

Full Synod: First Day

Monday 11 February 2008

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams)* took the Chair at 3.15 p.m. and was accorded a standing ovation.

The Chairman led the Synod in prayer.

Introduction of New Members

The Chairman: Before introducing new members, I would just like to remind you of those who will still be needing our prayers this week and in the time to come. You will be aware of the Bishop of Peterborough's condition and I hope that you will continue to hold him in your prayers. It is absolutely wonderful to see the Bishop of Portsmouth here with us – (*applause*) – but please do not stop praying for him! Mrs Jane Bisson of the Channel Islands has rung to give apologies as she is recovering from an operation, and I hope you will bear her also in your prayers.

I would now like to introduce and welcome those who have been elected or appointed to the Synod since last July: the Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd John Inge), the Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd John Goddard), the Dean of Manchester (Very Revd Rogers Govender), Revd Mark Beach (Coventry), Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council), Revd Stuart Currie (Worcester), Revd Andrew Dow (Gloucester), Revd Canon David Green (Sodor and Man), Revd Canon John Hall (Blackburn), Mr Philip Ivey-Ray (Chelmsford), Mr Dan Leathers (Church of England Youth Council), Revd Mark Thomas (Lichfield), Revd Celia Thomson (Gloucester), Revd Simon Tillotson (Canterbury) and Dr Brian Walker (Winchester). Although Nigel Stock is with us as Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, which is wonderful, he is no stranger because he previously represented the Northern Suffragans on Synod – but welcome anyway! (*Applause*)

Progress of Measures and Statutory Instruments

The Chairman: I report to Synod that those provisions of the Care of Cathedrals (Amendment) Measure 2005 which were not previously in force came into force on 1 January 2008. Those provisions of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2006 which were not previously in force came into force on 1 December 2007. The Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure received the Royal Assent on 30 October 2007, a number of provisions of the Measure came into force on 1 January 2008 and others on 1 February 2008, and more will come into force on 31 March and 11 June respectively. Details of those provisions can be found in the coming-into-force Instrument, a copy of which has been placed on the notice board for information.

Remaining provisions of the Measure will come into force on a date or dates to be determined. The Church of England Marriage Measure has been submitted to the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. The Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2007, the Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2007 and the Parochial Fees Order 2007 have all been laid before Parliament and came into force on 1 January 2008.

THE CHAIR *Sister Anne Williams (Durham)* took the Chair at 3.22 p.m.

Presidential Address

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): ‘The prevailing attitude . . . was one of heavy disagreement with a number of things which the [speaker] had not said’. Ronald Knox’s description of discussion at a student society in the 1930s may have a certain familiarity after the past few days but, given that public comment and criticism has been cast in such highly coloured terms, I have thought it right to say a few words to Synod this afternoon about what was and was not said last week and what the questions were which I had hoped might benefit from some airing.

Some of what has been heard is a very long way indeed from what was actually said in the Royal Courts of Justice last Thursday, but I must, of course, take responsibility for any unclarity in either that text or in the radio interview, and for any misleading choice of words which has helped to cause distress or misunderstanding among the public at large and especially among my fellow Christians. It is Lent and one of the great penitential phrases of the Psalms will be in all our minds: ‘Who can tell how oft he offendeth? Cleanse thou me from my secret faults’. I am deeply grateful to many of you for the support as well as the challenges I have received this weekend and for your willingness to treat all this as a serious issue which deserves attention; but I believe quite strongly that it is not inappropriate for a pastor of the Church of England to address issues around the perceived concerns of other religious communities and to try and bring them into better public focus. I hope anyway that you will bear with me now if I pick up a couple of points which I think have been distorted in the discussion.

The lecture was written as the opening contribution to a series on Islam and English Law mounted by the Temple Church and London University. As such, it posed the question to the legal establishment of whether attempts to accommodate aspects of Islamic law would create an area where the law of the land does not run. This, I said, would certainly be the case if any practice under Islamic law had the effect of removing from any individual the rights they were entitled to enjoy as a citizen of the United Kingdom; and I concluded that nothing should be recognized which had that effect. We are not talking about parallel jurisdictions; and I tried to make clear that there could be no ‘blank cheque’ in this regard, in particular as regards some of the sensitive questions about the status and liberties of women. The law of the land still guarantees for all the basic components of human dignity.

So the question remains of whether certain additional choices could and should be made available under the law of the United Kingdom for resolving disputes and regulating transactions. It would be analogous to what is already possible in terms of the legal recognition of certain kinds of financial transactions under Islamic regulation (including special provision around mortgage arrangements, for example), and it would create a helpful interaction between the courts and the practice of Muslim legal scholars in this country. If – and please note that word – this were thought to be a useful direction in which to move, there would be plenty of work still to be done with the greatest care on what would and would not be possible and appropriate areas for such co-operation. I noted, for example, that traditional Muslim attitudes to ‘apostasy’ posed a very serious question (recognized by many Muslim scholars today) and that honest discussion of this was imperative.

I have had a fair amount of recent first-hand contact with Christian minorities in Muslim-majority countries which has left me with no illusions about the sufferings they can and do face, even when there is a national legal framework which fully recognizes their liberties; but I noted that many Muslim-majority countries do distinguish clearly between the rights of citizens overall and the duties accepted by some citizens of obedience to Islamic law. It is that which encourages me to think that there may be ways of engaging with the world of Islamic law on something other than an all-or-nothing basis.

I hoped also, though, to raise a wider question about the relation between faith and law. We have taken it for granted that the law protects the consciences of religious believers, and all that I said last week needs to be read in that context (I mentioned the conscience clauses about abortion relative to the medical professions). So, while there is no dispute about our common allegiance to the law of the land, that law still recognizes that religious communities form the consciences of believers and it has not pressed for universal compliance with aspects of civil law where conscientious matters are in question. However, there are signs that this cannot necessarily be taken quite so easily for granted as the assumptions of our society become more secular. I think we ought to keep an eye on this trend and, if we do, we shall have to do more thinking about the models of society and law that we work with. It is an area where Christians and people of other faiths ought to be doing some reflecting together.

Much more could be said, but I wanted simply to offer a bit more of a framework for thinking about this controversy. As I implied earlier, part of both the burden and the privilege of being the Church we are in the nation we are in is that we are often looked to for some coherent voice on behalf of all the faith communities living here. That is a considerable privilege and I hope that we can use it well, however clumsily it may have been deployed in this instance. If we can attempt to speak for the liberties and consciences of others in this country as well as our own we shall, I believe, be doing something that we as a Church are called to do in Christ’s name: witnessing to his Lordship, not compromising it.

Perhaps you will allow me now to pass on to what I originally intended to say this afternoon.

It was always inevitable that 2008 should be in many ways dominated by the Lambeth Conference, and while it should not push away all the matters that are locally urgent for us here in England, it does not hurt for us to reflect briefly on what the significance of the Conference is for us and what we might both contribute and learn.

To start with, however, I would like to say just a few words about the kind of conference that is envisaged in the summer, in part repeating some of the things I said last month at the public launch of the programme. The challenge has been to devise a structure for our time together that manages both to address the major issues and to refresh and inspire those who will attend. The two-fold focus is equipping bishops for leadership and strengthening the identity and confidence of the Communion. That is why there is less emphasis on subject-oriented large groups. The primary need will be to get to know each other sufficiently well to confront the divisive matters that are around, and so there will be a larger number of slightly smaller groups. Taking a leaf from the South African book, we are calling these extended *indaba* groups: that is the word used for community consultation and decision-making. There will also be, as always, the Bible study groups, which have been in many previous Conferences the most important element of all. Their focus this time will be the Gospel of John, assisted by the commentary of one of the members of this Synod, Dr Richard Burridge, which has been printed in a special edition for the use of the Conference. The hope is that many others in the Communion will share in meditation on this text in the months leading up to Lambeth. There will, of course, be extended discussions of the proposals around the Covenant which we shall be discussing in this Synod also. We shall have the opportunity of several plenary sessions but we are planning few resolutions; and we have invited a number of high-profile speakers from public life, as well as from other Christian communions, to address us.

The Conference begins with a couple of days' retreat. Some critics have complained that Lambeth is too focused on prayer and reflection and not enough on decision-making. (*Laughter*) I am bound to say that I regard this as an extraordinary thing to say about any Christian gathering, as if we could make any decision worthy of the gospel without the utmost attention to listening together to God. I partly understand that some feel that there may be an attempt to appeal to the need for prayer and reflection as an alibi for not grasping the nettles; but I would gently but firmly say that it is also possible to use a rhetoric about needing decisive action as an alibi for not waiting on God. I simply pray that we will get the balance as right as we can.

I respect the consciences of those who have said they do not feel able to attend because there will be those present who have in their view acted against the disciplinary and doctrinal consensus of the Communion. Needless to say, I regret such a decision since I believe we should be seeking God's mind for the Communion in prayer and study together; but it simply reminds us that even the most 'successful' Lambeth Conference leaves us with work still to be done in rebuilding relationships. The decision of some to

be absent not only shows the deep differences over theology and ethics that have so strained our connections; it also reflects, uncomfortably for us, some of the legacy of hurt that is felt by some of our provinces at what is experienced as patronizing or manipulative or insensitive actions and attitudes on the part of many of the Churches of the 'West' or 'North': not only the Episcopal Church in the USA and not only on one issue, but us as well. That is hard to hear, but we have to hear it and to offer apologies and seek for better understanding. Lambeth cannot be the end of the story; and if at Lambeth we try to do proper justice to the idea of a Covenant it must be in the light of that need for a more serious and profound mutuality between us all.

I have said in other contexts something about why all this matters. Let me illustrate it by looking briefly at one particular situation. What I have just said about the legacy of bruised feelings and half-buried resentments is, of course, one of the things that so complicates our political, never mind our ecclesiastical, relationships with the post-colonial world. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Zimbabwe at the moment. A history scarred by exploitation and deep racial injustice can all too easily be used, as it has been there, to turn aside every criticism and even to refuse any proper help when a local regime has fallen victim to its own incompetence, corruption and self-delusion. It has been that much harder for many in this country to know how to respond to the needs of Zimbabwe for fear of simply reinforcing stereotypes of colonial patronage or misunderstanding, and we have tried to take our cues from those on the ground locally who are seeking justice and change.

In many circumstances the local Church would be the first group that we would turn to in this attempt to listen and understand but, as we are well aware, this has not been straightforward in Zimbabwe: we have had some in leadership positions who have been uncritically supportive of a violent and lawless administration. One of the most welcome developments of recent months, however, has been that the Anglican Church has rallied very remarkably to repudiate the excesses of the former Bishop of Harare and has installed a deeply respected and courageous elder statesman of the Zimbabwean Church, Bishop Sebastian Bakare, as chief pastor in Harare. The province's efforts to cleanse and renew the situation have been met by the expected levels of intimidatory behaviour on the part of some of Bishop Kunonga's supporters, but the process of reconstruction has gone forward with, happily, some support from the courts.

Bishop Sebastian is with us today, and it is a privilege to greet him on behalf of this Synod and the Church of England. (*Applause*) Sebastian, we want to assure you of our profound support for you and our gratitude for your courage and integrity. Please let all our brothers and sisters in Zimbabwe know how much they are in our prayers and thoughts here. I am conscious too that there are many Zimbabweans who have fled to the UK and who sometimes feel almost as vulnerable in the land where they have taken refuge as they did back home; I want to assure them also of our welcome and sympathy as a Church.

The records of Bishop Kunonga's administration in Harare make unhappy reading: a

story of conflicts and threats and the refusal of both outside challenge and outside help. Last year Bishop Kunonga announced his decision to separate from the Province of Central Africa, citing in support the 'liberalism' of that province on issues of sexual morality. This at least simplified some issues: I had already indicated that I should not be happy to invite him to Lambeth while serious charges in the ecclesiastical courts were still unanswered; but his decision has left him isolated from the life of the Communion, and his episcopal acts cannot now be recognized as part of that life. However, his preposterous charge against his province illustrates exactly something I noted last year in this Synod: the possibility of using conflicts in the Communion as an excuse to pursue self-seeking agendas in various contexts, and the great danger that this poses in divided or fragile local Churches. We saw it in Sudan and now here it is in Central Africa. It underlines the need to find ways of resolving or containing disputes in the Communion that do not leave quite so much room for opportunistic posturing of this kind.

In recovering the moral initiative so decisively in Zimbabwe, the Central African Province has drawn deeply on its own resources, but it has also benefited from the solidarity and practical support given from elsewhere in the Communion, notably from the diocese of Southwark in our own Church and the diocese of Rochester also, and of course from the unforgettably dramatic and effective public support of Archbishop Sentamu. The possibility of appealing in times of crisis and inner struggle to sister Churches is a crucial element in the life of any Church which calls itself catholic; and I have to repeat that, when I underline the importance of recovering a proper sense of what it is for the Communion to be a catholic body, this is near the heart of what I have in mind. The Archbishop of York's decision last week to respond to an urgent call from Kenya to go and assist there with mediation and peacemaking is simply another instance of what this means. He should be with us again, I should add, early tomorrow. Also, if I may mention it only briefly, the work that has grown up around Lambeth Palace in the past three years to service the development needs of several African provinces by helping to broker aid from various sources is grounded in the same vision of active catholicity as a form of mutual service. That gives me a chance to pay public tribute to the dedication and imagination of the international development team at Lambeth and those who have worked with them, often at some risk and hardship.

My point is that our mutuality in the Communion – and in communion itself – is not a matter of ecclesiastical housekeeping: it is also about helping one another to be the Church in any given place, that is, to be a community whose loyalties are to the kingdom, not to any kind of cultural or political partisanship. It means hearing critical questions from elsewhere and not dismissing them as ignorant or irrelevant; it means challenging one another to act with integrity; but it also means a degree of care and hesitation about assuming at once that you know how things work in another context. Our current style of electronic global communication is manifestly not designed to nurture these virtues and it can have a toxic effect on all sorts of other areas of communicating with each other; and we remain, thanks to original sin, much in love with talking about, rather than with, one another at the best of times. My deepest hope and prayer for Lambeth is that it will be a decisively counter-cultural event. Whether or

not we arrive at some unimaginable solution to both our theological and our structural challenges, I hope that we shall at least have shown that it is possible to think and speak with one another in the presence of God. Now I think about it, that is, of course, what Synod itself seeks to do. So please continue to pray for the Lambeth Conference. Pray that it may find new ways forward that will restore and deepen confidence in our Communion and trust between us, and that it may help to open up reconciliation for those who have felt injured or marginalized in any setting; but pray even more that it will be a context where, by thinking and speaking together in the presence of God, all of us may be set free to be more fully the Church God calls us to be, wherever we may find ourselves (which is also, of course, the real issue in what I spoke about in the earlier part of this address). So may God in this Lenten season help us to move more deeply into the mystery of our baptism into the fellowship and the communion of the crucified and risen Christ.

The Chairman: Thank you, Your Grace.

Report by the Business Committee

Revd Prebendary Kay Garlick: I beg to move:

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

I am really not looking for sympathy but even before last Thursday I feared that this Synod might be just a little hard to handle. That was because of the timings in this group of sessions, which are fraught with uncertainties. First of all, there is a good deal of legislative business, and it is always hard to judge how long such debates will need, particularly when they are on such important topics as clergy terms of service, Crown appointments and pension arrangements. Then there is the electronic voting – will it take us time to get used to it or will it immediately speed up our business dramatically? – and at this group of sessions there is no business ready and appropriate to be designated contingency business. So perhaps we should be taking some bets on what time we will finish on Thursday, although I suppose that might take the fire out of the debate on Mr Benyon’s motion tomorrow night. In view of all these uncertainties I would warn members that I may need to ask their permission to bring forward business if necessary to ensure the best use of the time that we have.

The worship this time has been organized by our new chaplain, Carl Turner, and we are very grateful to him for managing to make all the necessary arrangements in spite of having been very poorly for some months. As well as morning worship and the celebration of Holy Communion, there will be each day an opportunity to join in the reflective preparation for the Lambeth Conference recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury, using readings from St John’s Gospel and the PBC commentary by Richard Burridge.

We will be taking two Private Members’ Motions, Mr Benyon’s on casinos and

Mr Cox's on Bible availability, and one Diocesan Synod Motion, from Durham, on a Eucharistic Prayer for when children are present. This is an issue which has been raised during other debates so many times over the past ten years, and it will be good to take time to focus on it as a single issue. The Southwark Diocesan Synod Motion on the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod has been held back until we hear the outcome of the work of the legislative drafting group on women in the episcopate, and the Derby Diocesan Synod Motion on health and safety will be taken in July, as requested by the Derby diocese.

The Mission and Public Affairs Council is bringing two important and topical debates – on detention without trial and on mental health issues – and the Council for Christian Unity will present its report *Growing Together in Unity and Mission*. The debate on Mary will come to Synod later, after it has been considered by the House of Bishops, but members have been sent the report and the accompanying documents to read and consider in the meantime. At the July group of sessions members asked for a debate on the response to the draft Covenant that has been sent to the Covenant design group. Only last week this group, having considered all the provincial responses to its first draft, sent out a second, and copies of this have been made available to members. (I think they are on your seats today.)

The Business Committee have sent out three new documents to members this time, and we would be grateful for comments on how useful members may have found them. One is the second notice paper and is a chronological list of deadlines. The other two are guidance notes, one on Questions and one on electronic voting. We have tried to make these as user-friendly as possible, and our hope is that all three documents will make things easier for members and will help Synod to run more efficiently. The Committee have had much discussion on the subject of documents: it is a priority both in terms of members' time and in terms of environmental issues that we send out less paper. We are therefore firmly encouraging more succinct documents and endeavouring to create a clear and concise model of documentation that we hope will become the norm.

Last year we agreed the dates of the Synod's sessions up to and including November 2010, when the new Synod will be inaugurated. Since then, the work of the Elections Review Group has made it clear that the dates we had agreed would place inordinate pressure on diocesan offices in running their election processes, and I will therefore be asking Synod to agree to altering the dates of that November 2010 group of sessions to 22–24 November.

I mentioned earlier the introduction of electronic voting. Members will all, I hope, have collected their electronic voting card. In future there will be just one card, which will serve as both your Synod security pass and your voting card, but for now there are two cards and you will need both of them with you all the time. We felt that it was important for members to try out their expertise in using the handsets in a rather more relaxed setting than an actual vote, so I am now going to ask the Chair to adjourn the sitting just temporarily while we have a practice run.

The Chairman: Thank you. Yes, I am going to adjourn temporarily but woe betide anyone who walks out because you just may not know how to vote when it comes to it. So over to you for the lesson.

[The Chair of the Business Committee, Revd Prebendary Kay Garlick, conducted a demonstration of the electronic voting system and answered questions.]

The Chairman: The demonstration now being over, I will resume the sitting and if any of you still have questions unanswered please see Prebendary Garlick or one of us privately later on.

Mr Mark Russell (Archbishops' Council, Ex officio): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. There has been a lot of negativity about this. I think it is a fantastic idea. I would like to thank the Business Committee for listening to us and being so patient and getting the change made. Well done for putting it into effect! (*Applause*)

The Chairman: This item is now open for debate. Can I just point out to you that there are three places from which you can speak. As in York I will call two speakers at a time so that you can get yourselves close to the speaking podium.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd Nigel McCulloch): I thought it might be helpful, in the light of the mention in the report by the Business Committee, if I were to say a few words about the work of the women bishops legislative drafting group. Following a recent meeting of the House of Bishops, there were press reports which bore almost no relation to the meeting that I thought I had attended, so let me put the record straight and explain to Synod how the next stages of the process may unfold.

It was, as members will recall, in July 2006 that Synod invited the Archbishops' Council to secure the early appointment of a legislative drafting group. That took six months. The nine of us gathered for the first time in January 2007 and we have now met on ten occasions, including twice residentially; we have a further meeting at the end of this week. We have met groups, we have read submissions, we have studied material submitted to earlier groups, we have had long discussions with each other and we have prayed; and in October we were invited to attend a meeting of the House of Bishops. I am not sure that that was the answer to prayer but that was certainly the next thing on the agenda, and hugely important because in the light of that valuable exchange we were able to carry our thinking further, to the point where I was able to share with the House in January some of our emerging analysis. Contrary to the press reports, many members of the House of Bishops have said privately to me that that was one of the best discussions the House of Bishops had yet had on the subject. The House was not being asked to take decisions; it was instead an opportunity for the House to think around the issues before receiving the group's report and also to flag up points that it wanted the group to ponder further.

What happens next? All being well, the group will complete its work and sign off its

report this April, in good time for the House of Bishops to consider it and to decide the next steps at its meeting between 19 and 22 May, and that is in accordance with Synod's decision that the results of our work should be submitted to the House of Bishops for consideration and submission to Synod. Then it will be for the House to decide in May what recommendation to make to the Synod in the light of the group's report, and that report, of course, will be seen by Synod in full.

The aim of the House is to reach conclusions in May so that the Synod can spend as much time as it needs in July debating where we go from there. The Business Committee have always made it clear that time will be found as soon as the drafting group and the House of Bishops are ready. So, instead of speculating over what the drafting group is going to say and what the House of Bishops will recommend, perhaps I could gently encourage members of Synod to continue to hold in prayer all of us who are engaged on this very important and very delicate task. In your prayers, do remember that, whatever the group or the House may come up with, when the whole subject comes back to Synod it is actually each of you who, under God, will have the responsibility of making the decisions.

Mr Tim Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I want to do two things. First, I want to congratulate the Business Committee on some very worthwhile steps they have taken to improve the way in which we as a Synod do business; second, I want to ask the Business Committee to think again and to try harder in relation to one aspect of electronic voting.

My first congratulation is on the perfect ordering, this time, of our agenda which in the past has not always been achieved by Business Committees. It is most welcome this time that Archbishop Rowan's inspiring presidential address was scheduled right at the beginning so as to set the tone for all that will follow and so as to remind us of our great good fortune in being led in difficult times by a wonderfully gifted and challenging archbishop. It is helpful too that Questions come on this first evening so that questioners can draw out in advance answers that are relevant to subsequent debates. It is also good that the Business Committee has fitted all our business into four days rather than five, saving money for the Church and saving time for us.

My next congratulation is on the admirably nanny-like efforts which the Business Committee is making to persuade us all not to waste the precious resource of Question Time but to reserve it for Questions which really need an oral answer. If questioners were to follow this wise advice, the final part of this evening's business will be both shorter and less tedious than usual.

The two other steps on which I congratulate the Business Committee are set out in paragraphs 45 and 46. It is most welcome that, as paragraph 45 says, 'The Committee has agreed to adopt a firmer line in dealing with proposals for presentations to the Synod under Standing Order 95A, and to allow stand-alone presentations only in exceptional circumstances'. In the recent past the Synod's procedures have, in my view, been abused by the way proper debate and effective questioning in relation to some

items of financial business have been avoided by permitting officials to make monologue PowerPoint presentations without prior circulation of papers and with minimum subsequent opportunity for questioning and discussion. Paragraph 46 expresses the Business Committee's view that 'the amount of paper circulated to Synod members should be kept to an effective minimum'. It will be evident to all of us who have carried up to London the papers for our four days of debate that the burden is significantly lighter than usual. This is most welcome, and I thank the Business Committee.

In conclusion, however, I want to ask the Business Committee to think again about their proposals for publication of the individual member voting information which will be available as a result of our wonderful new electronic voting system. The proposal is for publication 'on the General Synod website, as soon as practicable after the end of the group of sessions'. This is inadequate. There will be a proper and reasonable desire to see the voting information immediately after a division and not just to make sure that one's own voting machine worked properly, but because then the issue is still hot and of interest. Surely it must be technically possible to produce an immediate print-out for display on a notice board? Certainly I would hope that could be done once the staff have had experience of operating the new system during this group of sessions. Equally, in the longer perspective, there will be a proper and reasonable desire on the part of those who consult the printed *Report of Proceedings* to see the voting information as part of that volume, perhaps in summary tabular form on a few pages at the back of the book. I hope that Kay Garlick will agree to give further consideration to this issue as readily as I trust she will accept my congratulations on the Business Committee's other valuable steps.

Revd Gill Hemwood (York): A question for clarification, please. Will there be the opportunity to debate the report *Four Funerals and a Wedding* (GS Misc 877) in this group of sessions of General Synod or at a future group of sessions? The explanatory memorandum GS 1672X says that GS 1672 will give effect to the recommendations contained in GS Misc 877 and the power to prescribe what costs and expenses are included in statutory fees. In reading GS Misc 877 I found numerous questions arising, based on the experience of parochial ministry in the north of England, and perhaps there is a danger that, in trying to set a national fee inclusive of costs, ministry and mission may be compromised if costs included are lower than actual parish costs. As a simple example, the heating costs for a church on the top of a hill in a northern county will be considerably different from those of a sheltered urban church in the south. Our brides and bridesmaids along the southern edge of Middlesbrough wear very fashionable and somewhat scanty attire throughout the year; this requires heating for weddings in all but eight weeks of midsummer. I am reassured that GS 1672 states that there should be no overall loss of income for either parishes or dioceses, but as a parish with 32 weddings and only 29 funerals we may reflect a trend quite different from GS Misc 877 *Four Funerals and [only one] Wedding*. I am sure we are among many parishes working hard to welcome more couples for weddings in church and we are located in an area with many new houses and a resulting lower-than-average age of our population.

Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield): I wish to comment briefly on the positioning of Question Time in this group of sessions, and here I take a different view on the matter from that just expressed by my good friend Tim Allen. It seems to me that if we have Question Time in the first session of a group of sessions that is far too close to the beginning of the group for Question Time to be properly effective. It looks as though we are going to be entering into Question Time this afternoon some time between five and six o'clock, but none of us saw the Questions notice paper until we came into this hall some time between three o'clock and 3.15 p.m. That has not given enough opportunity for members of the Synod to study the Questions thoroughly to see what supplementary Questions might be desirable. It is essential that there is at least a day and a night, if you like, between the appearance of the Questions and the holding of the relevant Question Time. This will increase the effectiveness of Question Time because it will enable supplementaries to be put which may express a different point of view from that expressed by the original questioner. Supplementaries may also give an opportunity for people who wish to raise a particular item, and who do not know how they are to fit it into the business of the week, to see a particular Question down and to try to ask a supplementary on that.

I do hope that for future groups of sessions of Synod there will be a Question Time later than the first session, and I think it might be a good thing to establish a set procedure – for instance, that Question Time will always begin at 10.30 a.m. of the second day of a group of sessions – so that we all know in advance when it is going to come. That would make it a stronger parallel with what goes on in other legislative bodies, including those just a few hundred yards away from here.

Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark): I just wish to comment on the Business Committee's apparently reasonable requirement of at least 100 signatures for Private Members' Motions to be debated. This is, it seems to me, a further downgrading of individual members after the abolition of the right to amend without the support of additional members, which I think we have kept down to two despite the fact that it was originally proposed by the Standing Orders Committee as ten. It is unclear to me why the Business Committee wants to tie its own hands rather than exercise sensible discretion. Anyway, it seems to me that it should not do so uninstructed by a vote of the Synod.

I also want to look at this question of the moving of Private Members' Motions because, in the report of the Business Committee, we are told that Private Members' Motions moved in the current session cannot be made available for signature if they are moved later than 5.30 p.m. today (which is an hour away). With modern technology and with computers all round the place, plus the fact that we are using electronic voting methods, it seems to me quite extraordinary that whereas in the past it was possible for private members to move motions which could be signed in the current session – indeed to move them the day before and for the motion to be available the next day – we should have stepped back in this matter. It may be that Private Members' Motions are not important, but it is just another example of the way in which the individual member has found his rights and abilities constrained.

While we are on the subject, it is unfortunate, to say the least, and sends out a strange message to people whom we want to stand for the Synod that the House of Laity had to co-opt Dr Chadwick for the role of chairman of the Dioceses Commission. It seems to me that we ought to be encouraging people to think that this is a worthwhile place to spend your time. If we say that we cannot find people of the right quality, I wonder why the Bridges report's proposal to limit the size of the House was so eagerly brought back by the management, as it was, after being defeated initially. It seems very strange that within just two years of this reform being introduced we find that the House of Laity is insufficiently stuffed with the right amount of talent to be able to furnish what is required in this respect. This is no criticism, of course, of the individual who has, in fact, happily agreed to do this job and with the recommendation of the Archbishops; it is just that it seems to me to be part of an ongoing process, going back some time, where individual members have been more and more constrained in what they can actually achieve. This relates also to the usurpation of the role of Standing Committee by the Archbishops' Council from the original role that the Standing Committee of the General Synod had from 1970, and I hope that when the results of the creation of the Archbishops' Council are next examined this will be looked at, along with these other issues.

The Chairman: Thank you. I was just about to stop you there, Mr Sutcliffe, because you were getting into the pros and cons of something; this is a debate on the agenda and is not a reason for making the speech that you cannot find any other place for. I just want to remind Synod of that.

The Bishop of Lincoln (Rt Revd John Saxbee): I want to talk about how this Synod addresses this agenda, but before I do, Madam Chairman, I hope that you will allow me a word of personal explanation on behalf of the House of Bishops in relation to a previous item: we collectively felt that it was important to give a demonstration of moral and spiritual leadership to the Synod and that to encourage the consumption of chocolate during Lent would have been very inappropriate.

On the subject of leadership, we have over the centuries agonized over the relationship between reason and religion but one of the least seemly and perhaps least regarded factors of the past few days was the emergence even within the membership of this Synod itself of some doubt as to whether anyone who possesses gifts of intellectual rigour could also be exercising leadership in our Church. As soon as someone demonstrates that they can marshal a complex, well-researched and intelligent contribution to debate – and in our Archbishop we have a market leader in that respect – we take fright. ‘Get thee to an academy,’ the cry goes up. What are we saying when we say that kind of thing? We are gathered here as members of this Synod: we share leadership in the Church. Are we on that premise required to leave our brains at the door lest we frighten the horses when we reason together? Surely not. This nonsense needs to be nailed once and for all. We are called to love the Lord our God with all our mind as well as with our heart, soul and strength. So this agenda – and I do congratulate the Business Committee on this agenda – deserves to be addressed by our best powers of

thought as well as by sentiment and deeply felt convictions. It never occurred to me that this would be something that might need to be said to this Synod, but over the past two or three days I think it probably does need to be said – or, at least, I need to get it off my chest.

Reason remains one of the key pillars supporting the Anglican way; reasoned argument remains one of the crucial factors in how we do business with one another; and in the next few days, in addressing this agenda, I look forward to hearing just how intellectually coherent and intelligent this Synod can be when we put our minds to it.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Alison Wynne (Blackburn): In paragraph 48 of the report the Committee tell us that they have been assured by York University that there will be an improvement in the facilities and services. I just wonder if they can clarify what assurances have been given and, in particular, if there will be some means whereby all members of Synod may enter the chamber, if not through the same door at least in the same direction, rather than, as has been the case in the past, those with mobility disabilities having to enter from the rear of the platform and down the ramp at the front of the platform, no doubt feeling that they are being watched by everyone else there.

Mr Nigel Chetwood (Gloucester): I want to speak to an item which is not on the agenda so I shall have to be very careful in what I say. It is GS Misc 873 on Extended Communion. The wording of paragraph 5 in the main paper and paragraph 5 in Annex 1 was disturbing. I will explain why. With a group of twelve other people I am an assistant chaplain at the hospital in the town where I live and we take it in turns to go in each week to talk to the patients and to give them Extended Communion. In this reference to the House of Bishops' paper it is deemed that in due course this kind of work will be seen to be unnecessary. That is disturbing because there is a practical need there for Extended Communion, and I just wish the House of Bishops could give a bit more boot to it and encourage it rather than being a little bit mealy-mouthed, if you will forgive the phrase.

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): I stand to ask if the Business Committee will consider preparing for a significant debate at a future session on the proper inclusion and accommodation of people of other faiths and legal systems into British society. Significant issues have been raised by our Archbishop and we need to reason together about this here in Synod. However, a debate is needed because a number of factors have as yet not been taken into account. As I raise this, some of us are wondering if our gracious invitations from the Archbishop and Mrs Williams to wine and canapés in Lambeth Palace on Wednesday still stand; and his address does give me hope. However, we are meeting in the Guard Room so he is clearly not taking any chances.

Christian colleagues in India, Nigeria and Pakistan have noted to me in the past few days that Islam has never allowed itself to remain as a subservient legal system; neither

can its system be taken piecemeal on a pick-and-choose basis. It is exclusive and it is integral. Second, in Indian history –

The Chairman: Dr Sugden, you are getting into the issue and you are making a speech. Will you please address the agenda?

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): Indeed. Because of a number of issues to do with history, the experience of the Church and the government of India, where these issues have been dealt with over the past 200 years, and because there is perhaps a need actually to challenge the Islamic community to accommodate to us, as well as this community accommodating to them, it seems to me that we should be asking for a debate on this matter in Synod, as well as hearing the Archbishop's own views on the matter.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): For several years I have sought to reduce the burden of administration on the Church by moving administration to the right levels. Indeed for those who remember Annex C to the strategic spending paper that we reviewed five years ago, that initiative, to see how we could make diocesan administration more efficient, actually originated with me in the Church Commissioners. I have to say, however, that this agenda introduces a series of issues which will certainly reverse the limited progress that we made with the diocesan administration working group. At the very time we established new arrangements, which will allow the merger and reorganization of dioceses through enabling regulations for the Pastoral Measure – and I refer here to the amendment proposed to the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation 1993 – we are busy pouring administration into diocesan offices. I refer not just to the parsonages issue but also to the parochial fees issue, about which our diocesan secretary in Oxford has written, 'I estimate it would need an extra full-time post to run the accounting side of the proposed system. Such a post could cost at least £28,000 a year.' It implies an additional cost across the dioceses of nearly £1 million for this single proposal.

It is not appropriate that I go into the details of the problem of overloading diocesan administration in this debate but may I ask the Business Committee through you, Madam Chairman, to arrange a debate centred on reducing the huge burden of administration and time lost to mission at all levels in the Church as a result of archaic concepts of how to do administration? I have here a paper written by Mr David Brown, who was lay assistant to the Bishop of Lichfield for twelve years. It is entitled *Releasing Bishops for Relationship* and it calls for a significantly more professional approach to administration so that time is freed up for mission. Our agenda today suggests that we are a long way from doing that: in fact, as I said earlier, quite the reverse. My plea is that we take a strategic look at cutting out administration, duplication and waste, and then let that guide our future debates on these matters.

Revd Canon Alan Hargrave (Ely): Thank you to the Business Committee for all their hard work. I am, however, somewhat disappointed not to find on the agenda or indeed

in the forecast a debate about the open letter sent in October 2007 by 138 prominent Muslim scholars and addressed to Christian and political leaders in the West called *A Common Word between Us and You*, which you will have seen in the news and which is still on the web. For me this is one of the most hopeful events of last year, and I know that the Archbishops, the Prime Minister and many others have already warmly replied to it. It is based on themes from the Koran and the Bible, on love of neighbour and hospitality, inviting dialogue about how our communities can live together well; and I think that perhaps this would address some of the wider issues that Chris Sugden has just mentioned. It seems to me an issue of huge importance and perhaps something that the Business Committee might consider bringing forward on to the agenda for York. If that is the case, could I suggest that we invite one of those prominent scholars, one of the authors of that document, to address us at Synod as well as debating it ourselves and giving careful and timely consideration to all these issues which have come so much to the fore recently?

On that subject of having a timely, considered opportunity for reflection, I would like to say that if it comes to a straight choice between point-scoring, political sound bites and generous, thoughtful godliness, give me the latter any day.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): Her Majesty's Government have recently announced their intention to repeal the law on blasphemy. That is an area that the Synod really should be looking at because the law on blasphemy is not, as some suggest, intended to protect the Church of England: it protects the Christian faith of this country. It may be worded to suggest that it is the Church of England but the Church has no doctrine of its own; the Church of England's doctrine is that of the universal Christian Church. I would suggest, therefore, that this is something which we really need to look at and debate because at present the Christian faith is under attack from all corners and this is something that we should not give up easily.

In 1967, when David Steel passed through Parliament the Abortion Bill it was said that there would only be a small number of abortions in the future; we know that last year there were something like 200,000 abortions in this country. There may not be a lot of blasphemy at the present time but once the blasphemy law goes you can bet your bottom dollar that there will be.

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 Prebendary Kay Garlick, in reply: Thank you to the Bishop of Manchester for explaining the process of the drafting group. As he said, we are hoping very much that we will bring something to General Synod in July and members will have noted that it is now in the forecast for July. Thank you to Tim Allen for his kind words: I sat and

enjoyed them. In terms of the publication of voting figures and having those immediately, as I said earlier I hope that we shall be able to do that. We did wonder whether we should say that we would do it, but we did not want to promise what we could not manage. So for now we have said ‘by the end of the sessions’ or ‘immediately after the end of the sessions’ but I hope that eventually it will be more immediate; and we will look into the possibility of putting it, in some form, into the *Report of Proceedings*.

Gill Henwood asked about the fees report. This was a report made to DRACSC and to the Archbishops’ Council and was not directed to this Synod, but of course we will be discussing it in terms of its legislation on Wednesday morning, so there will be plenty of opportunity to talk about it then; and always the General Synod will continue to decide the fees Orders in the future, as it always has done.

Dr Marshall talked about Question Time and said that it was too close to the beginning. The trouble is that many people feel that it is important to be able to ask Questions before we have all the debates, in order to highlight particular things or gather information and let everybody hear a certain bit of information before the debates happen. We did, at a past group of sessions, try Questions later on in time and we got lots of complaints about it. However, we have never tried the morning of the second day so I will ask the Business Committee what they think about that.

Mr Sutcliffe referred to the need for 100 signatures for Private Members’ Motions; this has been the convention and, if you look, it is there. Of course, the Private Member’s Motion is the most important way for individual members to get their particular point discussed, but when it comes to tying *our* hands in terms of discretion, it is not about our discretion but about the members’ discretion because the signatures indicate that members actually want this to be discussed at the next group of sessions. It is not us. We have an amount – 100 signatures – in order that we know that that is what people want to discuss. There is a problem, of course, now that we meet only twice a year, because you cannot sign between sessions. That does lengthen the process and I agree that it was easier when we met three times a year; we will perhaps have to look at whether it is possible to sign between sessions in some way.

To the Bishop of Lincoln, I thought that the chocolate could have been eaten on Sunday or you could have saved it until Easter. I would have saved mine until Easter and I would not have minded at all, but there we are. In terms of reasoned argument it is, of course, one of the great things about Synod – and all of us, I am sure, will think this – that we come to Synod and, whatever it is we debate, there is always someone who is an expert in the field and can tell us things that we had no idea about before; it is one of the best things about Synod and long may it go on.

Alison Wynne talked about the facilities at York. We have had discussions; there were particular problems last time and it was because of those particular problems that we are beginning to look to see whether it might be that we want to change venues for the

July group of sessions; but it will not be for this July. We will go back to York this July and we shall see how they have got on with mending the problems that there were; but we will look particularly at the problems about getting on to the platform.

In answer to Mr Chetwood, who spoke about hospital assistant chaplains, the House of Bishops and their theological group will, I am sure, have heard what he said.

In reply to Dr Sugden, I think the Business Committee would, of course, be very open to the proposal for a debate on the rights of particular religious groups within a society, within the civil law or the society which likes to call itself secular; but any such debate would have to be very well prepared and well documented, and it might be that something like the Archbishop's speech might prove to be a good part of that documentation. It would, however, be very important that people would have read the speech, and I cannot help feeling that that is quite a key thing and that we do not actually have debates on documentation from the media.

To Gavin Oldham, Alan Hargrave and Barry Barnes – Gavin talked about the debate on reducing admin and Alan Hargrave on the Common Word document and Barry Barnes on the blasphemy laws – what you need to do is to try to get a Private Member's Motion about these things – that is the way to get it discussed – and get 100 signatures. You have until half-past five. If you look at paragraph 11 of the report, if by half-past five you can get your motion to David Williams then it can go on the table and, if you can get 100 people to sign it, it is quite possible that we might be able to consider it in July; but you will have to get your skates on. The other way is *via* a Diocesan Synod Motion or to talk to relevant boards or councils who might bring such a debate for you.

The motion was put and carried.

Revd Prebendary Kay Garlick: I beg to move:

‘That this Synod meet on the following dates in November 2010:

22–24 November (inauguration of the new Synod).’

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (Ven. Clive Mansell)* took the Chair at 4.58 p.m.

Questions

The Chairman: Please remember that normally there are only up to two supplementaries on any Question. Please also remember that supplementaries are questions and not speeches.

Revd Dr Richard Burrige (London University): On a point of order, Mr Chairman, in the light of your comment. Under SO 107A, as you pointed out, there are only two supplementary questions per Question. What is the effect when, as so often happens, several Questions are answered with only one answer? There may be three or four questioners there, each of whom would like to ask a supplementary. If only two supplementaries can be asked, it cuts it down an awful lot.

The Chairman: Thank you, Dr Burrige. There are two supplementary questions which may be asked in respect of each original Question.

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

Ministry Division

*1. *Mr Nigel Chetwood (Gloucester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

How many full-time tutors were employed by the regional training courses and the theological colleges in 2007, and how many students were being taught at each establishment?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James) replied: Ministry Division has only complete information on staffing in the form of Full-time Equivalents. The figures for 2006/07 were:

Theological Colleges	Total Anglican Ordinands 2006/07	Other Full-time Students 2006/07	Total Full-time Students 2006/07	Other Part-time Students 2006/07	Full-Time Equivalent Academic Staff 06/07
Cranmer Hall	54	38	92	65	6.9
Mirfield	33	3	36	5	3.7
Oak Hill	71	71	142	29	11
Queen's Foundation (College)	15	40	55	110	3.25
Ridley Hall	74	4	78	0	7.35
Ripon College, Cuddesdon	54	4	58	32	5
St John's, Nottingham	97	2	99	62	6.5
St Stephen's, Oxford	22	13	35	14	4.5†

†Only two members of staff are funded from Vote 1

Trinity College	50	65	115	57	8
Westcott House	62	4	66	2	5.25
Wycliffe Hall	74	54	128	85	10.2
TOTAL COLLEGES	606	298	904	461	71.65

Courses	Total Anglican Ordinands 2006/07	Other Full-time Students 2006/07	Total Full-time Students 2006/07	Other Part-time Students 2006/07	Full-Time Equivalent Academic Staff 06/07
Carlisle & Blackburn Eastern Region	21	4	25	26	2.34
Ministry Course	88	8	96	0	4.5
East Midlands	29	10	39	1	3
North East	35	3	38	0	3
Northern	89	1	90	1	5
North Thames	59	0	59	0	3.5
Oxford Ministry Course	45	8	53	0	3
STETS	108	31	139	0	6.58
SEITE	81	6	87	44	4.5
South West	38	20	58	0	2.95
#WestMidlandsat Queen's	43	5	48	0	2.75
West of England	36	2	38	40	3.4
TOTAL COURSES	672	98	770	112	44.52

Other part-time students attending the Queen's Foundation, Birmingham are all shown against Queen's College

*2. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

According to the most recent information available, approximately how many stipendiary clergy have a freehold; how many stipendiary clergy do not; how many clergy are paid by other employers, in colleges, schools et cetera; and how many active non-stipendiary and self-supporting ministers are there?

The Bishop of Norwich replied: According to the latest information, about 5,000 stipendiary clergy have a freehold and about 4,000 stipendiary clergy do not. About

1,600 clergy are in paid service in chaplaincies and other ministries, and there are about 3,000 active non-stipendiary ministers.

3. *Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Do the selection processes for assessing and recommending ordination candidates suitable to lead churches include some form of personality-type profiling, especially in the light of the evidence indicating a disproportionately high percentage of 'I's as compared with 'E's among Anglican clergy, in comparison with the proportions in some growing churches and also the population as a whole?

The Bishop of Norwich: Although the Myers Briggs Type Indicator is not accepted uncritically, it can be a useful tool for personality profiling and is used by some directors of ordinands in dioceses. Currently we do not use personality-type profiling in our selection procedures. However, it is something we keep under review. For myself, I would not be too keen to exclude all those 'I's in the ordained ministry: 'I's are more prayerful and reflective, or so I am told by my 'I' chaplain.

4. *Revd John Chorlton (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

In reply to a Question in July 2007, the Ministry Division said that it would not normally recommend an independent inquiry into allegations of bullying or harassment in a theological college or course 'unless it was discovered that proper internal processes had not been carried out'. If a college's lawyer admits to an employment tribunal that the correct procedures were not followed, is this sufficient evidence to the Ministry Division that proper internal processes have not been carried out and therefore for it to instigate an independent inquiry?

The Bishop of Norwich: Theological colleges are independent, self-governing institutions. They are not under the authority of the Ministry Division. However, where a college has made a public admission that correct procedures have not been followed, the Division seeks to ensure that its governing body takes action to ensure future good practice. This is then investigated thoroughly in a full Bishops' Inspection and recommendations made as necessary, in the context of determining whether a college should continue to be recognized as an appropriate place for the training of our future ordained ministers.

Revd John Cook (London): Would the chairman of the Ministry Division note that an out-of-court settlement involves no finding or admission of guilt concerning reasons for dismissal?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am happy so to note.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): Has that happened in the recent case, that the investigation you suggested the Ministry Division would undertake has started? Or is it yet to happen?

The Bishop of Norwich: A full inspection of the college to which I think you are referring is about to be under way, yes.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): About to be? Can we have more clarification on what 'about to be' means?

The Bishop of Norwich: Well, it is being set up and the college is being inspected; the actual inspectors are not there yet.

5. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

When Ministry Division inspects a theological college or course, do the inspectors enquire whether it requires any of its staff or students to subscribe, explicitly or implicitly, to any particular beliefs, values or ethics, other than the Declaration of Assent and, if so, what is deemed acceptable?

The Bishop of Norwich: Some theological colleges require staff to subscribe to statements of belief contained in their trust deeds. I am not aware of any college or course which requires students to do so. The focus of inspections is primarily on whether an institution is preparing candidates satisfactorily for ordained ministry in the Church of England. Inspectors seek confirmation that the beliefs and values embedded and taught within an institution are consonant with this goal. They are guided by the principles set out in the Declaration of Assent.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): Can you let Synod know which theological colleges require their staff to subscribe to statements of belief, and what these are? Obviously that would be in writing, but could you confirm now that none of the non-residential ordination courses has such a requirement?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am not aware that any of them have a requirement but I would need to check. Certainly this is not esoteric, secret knowledge: it just requires some research.

6. *Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Has the Ministry Division given consideration to how those involved in disputes in the context of a theological college or course could be helped to resolve them by use of the process under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 (including conciliation) and, if it has, does it intend to issue any guidance to that end?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 is intended to deal with complaints about misconduct by a member of the clergy. Whilst in principle it applies to ordained ministers of theological colleges and courses, in practice the majority of disputes that arise in those contexts would be unlikely to fall within the scope of the

Measure because they would not involve misconduct. However, there is nothing to stop parties to a dispute taking advantage of the institution's own grievance or disciplinary procedures or simply agreeing to adopt the conciliation procedure.

7. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Having established the concept of ordained pioneer ministry and encouraged candidates to train for it, what action is the Ministry Division taking, or will it take, to try to secure for new ordained pioneer ministers the availability of an adequate number of title posts in which their pioneer calling can flourish rather than being frustrated?

The Bishop of Norwich: Guidance on ordained pioneer ministry was approved by the House of Bishops in January 2006. The Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee issued additional guidance to bishops about deployment to a first post in March 2007. Revd Dr Steven Croft, the Archbishops' Missioner and team leader of Fresh Expressions is himself keeping these guidelines under review.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): What does the guidance to bishops recommend the bishops to do? Will the implementation of those guidelines ensure that there will be sufficient suitable types of post available for those training for ordained pioneer ministry?

The Bishop of Norwich: The guidelines are not in any sense secret. I could make certain that you see them, rather than attempting to summarize them here. What the Ministry Division cannot do is actually determine where titles take place or their content; that is left to bishops. The Ministry Division can advise. I would say, in addition, that a measure of frustration is probably necessary in the formation of deacons, priests and bishops and, in the light of the past few days, archbishops as well.

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

What will be the effects on the Church of England's financing of initial training for ordained ministers and for authorized lay ministries such as Reader of HM Government's proposals to discontinue provision of Higher Education Council for England moneys in relation to people studying for equivalent or lower qualifications (ELQs), and what representations did the Ministry Division make to the Government's Innovation, Universities and Skills Committee about this by the 14 January 2008 deadline?

9. *Mrs Anneliese Barrell (Exeter)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What representations has the Ministry Division made to HM Government relating to the funding for the training of priests who already hold a first degree?

10. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What is the potential cost to theological colleges and the Church of HM Government's proposed changes to higher education funding, and what representations are being made in this regard?

The Bishop of Norwich: With permission I will answer these Questions together.

Approximately 75 per cent of ordinands will be affected by the proposed changes. It is difficult to be precise, but we estimate that the proposed change could add anything up to £1.5 million to the cost of training for ordination. Reader training is funded by the dioceses and it is difficult to estimate any financial impact there. Our response to the HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) consultation is available on the Ministry Division's website. I made a formal submission ahead of the 14 January deadline to the Select Committee, as did some of our ecumenical partners and theological institutions. The Archbishops and I, on behalf of the House of Bishops, wrote to the Secretary of State. At the Select Committee the Minister, Bill Rammell MP, announced that HEFCE would set up a two-month consultation about the study of theology, recognizing that there were particular concerns. I spoke with the Minister later that day, and two days later had a meeting with the chief executive of HEFCE, Professor David Eastwood. Last week representatives met with a senior member of HEFCE as part of this continuing consultation. We are pressing our case firmly and, I think, fairly.

Revd Dr Richard Burridge (London University): In congratulating you upon that consultation and reaction from the Secretary of State, can I also encourage you not just to press the case for those who are training for ordination but also for the fact that this impacts upon many people who then go to universities such as King's College, London as mature students, often to read theology; it is taking millions out of theology training across the whole of the country, and not just out of ordination training. Please make that point to the Secretary of State as well.

The Bishop of Norwich: I entirely agree and understand that. There are two quite separate arguments that we have to make, and the two are related.

11. *Ms Kathryn Campion-Spall (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What contingency plans does the Ministry Division have to ensure the continuing availability of the current range and quality of theological training courses in the event that HEFCE funding is completely withdrawn for those studying for equivalent or lower qualifications (ELQ)?

The Bishop of Norwich: It may not be possible to maintain the entire range of our courses if the Church decided it could not afford the additional cost that the potential changes may bring. I hope an exemption or a mixture of moves may be secured, but there are some other options that we are exploring, namely a mix of two-year

foundation degrees (currently exempt from the changes), employer co-funding options for honours degrees and more extensive use of postgraduate qualifications.

12. *Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Where does ultimate responsibility lie for the management and oversight of theological colleges approved by the Church of England and what are the remit and authority of the Conference of Anglican and Ecumenical Institutes for Ministerial Training?

The Bishop of Norwich: The management and oversight of a theological college is the responsibility of the governors of that college. The Conference of Anglican and Ecumenical Institutes for Ministry Training has no standing in this management and oversight. The House of Bishops has responsibility for the recognition of each institution as suitable for the training of our ordinands and is assisted in this task by the quinquennial inspection process.

13. *Revd Jonathan Clark (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

The Ministry Division's new proposed block grant scheme will result in a significant reduction of funding to most non-residential ordination courses. What action is proposed to remedy this cut?

The Bishop of Norwich: The block grants will provide a transparent and assured method of funding year on year. They are cost-neutral. In other words, there is no overall saving or reduction in the moneys that are already allocated by this Synod in Vote 1. The aim is to enable the governors of our colleges and courses to determine their own budgetary priorities and avoid detailed inspection of every item of expenditure by the Finance Panel. The 2008–09 block grants, which are due to be published only in this coming April, will not reduce overall funding. Inevitably some courses may benefit a little; others may lose a little. The Finance Panel is intending to set up a small working group to look carefully at funding levels and will meet with the course principals to hear their views. However, Synod will recognize that Vote 1 has to represent value for money and be at a level that dioceses and parishes can afford.

Revd Jonathan Clark (London): I represent the Synod on the governing body of the North Thames Ministerial Training Course. The draft allocation as we have it at present includes £870 *per annum* for office expenses and there is no line for library expenses. The course currently budgets for these items £47,000 –

The Chairman: Mr Clark, can we have a question, please?

Revd Jonathan Clark (London): Yes it is a question – and we are running out of money. Will this course concern the Ministry Division?

The Bishop of Norwich: The point of the block grants is that there are not separate lines

in them. It will be a block grant for the course to use as it thinks best. That is the major difference between the block grant and the present system, whereby the Finance Panel has trawled over the details of every course's accounts. It gives greater flexibility to the course. The overall funding will not reduce, and we will look at these issues in due course before the final amounts are published. This is premature, given that the final amounts have not been published.

14. *Mrs Christine McMullen (Derby)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What monitoring and review processes have been put in place to assess whether theological institutions in the new regional training partnerships can deliver adequate formational and theological teaching within the new funding arrangements in 2008–09?

The Bishop of Norwich: The primary responsibility for the delivery of adequate theological education and training lies with the governing bodies. Governors must take their financial governance responsibilities seriously and review the methods of provision in the light of the number of sponsored ordinands and the resources available. The overall level of funding for theological education, as I have said before, will not diminish. Prior to the setting of the block grants there will be a process of consultation at a staff level to establish the needs and priorities for funding. At a national level the Finance Panel will continue carefully to review the funding provided. The Panel will also continue to review the audited financial accounts and the budgets of any institutions which seek additional funding under the published criteria. The Panel will make an annual report on the funding provided to the Ministry Division and the Archbishops' Council and to the Synod in the annual budget document.

15. *Mrs Anneliese Barrell (Exeter)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What criteria are used to decide whether or not SWMTC is to receive financial support, and is its vital importance to the dioceses in the south west of England one of them?

16. *Revd Prebendary Sam Philpott (Exeter)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

What procedure is followed and who is consulted when making decisions whether or not to give financial support to a training course, and was this procedure followed in respect of the decision to reduce the level of such support to the South West Ministerial Training Course?

The Bishop of Norwich: With permission I will answer these two Questions together.

The 2007–08 funding for SWMTC was calculated by the Finance Panel based on *Managing Planned Growth* (GS Misc 597). The funding of £192,388 was based on 36 ordinands. After allowing for the reduction of two ordinands from the previous year,

this actually represented a 5.9 per cent increase in funding from the previous year's total of £191,717 for more ordinands.

The block grant guidelines indicate that additional funding is available where geographical factors mean that an institution is unable to enter partnerships with other institutions. Assurances have already been given by staff members and the former chairman of the Finance Panel, the Bishop of Derby, that SWMTC will receive additional funding above the standard block grant. This will be equivalent to the present premium funding paid compared with other courses.

Revd Alan Bashforth (Truro): – Synod representative on SWMTC council and, because I was absent one day, chairman of their finance committee. Could you just explain, Bishop, when that figure will be released, that figure of the additional funding that SWMTC will receive, because it makes our financial planning at this time very difficult without having that actual figure?

The Bishop of Norwich: I would have thought it would not be known until April at the earliest, when the actual block grant figures for next year will be made known; but I will contact you separately about that. As a former chair of SWMTC council for seven years, I think I am aware of the geographical and other constraints within which SWMTC has to work; but of course it is not unique as even in the east of England we are a bit spread out as well.

17. *Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Can the Ministry Division advise whether, as charities, theological colleges and courses are required by law to reveal the sources of all donations and other incoming funds, especially if there are conditions attached, or whether they are expected to do this as a matter of good practice?

The Bishop of Norwich: Charities are required under the Statement of Recommended Practice 2005 for charity accounts to detail the various types of funding received and any specific purposes, but not the actual sources. Charities may wish sometimes to give special thanks to particular donors and they may mention the donors by name. This is not, however, required as a matter of good practice.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): When Ministry Division inspects a college or course, does it enquire about substantial donations with conditions attached, which may be compromising the integrity of that institution?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Ministry Division does not inspect any colleges or courses; the House of Bishops' inspectorate does. That is the first thing it is always important to say. In terms of the overall funding, if there are any very substantial donations then naturally the inspectors are going to be interested in where they come from because they matter in terms of the overall funding of the training. We are conscious always that in

many cases in theological colleges now the funding that comes through ordination candidates is not the only stream of funding that sustains them; indeed we encourage other forms of funding and other education to happen in them in order to enable our students to be trained. So we are not suspicious of other forms of funding, although we may be interested as to where the funding comes from.

18. *Mrs Christine McMullen (Derby)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

When was the last time course/college councils were given guidelines about organizing pension arrangements for lay members of the academic staff who are paid on the Lichfield scale?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Lichfield scale exists to indicate to governors the maximum level of salaries and some other benefits that are funded from central Church funds. The Finance Panel did originally assist a number of institutions to set up their pension provision through the Church Workers Pension Fund for their employees. Since then, no specific guidance has been issued. Governors of the training institutions have been able to make direct contact with the CWPF as necessary. It really is the responsibility of governing bodies to set the terms and conditions of employment for their staff.

Mrs Christine McMullen (Derby): I understand that in the past there were guidelines. I wonder if Ministry Division could consider sending out guidelines again to a diminishing number of lay members of staff?

The Bishop of Norwich: I will take that back and consider it with the other members of the Ministry Council.

The Chairman: The next three Questions are to be answered by the Bishop of Ripon and Leeds as chairman of the Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee.

19. *The Archdeacon of Dorset (Ven. Alistair Magowan)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Given the significant increases in the price of fuel, has any action been taken to ask the Government to review the tax-free mileage allowances, which have remained static for several years?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): Yes. The Churches' Main Committee made representations to her Majesty's Revenue and Customs in 2005 and 2006 concerning approved mileage allowance payments. However, the Government declined to increase their rates, on the grounds that, first, there was no evidence that total motoring costs had increased significantly and, second, the existing rates encouraged 'greener' motoring. Following the 2007 Budget, Revenue and Customs

commenced a wide-ranging review of the structure of mileage allowance payments, especially whether differing costs could be better recognized, environmental awareness could be encouraged, and tax and National Insurance contribution treatment could be aligned. All diocesan offices were notified of this review and invited to make submissions. In their submission, the Churches' Main Committee stressed, first, the particular problems faced by clergy in rural areas and, second, the need for any new system to be simple to administer. It is expected that there will be an announcement in the Budget on 12 March.

The Archdeacon of Dorset (Ven. Alistair Magowan): I am grateful for that answer. Could I ask that we may be able to go back particularly with the plight of the rural community and rural clergy, as many of them are doing over 10,000 miles a year because of the nature of their benefices and they often pay more per litre, so they are hit several ways in terms of hardship?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: Yes. Thank you.

20. *The Archdeacon of Warrington (Ven. Peter Bradley)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Can the chairman of the Ministry Division please provide a list of the total numbers of stipendiary clergy presently in post in each diocese alongside the Sheffield figure for each diocese?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: I have arranged for the latest information available to be posted on the notice board.

Information relating to Question 20 from the Archdeacon of Warrington:

Distribution of FTE stipendiary diocesan clergy 2006

Actual and according to the clergy share deployment formula

Ref. No.	Diocese	December 31st 2006		Number over/under (-) share	Percent over/under (-) share
		Actual	Share		
1	Bath and Wells	225	203	22	10.80%
2	Birmingham	177	180	-3	-1.80%
3	Blackburn	218	209	9	4.40%
4	Bradford	106	106	0	0.30%
5	Bristol	138	135	3	2.20%
6	Canterbury	153	159	-6	-4.00%
7	Carlisle	142	137	5	3.50%
8	Chelmsford	405	398	7	1.60%
9	Chester	252	253	-1	-0.60%

10	Chichester	316	282	34	12.00%
11	Coventry	133	130	3	2.20%
12	Derby	160	167	-7	-4.20%
13	Durham	199	208	-10	-4.60%
14	Ely	146	142	4	2.50%
15	Exeter	230	238	-8	-3.30%
16	Gloucester	144	142	2	1.10%
17	Guildford	171	159	12	7.60%
18	Hereford	103	115	-12	-10.30%
19	Leicester	148	153	-6	-3.60%
20	Lichfield	309	323	-14	-4.40%
21	Lincoln	193	227	-34	-14.90%
22	Liverpool	215	215	0	-0.20%
23	London	522	512	10	1.90%
24	Manchester	271	269	2	0.60%
25	Newcastle	144	143	1	0.30%
26	Norwich	191	200	-9	-4.60%
27	Oxford	390	392	-2	-0.50%
28	Peterborough	156	157	-1	-0.60%
29	Portsmouth	117	113	4	3.30%
30	Ripon and Leeds	132	140	-8	-5.70%
31	Rochester	227	191	36	18.90%
32	St. Albans	269	267	2	0.70%
33	St. Edms and Ipswich	144	155	-11	-7.30%
34	Salisbury	216	219	-4	-1.60%
35	Sheffield	171	167	4	2.20%
36	Sodor and Man	19	19	0	0.00%
37	Southwark	348	332	16	4.70%
38	Southwell	153	166	-13	-7.80%
39	Truro	112	118	-6	-5.40%
40	Wakefield	156	158	-2	-1.30%
41	Winchester	224	226	-2	-1.00%
42	Worcester	147	139	8	5.60%
43	York	247	268	-21	-7.70%
Province of Canterbury		6,208	6,174	34	0.60%
Province of York		2,423	2,458	-35	-1.40%
CHURCH OF ENGLAND		8,632	8,632	0	0.00%

Note: The 'Actual' is the number of full-time stipendiary clergy plus the whole-time equivalent of the part-time clergy

The Archdeacon of Warrington (Ven. Peter Bradley): Thanks for that, Bishop. Can you tell us what sanctions are in place, if any, that can be applied to those dioceses which consistently exceed their Sheffield quota?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: It is up to dioceses to decide what their policy is towards attaining clergy share numbers. They are encouraged to move towards the share of clergy that they should have according to the deployment formula, but it is not in anyone's power to provide sanctions against dioceses which exceed their numbers, and indeed in some cases that is actually helpful where there are clergy who might otherwise be unemployed.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): In the light of the evidence that actually the Sheffield formula is having the opposite effect of what it seems to have, and the concern expressed by some northern bishops with whom I have been in consultation that they are unable to attract people because they cannot afford to pay for them, because of the way in which the Sheffield formula kicks in and penalizes dioceses that take additional clergy, can I invite DRACSC to undertake a review of the Sheffield formula, which has been in place much too long now, and find a new way of seeking people to move from the south to the north, rather than the Sheffield formula which currently operates as a disincentive? I just think you need a different way of doing things.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: DRACSC is aware of the issues which people raise about the formula. As you will see from the figures, the vast majority of dioceses are very close to their formula numbers. The province of Canterbury has out of a total of over 6,000 clergy just 34 more than its share and the province of York in its 2,500 clergy the same number fewer; so these numbers are not as different as might be implied by the question.

21. *Dr Roger Fry (Europe)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Has consideration been given to the implications of the legislation regarding age discrimination for the current arrangements for the retirement of bishops, clergy, Readers and others who serve the Church?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: Yes. The Deployment, Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee issued guidance notes about the age discrimination legislation in November 2006, including an objective justification for a compulsory retirement age of 70 for stipendiary clergy. Unpaid ministers, including Readers, are excluded from the provisions of the 2006 regulations, and the guidance does not apply to them. However, clergy in house-for-duty posts could be regarded as being paid. The Church of England Pensions Board has examined the regulations and has advised that there are no implications at present for the operation of the clergy pension scheme.

Dr Roger Fry (Europe): Other mainstream Churches such as the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church do not require bishops and clergy to retire at 70. Will the Church of England review its practice in the light of this fact?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: I think that we have at the moment the objective justification which is in our guidance, and I do not think that there is at the moment any particular intention to review that. If you wish to develop the argument with us, no doubt you will do so.

Mission and Public Affairs Council

22. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

In the context of the passage through Parliament of the Human Fertilization and Embryology Bill, what action has been or will be taken by the Mission and Public Affairs Division to commend to peers and Members of Parliament the clear expressions of opinion concerning the law on abortion contained in successive General Synod resolutions?

Dr Philip Giddings: In its recent bulletin to peers and MPs, the MPA Division included a briefing paper on abortion which reflects the views of the General Synod on that subject. We are also in contact with the Pro-life All-Party Parliamentary Group. In the context of the parliamentary debate to which Mr Scowen refers, I understand that the Lords Spiritual deemed it inappropriate to rush through what they judged an ill-thought-out amendment relating to abortion in the middle of a highly complex Bill which was not about abortion but which raised profound questions about the nature of human beings, families, saviour siblings, hybrid embryos and the need for a national ethics committee, on all of which aspects bishops spoke. Their expressed view was that the important issue of reducing the number of abortions was better addressed separately and properly. I agree.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): If, notwithstanding that view, any further amendment concerning abortion is debated during the passage of the Bill through either House, will the Division actively seek to urge MPs and peers to vote in accordance with the views which this Synod has repeatedly articulated?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Division will consider each event on its merits, keeping in mind its responsibility to ensure that all those concerned should be aware of the views of the Synod.

23. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) has issued a consultation document, *Believing We Can*. Its stated purpose is to promote the contribution faith-based organizations can make to reducing adult and youth re-offending. Was the Church of England, through the Mission and Public Affairs Council, invited to contribute and, if so, what representations did it make? Failing such an opportunity being provided, what response is now being made to the many points raised in the document?

Dr Philip Giddings: Although the Church of England was not invited specifically to respond to the consultation document, we have chosen to do so through the ecumenical Churches' Criminal Justice Forum, which is consulting representatives of Churches and Christian voluntary organizations working with offenders. Individual members of the Council, members of Synod and other Church members who have observations to make are encouraged to contact the Forum as soon as possible, bearing in mind that the consultation closes next week, on Friday 22 February. The Council will be informed of the content of the CCJF response and will keep in touch with future developments. A copy of the response will be posted on the Church of England website.

Mr Colin Slater (Southwell and Nottingham): In view of the fact that this Synod has previously expressed its mind on the important social issue of re-offending levels by both adults and young people, does the chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council share my disappointment that NOMS has chosen not to engage with the national Church on this major consultation exercise? If he shares that sense of disappointment will the Council take steps to ensure that it is fully involved by NOMS in any follow-up work?

Dr Philip Giddings: I am always anxious to ensure that the Council is fully consulted by Her Majesty's Government and their various agencies on these important questions, particularly this one. The Council will continue to do its utmost to propound the views which this Synod and others have represented in this very difficult area of managing offender services.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): Is the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council aware that the Secretary of State for Justice made a statement in the House on 29 January regarding the organization of the Ministry of Justice in general and of the National Offender Management Service in particular, and that it is possible that those new arrangements, which come into place on 1 April, may provide a fresh opportunity to engage on this and related questions?

Dr Philip Giddings: Yes he is.

24. *Mr Philip Ivey-Ray (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

What steps are being taken to resist the proposed repeal of the blasphemy laws?

Dr Philip Giddings: In their evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee on Religious Offences in 2002, the Archbishops' Council advocated a graduated approach by which the enactment of a law on incitement to religious hatred could provide the context for the abolition of the common law offences of blasphemy and blasphemous libel. Following the Government's announcement on 9 January of a short consultation on abolition, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York sought the opinions of other denominations and have responded to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local

Government. Their Graces concluded that, while the manner and timing of the proposal were not ideal, the Church of England would not resist abolition provided that we could be assured that other legal provisions will afford the necessary protection to individuals and to society and that the position of Christianity in the constitutional framework of our nation will not be put in question.

Mr Philip Ivey-Ray (Chelmsford): How will the Archbishops ensure that other legal provisions will protect the holy name of the Trinity of God with equal legal force as the existing common laws against blasphemy and blasphemous libel when every private prosecution brought by organizations such as Christian Voice and by private individuals has been overruled by politically biased district judges or stipendiary magistrates –

The Chairman: Mr Ivey-Ray, I think you are straying beyond a straight supplementary. Dr Giddings, you are being asked for a legal opinion and you may wish to refer that to somebody else.

Dr Philip Giddings: I am sure the Archbishops will have heard the question and the concern which underlies it, and it is a significant challenge; but if the law is to be changed we need to ensure that it effects proper protection.

Revd Dr John Hartley (Bradford): In view of the public consultation which has been announced, how can the members of this Synod, being the representatives of the Church of England, be involved personally in this consultation?

Dr Philip Giddings: I think the answer to that question is by writing directly to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government powerful, well reasoned letters.

25. *Mr Roy Thompson (York)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Is the Council aware of the increasing poverty for pensioners in northern England caused by the high and penal percentage of income needed to pay for community tax compared with higher earners, and how has it made any views known to the Government?

Dr Philip Giddings: The MPA Council has not addressed the question in the form put. However, it continues to make its views known to Government in terms of the wider issues underlying this Question and to work with a number of Church and other groups in doing so. Moreover, the Council has recently commissioned a scoping study to look at issues affecting older people in society and in the Church, and to guide the Council's future engagement with these issues. Pensioner poverty – not, incidentally, confined to northern England – will certainly be raised within that study. Similarly, the Council keeps a careful eye on economic policy, including taxation, and the social implications

of widening inequality. Community taxes are only one factor affecting pensioner poverty and involve much wider questions about local democracy and the respective powers of national and local government.

Mr Roy Thompson (York): Will the study compare the percentage paid by the northern pensioner with the percentage paid by a well known resident of Islington, with a reported income of £40 million?

Dr Philip Giddings: I doubt it, but since the point has been raised I will draw it to the attention of those involved in the scoping study.

26. *Dr Roger Fry (Europe)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Will the Council take steps to discourage the use of the widely used but misleading term ‘multi-faith society’ on the grounds that it fails to recognize that, even though other religious traditions are also represented here, England remains a country in which the Christian tradition is accepted and valued by the majority of its citizens?

Dr Philip Giddings: The term ‘multi-faith’ is intended to reflect the diversity of religions in our society, but it does not do justice to the depth and breadth of the Christian faith in all aspects of contemporary Britain. The numerical preponderance of Christianity was shown in the 2001 census, which reported that, of people declaring themselves of a religious faith, 93.2 per cent identified themselves as Christian, 3.5 per cent reported themselves as Muslim, 1.2 per cent as Hindu and 2 per cent as of all other religions together. As a percentage of the whole population, 71.6 per cent declared themselves as Christian, 4.4 per cent as of religions other than Christian, and 22.8 per cent as of no religion or religion not stated.

The issues raised by indiscriminate use of ‘faith’ language were covered in General Synod’s debate on the report *Presence and Engagement* in July 2005. An MPA Council task force is taking forward the Synod’s recommendations.

Clergy Discipline Commission

27. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Clergy Discipline Commission:

What is the estimated cost of holding a three-day hearing of a tribunal under the Clergy Discipline Measure, and how is this allocated between the different parties?

HH Judge John Bullimore: The actual costs of the tribunal hearings that have so far taken place are still to be determined, but previous estimates indicated that a complaint involving a three-day hearing would cost in total, from beginning to final determination by a tribunal, about £30,000. Of this sum, £20,000 (representing the respondent’s

costs) would be funded by the Legal Aid Board if the respondent were legally aided and, if not, would be met by the respondent, about £2,000 (representing the bishop's costs) would be met by the Church Commissioners and the balance (representing the costs of the tribunal, which would be about £8,000) would be payable by the Archbishops' Council.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): I understand that the costs of the most recent tribunal were very much greater than the costs that you have quoted in terms of the early estimates. Could you please advise us when it will be possible to know what the actual cost of these tribunals is going to be?

HH Judge John Bullimore: I am not able to give you that information. I do not know when the final costs will be determined. I am not aware of the premise on which your supplementary was based.

Crown Nominations Commission

28. *Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Could the Chairman of the Crown Nominations Commission publish details of the dioceses from which appointments have been made to the post of diocesan bishop over the past ten years?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): We have this information from 2002 and it has been posted on the notice board. It has not been possible in the time available to do this for the previous five years, but we will do this and pass the information to Mr Hancock as soon as we can.

Information relating to Question 28 from Mr Paul Hancock:

Dioceses from which appointments have been made to the post of diocesan bishop over the past ten years

Birmingham	Lichfield
Carlisle	Lincoln
Chester (x2)	Monmouth
Chichester	Norwich
Coventry	Oxford
Derby	Royal Peculiar
Durham	Southwark
Ely	Wakefield (x2)
Guildford	Winchester

Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool): Thank you, Archbishop. Would it be possible in the future to ask for similar sorts of information about other offices, such as that of dean?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I see no objection in principle to that. I will consult.

29. *The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Nicholas Reade)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Is the Crown Nominations Commission among those bodies bound by section 1 of the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: The Act of Synod applies to the Crown Nominations Commission and to all other bodies and persons in the Church of England involved in the making of senior appointments.

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Nicholas Reade): While no one can break the confidentiality of Crown Nominations Commission meetings, what assurances can we offer the Synod that a requirement by diocesan representatives that their future diocesan bishop be willing to ordain women as priests would be set aside during deliberations of the Commission?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: As the bishop has said, it is impossible to break the confidentiality of the CNC meetings. I can assure the bishop and the Synod, however, that in charring meetings of the Commission the Archbishop of York and I try to ensure that any exploration of an individual's position on this issue is confined to how adequately such a candidate would support the ministry of women rather than any views on the subject that the candidate might express.

30. *Mr Paul Eddy (Winchester)* asked the Chairman of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Given the answer by the Bishop of Peterborough to my Question in November 2007, will the chairman of the Crown Nominations Commission please confirm whether or not, when considering suitable candidates to propose for bishoprics, the Commission complies with the Anglican understanding of marriage and Our Lord's command in Mark 10.11–12: 'Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery'?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: There are no provisions in Measure, Canon, synodical resolution or House of Bishops teaching document that touch specifically and directly on the possible consecration to the episcopate of someone who has remarried after divorce or who has married someone who is divorced. Scripture itself has slightly different voices on this issue if you take Matthew 19 into account as well as Mark 10. There have been rare cases of persons already in episcopal orders marrying in these circumstances, but there has been no instance of someone in this situation being

consecrated bishop in the Church of England. In this context, the CNC is bound to consider all names submitted to it in relation to particular vacancies, but in the case of a remarried divorcee or someone married to a divorcee the CNC would need at least to be satisfied both that such a person could be a focus of unity in the diocese and that the relevant archbishop was prepared to consecrate.

Mr Paul Eddy (Winchester): I am grateful to His Grace for his reply. Given the great care and attention Synod gave the hugely pastorally significant report *Marriage in Church after Divorce* and given the wide implications of a remarried divorcee becoming a bishop on the Church's official teaching about and support of marriage, would His Grace now consider asking an appropriate body to prepare such a teaching document to be considered by Synod so that a consistent approach might be adopted by the CNC on behalf of the whole Church?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you. I would grant the desirability of a consistent approach on this subject. The question has already been discussed among members of the House of Bishops and I hope that at some point we may be able to articulate a consistent policy on this.

Liturgical Commission

31. *Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Since there was confusion about the correct readings for each Sunday of Epiphany this year in parishes using books containing the lections from the *Revised Common Lectionary* (RCL) because Epiphany 2008 was a Sunday, will the Liturgical Commission consider whether the Church of England should revert to the RCL terminology which refers to Sundays 'after Epiphany' instead of 'of Epiphany'?

The Bishop of Wakefield (Rt Revd Stephen Platten): First of all, I regret the confusion this year. The root cause was a mistake made in the 1990s in compiling the *Common Worship* Calendar, Lectionary and Collects. That mistake was subsequently corrected, but too late for the main volume and the printed-out lectionaries. In more recent volumes – including the final volume *Festivals* which was published this month (big advert for it!) – the Calendar and rules are correct. The annual lectionary booklets were correct and the *Transforming Worship* website explained the unusual position.

The point is that the Sundays are 'of Epiphany' and not 'after Epiphany' because in the *Common Worship* Calendar Epiphany is a season (from Epiphany to Candlemas) and not a single event (like Trinity Sunday). Therefore the suggestion included in the Question would incidentally imply the abolition of the whole season. Most of the *Common Worship* volumes would need to be changed, and this would result in far more confusion every year than there was, exceptionally, this year.

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): Thank you for that clear explanation, and for the reference to

the *Transforming Worship* website, but that specific, clear explanation is not on the website. There is a lengthy explanation of what moves to which Sunday in which circumstance, but it would be good to have the explanation you have just given as well.

The Chairman: Have you a question, Mrs Slater?

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): Yes. In addition, it says that on subsequent Sundays of Epiphany the readings are all moved down one week but the collects are not moved down. Why not?

The Bishop of Wakefield: Because the collects relate to the Sundays within the season, as I have just explained. We have tried to explain something on the *Transforming Worship* web site but I am sure we could add more to that if it was helpful.

Canon Dr Christina Baxter (Southwell and Nottingham): I wonder if the implication of the Bishop's answer is that, because Epiphany is a season and Trinity is a single event, the Trinity is less enduring than Epiphany? (*Laughter*)

The Bishop of Wakefield: I would have thought rather the opposite, bearing in mind the length of Trinity and the number of Sundays that follow.

Church Commissioners

32. *Mrs Joanna Monckton (Lichfield)* asked the Church Commissioners:

Did the Church Commissioners provide Christmas lights in areas of London in 2007, in particular in Connaught Square, and, if they did, for what reason and at what cost?

The First Church Estates Commissioner (Mr Andreas Whittam Smith, Ex officio): No Christmas lights were provided in Connaught Square but they were provided along Connaught Street and Porchester Place, the two streets that make up the shopping and restaurant area of the Commissioners' Hyde Park estate known as Connaught Village. This was an integral part of the Connaught Village Christmas festival which aimed to encourage residents to support their local shops and restaurants, make the area more attractive and welcoming to visitors and build a sense of community. Providing the lights will cost £12,000 and that will be spread over three years.

33. *Prebendary Diana Taylor (Bath and Wells)* asked the Church Commissioners:

When the Commissioners decided to serve rent increase notices on their farm tenants, did they consider the dismay and confusion it would cause to all those who helped raise more than £600,000 for the farming help charities during last year's widespread flooding and disease problems and particularly to those church communities which had often led the appeals for help?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: In recent years farm rents have been static or falling, reflecting the difficulties faced by the industry and falling farm incomes. During this period farm tenants have sought rent reductions and we have granted them, particularly during the foot and mouth crisis, but there is now scope for cautious optimism regarding farm incomes and the Commissioners would be failing in their duty if they did not serve notice to review rent levels. The service of such a notice does not automatically result in either a rent increase or a rent decrease; it is a mechanism to open a dialogue between landlord and tenant and their respective agents.

None of the Commissioners' land was directly affected by the flooding and disease incidents of 2007. Had it been, they would have acted as they did during the 2001 foot and mouth outbreak, when rent relief was given where appropriate.

Prebendary Diana Taylor (Bath and Wells): Thank you for that. If there are perhaps to be increases in some farm profits, do the Commissioners believe their tenants should retain a fair share of these for their long-overdue on-farm investments and for some little personal reward after many difficult years?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: When these negotiations are under way we look very, very carefully at the farm income and expenditure by the tenant and expenditure by us, and it is done in an extremely systematic fashion; but given that food commodity prices, whether one likes it or not, are turning up very substantially, I think it is only right that we should expect some of this to move through to rents which have been very low, as you know, for many generations.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Tom Wright): Is the First Estates Commissioner aware that in the Durham dales and related areas where there are many different landlords the Church Commissioners are regarded as one of the best among the landlords there, and will he convey to his staff the gratitude (speaking as the patron of the Upper Tees agricultural support services) of that community for what has been done in what has been a very difficult time recently? Since I have been in the past occasionally critical of the Church Commissioners, I thought it would be nice to say something good for once.

The First Church Estates Commissioner: I am very, very grateful to the Bishop for that, and I hope that other bishops will follow your concern for what I am up to!

34. *Prebendary Diana Taylor (Bath and Wells)* asked the Church Commissioners:

How much appropriate advice do the Commissioners seek from the expertise available within the Church when considering their rural portfolio, from, for example, the MPA's Rural Strategy Group, the National Rural Officer and the Arthur Rank Centre at Stoneleigh, or are all decisions made via their external agents?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: Decisions are implemented by agents but taken by the Commissioners in the light of advice from professional advisers and regular

dialogue with a range of other contacts. The Commissioners have a duty to manage their assets in accordance with their legal responsibilities to their beneficiaries and, while they have regard to the advice they receive from all contacts, they must ultimately make their own decisions in the context of their overall investment strategy, management policy and the market.

Revd Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): Has consideration been given to the choice, to the briefing and to the management of land agents, to the end that their work supports the standing of the Church, both locally and nationally?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: We do that in quite a thorough fashion. When the Commissioners make a formal visit to their estates – which takes place right through from April to September – we always make sure that local clergy are involved in this visit, and we generally have a briefing before the visit commences when we have all the farmers together and the local clergy and we discuss both sides' objectives, how these estates fit into our picture, and we then consider their own concerns; it is a very good interchange between farmers, clergy and Church Commissioners.

Pensions Board

35. *Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

What records does the Board keep of the numbers of clergy who move to an address abroad on retirement, and can he provide figures for the past five years?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: Although the Board has a record of how many pensioners are living abroad – which was 469, at the end of January this year, out of a total of 8,800 – it does not record whether they moved before, at or after retirement. However, we estimate that on average about 25 pensioners move abroad at the point of retirement each year.

Revd Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): Anecdotal evidence suggests that more and more clergy are choosing to build their retirement life in a new and much cheaper country. This is because they feel they cannot afford to live in this country. Will the Board undertake to keep a year-on-year tally of those who do move abroad, as that will provide an indicator of the adequacy or otherwise, as perceived by retiring clergy, of the lump sum, the CHARM scheme and indeed the monthly pension itself?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: Yes I will.

The Bishop in Europe (Rt Revd Geoffrey Rowell): If there are records of any kind kept, is there a possibility of encouraging clergy, when thinking of retiring to Europe, to do some consultation so that they might retire – if they wished to continue some kind of ministry – to places where they might be most useful?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: May I first assure this Synod that records are kept. Whether they are relevant to the question asked by the Bishop, I am not sure. We are restricted in our trusts as to the range of our activity, and certainly in the financial services area we are not authorized to give advice. Travel may be a different situation.

36. *The Archdeacon of Warrington (Ven. Peter Bradley)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

Can the Chairman of the Pensions Board please explain why the lump sum payable on death-in-service is delayed until copies of birth and marriage certificates are presented, a practice which has introduced delays that can lead to potential financial hardship for the bereaved?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: Lump sum death-in-service payments are made under 'discretionary trusts'. In other words, the Pensions Board has the discretion as to the person or persons who should receive the payment. This approach, which is adopted by the vast majority of pension schemes in the United Kingdom, is designed so that the payment does not form part of the scheme member's estate, thus ensuring that no inheritance tax is payable on it. In exercising its discretion, the Board has to make all reasonable enquiries as to the member's circumstances and ensure that due consideration is given to anyone who may feel they have a legitimate claim to the payment. In many cases the lump sum can be paid quickly. In other cases more extensive enquiries may be necessary, with the result that payment may take longer. Completion of a nomination form by scheme members, along with the speedy provision of a death certificate, greatly assists the Board in carrying out its responsibilities expeditiously.

37. *Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

What is the process for determining applications under the CHARM scheme and what are the qualifications of those who make the determinations?

38. *Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford)* asked the Chairman of the Pensions Board:

What principles and rules are used in determining applications for assistance under the CHARM scheme and has the Board considered whether, in so far as they require account to be taken of the capital assets and projected income of the applicant (a kind of means test which has been increasingly removed from State benefit schemes), they may tend to discourage prudent saving and encourage spending?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: With your permission, Chairman, I would like, if I may, to answer these Questions together.

The objective of the CHARM scheme is to enable retiring clergy, who have completed at least five years' service, to obtain a suitable retirement property if they do not have the

financial resources to provide such accommodation themselves. Assistance is not provided 'as of right' and is related to each applicant's financial circumstances. The 'needs assessment' takes into account both capital resources and projected income. Applicants with sufficient capital to invest are normally assisted through the mortgage section of the scheme. Those without such resources are assisted through the rental section and are first expected to consider any existing vacant properties in their preferred area. If none is suitable, the Board will purchase a property which fits within the criteria of the scheme. Means-testing of the sort used in the scheme remains a feature in State benefit schemes, including housing benefit. We do not believe that the current arrangements discourage prudent saving or encourage spending. Staff who make determinations under the scheme have demonstrable competencies relevant to the position they hold, combined at senior level with many years' experience in housing, and are overseen by the Housing Manager, who is a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Housing.

Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford): Does the chairman recognize the difficulty which the opacity of the workings of the CHARM scheme causes to clergy in financial planning for retirement from the outset of their ministry, in particular knowing whether it is worth while to deny oneself in the short term and to try to save for the longer term, and their anxiety about being dependent on the decisions of unknown officials, and will he undertake to open up the system to greater transparency and to communicate this to the clergy?

Mr Allan Bridgewater: The simple answer to Mr Ayers's request at the end would be Yes, but I would like just to add that at all times the Board and its staff seek to demonstrate consideration to and care for those facing the future with not a little concern. He will also be aware that the housing provision for clergy approaching retirement and in retirement is currently under major review.

Archbishops' Council

39. *Mr Jim Cheeseman (Rochester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

In the light of the changes made in the clergy pension scheme, is consideration being given to the raising of the compulsory retiring age from 70 in order to give more clergy the chance of retiring on full pension?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James): At the moment about a quarter of clergy choose to retire before the age of 65 on a reduced pension – the actual figure is 23 per cent – and very few continue to work until 70. However, the changing demographic does mean that in the future people are likely to want to work for longer, and DRACSC is conscious of this. In 2011 the Government will review the default retirement age of 65 introduced by the Age Regulations, and we await the outcome with interest. In some parts of our Church, however, I ought to say retirement has never been fashionable: there have been only 12 Bishops of Norwich, including me, since 1792, and

one of my predecessors was invited to be the Archbishop of Dublin at the age of 89; so those days may yet return.

40. *Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Will the Council address the need for more effective machinery to transfer the pastoral oversight of churchgoing Church of England parishioners who move home between parishes?

The Bishop of Norwich: It is difficult to see the kind of machinery which could be introduced. In the past some clergy did write to the vicar in their previous parishioners' new parish. However, given that today quite a number of people choose to attend a church other than their local parish church, this may not be practical or even necessarily desired by those who are moving.

Dr Edmund Marshall (Wakefield): Is there any estimate of the number of active Church of England parishioners who are lost to the Church as a whole when they move home between parishes?

The Bishop of Norwich: I do not think there is, but one would hope that those people who move might introduce themselves to whichever new church they go to; and it does depend, all of this, on the ministry of welcome that happens in any church they choose to go to. One vicar commending parishioners to another will not necessarily incorporate them into the life of the church; it will depend on the nature of the welcome of the church when they get there.

41. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

In view of the substantial increase in Vote 1 costs for ministry training, would the Archbishops' Council instigate an analysis of the effectiveness of that spending by comparing the likely extent of ordinands' ministerial service against the training investment we are making, across different colleges, courses and dioceses?

The Bishop of Norwich: Legal advice given to the Ministry Division suggests that any criteria that sought to determine the type of training given to an ordinand by reference to their potential years of service could potentially be open to challenge under legislation on age discrimination introduced by the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): What scope is there to decouple the period of ministerial training from employment so that the training stage is funded by grant from the Church to meet college and subsistence costs, with employment not starting until graduation, in order that we may not be prevented from undertaking such analysis by the Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am trying to work that out, as to how you decouple the training you would exercise in order to be ordained from ordination itself; the two seem to me quite linked.

The Chairman: Bishop, I am advised that legal opinion is required for that, so you will probably be glad to leave your answer there.

The Bishop of Norwich: Thank you very much. What a relief! We can talk later.

Revd Dr Richard Burridge (London University): In view of the fact that the Question raises the issue of substantial increase and level of comparison, is any comparison being done of the investment being made in the training of the clergy with the investment being made in other professions? The last time we did that, in the Hind report, it showed how very little we were actually spending on the training of our ministers.

The Bishop of Norwich: I think that is the most recent research that has been done. The idea that we are overspending on our training for ordination seems to me fairly ludicrous really; but there is something to be investigated here.

42. *Mr Brian Newey (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

What adjustments to financial plans does the Archbishops' Council propose to make to reflect the increase in the number of ordinands in training since Vote 1 was agreed by this Synod last July?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council, Ex-officio): May I just say, Mr Chairman, this is my first occasion of speaking to Synod and members might think it more appropriate for me to be asking questions rather than answering them, but I will do my best.

In September 2007 50 more ordinands entered theological college training than assumed in the 2008 budget. Due to the higher numbers in training, Synod is likely in July to be asked to approve the transfer of between £600,000 and £1.2 million from the Vote 1 cash reserves to avoid a supplementary request to the dioceses. Inevitably diocesan contributions for the 2009 Vote 1 budget will increase significantly, depending upon the extent to which reserves are replenished and on the predicted numbers for those entering training in autumn 2008 and 2009. Diocesan secretaries were informed of the emerging position in January so that they could reflect it in their 2009 budgets. The Ministry Division is currently reviewing a number of options regarding the cost of Vote 1, but I am sure that Synod will be pleased overall at the good news of additional numbers of ordinands in training.

43. *Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

The draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure proposes setting up a

diocesan corporate trust body called a 'parsonage board' in each diocese. What is the Archbishops' Council's assessment of (a) the aggregate cost of setting up these boards, (b) the aggregate annual running costs of these boards, and who would pay these costs?

44. *The Archdeacon of Berkshire (Ven. Norman Russell)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

If unamended, the draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure will require the setting up of a separate parsonages board in every diocese. What estimate has the Council made of total start-up costs across the dioceses of another corporate and charitable body in every diocese and of the extra cost of administration?

Mr Andrew Britton: With the Chair's permission, I will answer these Questions together.

The costs of diocesan parsonages boards, to be borne by dioceses, will depend on the circumstances of each diocese. In total we estimate the additional cost in the first year of operation for the 44 dioceses would be very approximately £264,000 and £176,000 *per annum* thereafter. Individual dioceses may well be able to reduce the extent of additional costs in some areas, for example by negotiating with their auditors to minimize any increase in audit fees.

The Archdeacon of Berkshire (Ven. Norman Russell): Have any diocesan secretaries raised concerns with Church House about the additional costs in the increased bureaucracy involved?

Mr Andrew Britton: Not to my knowledge, but it is no doubt a reasonable concern on the part of some dioceses. I would myself feel that there is so much involved in this Measure that the financial costs, which are not enormous, would not sway people's minds unduly.

Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester): May I ask whether the Bishop of Dover consulted the Archbishops' Council in preparing the figures which he publishes in GS Misc 883, as he has produced figures which are significantly different from the figures which I have just been given.

Mr Andrew Britton: I do not think that is a question I am able to answer, I am afraid, as it does not refer to the figures that I have here but to different ones.

Mr Philip Lovegrove (St Albans): Would it be a relief to Mr Britton to discover that I doubt that there would be any difference in costs in the St Albans diocese because all the work is currently done by a sub-committee of the board of finance, and I could not imagine that there would be any difference in cost whatsoever. The most important issue is that the surpluses earned by proper management of our property affairs were significantly better than anything that could be done by individuals in parsonage houses.

Mr Andrew Britton: The costs that are estimated here are based on setting up a separate legal entity to deal with parsonages, and some cost of that sort would probably be incurred in all dioceses; but you are quite correct in suggesting that how this affects different dioceses depends very much on their governance, which is not the same in every case.

45. *The Archdeacon of Berkshire (Ven. Norman Russell)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

If the Draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure is passed unamended, what is the Council's assessment of the amount of any compensation payable to people still alive who have contributed financially to benefice property?

Mr Andrew Britton: We are, of course, grateful to those who have supported the Church's work in this way. However, the Council's understanding of the general legal position as regards charitable gifts is that, once there has been an effective outright gift to charity, the donor no longer has any legal interest in the property he or she has given. On that basis, the effect of the draft Measure in its current form would not give rise to any right to compensation on the part of those who may have contributed financially in the past, and the financial memorandum prepared by the Council under SO 98 accordingly makes no reference to that possibility.

46. *Revd Canon Gordon Oliver (Rochester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

What are the recommended criteria for the allocation to particular projects of the moneys available for distribution to dioceses through the Parish Mission Fund, and how are the actual allocations of such funds monitored?

Mr Andrew Britton: Parish Mission Fund moneys can be credited to diocesan stipends accounts or they can be invested in specific mission initiatives in the following areas:

- The mission development of a new Church ministry in an existing or new community;
- The mission development of a new ministry within an existing parish church;
- The mission development of network ministries; or
- The support of other mission initiatives that are particularly focused on the development of Christian community among people who are not currently part of the life of a church.

Dioceses certify annually that they have spent the funding in line with the requirements of section 67 of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Act 1840 and the scheme's policy guidelines. They also submit details of specific projects to which funding has been

allocated. A report on the use of the funds is made to Synod by the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners each July.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I just would like Mr Britton to confirm that in the annual report of the Church Commissioners there is always a supplement detailing some of the best activities and uses of funds through the Parish Mission Fund, that the Church Commissioners are always seeking other applications, that section 67 is alive and well and that those funds are available and will, of course, be monitored.

Mr Andrew Britton: Thank you for the Question. I think the use of the Parish Mission Fund is coming more evidently in line with its objectives and the money is being spent in a more timely way than was the case when it was first introduced.

47. *Professor Anthony Berry (Chester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Given that over the past 25 years dioceses and parishes have had to become substantially self- and mutually supporting and have developed a variety of schemes of giving and sharing, could the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners undertake a review of these various schemes with a view to sharing theological and ecclesiological understanding and good practice?

Mr Andrew Britton: A review of the parish share systems used by dioceses was conducted in 2005, and is being updated in the first half of this year. This includes elements of theological reflection on the importance of mutual support. Systems in use for sharing and giving between dioceses and the central Church are subject to periodic review, and the Council commissioned a limited review of the apportionment formulae last autumn, which is due to report imminently.

48. *Professor Anthony Berry (Chester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Could the Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners consider how, over 25 years, the Church might substantially enhance its historic financial endowment?

Mr Andrew Britton: At national level about one-third of the Commissioners' historic endowment will be spent out over the next 50–60 years as they fulfil their clergy pensions obligations, but over the past ten years their fund has grown by 80 per cent and they plan to continue to increase their fund in nominal terms by achieving the best possible long-term return from their diversified investment portfolio. Increases in endowments held by parishes are likely to come from legacies restricted for endowment, yet the current recommendation to parishes in seeking to grow legacy income is that they should seek gifts that have as few restrictions as possible to enable parishes to spend gifts on projects to enhance their mission and ministry as they wish. Current promotion of legacies to the national Church and to dioceses is as an alternative to

parishes, as we recognize that most benefactors prefer to leave money to their local church.

49. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Is the Archbishops' Council able to say whether the cost of administration of (a) the National Church Institutions and (b) the dioceses has risen or fallen over the past ten years and, if so, by how much?

Mr Andrew Britton: For dioceses we have comparable figures only for 2000–04, which are from the most recent financial overview exercise. Over this period the cost of diocesan management and administration increased by an annual average of 3.8 per cent; this compares with average annual increases of 3.6 per cent in average earnings and 2.5 per cent in retail prices over the period. Over this same period the ongoing administrative costs of the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners and Pensions Board increased by an annual average of 1.9 per cent. Between 2000 and 2006 these bodies' costs increased by an annual average of 2.9 per cent, which compares with increases in average earnings of 3.7 per cent and retail prices of 2.8 per cent. Since 2000 many organizations have faced significant increases in their pension contributions, including dioceses and National Church Institutions, and the annual expenditure increases shown above reflect the absorption of those additional pension costs.

50. *Mr Roy Thompson (York)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Is the Archbishops' Council minded to review the level of recommended allowances for attending General Synod sessions in London in view of the increasing costs of hotels and meals?

Mr Andrew Britton: These allowances are kept under regular review and current policy is to increase them annually in line with inflation.

Mr Robin Stevens (Chelmsford): Is Mr Britton aware that within 15 minutes' walk of here there are plenty of hotels in Pimlico at £50 a night, with a complimentary breakfast? My hotel tonight costs £45. We do not need to spend over £100.

Mr Andrew Britton: I was not, but I am now!

51. *Revd Jan McFarlane (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Following last March's General Synod motion on standards in the media, what further 'carefully framed research' has been announced in this area?

Mrs Anne Sloman (Archbishops' Council, Ex officio): Following the debate, the Communications Office, working with the Bishop of Manchester, encouraged the media

regulator Ofcom to carry out further research and wrote to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. Since then, the Government have initiated the Byron review into how to help parents and their children get the best from the new media technologies while protecting children from inappropriate or potentially harmful material. In addition, The Children's Society has included the impact of media and communications technologies in its Good Childhood Inquiry, and Ofcom has itself carried out research into how children and young people engage with a range of media. Material from the debate was also sent to Clare Curtis-Thomas MP, who had previously expressed concerns in Parliament about the sales of top-shelf magazines, to support her approaches to Gordon Brown on this issue when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Revd Jan McFarlane (Norwich): Thank you for your answer. Is the Archbishops' Council considering carrying out any research of its own into this area?

Mrs Anne Sloman: No, but we shall be continuing to encourage further research, as the motion from last year's group of sessions requested. We are also planning to broaden the remit of the General Synod's religion in broadcasting group to cover wider media issues, to help us better monitor this area.

52. *Mr Nigel Holmes (Carlisle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Has the Church of England congratulated the new Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Andy Burnham, on his appointment and alerted him to its concern that the stated desire of the Executive Chairman of ITV, Michael Grade, is to be free of any obligation to broadcast religious programmes?

Mrs Anne Sloman: Yes. In his letter the Bishop of Manchester reiterates his concerns about the future of public service broadcasting in the digital age. The question, in fact, goes beyond religion to how other types of programming – like children's television, the arts and local and regional programmes – are also provided on television in a multi-channel world. Among other concerns, the Bishop raises the specific ones Mr Holmes mentions about ITV and its intention to drop many of its obligations for these types of programme. I hope Mr Holmes has also raised his own local concerns about Border TV and the proposal to merge it with Tyne Tees TV, to the detriment of maintaining an informed community in the Borders.

53. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

In view of the significant proportion of people who have grown up with no experience of the Church or the Christian faith, would the Archbishops' Council consider establishing an ongoing programme to replace Church-exclusive terminology with everyday language wherever possible within our activities, including ministry and administration, just as *Common Worship* has sought to do with our liturgy?

Canon Dr Christina Baxter: The Microsoft Word spell checker is probably not alone

in struggling with words such as ‘quinquennium’, ‘suffragan’ and ‘synodical’, so if Mr Oldham has some specific suggestions in mind I am sure the Council will be pleased to consider them. Indeed I wonder if this is a piece of work where lay initiative might pay dividends. The Archbishops’ Council would, however, have to be persuaded that effort invested in reforming our language of ministry and administration was not a diversion from more important tasks and had a good chance of yielding a fruitful mission harvest. If Mr Oldham is convinced of the harvest, perhaps he can persuade colleagues to work with him informally and/or present a Private Member’s Motion.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): As this answer indicates from the phrase ‘effort invested in reforming our language of ministry and administration’, the term ‘ongoing programme’ was interpreted as a one-off review, involving a material one-off cost. Would it make any difference to the answer to know that it refers to a change in direction in the use of language not incurring any wholesale review?

Canon Dr Christina Baxter: It might make us think again but the Archbishops’ Council has a very great deal of other business to do and I think would be assisted by members of this Synod being part of the process.

54. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

In 2000 this Synod asked for a report into the possibility of admitting women into the episcopate. Since then all further discussion in this Synod has resulted in votes in support, but a second quinquennium is slipping by. What efforts are being made by the Archbishops’ Council to restore momentum?

Canon Dr Christina Baxter: In July 2006 Synod entrusted the responsibility for this phase of the work not to the Archbishops’ Council but to a legislative drafting group. Synod also decided to trust the group to work at its own speed rather than imposing a timetable on it. The Council welcomes the group’s indication that it hopes to get a report to the Bishops in May, with a view to a debate here this July.

55. *Mr Martin Dales (York)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Has any work been done regarding the costs to the Church of England if the Prime Minister’s Appointments Secretary’s office ceases to continue its valuable input into the Crown appointments process?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: In our initial discussions with the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of York and I have raised the question of the future responsibility and resourcing of the work that is currently undertaken on behalf of the Crown. The proposals that we have set out in GS 1680 mean that there could continue to be some significant involvement from those who advise the Crown, but there will need to be

further discussions with the Prime Minister about this in the light of whatever decisions Synod reaches on Thursday.

Mr Martin Dales (York): In paragraph 33 of the ninth (green) notice paper that we have received today, it states, ‘Without significant Whitehall support . . . the additional . . . cost to the Church would probably be a six figure sum, in addition to’ whatever the other costs are. What sort of six-figure sum are we talking about and, whatever it is, does it not reflect how valuable and, some would say, essential is the input the State gives in this particular area of the Church and State’s life together on behalf of the nation?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I would agree that it indicates precisely the importance of the facility we currently have. I cannot give any details about the six-figure sum because I do not have them, and I think that while this process is still uncertain in our discussions with No 10 it would not be possible to be much more precise than that.

House of Bishops

56. *Revd Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In the light of the review of past child protection cases which is being undertaken by dioceses, cathedrals and other Church bodies holding personnel files on large numbers of people, what advice is being given to PCCs and incumbents who may have records on locally employed or volunteer workers such as youth workers and church musicians?

The Bishop of Hereford (Rt Revd Anthony Priddis): The Past Child Protection Cases Review model protocol is targeted at files and relevant information held at diocesan level by former and current diocesan staff. This was done so as to be carried out within a reasonable timescale – we have given it 18 months – to enable potential outstanding cases which might pose risks to be identified. The review also encourages anyone else with concerns, including those in congregations, to come forward to those within the dioceses who have the expertise, in order to ensure that children and young people are protected. It is in the spirit of the protocol for parishes to conduct reviews of their files and to seek the help of their diocesan child protection adviser and their diocesan child protection management group. However, more formal guidance on this is likely to be included in a new edition of *Protecting All God’s Children* which is being worked on currently.

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

As part of its strategic leadership role, mission responsibility and concern for an inclusive Church, has the House of Bishops given, or does it intend to give, some attention to the steepening decline in the proportion of male church attenders between the ages of 20 and 45, in the light of the research statistics that indicate a drop from 44 per cent in 1980 to a predicted 25 per cent in 2010?

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Michael Hill): The House of Bishops commends and supports ongoing research, both within and outside the Church, which identifies our priorities for mission. Young men are clearly one such priority. Indeed, Mr LeRoy's concerns are the concerns of many in the House and in this Synod. As well as the House of Bishops, many diocesan mission staffs are aware of the work of agencies such as Christian Vision for Men, and they seek to publicize and commend these to the parishes where appropriate. More generally, we are encouraging good practice, both in inherited Church life and through the growth of Fresh Expressions of Church. In many places, Fresh Expressions are able to reach beyond the Church's usual constituencies. Sport-based new churches, such as Tubestation, the Cornish surfers' church, are just one example of this creative work with younger men in the population. The House strongly encourages these developments.

Mr Peter LeRoy (Bath and Wells): In thanking the Bishop for that constructive response, may I ask whether the House has considered both what part may be played by the 40-something average age of the newly ordained and also the analysis of this alarming decline in terms of the perceived feminization of church culture in the book entitled *Why Men Hate Going to Church*?

The Bishop of Bristol: The honest answer to your question is that I do not think there has been serious consideration of either of those two points. On the latter point, the issue of an analysis of what is going on here, I think, is interesting and there have been some studies beyond the Church which point out what I think has some fairly obvious foundations: that the fall-away of young men in the Church has in part something to do with the fall-away of young women in the Church. (*Laughter*)

58. *Mr Martin Dales (York)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

How will the recommendations of the Pilling report be implemented and monitored?

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Tim Stevens): The implementation plans of the recommendations of the report *Talent and Calling* are work in progress. They are very much linked with any new arrangements resulting from the revised arrangements for Crown appointments. A total package of revised appointment arrangements will be considered by the House of Bishops, and arrangements for monitoring and review will be considered as part of this.

59. *Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In reply to a Question in February 2007 the Bishop of Dover stated that work was already under way on a paper explaining the current teaching of the Church on Communion before confirmation, and how the practice relates to baptism and confirmation. Could the Synod be now updated on the progress of this piece of work?

The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Stephen Venner): The Board of Education commissioned

a small working party to consider the issues relating to confirmation, and the group has met twice during the past year. Unfortunately the work has not progressed as quickly as we had anticipated, due to the relevant officer of the Board being off work due to illness, and that lasted for several months over the summer. The Board will be reconsidering the issue as part of our review of youth and children's work currently taking place.

Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford): Would the Bishop of Dover reconsider whether the type of guidance that I originally asked for, touching as it does on initiation rites, is most appropriately provided by a small working party within the Board of Education?

The Bishop of Dover: I will certainly consider that but the small working party within the Board of Education was not limited to the membership of the Board of Education or the remit of the Board of Education but would be working across other boards and theological groups as well.

60. *Mr Nigel Greenwood (Ripon and Leeds)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In view of the outstanding majority in the recent Ripon and Leeds diocesan synod calling for legislation enabling women to become bishops to be completed during the present quinquennium of the General Synod, will the legislative drafting group be urged to fulfil its remit contained in the General Synod motion of July 2006 in time to allow legislation to be brought forward for consideration by this Synod in July 2008, and what timescale is envisaged for its further progress?

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

What specific action has been taken in response to the motion passed in July 2005 agreeing that legal barriers to women bishops should be removed?

62. *Mrs Shirley-Ann Williams (Exeter)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Given that we are representatives and not delegates, we are morally accountable to our dioceses to keep them informed of the progress of General Synod business. When will we be able to have information on how the legislative drafting group is faring on the subject of women and the episcopate and of a possible debate in Synod to further its proposals on how to move forward?

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd Nigel McCulloch): With permission, I should like to answer these Questions together.

As I indicated in my earlier contribution to the debate on the Business Committee's report, the group aims to have its report ready in time for it to be considered by the House of Bishops in May, with a view to a debate in the Synod this July. The July 2006 motion asked the Business Committee to make time available for Synod to consider the

report ‘before first consideration of the draft legislation’. Since the exact terms of draft legislation will depend on the decisions that Synod takes on our report, introduction and first consideration of the draft Measure could not be before next February.

Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans): Thank you for the response about what has been happening since 2006. However, my Question was about what action had been taken following the July 2005 vote about removing the legal barriers to women bishops. So may I ask again what specific action has been taken following the July 2005 motion?

The Bishop of Manchester: You will realize that, since the July 2005 motion, the July 2006 motion has affected that particular issue because it asked not only for a draft Measure and amending Canon necessary to remove the legal obstacles to the consecration of women to the office of bishop but also for a draft of possible additional legal provision consistent with Canon A 4 to establish arrangements which would seek to maintain the highest possible degree of communion with those conscientiously unable to receive the ministry of women bishops. Those matters, as the questioner will understand, are hugely complex. I can assure her that the legislative group is looking at all those matters exceedingly carefully and that we will do our utmost to ensure that the particular point she raises, and refers back to the 2005 motion, will be looked at and presented to this Synod in our proposals.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): You mentioned the group of sessions in February 2009 as being the first time when legislation could be considered, if I understood your answer correctly. What might prevent that being the date on which we would consider it? What further prevarication might happen?

The Bishop of Manchester: Who knows! I think it is fair to say that the future timescale is inevitably conditional on the future decisions that this Synod itself will make. I think it would be right for me to indicate that there would still be a series of stages that any legislation of this kind would need to go through, involving, of course, a revision stage and Article 8 references to dioceses. Incidentally, that is detailed in the annex to GS 1605A of January 2006. So – and I think this may be the point that you are seeking clarification on – it makes it highly unlikely that final approval could be achieved by July 2010.

63. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Nearly two years have elapsed since this Synod commissioned draft legislation to allow women to be admitted to the episcopate. No progress report is available despite the lapse of time. What assurance can members be given that the arguments rehearsed by the Bishop of Rochester and his group about women in the priesthood are not being revisited at even greater length by the legislative drafting group?

The Bishop of Manchester: I have answered the general question about progress in earlier answers. On the question of revisiting earlier work, I can give an assurance to

members of Synod that we have not sought to duplicate the magisterial theological work undertaken by the Rochester group.

64. *Mr Robert Hammond (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What, if any, consideration is given by the House of Bishops to the reputation of the Church of England before individual bishops make decisions and take actions that then lead to adverse publicity at industrial tribunals?

The Bishop of Manchester: The role of the House of Bishops does not extend to considering individual appointments; those are for individual bishops to make, taking into account all relevant considerations, and foremost among these would, of course, be fidelity to the teaching and practice of the Church of England.

65. *Mr Nigel Holmes (Carlisle)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In July 2000 the Bishop of Chester promised the General Synod a ‘proper survey’ of the use of Communion by Extension within five years. Is the House satisfied that its theological group’s two-page report GS Misc 873, more than seven years later, based on replies from just over half the dioceses, fulfils that commitment, given that the practice of Communion by Extension varies so markedly from one diocese to another and can shift from strong support to a total ban when the bishop changes?

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd John Hind): The theological group’s report was made to the House in 2005, and the House approved that report at its meeting in 2005. GS Misc 873 represents a digest of that and suggests that 78 per cent of the diocesan responses indicated that the House’s guidelines were adequate.

66. *The Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Colin Slee)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House of Bishops’ theological group yet considered and studied, and what plans does it have in place to respond in a constructive and serious way to, the statement *A Common Word Between Us and You* published by 138 Muslim theological scholars and addressed to the Christian Churches from Jordan in September 2007?

The Bishop of Chichester: The theological group has not been asked to reflect on this letter.

The Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Colin Slee): In the light of the events of the past few days and noting the potential conflict of interest for one member of the House of Bishops’ theological group, is it not urgent to ask the theological group to undertake this work?

The Bishop of Chichester: I think that is a question I am not competent to answer.

The Chairman: Thank you, Bishop. My legal adviser was saying just that.

Dr Brian Walker (Winchester): Bearing in mind the importance of developing a deeper understanding and acceptance of Muslims and other faith communities, how could the House of Bishops encourage Synod to use not only this initiative to discuss and reflect on our response but also the new initiative which was launched last week, *Generous Love: the truth of the gospel and the call to dialogue – an Anglican theology of inter-faith relations*, which has a foreword by our Archbishop?

The Bishop of Chichester: I think the group would obviously undertake any work that the House asked it to do in this matter as in any others, and it would certainly be guided by some of the Archbishop's own words in immediate response to the letter to which Dean Slee's Question referred. He said at the time that the theological basis of the letter and its call to respect each other and to be fair, just and kind to each other are indicative of the kind of relationship for which we yearn in all parts of the world, especially where Christians and Muslims live together. It is particularly important in underlining the need for respect towards minorities in contexts where either Islam or Christianity is the majority presence. That undoubtedly is capable of further exploration and development, and the group would certainly do any work that it was asked to do.

67. *Mr Terence Musson (Truro)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In view of Canon C 10(3) regarding the time that should ordinarily have elapsed before a priest may be instituted to a benefice, (a) does the House of Bishops have a policy or general understanding regarding the circumstances under which someone who has been ordained for less than three years might be instituted; and (b) would the House consider determining whether there is an increasing trend to institute those who have been ordained for less than three years and issuing some guidelines, particularly for the benefit of patrons and parish representatives, as to the circumstances under which it might or might not be appropriate to consider appointing such a person?

The Bishop of Norwich: With regard to (a), the House does not have such a policy or general understanding. With regard to (b) there are no current plans to do further work in this area as the House would expect the norm to be the time indicated in the Canons.

68. *The Bishop of Chester (Rt Revd Peter Forster)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Further to the reply given in November on the question of the age at which Readers are required to obtain permission to officiate, can the House of Bishops confirm that there is no formal legal basis for Readers, NSMs and house-for-duty priests-in-charge being required at the age of 70 to seek permission to officiate?

The Bishop of Norwich: Yes that is correct.

Secretary General

69. *Mrs Joanna Monckton (Lichfield)* asked the Secretary General:

Which individual or body is responsible for holding to account an individual or body which acts without regard to section 1 of the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993?

70. *Mrs Elnora Mann (London)* asked the Secretary General:

To which individual or body should this Synod look to uphold and enforce the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993 for so long as it remains in force?

71. *Mrs Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield)* asked the Secretary General:

Are diocesan vacancy in see committees among those bodies bound by section 1 of the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993?

The Secretary General (Mr William Fittall): With permission, I shall answer these three Questions together.

An Act of Synod is defined in Standing Orders as ‘an expression of the will or opinion of the Church of England as expressed by the whole body of the Synod’. Unlike a Measure, Canon or Regulation it is not a form of legislation so questions of enforcement and legal accountability and being legally bound by its provisions do not arise. It does, however, create expectations about conduct which apply to all persons and bodies involved in senior appointments, including vacancy in see committees.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I am slightly puzzled by that answer because in relation to Question 71 it seems to me that we needed some assurances. Each vacancy in see committee is issued with a guidance document produced by the Legal Adviser under, I think, section 4 of the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation, which gives advice as to the general conduct of the vacancy in see committee’s business. Can we be assured that there is nothing in that advice which seeks to constrain the vacancy in see committee from expressing an opinion either one way or the other on the desirability of the diocesan bishop they are seeking being willing to ordain women and being a supporter of the ordination of women?

The Secretary General: I have learned to have full confidence that the advice given by the legal office does take account of all relevant documentation, so I am sure that what they have said is correct. I think the underlying difficulty is that the Church is trying to manage two very difficult issues here which are in tension with each other; but the words I uttered about what the Act of Synod says are true, and the Act of Synod certainly creates expectations about how people conduct themselves, including in vacancy in see committees.

Mrs Elnora Mann (London): Thank you for your reply, but I think I need further clarification because I am no wiser for what you have said. Could I have further clarification, please?

The Secretary General: I think the main point at the heart of my reply is that an Act of Synod, despite that rather misleading word ‘Act’ – which many people associate with legislation because, of course, we talk about Acts of Parliament which *are* legislation – is not legislation. Our legislation comes in the form of Measures, Canons and so on. Therefore there are no enforcement mechanisms of a legal kind in relation to an Act of Synod. Nevertheless, an Act of Synod does declare the mind of the Church through this Synod and people are *expected* to observe that.

The Bishop of Chichester: Does the Secretary General remember that the then Archbishop of York persuaded the House of Bishops and the General Synod of the time that legislation was not going to be necessary if they passed an Act of Synod to provide proper security for minorities who could not accept that particular development, and it was precisely because the Act of Synod was regarded as something solemnly binding that persuaded many people that it was a sufficient safeguard and protection?

The Secretary General: Well, I was working for a different organization back in 1992–93 so I certainly was not here to hear those words; but I am sure that the Bishop reports them accurately.

72. *Revd Canon Professor Marilyn McCord Adams (Oxford University)* asked the Secretary General:

Can it be confirmed that the fact that Resolution B under the Priests (Ordination of Women) Measure 1993 has been passed in a parish does not entitle the incoming incumbent or priest-in-charge to stipulate that women priests may not robe at his induction or licensing?

The Secretary General: Part 2 of the 1993 Measure does not regulate the wearing of robes, so the fact that a parish may have passed a particular resolution has no legal bearing on who is invited to robe at an induction or licensing.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd John Gladwin): Would the Secretary General confirm that services of this character happen under the authority and direction of the bishop and that the person so licensed or instituted only exercises that authority once the legal work has been done in the service?

The Secretary General: That sounds like a second episcopal intervention in the past five minutes which has to be accurate. (*Laughter*) It does seem to me that the notion that the wearing of robes at these services should be down to a matter of legislation is perhaps not a very fruitful one, and I am pleased to hear that, in the case that may have lain behind this Question, a solution was, in the event, found which was satisfactory to all concerned.

73. *Revd Brian Lewis (Chelmsford)* asked the Secretary General:

By virtue of the definition of Article 8 business in SO 131, such business includes any scheme for a permanent and substantial change of relationship between the Church of England and another Christian body, being a body a substantial number of whose members reside in Great Britain. Has consideration been given to whether the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales represent such other Christian bodies for the purposes of this Standing Order?

The Secretary General: The Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales are clearly both Christian bodies, a substantial number of whose members reside in Great Britain. Whether a scheme constituted Article 8 business would turn, therefore, on whether it was determined that it involved a permanent and substantial change in the relationship between the Church of England and those Churches.

74. *Dr Peter Capon (Manchester)* asked the Secretary General:

What progress has been made with the preparation of guidance to PCCs with incomes of £100,000 or more about registration under the Charities Act 2006, and is there any deadline for such registration to be completed?

The Secretary General: The Council has agreed with the Charity Commission a streamlined process for registration, including its approval of standard governing documents. Guidance notes, part-completed registration forms and a booklet for PCC members will be offered to dioceses. We await the Commencement Order from the Office of the Third Sector containing the timescale for registration but expect PCCs with incomes of more than £100,000 to have to register from October 2008. Of course, PCCs with smaller incomes will not have to register.

Dr Peter Capon (Manchester): Could the Secretary General indicate what options will be open to PCCs that wish to vary the governing documents from the standard ones?

The Secretary General: At the end of the day PCCs are independent legal bodies and they will themselves have to register, but what we have sought to do with this is to produce something which is streamlined and sensible, really to take the burden off PCCs. We estimate that approaching 2,000 PCCs will have to register and it seemed sensible to agree with the Charity Commission some model documents; but at the end of the day PCCs have to be responsible for the documentation that they submit.

75. *Revd Tim Stratford (Liverpool)* asked the Secretary General:

Given that the charitable status and legal identity of PCCs has been reviewed, what is the legal identity and status of team councils in multiple PCC team benefices which have had PCC responsibilities delegated to them?

The Secretary General: Where PCCs of parishes that are part of a team ministry delegate their functions to a team council, each of the PCCs remains a legally distinct charitable body and continues to have the same responsibilities in relation to its charitable status, including as regards accounting, as it had prior to the establishment of the team council. The team council itself is not a distinct charitable body. Guidance about the position of teams can be found in paragraph 1.22 of the third edition of *The Charities Act and the PCC*.

76. *The Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Colin Slee)* asked the Secretary General:

When clergy retire and no longer hold a licence or PTO they nevertheless remain debarred from membership of church electoral rolls or voting in any church forum. Is the Secretary General aware of this anachronism and are there any plans to amend the Church Representation Rules in order to provide retired clergy with a democratic vote?

The Secretary General: Retired clergy are ineligible to be entered on a church electoral roll because that is a register of laypeople, used as a basis for the election of lay representatives. The basis of the exclusion of retired clergy who do not have PTO from any role in electing the clerical members of a deanery synod is less obvious. Possible changes to the franchise do, however, always raise issues that need careful study so I am passing this exchange to the Elections Review Group for their consideration.

The Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Colin Slee): Given that electoral rolls are not solely an instrument for electing lay representatives, under the terms of the Cathedrals Measure 1999 there is a place on cathedral community rolls for both ordained and laypeople. Would the Elections Review Group take notice and will its members take so long that the clergy I have in mind may by then be playing their harps?

The Secretary General: The Dean makes his own point, and it is really one for the Elections Review Group to consider.

77. *Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln)* asked the Secretary General:

For each of the years 2004–2007 how much has been paid, whether after a tribunal judgement or as a compromise or other agreement, to current or former staff of the Archbishops' Council who have brought claims to employment tribunals relating to their employment with or its termination by the Archbishops' Council?

The Secretary General: Over these four years there was one case in the High Court and none in an employment tribunal. Four staff employed in Archbishops' Council departments entered into compromise agreements, the terms of which are confidential. The total money attached to these agreements was £16,733. Seven staff who worked in the Council's common services departments (which also serve other National Church Institutions) entered into compromise agreements. A substantial proportion of the total paid to staff under these agreements, which was £559,039, fell to the other NCLs.

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): Is the Council budgeting for that level of expenditure for those budget heads over the National Church Institutions over the four years from 2008?

The Secretary General: These sorts of agreement tend to arise when there is restructuring. They are very difficult exercises; they come unpredictably; and they are particularly difficult (and that is the reason for the large amount of the latter figure) because the staff who worked for the NCIs, who joined before July 2006, have extremely generous severance and early retirement terms. We have actually changed that now for new staff who have arrived since July 2006. Not only as a Council, but in the other national Church bodies, when drawing up budgets we do think about the need in this area and we have a small amount in the Vote 2 reserves to deal with these things; but it is never pleasant doing restructuring and it is a not inexpensive business, at least in respect of those staff who may have very long service, and of course there are a whole number of other reasons why one does not readily want to part company with staff who have given very faithful service over a long period.

Clerk to the Synod

78. *Mr John Ward (London)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Further to our debate on climate change in July 2006, what work has the Clerk done and what recommendations can the Clerk make to reduce the carbon footprint of the General Synod?

The Clerk to the Synod (Mr David Williams): The Business Committee, as was explained earlier today, is exploring practical steps by which the Synod's impact on the environment can be reduced. In particular, the Committee takes the view that the amount of paper circulated to the Synod should be kept to an effective minimum and has proposed in its report a number of steps to achieve this. The Committee also wishes to encourage members to adopt car-sharing arrangements and use of public transport where possible. Church House Conference Centre and the University of York each have a green list, which sets out ways in which their impact on the environment is minimized. Copies of these have been posted on the notice board.

79. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Is there any time limit by when the women bishops legislative drafting group must report to the Synod and, if not, is there any way in which the Synod, if it is so minded, can impose a time limit on this and on when the associated Diocesan Synod Motions that have been parked awaiting the report of this drafting group must be debated?

The Clerk to the Synod: No time limit was specified in the resolution passed by the Synod in July 2006 which asked the Archbishops' Council to set up the legislative drafting group.

It is always open to the Synod to pass a resolution resulting from a Diocesan Synod Motion or a Private Member's Motion requesting that a report be prepared or debated by a given date. However, the Synod will see that a report from the group is included in the forecast of future Synod business for July 2008 (subject to the House of Bishops' decision in May). The only Diocesan Synod Motion which is currently being held over is the Southwark motion on the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod and, as the Business Committee's report has indicated, consideration of this awaits the outcome of the work of the legislative drafting group.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): Is there not also a motion from the Rochester diocesan synod being held over?

The Clerk to the Synod: The motion from Rochester appeared much later and it is some way down the list; it is not being held over because it has not actually reached the point at which it would normally be considered. I should just remind Synod that the Business Committee is under an expectation that Diocesan Synod Motions are considered in the order in which they are received, and the order in which they are received is that which is set out in Special Agenda IV. So the Rochester motion is not in that category.

Board of Education

80. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Against the current tide of secularism and religious diversity, what steps are being taken to ensure that the teaching of Christianity retains a central place in the school curriculum?

The Bishop of Dover: The legislation and regulations governing the content of RE in maintained schools protected the prominence of Christianity in locally agreed syllabuses. This usually means that Christianity is allocated more time in the curriculum than other faith traditions. However, the Board of Education shares some of Miss Dailey's anxiety about the teaching of Christianity. Recent research has shown that, despite the additional time given to Christianity, there are issues of coherence and depth in the teaching units in many syllabuses. The Board of Education's appointment of a national RE development officer, whose role will include the development of excellence in teaching and learning about Christianity, should help, but there is also a substantial challenge to local churches. School governors monitor the provision and quality of RE teaching in their schools, and Christians should be encouraged to offer themselves for this task and thereby make a real difference.

81. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Given the growing tendency for organizations, when deciding what activities to hold for young people in their care, to be driven more by fear of legal action against themselves

than by the need for the young people to flourish and have fun, has the Board considered whether there are ways in which individual PCCs can do their bit to confront the compensation culture rather than conform to it?

The Bishop of Dover: The Board of Education wholeheartedly supports the systems and checks now in place to protect the children and young people with whom the Church comes into contact. It would be irresponsible to suggest that PCCs make no attempt to ensure that those who are in charge of children in their name should not be of the highest calibre and integrity. Nevertheless, recognizing that no activity is totally risk-free, if the proper processes are followed there is no reason why parishes should not offer a full range of activities for the Christian nurture of children and young people, and I guess that includes pancake races!

Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division

82. *Revd Canon Andrew Nunn (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division:

What advice can be given to churches where their roofs are constantly being stripped of lead but they are not allowed to replace it with an alternative material?

Mr Timothy Allen: The latest guidance notes published by Ecclesiastical Insurance, after discussion with English Heritage and the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division, have been circulated widely to churches and cathedrals and may also be found on the Ecclesiastical Insurance and Churchcare websites. While the preference is for like-for-like replacement, especially where effective security measures can be achieved, it is acknowledged that there may be circumstances where consideration of alternative roof coverings is appropriate.

Council for Christian Unity

83. *Mr Gerry O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

Have there been any discussions with representatives of the Roman Catholic Church on the issue of eucharistic hospitality and, if so, with what result?

Mrs Margaret Swinson: The principles governing eucharistic hospitality for Roman Catholics are set by the Second Vatican Council. They are articulated in the *Ecumenical Directory* and are applied by the Bishops' Conferences. In 1998 the Bishops' Conferences of England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland published the teaching document *One Bread One Body* and invited ecumenical responses. In 2001 the House of Bishops published *The Eucharist: Sacrament of Unity*. This response endorsed the theology of *One Bread One Body* but disagreed with the discipline for eucharistic hospitality. The English Anglican-Roman Catholic Committee (English ARC) has

engaged in a series of reflections on the issues raised by those texts and, in particular, on the spiritual concerns created by the lack of equivalence in our Churches' rules for eucharistic hospitality. English ARC will seek to publish these reflections as an ecumenical challenge and resource.

Finance Committee

84. *Mr Robin Stevens (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Finance Committee:

The initiative *A Matter of Life and Debt* was launched on the Church of England website in January 2008 to help the Church minister to the increasing number of people in debt. How has the initiative been received, and how do you plan to monitor its success?

Mr Andrew Britton: The launch of *A Matter of Life and Debt* – an online resource comprising common-sense advice, a post-Christmas debt check list, suggestions for prayers and useful links – received widespread coverage in the national and international media. As well as featuring on the front page of *The Times*, the initiative featured in the *Guardian* and the *Daily Mail*, on over 50 web sites internationally and on radio and TV in the UK and abroad. Indications are that the financial sector and debt agencies have also welcomed the Church's involvement, recognizing that debt is often accompanied by emotional and other issues that finance professionals may be less well equipped to handle. Monitoring success is not easy. We hope to see increased teaching on debt and ethical spending in churches and an increase in the number of churches which are running some form of money ministry, for example debt counselling or personal budget coaching.

Mr Robin Stevens (Chelmsford): Are you content that the clergy know of this initiative and are picking up the information from the website and making use of it?

Mr Andrew Britton: I very much hope so, but I thank you, Mr Stevens, for drawing their attention to it by your Question.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I wonder whether the initiative has drawn attention particularly to the very valuable work with Christian agencies by Credit Action and the availability of its material and advice to parishes?

Mr Britton: Yes I hope so. Again, I think this is an issue which needs widespread coverage within the Church, and anything that members of Synod can do to encourage that I would welcome.

The Chairman: Thank you, members of Synod, for helping us get through all the Questions for oral reply within the time of business today. (*Applause*)

After the closing act of worship, the Session was adjourned at 7.02 p.m.