

**THE CHRONICLE
OF CONVOCATION**

Being a

**Record of the Proceedings
of the
Convocation of Canterbury**

Tredecima Convocatio Elizabetha Secunda Regnante

The Full Synod and the
Lower House
in the Sessions of

23 November 2010

Sessions I,

Published for the Convocation of Canterbury.

© The Convocation of Canterbury

OFFICERS OF THE CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY

President:

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
Lambeth Palace, London SE1 7JU

Prolocutor of the Lower House
(from November 2010)
Vacant

Acting Prolocutor

The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding (Senior Pro-Prolocutor)

Pro-Prolocutors

The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding DD (*Hon*)
The Venerable Christine Hardman

Registrar of the Convocation
Mr Stephen Slack, Solicitor

Synodical Secretary, Actuary and Editor of the Chronicle
The Reverend Stephen Trott MA LLM

Ostiarius

Mr Clive McCleester, Custos and Head Virger,
Winchester Cathedral

STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE LOWER HOUSE

The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding (Pro-Prolocutor)
The Venerable Christine Hardman (Pro-Prolocutor)
vacancy
vacancy
vacancy
vacancy

**CONVOCATION OF
CANTERBURY**

Tredecima Convocatio Elizabetha Secunda Regnante

SESSION I

Tuesday, 23 November 2010

**Minutes of the Full Synod
and the Lower House**

SESSION I

Tuesday, 23 November 2010

Full Synod

After a service of Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey at which Her Majesty the Queen was present, Her Majesty inaugurated the Ninth General Synod of Her Reign, in the Assembly Hall of Church House, Westminster.

CONVOCATION OF CANTERBURY

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury assembled in the Harvey Goodwin Suite, Church House, Westminster, on Wednesday, 24 November 2010 at 4.00 p.m.

Full Synod

1. PRAYERS

Opening prayers were said by His Grace the President.

2. ASSESSORS

The President: The office of Prolocutor being vacant, The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding as senior Pro-Prolocutor is performing the functions that would normally be undertaken by the Prolocutor, according to SO 5C of the Standing Orders of Convocation. I call on him to announce his Assessors.

The Acting Prolocutor: With your permission, your Grace, I would like to appoint as Assessors for today The Reverend Prebendary Alan Moses (London), The Reverend Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford), The Reverend Canon Celia Thomson (Gloucester) and The Very Reverend Vivienne Faull (Dean of Leicester).

The President: That has my consent.

3. ADMISSION OF THE SYNODICAL SECRETARY

The President: The former Synodical Secretary The Reverend Gill Dallow has moved to Wales - very sensibly! - and has consequently had to step down from office, because under the Standing Orders of Convocation the Synodical Secretary must be eligible for election to Convocation.

This is therefore an occasion for noting our enormous gratitude to Gill for her work in office in this role and sending her our best wishes for her new ministry in the team at St Mark's, Gabalfa, Cardiff, and in chaplaincy to the Welsh Assembly.

A new appointment was required in the light of Gill's departure and I have nominated to her office The Reverend Stephen Trott. He is willing to take on this responsibility and I shall now invite Prebendary Houlding formally to admit him to office.

The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding (Pro-Prolocutor) admitted The Reverend Stephen Trott to the office of Synodical Secretary.

The Acting Prolocutor: Fr Trott, as you shall be the Actuary, I advise you that you shall also be the editor of the Chronicle. [Applause]

4. GUIDELINES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF THE CLERGY

The President: I have agreed with Fr Houlding that this item should be considered in full Synod. We shall have a presentation from David under SO 97A of the General Synod, as applied to this House by SO 1 of the Standing Orders of the Convocation. I will ask David to address us and after that to answer questions, but I hope not too many questions as it would be nice to conclude this item within about a quarter of an hour.

The Acting Prolocutor: The Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy are the fruit of work undertaken by the Convocations through the years 2000-2005, under the chairmanship originally of Canon Hugh Wilcox and published first of all in 2003 on the authority of the Convocations themselves. In other words, they are very much the work of the two Convocations of Canterbury and York.

They are written by ordained ministers for the benefit of all those in ordained ministry in the Church of England. They do not have a formal legal status, being neither canons nor a code of practice but they offer helpful guidance to everyone engaged in service as ministers of the Church of England: guidance which is often taken into account in the course of the tribunals which administer the Clergy Discipline Measure and allied legislation. Perhaps one might ambitiously describe them as sanctified common sense.

The structure of the guidelines as they exist is based on the Ordinal, taking the different sections of the Ordinal to guide us through what is considered to be a way of life. The guidelines also need to be kept up to date, both to reflect changes to legislation and to the current conditions under which we were asked to fulfil our ministry. They are to be revised, to take account of recent developments and to frame the text in accordance with the new Ordinal, so as to make it clear what is the primary source for their inspiration.

Church House has kindly allocated a budget for the working party – a joint working party of both Convocations – to meet in Church House to produce the text of the revised guidelines. This work now does need to be done, especially in the light of the Discipline Measure, which we are considering at this moment, though we did not reach it this afternoon. It is essential that we do bring this document up to date.

The Prolocutor, the Archdeacon of Berkshire, asked me and the deputy Prolocutor of York to chair the new working party. The secretary to the working party, that is to say our new

Synodical Secretary, has written to a number of potential contributors to the revision, asking for their comments and advice. Replies have so far been received from the Legal Office in Church House; the Fees Policy Working Group; the Bishop of Guildford; Elizabeth Hall, the national Safeguarding Children adviser; Ven. Ian Jagger, Archdeacon of Durham; The Reverend Beatrice Brandon, Archbishops' Adviser for the Healing Ministry; and Lord Justice Mummery, Chairman of the Clergy Discipline Commission. We are still waiting for further replies.

The Clergy Discipline Commission has asked for us to wait for a full reply until after its January meeting, at which it will provide detailed comments on the text and proposals for revision. It is entirely open for any members of the two Convocations to send in comments and proposals, or representatives of any other body who have views to express on the revision of the guidelines. These should be sent to the Synodical Secretary, who is, as I have said, the secretary to this working party. I hope that, for the moment at least, clarifies the point at which we have reached.

The President: We can now take some questions – or not!

The Reverend Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): In the light of the whole paperwork to do with common tenure, statements and particulars, role descriptions and all of that, is the process such that we can be assured that there will be a synergy – if that is the right word – between the guidelines document which is to be produced and the kind of documents which are being issued by dioceses over the next few months?

The Acting Prolocutor: That would be correct and that is why it is very important that we consult Lord Justice Mummery, to make sure that there is nothing here that in any sense contradicts the Clergy Discipline Measure.

The common tenure business comes into play very significantly because, again, in that work we have sought to provide the right protection and help for clergy. Therefore, this document is not so much a document that can as it were be used against you, which is why we need to clarify its legal status – because at the moment it is not a legal document, and we have to emphasise that – so that it can be used in support of your ministry. It is why earlier on I described it as “sanctified common sense”.

The Archdeacon of Birmingham (Ven. Hayward Osborne): You said that the document as it stands at the moment does not have any formal endorsement but is an advisory document. Is there any intention to put it on any kind of more formal footing or will it remain just advice from clergy to clergy?

The Acting Prolocutor: At the moment it is very much just that. It is a document written by clergy for clergy, emanating from the two Convocations. As to exactly where we go, we need to take further legal advice. It is something that we do have to look into very carefully, precisely because with the new Clergy Discipline Measure the landscape changes somewhat.

The President: Are there any further queries? It seems not. David, any concluding remarks?

The Acting Prolocutor: As long as the Convocation is happy that we continue this work along the lines that I have outlined already.

The President: That completes the business of full Synod. I shall now invite the Upper House to withdraw with me.

His Grace the President and the members of the Upper House withdrew.

Lower House

The Reverend Prebendary David Houlding (Pro-Prolocutor, London) took the Chair.

The Acting Prolocutor: I should explain first of all that I find myself in the chair because I am the Pro-Prolocutor, as you probably realise. I had to take the place on the platform at the beginning and at the final session of Synod, because I have been at this game rather a long time. I am not going to be a candidate in the election of the Prolocutor, so I can take the chair for this. With your good will, therefore, I can chair the whole of the meeting this afternoon, if that is acceptable to you. (*Agreed*) Having said that, I hope that I might be a candidate in the election of the Pro-Prolocutors! (*Laughter*) But that is slightly later on in the process.

We move to the explanation of the procedure for the election of the Prolocutor and the two Pro-Prolocutors and four members of the Standing Committee. Our Secretary will explain the process to us.

5. EXPLANATION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELECTION OF (1) THE PROLOCUTOR AND (2) TWO PRO-PROLOCUTORS AND FOUR MEMBERS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

The Synodical Secretary: The elections process is slightly convoluted, as you might expect. The Prolocutor is the chairman of a body that dates back probably to the twelfth century; so it is a very ancient office and therefore of considerable significance in a General Synod which is not one body but a body comprised of the two Convocations and the House of Laity meeting together. The election for Prolocutor is therefore a matter of some considerable importance for us as the Lower House.

The Standing Orders of the Convocation set out how this is to be done, in a context in which we also elect members of the Archbishops' Council – two of those – and the Prolocutor is also a member of the Archbishops' Council, forming our three representatives on that body.

The election of the Prolocutor is the first office I want to speak about today. Nomination papers for the office of Prolocutor were circulated at the beginning of November and the period for nominations ends on 26 November. If you have not already completed, signed

and had nomination and seconder on your form, there is still time to do it if you are considering standing as Prolocutor of this Convocation. It is not necessary that you take part in the hustings this afternoon and it is perfectly possible, after you go home, to decide that you might like to be a candidate, to fill in your form and to return it.

Those who are validly nominated by 26 November will find themselves on a voting paper which will be issued by post in early December. These will have to be returned before Christmas, and I am assured that the result will also be known before Christmas.

The Prolocutor, in very modern times, is assisted by two elected Pro-Prolocutors. When I first joined General Synod some time ago, the Prolocutor nominated his Pro-Prolocutors and the members of the Standing Committee but now we elect our Pro-Prolocutors, who are the deputy Prolocutors, and we elect four other members of the Standing Committee – and this is where it becomes complicated.

There is a single election at the beginning of February and the closing date is after the end of the February group of sessions. It is a single election which, assuming the President and the Prolocutor agree, will be conducted by postal ballot in March on one voting paper. There may be some who wish to be elected as Pro-Prolocutor but have no desire to be a member of the Standing Committee, some who only want to be members of the Standing Committee and do not want to be a candidate for the office of Pro-Prolocutor, and some who are happy to be elected to whatever comes their way! The ballot paper will therefore be designed so that you can stand as Pro-Prolocutor or as a member of the Standing Committee and, once people's intentions are made known to the Synod office, the count will take place in such a way that those who wish to be candidates for the office of Pro-Prolocutor will be counted first and they will be elected first; and, once they have been elected, we move in the count to the election of the total of six people to serve as Pro-Prolocutors or members of the Standing Committee – so that in effect we have two Pro-Prolocutors and four members of the Standing Committee.

When the time comes, you will have to make it clear, if you are standing for election, what you are standing for election as. Then you will have to leave it to the electorate to make up their minds on the basis of the voting paper.

The purpose of doing it in this way is to try to elect a team of six persons by single transferable vote, so that if possible – humanly speaking or inhumanly speaking, whichever way you prefer – we represent the various interests of the members of the Lower House, whether in terms of churchmanship, gender, office, diocese or otherwise. Hopefully, with six vacancies to be contested, we will achieve a balance and a team, and that will be reflected in the way in which you vote in the elections.

First and most important, therefore, Prolocutor following this meeting, and two Pro-Prolocutors and four members of the Standing Committee to follow the February group of sessions. If anyone would like to write to me for elaborate detail on process, my predecessor Canon Michael Hodge is the world expert on such matters and has promised me his assistance in the event that I cannot possibly work it out for myself – and I am not sure yet that I have done, but I will do everything I can to help clarify if you would like to write to me at any stage.

The Acting Prolocutor: We come now to an item which I think will be of interest to all of us. I recently attended a meeting of the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum and I was very interested in what I heard. I met someone who gave us a presentation about a clergy credit union – Antony MacRow-Wood – and I suddenly thought “This is exactly what we need to hear about”. I therefore invite Mr MacRow-Wood to introduce the discussion.

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood made a presentation.

The Acting Prolocutor: I cannot believe that there will not be a number of questions, so off you go.

The Reverend Professor Richard Burridge (London University): It is a quick question about the last point and about the financial ethics being referenced to the chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group of the Church of England. I am delighted to see that you will be reviewing the ecclesiastical and family insurance as subjects. Will there also be some recognition of our ethical policies in the Church of England?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: Yes. A clear part of credit unions is that they are an ethical financial service provider; so I would be very keen to have a copy of your guidelines.

The Reverend Professor Richard Burridge: Just go straight to the EIAG website. There are pages and pages of it there.

The Reverend Canon Deborah Flach (Europe): This is where people’s hearts sink, when I rise to ask whether the clergy in the diocese in Europe can be included in this. You will know that, under pensions, we are not eligible for Class 1 and we are not eligible for the other schemes. Would we be eligible for this, please?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: I have a nasty feeling that, because you do not live in an area covered by the regulatory regime, the FSA, you would not be able to. However, if you have previously worked in this country and then went into the diocese of Europe you can be what is called a non-qualifying member. That means you do not currently qualify for the Common Bond but you can still use the credit union and use all its services.

The answer, therefore, is that if you are going to work in the diocese of Europe, join it when you are working in this country first.

The Reverend Canon Deborah Flach: What about those who trained in this country?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: If they are training in this country, that is no problem; because when they are training they would be eligible for membership.

The Reverend Hugh Lee (Oxford): You stressed that initially it had to be deductions from payroll and so on, and yet you say it is for all clergy. Do you actually mean that it is for all stipendiary clergy initially?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: What we are going to do on this is to get the momentum going with those on the payroll, because they are the cheapest members to serve, to help us build up the volume of business that way. Once we have built it to sustainable levels, then we can take others on. We will not stop anybody else joining initially but we will not necessarily actively seek membership from groups that are more expensive to serve, until we have got over that initial starting process.

The Archdeacon of Lincoln (Ven. Tim Barker): Who is “we” in terms of who is actually running it, apart from yourself?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: There is a shadow board made up of various people. There are three clergy on it – Canon Jim Pendorf from St Edmundsbury and Ipswich and Nick Leggett from Bath and Wells diocese. We have other members who are on diocesan boards of finance. We have the chair of the Salisbury diocesan board of finance on the committee. We have a former retired merchant banker with us and we have a member of the Building Societies Association who used to work for the FSA. We also have a clergy spouse from Bristol diocese who is putting in the angle from the family’s point of view. So it is quite a group, and our business plan spells out who is on the shadow board.

Once the credit union is launched, there will be an annual general meeting and members will be able to elect the board. Then it really is your financial institution. You own it and you run it through your board.

The Acting Prolocutor: Interestingly, we anticipated more discussion. Is there anything else that you feel you would like to ask?

The Reverend Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): What a fantastic idea! Thank you very much for doing it. [Applause]

The Acting Prolocutor: It is not a debate, so we are not taking a vote but I think your applause indicates that we do think that this is a very good idea, as I thought we would. As financial hardship sets in, this could well become a very significant form of assistance for us.

Do I take it that you are supportive of this and you would like to see it carried forward? In a sense, this was a testing of our mind, to see whether you would be behind it and supportive of it. From what I am hearing, I think that this is certainly the case.

Antony, is there anything that you would like to say in conclusion?

The Reverend Antony MacRow-Wood: Please take your enthusiasm back to your dioceses and stir them up; tell them that this is happening. More publicity will be coming out in due course. Thank you for listening. [*Applause*]

7. FORMAL MOTIONS

The Acting Prolocutor: I invite my fellow Pro-Prolocutor, the Archdeacon of Lewisham, to move the formal motion standing in her name.

The Archdeacon of Lewisham (Ven. Christine Hardman, Pro-Prolocutor, Southwark): I move the formal motion standing in my name, which I am assured that we need to do and which I am assured is very non-controversial.

- '(i) That the Acting Prolocutor be authorised, pursuant to SO 13, to nominate members to serve on any Committee after the House has risen with the concurrence of the Standing Committee of the House;
- (ii) that those resolutions which should be conveyed to the Upper House be so conveyed.'

The motion was put and carried.

The Archdeacon of Lewisham: One of our members, the Dean of Southwark Colin Slee, as you will have heard from the prayers of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is very seriously ill at this time. I have a request that we might send from this House an assurance to Colin and to his wife Edith that he is being held in our thoughts and in our prayers, as is Edith.

The Acting Prolocutor: Thank you very much for that.

8. MINUTES

The Acting Prolocutor: We turn to the last piece of formal business, which is very exciting. If you are new to the Convocation, in a sense this is the most important part of our proceedings. Wait for it! The minutes!

The Minutes of this Session were read, confirmed and reduced to Acts according to the ancient custom of Convocation.

The Archdeacon of Bath (Ven. Andrew Piggott): I have one serious point and one semi-serious point. Given that the minutes are read as a preferred way to sending them out by post and given the availability of email, might it be worth considering sending the minutes out by email to save having to go through the exercise of reading them out? The semi-serious suggestion is that they could even have been emailed last night!

The Synodical Secretary: If I had known who was going to speak, that would have been a very practical proposal! Within a few days, however, you will find the full Chronicle of Convocation appearing on the Church website, with the full details of the whole event. That is part of my task as editor of the Chronicle.

The Acting Prolocutor: We will take further advice on the serious point you make. Convocation is older than Parliament. The General Synod is made up of the two Convocations; so, although we can have a more light-hearted time at one level, none the less our work is significant and I am sure that there will be referrals to Convocation of a more serious nature coming up in the course of this quinquennium. We do participate here very seriously, therefore.

I think it is appropriate – though I am not sure how this done – for the Convocation to express to Her Majesty, the Supreme Governor, its gratitude for her presence at the opening of this quinquennium. If that is your wish, we shall endeavour to do that.

The Acting Prolocutor gave the Blessing, and the House stood prorogued.
