutions Measure to consult the Archbishops' Council and the Appointments Committee. The paper before Synod sets out the process that has been followed in identifying the name that is before it. We believe that this has been an open and transparent process, and it is only right that it should be. I hope that it will give Synod the confidence to approve this appointment without demur.

The name before you is that of Mark Russell, who I think is with us in the public gallery. In Mark we believe that we have found someone with exactly the skills we need to make a very significant contribution to the life and work of the Council. Members will see in the background paper something of Mark's career so far, the range of experience that he brings, from the work in Northern Ireland, from a particularly imaginative and demanding ministry with children and young people, and a proven track record in youth ministry here in England as well as in his native Northern Ireland. He began life as a Methodist but is now a licensed Anglican Reader in the diocese of St Albans. I am very confident that he is going to bring a great deal to the work of the Archbishops' Council. I personally am delighted that he is willing to undertake this, and hope that he will have the Synod's support and that members will hold him in their prayers as he undertakes this work.

*The Chairman:* The item is open for debate. *(No response)*

*The motion was put and carried. (Applause)*

## **Chair of the Pensions Board**

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod approve the appointment of Mr Allan Bridgewater as chair of the Church of England Pensions Board from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2007.’

Once again I move this item on behalf of the Archbishop of York and myself.

As many members will know, Allan took up office in January 1998, succeeding Howard Gracey, who had chaired the board for 17 years. We were very fortunate in persuading Allan to take on this new challenge at a time of such major change in our arrangements for financing clergy pensions. As the former group chief executive of the Norwich Union

Insurance Group and chairman of the Association of British Insurers, he has brought to our affairs a unique knowledge of a very complex and important world, and his services to the insurance industry were recognized by the award of the CBE in 1998. This has not been for Allan in any way a retirement job. He remains chairman of Swiss GB and as such the proud master of that building in the City which, while it bears the technical address of 30 St Mary Axe, is more commonly known as the Gherkin. I do not think that the sixth floor of Church House can quite compare with this, but Allan has given generously of his time and commitment to the board as part of his Christian service. He has had the firm respect and warm support of his fellow board members as well as of many in the dioceses, the Commissioners and elsewhere in the Church. As a founder member of the Joint Employment and Common Services Board of the national Church institutions, he has played an important part in carrying forward the implementation of the Turnbull agenda.

Allan was initially appointed for three years and then reappointed for a further five. I am deeply grateful that he is willing to serve for two more years and thereby to provide some welcome continuity in the conduct of the board's affairs. None of us will need to be reminded of the considerable change and uncertainty in the wider pensions world, and scarcely a day passes without some fresh story appearing in the press connected with these matters. It is also a time for change in the board itself. The terms of office of a number of board members are due to end in December, and the board also has a new chief executive in the shape of Shaun Farrell who, in October, succeeded Roger Radford, to whom incidentally we can also offer congratulations for the award of an OBE in the New Year Honours List.

Members will be well aware of the vital significance of the Pensions Board's work for the morale of thousands of active and retired clergy and their families and indeed many lay workers and administrators who so faithfully serve the Church. We are deeply fortunate to have someone of Allan's calibre in the chair of the board. I invite Synod both to show its appreciation to him for what he has achieved since 1998 and to approve this motion. I believe that Allan is also in the chamber, and I hope that we can greet him. (*Applause*)

*The motion was put and carried.*

THE CHAIR *Mr James Humphery (Salisbury)* took the Chair at 5.55 p.m.

## **Diocesan Synod Motion**

### **Canon B 44 (GS Misc 763A and B)**

*The Chairman:* It is my intention that the debate be as tightly framed as the motion, which is very specifically directed at the Canon. It is not an opportunity for a general debate on ecumenical affairs. I am obliged to advise members of Synod that there are financial implications of this motion; it is not my intention to call a member of the

Finance Division to speak to those but I draw your attention to the financial statement on the fifth notice paper and, in particular, to paragraph 5 of that notice paper.

*Revd Canon Dr Alan Hargrave (Ely):* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod request that legislation be introduced to rescind paragraph 5 of Canon B 44 *Of local ecumenical projects.*’

I hope that this will be a slightly more substantial hors d’oeuvre than has been predicted.

Ely diocese would like to ask Synod to rescind paragraph 5 of Canon B 44 which requires, in particular, that in a local ecumenical partnership an Anglican Holy Communion service be celebrated by an Anglican priest on Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Easter Day, Ascension Day and Pentecost Sunday, in other words at all the major Christian festivals.

So what of Cambourne, a completely new and rapidly growing town a few miles from Cambridge, with a single, vibrant, growing local ecumenical partnership church made up of several denominations and led by an outstanding Presbyterian minister of the Church of Scotland? He is the one leading that work, reaching out with God’s love to the community, working with its leaders and planners; he is the one enabling, encouraging and presiding over this nascent church and seeing it spring to life from nothing before our very eyes. It is a truly wonderful and exciting project, as is the even younger one at Hampton, not to mention the now well-established one at Bar Hill: all brand new settlements springing up on what was simply open countryside not too long ago.

Yet at all the major Christian festivals Cambourne church is currently required by canon law to bring in an Anglican priest to celebrate Holy Communion, either at the main service or by artificially creating another service at a different time, thus risking undermining the authority of the minister of that LEP in his own parish. There is provision in the Canons for the celebration of Anglican Communion, but to insist on it at all the major festivals in all our LEPs seems a bit like imposing our will on our ecumenical colleagues rather than being truly equal partners.

Responding for the Council for Christian Unity, Paul Avis rightly points out the errors in the Ely briefing paper: that LEPs are not anomalous and that the canons do not bring about a mutual recognition of ministerial orders. He is quite right and I apologize for those errors. He also says that LEPs should not in themselves be coterminous with a parish; but demographically, for these brand new communities, it simply does not make sense to bundle them up in a rather contrived way with somewhere else. They are completely new, discrete, demographic units. Let us imagine, however, for a minute what might happen if we did, for example, put Cambourne in with the parish of Bourn three miles down the road. It would not bring Anglicans in Cambourne desirous of attending an Anglican Eucharist any nearer to Bourn parish church, and the danger

would be that the new LEP could then say, 'Well, there's an Anglican Communion service down at Bourn every Sunday, so we never need have one here.' That is not what we are seeking to achieve in Ely diocese.

On the ground, at the grass roots, ecumenical initiatives are moving forward apace and in a way that is often thrilling to see; they are responding to God's call to mission and to the pressing needs of our local churches and communities. They are often beacons of hope and life and unity, to which we should all aspire. However, events and practice on the ground are rapidly outstripping our legislation, which does not envisage much of what is actually happening at the grass roots. Ecumenically, the biggest single, most urgent issue that confronts us was highlighted in our last group of sessions by Colin Buchanan (whom God preserve), namely the Anglican recognition of the orders of our ecumenical partners.

As a consequence, at well-established LEPs such as Bar Hill, there are people from a generation of Christians who have grown up not knowing what denomination they belong to because they have belonged to an interdenominational church, and now they are coming forward for ordination and are faced with the painful task of having to choose a denomination into which to be ordained, and then a grilling from their selectors as to why they are not good Anglicans!

Resolving that one issue would remove most of the ecumenical legal problems which now confront us. In the meantime, however, what we in Ely are asking for is a much more modest but significant step to send a clear message to our LEPs round the country and to our ecumenical colleagues that we are indeed equal partners with them and are not insisting on our own way but working together for that unity for which Our Lord prayed with such great passion the night before he died.

I commend the motion to the Synod.

*The Chairman* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Revd Fleur Houston (Ecumenical Representatives, United Reformed Church)*: I speak also as a minister of one of the oldest single-congregation LEPs in the country: Blackbird Leys in Oxford, which also serves as parish church.

There is absolutely no reason why an LEP should not hold a service from time to time that follows the particular practices and procedures of any one of its sponsoring denominations. There is no reason why this should not be during the regular Sunday morning service, and it would not be unknown for an LEP to invite a minister of that particular Church tradition to lead worship on such an occasion. The principle applies equally to LEPs who also serve as parish churches. However, on the great festivals of the Christian year there is an expectation on the part of the congregation that worship will be led by the person who exercises pastoral ministry in that context, who knows the joys and sorrows of the congregation, a person whom they know and trust and a person who

indeed, in certain circumstances, they may believe to have been called by God to induct or ordain.

To invite a minister from outside, another person, to come and stand in on the great festivals of the Christian year is offensive to ministerial order; it is offensive to the pastoral bond between the minister and the congregation; and it is demeaning to the priesthood of the Anglican who is required to stand in on such an occasion. As the paper from the CCU points out, Canon B 44 only requires such a service to be held in the parish. Indeed they might have suggested that if no other Anglican church is available it is usually possible to make such provision in the local residential home. But why is it not possible for hospitality to be extended to Anglican communicants and for alternative provision to be made on these great festival days at another time of day?

It is a fundamental ecumenical principle that your partner's problems are your problems, so I would invite members to listen to what your ecumenical partners are saying. If, as the CCU paper suggests, this is not the time to revise the ecumenical canons, I would plead with you to exercise vigilance in order to prevent the type of gratuitous offence which has been given and which has been highlighted in the Ely Diocesan Synod Motion.

*Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield):* In bringing this motion to Synod the diocese of Ely have actually referred to us a problem which is really of their own making, for if the diocese and Bishop of Ely had fully observed the requirements of the relevant paragraph 5 of Canon B 44, which they are now seeking to have rescinded, there would have been maintenance of worship according to Anglican rites in the parishes concerned with reasonable frequency. That such a provision has apparently not been made and is not continuing is not the fault of the Canon but is a fault of omission on the part of the diocese and Bishop of Ely.

In my experience as a diocesan ecumenical officer, I have found that most of the LEPs in which the Church of England is involved automatically come within the ministry of Anglican incumbents because they lie within their parishes, but where there is an LEP without such a parish incumbent paragraph 5 requires the bishop to arrange for appropriate Anglican clergy to provide the appropriate Anglican ministry to the LEP. Such clergy could be incumbents of neighbouring parishes or the relevant rural dean or archdeacon or one of the bishops of the diocese. Indeed, in any parish where there is no incumbent priest the charge of caring for the parish rests with the diocesan bishop himself. We need to remember that at any parish induction service the cure which is received by the incumbent is one which continues to be shared with the Diocesan, so in the two parishes in the diocese of Ely where the problem which has led to this motion has arisen, the Church of England clergyman with pastoral responsibility is himself and, in default of other arrangements being made under paragraph 5, he should in person visit the parishes – (*laughter and applause*) – to preside over Anglican public worship and Eucharists there with reasonable frequency. I cannot believe that any local minister

of another denomination would resent the involvement of the diocesan bishop in this way!

So I ask members of the Synod to vote against this motion, totally against, and I suggest that our friends from the diocese of Ely go back and use paragraph 5 to resolve the problem which they themselves have made.

*The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Anthony Russell):* I was not going to come today, and I have made the wrong decision, I am afraid!

The plain fact – we face a very complex agenda during the next few days – the plain fact of this is that the present legislation prevents the very good Church of Scotland minister celebrating on the principal Christian festivals because there has to be a Church of England Communion. I am sure you are right in much of what you said – though I have some doubts about some very particular bits – but nonetheless that is the plain fact. There is an excellent minister there. He is not able to celebrate on the principal festivals. Ely is the fastest-growing diocese, let me tell you, in this country. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has ensured that Ely will be covered with houses in the very near future. Many of those will be in single-church ecumenical projects. The reason that this has been brought here is simply because we want to deal with this matter now before it is replicated time and time again. I appeal to Synod to support this for the reasons that were given by the ecumenical representative: ecumenical reasons and good, sound pastoral reasons, and also that I may have a good night's sleep tonight.

*Revd Moira Astin (Oxford):* I feel a bit of a fraud because I have just stopped being the minister of a local ecumenical partnership and gone to a purely Anglican church (though I am not sure that such a thing exists). I am still the ecumenical officer for Berkshire which, for reasons of history, does not exactly match the archdeaconry – but that is the joy of the Anglican Church. In fact, the Anglican Church has a lot of joys which are also pains. I would like to argue today that pain, in an odd way, is a good thing. Those who have seen people with leprosy will know that. Pain makes you keep on going until you get to the bottom cause of what's going wrong, rather than trying to intervene too quickly. There are big tensions in ecumenical work between our desire to get to full visible unity as quickly as we possibly can and some of the key things that the different denominations hold out as important parts of our understanding of what it means to be a Christian in this country.

One of the things that we hold in the Church of England is this burden – and it is a burden in some senses – to be there as the Church of England for everybody in the country. We have the burden also of our parish system, but it is an important burden and one that this particular paragraph seeks to keep before us. So that in our ecumenical partnerships, where we often have excellent ministers of other denominations, we will keep faith with where we are at the moment in the ecumenical process, which is with our parish system and our commitment to being there and to having Anglican services, with

episcopally ordained Anglican priests taking those on occasion. I agree: it is a pain. We have a church which I am dealing with in a neighbouring parish where we are going to have to provide an Anglican service regularly enough, and nobody wants to do it at the moment. It is a pain.

Let us let that pain help us keep working to the true end, which is proper recognition of other ministries, rather than taking paracetamol, which is what I think accepting this motion would be.

*The Dean of Portsmouth (Very Revd David Brindley):* At one time I was team rector of a town which included an Anglican/Baptist/Methodist LEP among its churches. This LEP was a delicate flower, but the growing together of those from the three traditions was real and deep. Gathering together round the Lord's Table was thankfully at the heart of their commitment as a church community and as individuals, and members of all three traditions valued that. Any suggestion that on the major festivals they might suspend their normal eucharistic arrangements would have caused hurt and outrage. So quite consciously and quite deliberately – I am saying this with at least one of my former bishops in the chamber at the moment – we broke the rules. It was the only possible way to operate, and I suspect that in many LEPs that is the case. The reality is that if a relationship is to grow, there needs to be unconditional commitment. If we hold things back, if we ring-fence bits of a relationship, if we do not take risks, we are providing a brake on growth. The paper from the CCU suggests that hard cases make bad law. That is true, but equally undermining is a law which is widely or frequently ignored. Therefore I support the Ely motion.

*The Archdeacon of Surrey (Ven. Bob Reiss):* In my archdeaconry I have three local ecumenical projects and a fourth one we are hoping to establish soon. It is on the basis of my experience of those places that I want broadly to support the Ely motion. At the moment only two of them are parishes in their own right, one of them for reasons very similar to those given for Cambourne; but the others might well move that way in time. At the moment it is easy because it just so happens that every minister in those four is an Anglican, but that could very well change in the future, and if the present canon were in force so that an Anglican priest had to be brought in on the major festivals to take an Anglican Communion service it would certainly be contrary to the ecumenical spirit in which those projects had been set up, and it would be very demeaning of the ministry of the non-Anglican minister in whose appointment the Church of England itself will have been very heavily involved. Just think what we would feel if one of our partner Churches made the same requirement of their minister on those Sundays.

The simple fact of the matter is that, if there was someone living in one of those areas who particularly wanted an Anglican service on a major festival, I do not think that LEPs man their borders with armed guards, and it would be quite possible for someone to go to a neighbouring parish if they really wanted to.

It is for those reasons that I strongly support the thrust of this motion.

However, the purpose of my amendment is to retain one element in the present paragraph which the Ely motion would remove. Paragraph 5 of Canon B 44 refers back to paragraph 4, which is the paragraph under which the bishop may authorize the holding in a place of worship in the Church of England in that area of services of Holy Communion presided over by a minister of any other participating Church. The opening part of paragraph 5 says ‘Before exercising his powers under paragraph 4 above in relation to any local ecumenical project the bishop shall consult the authorities of the other participating Churches, and he shall so exercise those powers as to ensure that public worship according to the rites of the Church of England is maintained with reasonable frequency in a parish which is in, or part of which is in, the area of that project.’ It is that part of paragraph 5 that I wish to see retained.

I believe that a bishop has the responsibility to know what is going on in LEPs in his diocese, and he has a responsibility to ensure that adequate provision is being made for the Anglicans who live there. He will certainly, for example, want to know how far away the nearest Anglican service will be if there is not to be one in the LEP; and he may well want to ensure that there is some regular Anglican involvement in any, say, exchanges of pulpits or of altars that might happen, even if they are not on the major festivals. Retaining the first part of the paragraph will provide the canonical basis for a bishop to be able to exercise his responsibilities in that way but removing the rest of the paragraph will not force him to require an Anglican service on those major festivals.

The Council for Christian Unity’s argument against that seems to be that this arrangement is not prescriptive enough. Unlike the Council, on this particular matter I believe that we should at least trust our diocesan bishops to make sensible decisions. The Ely motion, amended by my amendment, will remove the unfortunate consequences of the present canon that Canon Hargrave has rightly pointed to, but it will retain the basis for proper episcopal involvement in what goes on.

It is for those reasons that I want to commend my amendment to the Synod.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Ian Cundy):* I find myself in some difficulty, because I speak as chairman of CCU this afternoon, but I am also an assistant bishop in the diocese of Ely and I was worshipping in one of the congregations mentioned earlier in the debate earlier this year. I think that the case has been made for looking again at the ecumenical canons, but I would urge the Synod not to engage in a piecemeal revision on the floor of the Synod without a lot of further thought.

Single-congregation LEPs, as we have heard, bring enormous opportunities for shared ministry between the Church of England and our ecumenical partners. They occasionally bring frustration and difficulty; they can absorb energy as well as release it, and we need to be honest about that. The ecumenical canons open up major opportunities for local unity in mission but they rightly set parameters, given the stage

that we are at on our ecumenical journey. Freedom is always necessarily bounded, and the House of Bishops and the CCU have provided guidance that helps to make these rules work smoothly in practice.

The Ely Diocesan Synod Motion asks the Synod to remove one requirement of Canon B 44, and the amendment that has just been spoken to restricts that slightly but is moving in the same direction. However, as the CCU briefing paper says, the canons are a carefully balanced set of disciplines. Exceptional opportunities are rightly held in tension with certain constraints. I believe that any call for one of those constraints to be removed should be considered only in the light of an examination of the canons as a whole.

The Church of England, under Canons B 11, B 14 and B 14A, is committed to providing regular worship in every parish, or at least in every benefice, in the land. As has been already said, there is considerable flexibility in this but no parish church should be entirely without public worship according to the rites of the Church of England; that remains a vital aspect of the historic national mission of our Church. As happily we are growing together with our ecumenical partner Churches, we share together in ministry and mission in many places, including in the offering of worship to God. Under the canons we are therefore happy to make exceptions to our normal provision, but our general commitment remains, and that is the framework in which these canons are set. That is the framework in which Canon B 45 requires that Anglican eucharistic worship should take place at certain times within the parish in which the LEP is situated, not necessarily at the principal service on that day, and not even necessarily in the place of worship of the LEP itself. I think that this is a reasonable and modest requirement in line with our general commitment to which I have referred. I do not actually think that it need be burdensome or unecumenical.

I appreciate that problems can occur when a single-congregation LEP is set up with boundaries that are coterminous with the boundaries of a stand-alone parish, and I appreciate that this may be more frequent in the future. In that case, as we have heard, there is nowhere else for an Anglican Eucharist to be celebrated in accordance with the canon in the parish, and it may not be easy for the bishop, even if he visits it himself, to ensure that a Church of England priest is always attached to the staff of the parish. I appreciate the problems that this has created for the parishes in Ely and in one or two other cases, and it is the reason why the CCU generally advises that LEPs should not be set up in this way.

I do believe that hard cases make bad law. While I am sorry for the difficulty in which the parish in Ely, and others, has found itself, I do not think that this particular way is the best way to address it. We would do better to look at the canons as a whole in the light of our growing ecumenical commitment rather than just removing or rescinding a single phrase. So while I have enormous sympathy for the situations that have been described, I urge the Synod not to pass this motion at the moment. The CCU works hard to support dioceses and parishes in their ecumenical relations, but the CCU through its

council at the moment is not convinced that this is the right way forward at the present point in our ecumenical journey.

*The Archdeacon of Surrey (Ven. Robert Reiss):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out* the word “rescind” and *insert* the words “delete from” and at the end *insert* the words “all words from ‘and in particular’ to the end”.’

*Canon Alan Hargrave:* I thank Bob for this helpful amendment. In truth, if I am honest, I think that the Ely motion as it stands is just a bit of a sledgehammer job, so we in Ely warmly welcome the amendment which removes the specific need for Anglican Eucharists at all the major festivals and leaves it to the discretion of the bishop, working with the local parties involved, to make reasonable provision and to act appropriately and responsibly in each local situation. We in Ely have complete confidence in our bishop! We believe that this is a much healthier and more mature option than a set of inflexible rules, so we feel that the amendment captures the spirit of the motion and refines it to make it much more helpful. We warmly support it.

*The amendment was put and carried.*

*The Archdeacon of Lancaster (Ven. Colin Williams):* I oppose the motion as now amended precisely because, if carried, it takes away the requirement for an Anglican celebration in LEPs on the specific days mentioned in Canon B 44(5). I believe that that provision remains an important safeguard for Anglicans within a local ecumenical partnership. Any setting up of a local ecumenical partnership must entail a delicate balancing act, balancing ecumenical intentions against the legitimate interests of each particular Church involved. As it now stands, Canon B 44(5) offers just such a balance. It enables Anglicans in a local ecumenical partnership to continue to enjoy something which has been the warp and weft of the Church of England for centuries: to attend an Anglican celebration of Holy Communion on days which, within the Anglican tradition, bear special significance. The high value which they place on making their communion in that way on those days will be something which Anglicans will bring to the table as the local ecumenical partnership is being discussed. This canon resources them in doing so. Our ecumenical partners will bring their own distinctiveness to the table and look for ways in which that can be respected, and they will expect us to do no less.

In this talk of distinctiveness I believe that there is an important point: we have arrived at that familiar phrase ‘diversity in unity’ or ‘unity in diversity’, whichever way round you have it. Any local ecumenical partnership, any ecumenical endeavour worth its salt, will work hard to back away from this sense of simply working to achieve the lowest common denominator; it will not want to bring about a bland *mélange* which is so bland that it offers no challenge, no cutting edge. It will want the local ecumenical partnership instead to become a forum in which partners not only celebrate their unity but also value their diversity and seek to learn from each other precisely at those points

at which we differ still from each other. So I oppose this motion because it seeks to remove from us the opportunity to celebrate our Anglican distinctiveness at one and the same time as committing ourselves to work in a dynamic way within a local ecumenical partnership with our ecumenical partners.

Significantly, in my view, the Ely paper and all that we have heard from the diocese of Ely seems to be almost totally silent on pressure from our ecumenical partners to make this change. My strong suspicion is that our ecumenical partners would much rather we be less timid about being simply ourselves. I believe that the deletion of this section of Canon B 44(5) would in reality be harmful to the ecumenical cause, and I urge Synod to reject the motion.

*The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Peter Selby):* I suspect that there are a number of members of Synod who represent a strongly held view within our Church that would not really support the existence of local ecumenical projects in which the sacrament of the Holy Communion is celebrated by persons not in episcopal orders on any Sunday, let alone Easter Day, and would not choose to belong to such a project if they could help it. What we have done is to vote, by instituting those canons, for the possibility of such projects being as it were pilot projects around the country. What this motion seeks to do is to enable us to be logical about that. I do not believe that it takes away the major issue which, I suspect, is represented as a sub-text in some of the speeches that have been made, namely that there is serious doubt in the mind of some of us whether we should be having local ecumenical projects. I do not happen to share those doubts but I think that they are the sub-text of much that is being said. What I do not think is helpful is to impose that debate on particular local projects by means of a requirement that is actually not logical: if it is not appropriate that Anglicans should be deprived of the opportunity of attending a Eucharist conducted according to their canons and their rites on a standard Sunday in the year, it is not appropriate on any other Sunday either. Therefore I think that what the Ely motion, as now amended, does is to allow for the organic development of a process in the life of ecumenical projects which will enable the bishop and the local people together to work out what point they have reached in their growth and life together. That is wholly to be commended, and a requirement of the kind that we currently have does not help in that process.

There is one other thing that I would like to say and it is on the subject of paracetamol. It is very customary when things get difficult – and I say this with all due respect to the speaker who said it – to introduce the spiritual value of pain, and to suggest that some small action is either a paracetamol or an Elastoplast or whatever metaphor comes to mind. What I think we are being invited to look at here is not that kind of pain but the pain that results from sitting in an uncomfortable position too long and not doing the obvious thing, which is to move.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd Nigel McCulloch):* I am very much in sympathy with the spirit of the motion from the Ely diocese and am very anxious that my dear friend the Bishop of Ely should not become an eternal insomniac. Ecumenism has

moved on a very long way from the 'project' language of the 1960s into the 'partnership' notion which, thankfully, we have today, and the Ely motion is helping us to affirm that. There are many dioceses represented here today who are taking ecumenism very seriously. Manchester is one diocese where the synod has almost unanimously voted to form a diocesan covenant with the Methodist Church and to do together all that we possibly can, because the Church – and this has been noted in several speeches this evening – if it is serious about its mission has to take new steps and new risks.

However, in working with our partner Churches it is essential that we move together and thereby maintain the level of support that has allowed us to move as far as we have done. So I laud the desire behind the Ely motion but I question whether simply removing paragraph 5 of Canon B 44 would provide a satisfactory answer to the situation it seeks to address. Ely argue that Church legislation has not kept pace with the theology of ecumenism. With respect, I think that it is exactly the other way round: theological agreement has not yet reached as far as the Ely diocese would like to go. As the Council for Christian Unity makes clear in its paper, recent agreements do not achieve interchangeability of ministries. Mutual recognition of the authenticity of one another's ordained ministries in that sense is, frankly, not where we are. That of course could be argued to be the ultimate long-term goal of the ecumenical movement, and, if that is what the Ely motion is really about, the simple removal of the canon does not and cannot achieve it. As the Bishop of Peterborough cogently argued, it would be too piecemeal an approach to gain the substantive revision of overall canon law that would be required.

So for me and, I suspect, many others who want to invigorate the ecumenical movement, this would be moving without proper review and consultation with ecumenical partners and moving beyond where our agreement is currently at. It would also risk losing a lot of the trust, in, for example, the near-unanimous agreement that has enabled the Manchester diocesan synod to back the significant partnership that we are now achieving, and I do not want to lose that level of trust.

I also want to ask how many places there really are where Canon B 44(5) is causing major problems. I was not wholly persuaded by Canon Hargrave that that is the issue. I think that, very understandably, he is wanting to push the whole ecumenical agenda forward. Speaking as a bishop who is keen to forge ahead ecumenically, I am particularly concerned that we really do things properly. The 2001 revised CTE constitutional guidelines for LEPs seem to me to provide a wise balance between risk and caution: 'The partnership shall respect the faith and practice of its member denominations. Worship shall safeguard and present the doctrines, practices, traditions and developing traditions of each participating denomination.' I hear the Bishop of Ely's defence, and, having been a bishop in a rural diocese before becoming urbanized, I understand where he is coming from; but the dispensation that a diocesan bishop can grant under existing canon law has already been demonstrated to be generous and intended to be so, whilst honouring the desire to

respect within a partnership the distinctive features and identities of the denominations participating.

It is not, as an earlier speaker noted, just Anglican identity that needs to be protected; and if one day the goal of full interchangeability is to be achieved then the way that the ecumenical movement is to go forward is not the way this motion intends, for I believe that the Ely motion could cause damage. Therefore, with regret, because I understand its hopes, I will oppose it.

*Revd Canon Thomas Oliver (Rochester)*: I wanted to pick up something that was said earlier in the debate about visiting Anglican priests. Because I am a sector minister, whenever I celebrate the Holy Communion I do so as the guest of another congregation. When I do that, I do it not as a foreigner but as a brother, as a partner in the ministry of the gospel. So I do not think that it is necessarily the case that if an Anglican comes into such a situation at a major festival they do so in a way that is calculated to be a put-down to other ministers in that local ecumenical partnership. It is a demonstration of the fellowship of the gospel.

However, one of my own agonies about the ecumenical debate and ecumenical documents is that I believe that one of the measures of their worthwhileness is the extent to which they attend to ultimate concerns as distinct from penultimate concerns, and it seems to me that there is a fundamental defensiveness about much of the way in which ecumenical documents and ecumenical relations are developed. For example, earlier in this debate we heard hackneyed phrases – forgive me, Bishop Ian – such as hard cases making bad law. Well, I would not know; I am not a lawyer. We have heard that we have to strike the right balance. I thought that setting up a local ecumenical partnership was done as a response to mission opportunity in a locality, that the penultimate concern is striking the right balance but the ultimate concern is servicing the worship and mission of the Christian community, often in a new situation. Because I hear a lot of defensiveness about the taking of risks in this debate, I am minded to vote for the motion for I think that we need to be very wary about ecumenism which gets lost in the penultimate and fails to attend to the ultimate concerns of the gospel; but if you do get the opportunity to invite me to celebrate Holy Communion, I would love to be with you as a brother in Christ.

*Revd Chris Lilley (Lincoln)*: I am speaking as the ecumenical officer for Lincoln diocese and also as a rural dean. Within our deanery there is a small market town of 2,000 people – well, quite large by Lincolnshire standards – where they are in the process of setting up an LEP with three churches in the town: Anglican, Methodist and Baptist. The combined congregation was 80 but since they started worshipping together it has increased to over 200. It is quite likely that the next minister will be a Methodist or a Baptist, and they would be caught by the restrictions of Canon B 44(5), so I have a particular interest and concern in this.

I welcome the comments from the Bishop of Peterborough, that he would support a

review of the ecumenical canons; a generation on, that is high time, and I hope that the CCU can move forward with that particular issue. However, I disagree with him over this particular matter, which I think we can deal with now without its damaging the balance of the canons and certainly without its upsetting our ecumenical partners. They are upset by the provision itself; they are certainly not going to be upset by our rescinding it or amending it (and I was happy to support Bob Reiss's amendment to the motion).

There is an issue of resources in all this, certainly for those of us in more rural dioceses. Yes, we are committed to every parish but we do not necessarily have the clergy resources to do as much as we would wish to. In my deanery we are looking at having to cut the stipendiary clergy from 11 to six; our Methodist colleagues are looking at having to cut from four to two; and there is a certain realism coming into this situation, that we just do not have the spare Anglican clergy to go in and take these extra services.

Finally, however, I would come back to a point that has been made already: it really is quite offensive today to many of our ecumenical partners for us as Anglicans to insist on bringing in an Anglican priest and upsetting the careful balance of LEPs. I ask Synod, please, to vote in favour of this motion.

*Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark):* On a point of order, Mr Chairman. Would you accept a motion for closure on this amended motion?

*The Chairman:* I certainly would, Mr Sutcliffe. I see no-one standing anyway, but thank you.

*Canon Alan Hargrave, in reply:* I thank everyone who has spoken in the debate. I will not comment on all the speeches, and I am sorry that I did not catch the names of some of those who spoke.

The Dean of Portsmouth and Fleur Houston said it more eloquently than I ever could, and what they said was from the reality of experience on the ground. Particularly in Paul Avis's paper, it sounds a bit like the response of a bureaucrat rather than someone addressing a pastoral urgency on the ground. Dr Marshall spoke of our having a problem of our own making in Ely. I do not think that he had heard my speech before he wrote his, because a lot of what he had to say had to do with this business of whether we should have a separate parish for an LEP or whether it should form part of a parish where there is an Anglican church. We are concerned about that because we believe that if we set up our LEPs within an Anglican parish the danger there is that the LEPs say, 'Well, there's a communion service in St Saviour's down the road therefore we never need to have Anglican worship in here', which is what the current canons allow. That is something that we definitely do not want to promote and have not promoted in the diocese of Ely.

I thank the Dean of Portsmouth for his comments.

In answer to the Bishop of Peterborough, I do not think that this is a piecemeal proposal, particularly not as it is amended. It is a simple and straightforward proposal. In terms of having safeguards, it seems to me that the best safeguard is the relationship of our bishops with our local ecumenical partnerships; if they are good, things will go well but if they are not good, things will go awry. I really believe that those relationships are at the heart of how well we are represented as Anglicans in those partnerships and indeed of how they turn out in general.

I liked the phrase from the Bishop of Worcester: 'organic development', and I think he also answered the issue of paracetamol.

I do not think that the Bishop of Manchester, if he will excuse my saying so, really addressed the motion as amended; he seemed to be speaking to the original motion.

Someone spoke about celebrating as a guest. It is one thing coming as a guest; it is another thing having a guest forced upon you at a time of their own choosing; that no longer is a guest. He also spoke of defensiveness. Let us not proceed out of fear but out of faith, which I understand to mean something like risky faithfulness. That it seems to me is what we are about in the cause of the gospel.

Chris Lilley spoke about the possibility of a review of the entire ecumenical canons, which I think do need reviewing; but I would remind Synod that, in his briefing paper, Paul Avis says that now is not the time to do that, so if we wait for that we will be waiting for a very long time. I would like to echo what Chris Lilley said, that this is offensive to our ecumenical partners.

The Cray report, backed by the Archbishop of York's comments in his sermon at York Minster in July, pointed to the need for a lighter touch from the centre to allow flexibility and flourishing at the edges. On several occasions in recent debates the Bishop of Birmingham has said something to the effect that rules are good servants but bad masters. Whether we like it or not, new ecumenical and mission ventures will continue to gather pace. As we know, many of these do not fit easily with canon law. We have two choices before us: either we change the laws to allow that flexibility and flourishing of some wonderful, creative mission initiatives at the grass roots, or else gradually we undermine the authority of the law, not just on these points but in general. This motion is a very small and modest step in this direction, and I urge Synod to support it.

*The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd Michael Nazir-Ali):* On a point of order, Mr Chairman. It seems to me that this is a matter touching the worship of the Church. Would it be in order therefore to have a division by Houses?

*The Chairman:* Are there 25 members who wish to have a division? There are 25 members standing.

*The motion was put and The Chairman,* pursuant to SO 36(d)(iv), ordered a division by Houses, with the following result:

	<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
House of Bishops	14	13
House of Clergy	90	72
House of Laity	109	80

*The motion was therefore carried in the following amended form:*

‘That this Synod request that legislation be introduced to delete from paragraph 5 of Canon B 44 *Of local ecumenical projects* all the words from “and in particular” to the end.’

*The Session was adjourned at 7.10 p.m.*