

Fifth Day

Tuesday 13 July 2004

THE CHAIR *Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield)* took the Chair at 9.30 a.m.

Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford) led the Synod in prayer.

Liturgical Business

Weekday Lectionary and Amendments to Calendar, Lectionary and Collects, Rules for Regulating Authorized Forms of Service, and ‘Rules to order the Service and Other Miscellaneous Liturgical Proposals’ (GS 1342A, as amended by GS 1342B) (GS 1520A)

Article 7 Business

Consideration of a Report by the Revision Committee (GS 1520Y)

The Bishop of Beverley (Rt Revd Martyn Jarrett): I beg to move:

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

When we first gave consideration in February to the new Weekday Lectionary, Professor Barton spoke of the importance of reading the Bible, and reading it in an orderly way. This in turn makes the devising and revising of lectionaries an important task. I suspect, however, that those who gain positive stimulation from that task may be few and far between; Professor Barton even suggested that some might think that the correct liturgical vesture for the makers of lectionaries was an anorak. The liturgical anorak has now passed, like a mantle, to me and I am required to report on our revision work.

In February we had a wide-ranging debate, so wide ranging, indeed, that the *Report of Proceedings* even records for posterity an enquiry as to what I might best call Canon Webster’s feline friends. Today our task is a much narrower one. We are not asked to debate the Lectionary in general but to consider the specific changes that the revision committee has, or has not, made in response to the points made in the February debate and in subsequent submissions.

The one major issue that we had to consider was the concern expressed in February by Canon Haselock and Canon Webster that a lectionary of continuous readings was unsuitable for use by groups who do not worship every day, and for cathedrals, where

the congregation consists, for the most part, of different people on each occasion. Among the issues mentioned were the length of the readings, the difficulty of understanding them if one had not heard the previous day's readings, and the inclusion of difficult passages which are thought to require explanation. These points amount to a request for a so-called 'pillar lectionary' of short readings which can stand alone.

The revision committee was sympathetic to that aspiration and considered it very carefully, but such a two-year cycle would contain over 600 pairs of readings, all needing to be checked to avoid clashes or near-misses with the other lectionaries. In our judgement the compilation of such a lectionary would go way beyond the remit of a revision committee, and it would take so long that the new Weekday Lectionary, for which many are waiting, could not be authorized in time to appear in the annual booklets for 2005–06. I understand that the Liturgical Commission is very willing to embark on the work, if asked to do so by the House of Bishops, and its chairman has already written to the cathedrals and choral foundations to seek their views on precisely what is needed. The revision committee strongly encourages the House of Bishops formally to request the Liturgical Commission to get to work on such a lectionary.

Otherwise, the points that we were asked to look at were relatively minor. In the Morning and Evening Prayer readings (Table 2) we agreed to rearrange the reading of Genesis so that the book is read in order, and a different part is omitted in years when Easter is early. By contrast, we did not agree to a similar proposal for St John's Gospel to be read in order from beginning to end, for the reasons set out in our report. We have reinstated the special readings for the days between Ascension Day and Pentecost.

Turning to the psalm tables, we deleted from Table 3 the seasonal provision for the two and a half weeks before Lent because that is Ordinary Time and not seasonal time. Some dislike the seasonal provision because it involves concentrating on a selection of psalms, but on the other hand one submission argued that that selection ought to be narrower and more specific. We judged that we had the balance to be about right.

In Ordinary Time (Table 4), some suggested that the semi-continuous provision was not continuous enough. We considered carefully whether we should re-authorize the ASB psalm cycle so as to provide a completely continuous cycle with fewer psalms per day than in Table 5. However, we decided against that. We did not wish to complicate matters further with another alternative. Nor could we agree that the old ASB psalm cycle should replace Table 4, since many had expressed appreciation of its features, notably the allocation of 'morning' psalms to the morning and 'evening' psalms to the evening and the splitting up of Psalm 119 so that it is read on Wednesdays (at Morning and Evening Prayer in alternate weeks). In our view Table 4 also strikes the right balance. We have made sure that those who use Table 3 in the seasonal weeks where there is a choice between the two tables rejoin Table 4 at the point which it has reached, so that in Ordinary Time both groups are in step with each other.

With regard to both the readings and the psalm tables, there are clearly some who think

that too many verses are provided for each Office. In the case of the readings, we have responded with a note stating that the abbreviation of readings for pastoral reasons is permitted. In the case of the psalms, we have highlighted one psalm for each Office as being the psalm which those who want to use only one should choose. We were asked to go further and indicate which verses of the readings and of the longer psalms might be omitted if a shorter reading is desired, but we have declined to do that. Both the reasons for shortening and the desired number of verses will vary. We were unwilling to do anything which might suggest that some verses are less important or more objectionable than others, so we have left that to local decision according to the circumstances. We did note that three-quarters of the responses from experimental parishes judged the length of the readings to be ‘about right’. This strengthened us in our view that we should not seek to alter the provision radically.

Among the amendments we have addressed the problem identified by our member Dr Owen in his speech in February: there are extra amendments to ensure that the Sunday readings which we have in common with other Churches will always be used on the same Sunday in the Church of England. In this matter, at least, we in the Church of England will now always be in step with our ecumenical partners.

Finally, we have made a number of other detailed amendments to the Daily Eucharistic Lectionary (Table 6) and to the Amendments in order to address problems which two of our non-synodical correspondents, Jonathan Goodall and Simon Sarmiento, drew to our attention. These are highly technical points and I hope that members will forgive me (indeed maybe they will thank me) if I do not go into detail about them.

May I in conclusion express my thanks to the other members of the revision committee? They included biblical scholars, those with proof-reading skills and – most important – calendrical experts, able to grapple with the higher maths involved in holding the Lectionary together when it is being pulled apart by those tectonic plates which centre respectively on Christmas (the date of which is fixed but which moves from one day of the week to the next) and on Easter (the date of which moves but which always falls on a Sunday). We are grateful too to the Steering Committee’s consultants, Revd Dr Anne Dawtry and Revd Dr Simon Jones, who checked everything that we did with impressive precision.

I hope that the Synod will feel that we have listened to the debate and members’ submissions and that it will take note of our report.

Revd Canon Paul Nener (Liverpool): I did not want to ask a Question, but on the ‘pillar’ lectionary that the Bishop of Beverley refers to as being requested the question I would like to ask is whether, if that is produced, it would replace the Lectionary in course – *this* Lectionary in course – and if so what about the clergy and others who use the Daily Office canonically and might then lose out in their daily meditation on particular books of the Scriptures? If it is going to be produced in addition to this Lectionary, would it perhaps be better to publish it in a separate Lectionary so that we

do not receive a highly confusing booklet? (Some of us are quite simple, as the Bishop knows.) Would it be two lectionaries, rather than one?

Thank you very much: I did mention *Hallel* psalms in the debate in February and thanks for the response that we will have a table to advise on which *Hallel* psalms to use on which days of the week (if we take that advice, of course). However, I notice on looking through this Lectionary that we still have odd weeks in which odd *Hallel* psalms appear and there seems no reason for it; I can never work out what they are doing there anyway. So perhaps if we are going to have a table, would it not be wise to Tippex (or whatever you do with computers) those *Hallel* psalms out which appear occasionally and rely on people's common sense to choose one from the table?

Mr Nigel Chetwood (Gloucester): I just have a concern about the way the Lectionaries are constructed, in the way that verses are omitted. I had a Question down, which was not reached on Saturday, on Canon F 9, which says that every church should have a Bible, a large-print Bible. As a Reader, I take services in a number of strange churches where the Bible has been replaced by a large-print lectionary on the lectern, and we have had the situation where the person reading the lesson could not find it yet there was not a Bible in the church that he could read from. I just want to express that concern: that if the Lectionary is going to be used in churches it should contain the full content of the Bible rather than bits.

The Bishop of Beverley, in reply: Thank you, members of the Synod, for such a concise debate! I hope that it may be a model for the future.

Thank you, Canon Nener. We spent a great deal of time in our revision committee talking about the *Laudate* psalms, but not everyone will want to use them and we think that the solution we have come up with is the appropriate one. As regards the 'pillar' lectionary, that will be an additional lectionary and of course it will be for the people who compile it to decide how it will be produced. That decision belongs to another day but they will no doubt have heard what you said this morning.

Thank you for the observation about the Lectionary and the Bible. Of course the Canons of the Church of England do state that there shall be a Bible available in every church, so that would be beyond the brief of our revision committee, which would take it for granted that the Canons were being observed.

The motion was put and carried.

The Chairman: The liturgical business entitled 'Weekday Lectionary and Amendments' now stands committed to the House of Bishops under SO 77(f).

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Stephen Venner)* took the Chair at 9.57 a.m.

Common Worship: Times and Seasons and Common Worship: Festivals: Report by the Liturgical Commission (GS 1549)

The Chairman: This is the book about which we have already heard in Question Time, and I have been dreaming of all those trains from London and elsewhere in the country, full of people coming to Synod with this large tome in plain covers – obviously a disguise – getting frightfully excited and laughing and crying on the way up: it is part of a new decade of evangelism. It is a significant tome for commendation by the House of Bishops after discussion by Synod and revision, so it is an opportunity for members of Synod to share their hopes, concerns and ideas which will then be taken on by those charged with the revision.

Revd Canon Jeremy Haselock (Norwich): I beg to move:

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

Early in his *History of the English Church and People* the Venerable Bede tells the story of the conversion of the English to Christianity. Embedded in the tale are a number of documents illustrating the story. Among them is a letter from Pope Gregory the Great to Augustine, his chosen agent in this great project: ‘Augustine, my brother,’ he writes, ‘you know the way we conduct services here in Rome; you were brought up with it. But if you find anything in the customs of the Church in Gaul, or any other Church, that would be more acceptable to God, make a careful selection from them, and teach what you can learn from other Churches to the English, who are still young in the faith. We are not to love customs because they are associated with particular places, rather, we should love places because they have good customs there. So choose from every Church those things which are devout, religious and good, and when you have combined them into a single service book, let the minds of the English people get used to it gradually.’

This excellent piece of liturgical advice from a wise and pastorally minded Pope might perhaps be listened to with profit by those revising the Roman service books today. It certainly resonated with the mind of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England in the 1980s, when it set about supplementing the basic rites in the *Alternative Service Book 1980*. A quick look through the list of acknowledgements at the back of *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* of 1986 shows that, in addition to newly written prayers, material was adapted from the revised Holy Week services of the Roman Catholic Church and from the liturgies of the Anglican Church in South Africa and of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America. *The Promise of his Glory* (1991) was even more eclectic, introducing us to material from such diverse sources as the Methodist Service Book, the Byzantine Rite, the Nestorian Liturgy, the worship of the Iona Community and that of the Canadian and New Zealand provinces of the Anglican Communion. Finally, *Enriching the Christian Year* (1993) came as an act of private

enterprise, compiled and edited by Michael Perham with contributions from other Commission members. It contained a great deal of newly written material alongside commended and authorized prayers from other sources.

From the outset of the *Common Worship* project it was part of the overall plan to provide seasonal material to complement the core provision in the way that these three volumes had supplemented the ASB. The method adopted by the Commission in order to provide this material was, first, to look through the three existing books to identify what still seemed useful and to edit those texts so as to bring them into line with the new models provided by the *Common Worship* core volume. It goes without saying that Synod will naturally be sympathetic to this environmentally friendly form of liturgical recycling.

The Commission also looked at material from the more recently published *New Patterns for Worship* (2002) and, where it seemed appropriate, we have incorporated it into this collection. The same review process led to the inclusion of authorized material from *Common Worship: Holy Communion, Pastoral Services* and *Christian Initiation*.

At this point perhaps I should remind Synod of the legal status of the material before us in GS 1549. Starting nearly 20 years ago, *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* and *The Promise of his Glory* were both scrutinized by the Synod in a process which pioneered the legal route that we are following today. Matter supplementary, but not alternative, to forms of service in the *Book of Common Prayer* can be examined by the Synod before commendation by the House of Bishops. Commended status amounts to a recommendation by the House of Bishops that the liturgical material in question is suitable for use in the exercise of a minister's discretion under Canon B 5. Such material used under Canon B 5 must be 'reverent and seemly and shall be neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter'.

The report now before Synod contains a great deal of material already commended. As I have said, our revision work brings this already commended material from *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* and *The Promise of his Glory* into conformity with *Common Worship*. Such material as we have chosen to use from *Enriching the Christian Year* we now bring before Synod with the recommendation that it comes officially into the commended category of Church of England liturgical provision.

There is much too in GS 1549 that has already been through the full authorization procedure. That is why in this report the source of each item is given on the right-hand side of the page. If the source reference includes an asterisk, it has been altered or adapted by the Commission for its present purpose. Where there is no other attribution, the material is newly written, and we would particularly welcome Synod's views on this new material.

The second task that the Commission set itself was to decide where material in the earlier publications could be dropped or revised in the light of usage (or neglect).

Correspondents over the past few years had also identified gaps which needed to be filled with new material. This second task became more important when the publication of the *Common Worship* core material in pew and president's editions focused primarily on Sundays and major festivals and omitted texts which had been part of the *Alternative Service Book* provision. In the *Common Worship* eucharistic material so far published there are clear gaps in both seasonal and festal material, and so we needed to restore to the Church a measure of the provision that it had enjoyed over the past 20 years.

A third and more controversial task has been to provide new liturgical and devotional material for which there is a perceived need. Here the Commission has responded, for example, to the request for more Creation material by providing a section called 'Seasons and Festivals of the Agricultural Year'. Others have urged us to provide more mission-oriented, less inward-looking ways of celebrating core festivals. For them we have devised alternative endings to the great festival services of the Church year so that congregations can be sent out inspired and enabled for mission through the proclamation of a short gospel passage and an appropriate dismissal sentence. We have responded to a new desire from a much broader range of parishes for seasonal devotional material by providing, among other things, a Way of the Cross for Lent and Passiontide and Stations of the Resurrection with which to celebrate Easter.

The report now before Synod comes divided into two collections of material. The first, *Common Worship: Times and Seasons*, is designed as a resource book in the manner of *Patterns for Worship*. Its natural home is in the worship leader's study as a quarry from which to hew the building blocks of pastorally appropriate worship in the differing circumstances of each parish church or worship centre. The second volume, *Common Worship: Festivals*, is designed for use in church as a president's book at the Holy Communion. So in addition to the material presented here in this report for Synod, this second volume when published will also contain such already authorized material from *Common Worship* Holy Communion as will make it the only book necessary, apart from lectionary material, for the president at the Holy Communion on a saint's day or festival.

I am aware that this report is a weighty tome and that, as it arrived when it did, not every busy Synod member will have had an opportunity to examine its contents in detail. Briefly I will outline the contents of the report and how it is arranged.

Common Worship: Times and Seasons contains resource material for use at the Holy Communion and at Services of the Word for the full cycle of seasons of the liturgical year, together with a number of fully worked out forms of service for principal services and other celebrations within each season. The seasons are presented according to the system adopted for the Calendar at the beginning of the *Common Worship* core volume.

Each seasonal section begins with a brief 'Introduction to the Season' which attempts to characterize the distinctive features and liturgical flavour of that part of the yearly cycle. Then follows the major resource section, headed 'Seasonal Material'. This is arranged

under the standard pattern of headings used in *Common Worship* which follow the order in which the material might normally be used in a service of Holy Communion or a Service of the Word. Then follow suggested patterns or outlines for particular services and, where appropriate, some fully worked-out orders of service. Any other resource material which cannot be presented under the standard headings is placed at the end of the section.

A word needs to be said about the bank of short passages of Scripture. We have resisted the temptation to organize these according to their possible position within a particular act of worship: they are not set out as opening sentences, offertory sentences, Communion sentences, after the manner of the ASB. It will be clear that some have been chosen for their particular appropriateness but as their use is not mandatory in *Common Worship* but permissive and governed by note, they are but suggestions, and other Scripture sentences equally suitable may be chosen from the authorized lectionary material for the day.

Common Worship: Festivals contains sets of resources for twelve festivals and a principal feast. In addition, there are Commons of the Blessed Virgin Mary and seven categories of saint's days which largely correspond with the categories originally identified in the ASB between pages 837 and 877, and now follow the order in the president's edition of *Common Worship*.

In the report before Synod, the material which will become the *Festivals* volume is laid out similarly to *Times and Seasons*. Its final arrangement will require some discussion with the publishers to ensure that it is carefully ordered for its intended use. To that end it will also include, we suspect, *Common Worship: Collects and Post Communions*, from the President's Edition pp. 123–212, and *Common Worship: Holy Communion*, from the President's Edition pp. 383–431 and 625–630.

The Commission has introduced distinctive new material in a number of sections of *Times and Seasons*, and it is on this material particularly that we would like comment and suggestions. For Synod's convenience the sections with new material are laid out on page 5 of GS 1549. Here I should like to mention a little more about process. These texts are not set in stone. They can and will be revised in the light of this debate, and if Synod members wish to submit written comments to the secretary of the Liturgical Commission by 17 September, the Commission will be able to bear these comments in mind when it comes to revise the new texts. The product of this revision will then be presented to the House of Bishops in January 2005 for commendation.

In the *Festivals* volume the liturgical material is by and large not new but is collected and arranged in a new way. New forms of intercession have in some cases been provided, and the Extended Prefaces of *Common Worship* (President's Edition) have been supplemented with some newly written or adapted from other sources. Comment on these will be very helpful to the Commission.

As I have tried to make clear, much of the material in this report comes from existing

sources and has been authorized or commended and tried and tested for up to 18 years. We have rescued a small number of prayers from the ASB. Where necessary these have been made gender-inclusive. Following St Gregory's advice to Augustine, additional material has been culled from the published liturgical books of other provinces of the Anglican Communion or other Churches. Wherever we have drawn on such material, including the Roman Sacramentary and the prayers of the Ambrosian rite, we have amended and adapted where necessary to enable the material to conform to our Anglican tradition and theology. The remaining material has been specially written to resonate with the style established in the existing *Common Worship Services and Prayers*.

I should like to thank all my colleagues who have been involved over about 15 years in the revision and compilation of this material, but more recently I should like especially to thank Fr Robert Hart for his indefatigable secretarial expertise.

The Commission looks forward to hearing the views of Synod on this report, both in debate and in written submission to its secretary.

To conclude on a personal and entirely biased note, I cannot but be glad that this report bears the number GS 1549 – (*laughter*) – and not GS 1552! On behalf of a totally unbiased Liturgical Commission, I ask Synod to take note of the report.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Dr Peter Capon (Manchester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. Under SO 33, I beg to move:

‘That the debate be now adjourned and resumed at the next group of sessions.’

The Chairman: As a new chairman, I will just pause to receive instructions.

Dr Capon has moved the procedural motion that the debate be now adjourned. Under SO 33, he has not more than two minutes to give his reasons. I will then ask Canon Haselock as mover of the main motion to speak for not more than two minutes. When I have heard those two speakers I will decide in my discretion under SO 33 whether to allow any more speakers on the procedural motion.

Dr Peter Capon (Manchester): In the debate on the agenda I requested that this debate be rescheduled for the next group of sessions on the ground that we did not receive this tome in time to study it. The acting chairman of the Business Committee told us that this was in part because of due consideration in the House of Bishops. I am pleased about that, but what about due consideration in this Synod? The proper consideration that this important material deserves is not possible when members have not been able to read the report. I know that much of the material is not new but this is the first time that we have seen it in this form. Many members will not have seen all the sources from which it is drawn, and some of the material is not previously commended.

Whenever we debate this report, under the take note procedure, we will only do so once; there will be no second chance. I know that we can write in after the debate, but that is no substitute for a well informed debate here. In the debate on the agenda it was suggested that no one was expected to read the whole report, but the outcome of this work will be two volumes of *Common Worship* which, even though it is only commended material, will give it a greater authority than it has at present. It is important that we get this material right, even if it means a bit more delay – and we have been waiting 15 years anyway.

When the books are published and someone in my diocese says, ‘What about the service on page such-and-such?’, should I reply to him, ‘Well, actually, I haven’t read that bit. The acting chairman of the Business Committee told me I didn’t need to’? Adjourning this debate to the next group of sessions will enable us to give this important material the consideration that it deserves.

Revd Canon Jeremy Haselock: On behalf of the Liturgical Commission, I am hugely grateful to Dr Capon for the seriousness with which he takes this material. Naturally, we would like it to have the fullest consideration that we believe it deserves. Nevertheless we have striven very hard to get this material to a completed state to present it to this group of sessions because we have a draft publication timetable ahead of us and a great deal of demand from the Church throughout the country to be able to use this material this coming Christmas and Easter. Therefore we would like to make this material available, commended by the House of Bishops, to a waiting Church.

Of course we can debate it in February, very happily, but it will mean delaying the publication of all this material for a full liturgical year. That I personally, and I think a lot of other people, would regret. So I would prefer to continue with this debate this morning.

The Chairman: I do not propose to allow any more speakers. It seems to me that the issue is quite clear.

The procedural motion was put and lost.

The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (Ven. Clive Mansell): – and a former country parson. I am delighted to receive this book; there is marvellous material in it and I have enjoyed reading it, not just on the train but at other times too. I am sure that it will be a great resource for people in parishes.

I particularly want to welcome the material for use in the seasons of the agricultural year; I am sure that it will be welcomed by folk not just in rural parishes but also in town and city parishes too. Too few prayer books and collections of prayers published in recent years have made any reference to the rural year, and it is a great joy to have that material here.

I would like to make two suggestions, if I may, for possible inclusion. One relates to the rural year and the other to another part of the season. In my North Yorkshire parish when I was a country parson we culled from the Yorkshire Agricultural Society harvest service a procession of harvest symbols, brought forth by different members of the congregation, different parts of the harvest from across the growing year; it was a very powerful thing to do and certainly made an impression on those who had moved into our rural parish from a town background where they had been less in touch with the growing of food. There are, I am sure, forms of this procession of the symbols of the harvest which could be used and perhaps included in the final volume, or at least the idea of having symbols of the harvest brought forward could be commended in the material for use during the rural seasons.

The other item that I notice is missing from this volume which was in *The Promise of his Glory* and which I found to be a very powerful piece of liturgy is the item in All Saints-tide material called 'Thanksgiving for the Holy Ones of God'. Some members may have used it. It is a bit like a litany, and you give thanks, beginning with Abraham and Sarah, and for our ancestors in faith, and it works its way through to the coming of Christianity to our land, through the period of the Reformation, through to great Christian people, right up to what was then the twentieth century. You were very conscious of stepping yourself into that great stream of Christian faith, back into biblical times and then right through into your own time. You had a great sense of indebtedness to those folk, who came from different Christian traditions as we moved through the course of history. I would want to ask the working party to consider including that in the provision for All Saints-tide as a very worthy and helpful piece of liturgical material.

Archimandrite Ephrem Lash (Ecumenical Representative, Orthodox Churches): I too had noted the number of this GS document and I was inspired to adapt a little poem which you will recognize, no doubt:

'England and England's rites were hid in night.
God said, "Let Cranmer be", and there was light.
This could not last; the Devil, shouting, "Ho,
let Stancliffe be", restored the *status quo*.'

To be serious. I want to congratulate the Liturgical Commission on this very fine collection of texts which bring the Churches closer and closer together. The ecumenical value of this is enormous. I did make my confession to the Bishop of Salisbury that I had not read all the 490 pages and I had not brought my magnifying glass, and he said that it would have been a thousand pages if they had done it in bigger type.

The material for the Epiphany, for Holy Week and Easter, these all seem to me to be excellent and valuable additions to the Church of England liturgy. I was very pleased particularly in the Epiphany rite to notice that liturgical time has reasserted itself. In the Additional Collects, you may remember, there was a prayer where the idea that we were

doing something actually now, like waiting with Mary for the Incarnation, was removed: it was not historically correct; but now I see that today things are happening in the Jordan at Epiphany time. That is a good thing. The great feature of all the Orthodox rites is that what we are doing is today. The only Sunday in the year where we have no resurrection gospel at Matins is Easter, because we are doing it so we do not need to be told what has happened: we are in fact coming to the tomb with the holy women at midnight.

I would like just to say a word of commendation also for the services for All Saints and All Souls. The commemoration of the departed is central to the Orthodox understanding of the communion of saints, although we do not use the Apostles' Creed, which has the communion of saints in, but you do. There is the idea that the Christian life, as Archbishop David was telling us on Sunday, is a journey, a journey that begins in the mother's womb and ends in the kingdom of heaven; there is an interruption that takes place at the physical death but it is still the same journey. In the Orthodox Church all Saturdays are commemorations of the departed. There are particular ones just before Lent and just before Pentecost, where we have something like a full All Souls day, but every Saturday is a commemoration of the departed because it is the day on which Christ was lying in the tomb and it is, therefore, the day of the week when we commemorate the dead. There is hardly a Sunday goes by in our churches where the people do not have memorial services for their departed friends and ancestors; they bring boiled wheat and things like that to commemorate them. This journey is one journey. The mystery of death: if you read our funeral service you will see that we are very conscious of the mystery of death. What is this mystery? What is this separation of soul and body? Normally we have a psalm verse before the reading of the epistle, but the one service which does not have a psalm verse is the funeral service, where we sing, particularly in the Greek, to a very cheerful tune, 'Blessed is the journey upon which you go today, for a place of rest has been prepared for you'. It is the continuity which is the keynote to the understanding of what we do for the departed. It is not a sort of cut-off point, after which we do not know what happens. All the language of the New Testament and so on is, of course, image language, but I think that this is very important.

Finally, I would just like to mention one text of ours which I see is our *contakion* for the departed (slightly mistranslated, but that is bad luck), but it ends 'Alleluia'. Do not forget that in the Eastern Church 'Alleluia' is particularly used in Lent and in Holy Week. Holy Week begins with a solemn singing of Alleluia, so if you are using Alleluia in an Orthodox text it also has the echo of Holy Week and the Passion of Christ. If you use that text, remember that Alleluia has a double meaning. If you talk about the Bible – I could have done – do read the *Church of England Newspaper* handed out: 'the Greek Bible, a plea to rediscover our roots', which of course includes the Book of Maccabees.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Tom Wright): It is always hard to follow someone whose beard is three times as long as one's own, and as to his tradition, well, even more so.

I am extremely grateful for this book which I have had a chance to look at because it came in its earlier version to the House of Bishops. I am very grateful to the committee that it has taken on board at least one-third of the submissions that I sent to it after the House of Bishops' meeting, and I look forward to making significantly further inroads hereafter. I am looking forward very much to using a great deal of this material and it will be terrific and very enriching, as much of it has been already in its various trial forms (though incidentally I do not regard it as a very good argument for proceeding with something to say that it actually has been authorized before; we do not believe in our own infallibility, I trust, and we have to be able to go on asking questions).

I am mindful of what the mover said, that there should be nothing here which is contrary to, or indicative of any departure from, (I think I have the punctuation of that sentence right this time) the doctrine of the Church of England, and I do worry about three things in particular. These are just small things compared with the great gratitude that I have for much that is here.

The first has to do with the prayers and the rubrics about the Church and the Jews; this is a very serious, difficult, sensitive subject, and anyone specializing in the letter to the Romans, as I have for most of my life, knows all about that. On page 187 there is a statement about the Passion narrative gaining its fixed form at a time of tension between Jews and Christians; that is true but not in the sense that this intends. There were tensions between Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah and Jews who did not believe that Jesus was the Messiah, right from the very beginning. The idea that the Passion narratives took shape post-70, that that was a time of tension, and that therefore they express – this is the implication of the preface – some sort of implicit anti-Judaism has been very fashionable in many circles but needs to be strongly refuted historically and in several different ways. The word *Ioudaioi* in John should be translated 'Judaean' in almost all its occurrences, not 'Jews' in that sense, and the line in Matthew – 'his blood be on us' – refers to the fall of Jerusalem, not to an ongoing blood-guilt. There are many other things going on in that paragraph which need to be teased out and which I think in their present form are very unfortunate. I hope that we will not instantiate them into one of our texts.

Second, the prayer on page 227 I really do have problems with. The Reproaches started life as the Church identifying itself with Israel, but this one has turned it inside out and is a reproach to the Church for its ill-treatment of Israel. Now of course there has been Christian complicity in anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. We all know that; we have been there, and we have worked through that, I hope; but I would be just as eager to confess all sorts of other things, and the way that this particular reproach is phrased – and I do not, alas, have time to go into the detail of this – actually makes several statements which are not biblically or theologically, in my view at least, justifiable, not least the idea of making them scapegoats for our own guilt. I am afraid that I hear there a bit of pop psychology and theology blended together. Of course there is such a thing as scapegoating, and of course some anti-Semitism may be explained that way, but the idea

that we the Church have in any straightforward way scapegoated non-Christian Jews is simply false. We should not confess things which are not true and of which we are not guilty.

The second main point that I wish to make concerns the so-called Feast of Christ the King. This came in in 1990 here, following our older sister up the road who did it in 1970. We already have a feast of Christ the King and it is called Ascension Day. Moving it to 25 weeks later suggests strongly, in the teeth of Scripture and tradition, that Jesus only attains sovereignty over heaven and earth at the end of the long post-Ascension story. If you think that I am being paranoid, read the paragraph on page 412, and you will see that the year ‘ends with the proclamation of his universal sovereignty’. That actually undercuts what, ironically, the Feast was trying to do: let us talk about Christ the King because that is so important politically, ecologically and so on. Yes it is, but we should be doing that on Ascension. There is also something problematic here about late Western views of heaven: the idea that Jesus going to heaven means he is sort of absent is totally unbiblical and wrong. The point about heaven is that the One who is in heaven rules on earth. That is what the Ascension is all about. There is a narrative flaw in putting the Feast of Christ the King where it is. I know that we have done for the past 20 or 30 years, but that is no reason not to say that it is wrong and we should get rid of it because we do not need it.

Finally, the point that I am very concerned about: the Church of England has always believed and taught straight from Scripture that those who die in the Lord are blessed for they rest from their labours; they are with Christ for that is far better. Jesus said to the dying thief, ‘Today you will be with me in Paradise’. Paul said, ‘There is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus’ and we sang it lustily on Sunday in York Minster: ‘Bold I approach the eternal throne, and claim the crown through Christ my own’. Instead, on page 412 we are told that the saints are the great ones: Peter, Paul and Mary *et hoc genus omne*, who have made it where our own recently departed have not made it and are still on a journey. That has never been mainstream, official Church of England teaching and it seems to me that instantiating it in this book simply undermines what we do in fact believe. You only have to look at the readings that they have chosen for All Souls Day to see the problem. They would have found readings that would support All Souls if they could, but they could not – *pace* Maccabees, I can hear from the far corner – and instead they have chosen ones which express mainstream, good New Testament belief. All Saints’ Day was not broken. Please do not fix it.

The Chairman: Revd David Bird, followed by the Bishop in Europe.

Revd Canon David Bird (Peterborough): Chairman, you had already called John Hartley, so he will go first.

Revd Dr John Hartley (Bradford): May I express myself in prayer rather than in a speech?

‘Lord God our Father, as we pray in public we are heard as teaching others how to think about the Faith. Help us in our words to help others to appreciate your truth, and save us from misleading them. **Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy.**

‘Christ Jesus, you guided your early Church to formulate the prayer *Kyrie eleison* in three petitions addressed in turn to the three Persons of the Trinity. Thank you that this principle has been observed on pages 11, 28–30, 37 and 49 of *Times and Seasons*, but forgive us that we have confused the nature and mixed up the Persons on pages 10, 64, 72, 83, 97, 105, in 17 other places in *Times and Seasons* and a further 21 places in *Festivals*. **Christ, have mercy. Christ, have mercy.**

‘Lord Holy Spirit, thank you for the reassurance you give that all who have died in faith are undoubtedly with Jesus in Paradise. Save us from praying for the salvation of those who have already died by using such words as those on pages 41, 53, 116, 139, 331, 400, 416, 422, 428, and 75 in the *Festivals*, for by such prayers we only sow uncertainty in the hearts of our hearers. **Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy.**

‘May the death and rising again of Our Lord Jesus wonderfully expressed in the scriptural Stations of the Cross and of the Resurrection be ever more our deliverance and our encouragement. **Amen.**’

The Chairman: Lord, forgive me for forgetting to call Mr Hartley when I had called him before!

Revd Dr John Hartley (Bradford): I absolve you. (*Laughter*)

The Chairman: Thank you. The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe, followed by Mr David Bird.

Revd Canon David Bird (Peterborough): Chairman, you did call me first before, and the Bishop very kindly said that I should go first.

The Chairman: It is like the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey, deciding who should be on Synod. I am happy that you have sorted it out!

Revd Canon David Bird (Peterborough): Unlike the previous speaker, I have not gone through the tome with the fine-toothed comb that he has obviously used, but I have looked at some of it and there is much in it that I want to commend.

Let me take you to Grange Park, which is a new church, a joint Anglican-Baptist church planted on the edge of Northampton in a new housing area. My curate colleague has gone to be its minister and I was visiting a few weeks ago. In less than two years the

congregation has grown to 100, 60 of whom are children, and when the children go out for their specific teaching the place seems very empty: I was left with about 28 adults because the children and their leaders had gone out. The service there includes a very short introductory sentence, a responsive sentence, an engaging confession, a responsive Creed or affirmation of faith, the Lord's Prayer and some closing sentences and a blessing. The service is very simple and very responsive. It is appropriate to the large number of children who are there, and many of them are children for whom church is a new thing.

What I want to say about this tome is that although some of the material is very worthy it is not usable, particularly with children. There is a little bit of the Christmas material which I think I would want to use in my own congregation, which again has many children in it, but I think that we have missed the boat again. If the House of Bishops has asked the Liturgical Commission for a book of this size, what has happened to our request in the past for material for use particularly when children are present? We have missed a trick again. I have had to put down a Private Member's Motion – forgive me, Chairman, for mentioning it – which needs to be signed by people if we are to get something for use when children are present. This is really important at a time when there are fewer and fewer children in our churches.

We need to do something about it and I hope that we can do so. I want to commend this and we will use it in the congregations to which I minister, but I did wonder whether, if St John were writing about this, he might say, 'But there are also many other things that the Liturgical Commission did. If every one of them were written down, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written.'

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Geoffrey Rowell): Last night I spoke to Synod as the 'Great Nit' in the Europe debate; today I speak as the 'lead bishop on death' (if they have not abolished lead bishops)! I also speak as one who was very heavily involved in the compiling of *The Promise of his Glory* and particularly enjoyed working with some of my Evangelical colleagues on the Commission when we were doing the All Saints/ All Souls material, especially about how we celebrate the saints as our contemporaries and not simply as past memories. I was very grateful to Archimandrite Ephrem for what he said: that perspective of the continuing journey which is our Christian life, a life which is one of continual, endless unfolding into the very heart of the life of God. We are to become, as St Peter says, partakers of the divine nature. That is the perspective in which we celebrate the Communion of Saints.

I am a little nervous of too rigid a timetable, if you like, of New Testament understanding being imposed. I think that the scriptural evidence is of a more varied kind. There is often a 'both/and' rather than an 'either/or'. Sometimes I seem to be hearing from the Bishop of Durham of heaven as a kind of limbo, or something full of 'soul sleepers'. Yes of course there is to be the final consummation at the last day; but when we celebrate in every Eucharist 'with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven' I believe that those are indeed realities. The reality of those who are in the

heavenly places could be shown, for instance, by the fact that there is a lot of evidence in the inter-testamental period as well as in things like the ascension of Elijah for those taken into some transfiguring life with God. So we are not simply saying that the saints are those who are waiting, and there is often a real recognition of those who are particular heroes of the faith, those in whom we see the life of Christ very particularly.

When it comes to my own death, I want, I think, to have those prayers which are acknowledging the fact that, although God in his mercy, I hope, has taken me and has transformed my life, there is still more transformation to come. In relation to the last speaker, I think I learnt something as a child by sharing imaginatively both in All Saints and All Souls; there are things that speak there.

As for the Feast of Christ the King, I am a little puzzled by the Bishop of Durham's argument that we celebrate that on the Ascension. Of course we do; I entirely agree that; but it seems to me just like saying that we remember the Crucifixion on Good Friday and therefore we cannot have Holy Cross Day. The richness of the mystery of the Cross is something that we can celebrate, looking at it in two ways. The Feast of Christ the King: you can look back again to what we celebrated on Ascension Day and reaffirm it, and it looks forward also as a kind of overlap into the Advent season.

So I welcome the All Saints and All Souls material originally in *The Promise of His Glory* and the Feast of Christ the King, and hope very much that as they are now presented to us in this new book they will be commended.

Mrs Viviane Hall (Oxford): I welcome this volume despite its weight and, coming from rural north Oxfordshire, I particularly welcome the material for the agricultural year, but I would like to speak on behalf of an incumbent in a neighbouring deanery to voice her request and ask for enlightenment as I am neither a theologian nor a liturgist.

One speaker has already referred to the lack of texts for use with children. I was approached by Judy with a plea regarding the Easter provision. Hers was not a trial parish, but Praxis provided the text and at a training session she was told she could use the material on a one-off basis and the Liturgical Commission would like feedback. So she loves the new *Times and Seasons* material but is disappointed that there is no short prayer for blessing the Easter candle. Her understanding is that the *Exultet* is the blessing of the Easter candle, but none of its variations in this book are practical in her situation. Hers is one of no doubt many parishes where an Easter vigil would attract very few people, so all ages, adults and children, come to the main Eucharist on Easter morning. She wants to bless the candle; she sees it as a wonderfully symbolic action which the children can feel part of, but neither children nor adults will understand or appreciate the lengthy prayers in this book. So in despair this Easter she put together her own brief liturgy, using some of the new material. She simply said, 'Bless this Easter candle, that it may burn with the light of Christ, for Christ the morning star has risen, never again to set, and is alive and reigns now and forever.'

Is the *Exultet* an ancient song of praise as suggested in the introduction, or a blessing? Why not a blessing for the candle? Judy's question led me to read much more of the new provision than I might otherwise have done, and to go back to *Lent, Holy Week, Easter* with which I was not really familiar. It cannot simply be that inanimate objects do not merit a blessing. On Advent Sunday the wreath is not blessed, but at Christmas the crib is blessed. On Plough Sunday the plough is blessed but at Easter the paschal candle is not blessed. So my question is: Why are some things considered worthy of blessing and others are not? What are the theological, liturgical and logistical reasons for this discrimination?

I have also seen the relevant section of the Roman Catholic Sunday missal. This has the same wording as we have here on page 298 for the acclamation and on page 320 for marking the Easter candle, but the section is described as 'Optional blessing of the candle'. So maybe we do have a blessing of the candle, but how do we define a blessing? Does it have to include the word 'bless', with or without actions, or is the unspoken intention sufficient? Whatever the answer may be, or if the term 'blessing' is inappropriate, could there not be some brief, child-friendly form of prayer to be used before the candle is lit?

Judy has similar problems with the provision for Good Friday. As she says, it is hard enough to get people to come to church on Good Friday at all, now that there are so many worldly attractions like shopping and sport and travel. The traditional services provided are lengthy and wordy. Could there not be some alternative provision to engage the young and indeed the unchurched of all ages and to teach them to know and love the rich spirituality of Good Friday and Easter Day?

Mr Dudley Coates (Ecumenical Representatives, Methodist Church): I would like first of all, as a Methodist local preacher, to thank the Church of England for the richness of the seasonal material that you have provided me with over the years. Unless you think I am only saying that because I am standing here this morning, I am on record as having said it when *Lent, Holy Week* and *Promise* came out and I reviewed them both positively in the Methodist local preachers' journal.

I might just say to Mrs Hall that one of my jobs on Easter morning, at dawn these days, is to act as cantor when we sing 'Sing choirs of heaven' (to the tune *Woodlands*) in my wife's benefice; as many of you will know, my wife is a priest of the Church of England.

However, the main point that I wanted to make was about one of the pieces of liturgical recycling or sanctified scrounging that I spotted in this book. I am very grateful that, as in *Promise*, I think, you have borrowed the Methodist Covenant material, material that is very precious to many of us; and many of us were greatly moved when Archbishop Rowan used it at – am I allowed to call it his enthronement? – a couple of years ago. However, the version that you have borrowed, which is indeed the traditional version, is one of two different versions which now appear in our Worship Book. One of the reasons, though not the only one, why my friend Kenneth Carveley drafted and we

produced in the Worship Book an alternative version is that there is one sentence in the traditional version, which you will find in this book on page 76, line 37, where it says ‘put me to doing, put me to suffering’, and that is not straightforward. In the alternative version which appears in our book, we say ‘Your will, not mine, be done in all things, wherever you may place me, in all that I do and in all that I may endure; when there is work for me and when there is none’ and so on. I simply want to ask the Liturgical Commission, if I may, at least to look at the other version which appears in the 1999 Methodist Worship Book and to consider whether it should be provided either in place of, or as well as, the version that currently appears on page 76.

Revd Canon Jonathan Meyrick (Rochester): I currently work in the cathedral at Rochester but, like the Archdeacon of Tonbridge, was once upon a time a country parish priest. I would like to commend particularly, in welcoming the whole report, the agricultural material at the end of *Times and Seasons*. We heard yesterday afternoon something of the continuing problems of farmers in this country, and no doubt all of us will remember the devastating effects of the foot and mouth disease crisis just a few years ago. Prayerful concern for those involved most directly was expressed up and down the country, and it seems to me important that that prayerful concern does not now evaporate as the immediate crisis is past, and that we continue to affirm our agricultural communities.

Those of you who know something of the western end of north Kent may not think of Rochester as primarily a rural community, and indeed it is not; we are set in a collection of towns that run seamlessly one into another and accommodate a quarter of a million people. There are new urban, semi-urban and suburban communities springing up all round us as part of Thames Gateway. Elsewhere in the diocese there are two outer London boroughs, a number of largish commuter towns and, yes, a sprinkling of rural communities. Nonetheless when Rochester Cathedral held its first blessing of the plough at an early January Sunday Evensong a few years ago, we were amazed at how many local farmers there actually were in and around this urban conurbation and how much they valued this affirmation of their work.

In many places harvest thanksgivings and even Rogationtide services seem to have lost much of their connection with farming. Plough Sunday, which is essentially an intercessory service and occasion, enables something of concern for agriculture and the farming community to be put back properly into our liturgical life.

It is one of my bedrock convictions that our place as the Church of England is to be at the heart of the various communities that we serve, demonstrating that that is where our incarnational God is too. If you have not yet read Wendell Berry’s book *Jayber Crow*, I commend it to you. It is a wonderful parable of what incarnation is all about.

One of the joys of working in a cathedral is that there are so many different communities that interweave with the cathedral’s, but of course to some extent that is true of all our churches; and embracing those communities which interweave with us in the love

of God and in prayerful concern is what being a national Church is all about. We will not be able to do very much for the communities wider in the world, which of course is a crucial thing to do, if we have not started embracing our own local communities, and there is much material in this book which will help us to do so more fully.

Dr Carole Cull (Oxford): There has been much talk about culling material from various places this morning, and I would like to begin by thanking my erstwhile colleagues on the Liturgical Commission and, I hope, still my friends at the end of this speech, for all the hard work – and I have some idea of how much work has gone into this, but you just cannot believe or imagine how much it is – in bringing this all together in one place, not least because it will save my having to carry a veritable library around with me when I go to take services in other places. However, I still think that you have missed a trick. I am very pleased that you have brought together material for the agricultural year, but what about those of us whose year runs from Michaelmas to Lent and Easter – or perhaps it is Michaelmas, Hilary and Trinity? (I can never remember because I get confused about which university I am at.) What about those of us for whom the academic year is the rhythm of our year? Where are the prayers for the beginning of the school year or the beginning of the academic year? Where are the prayers to help us in our local Church school when SATS are about to happen or when public exams are happening?

Where are the prayers that help those of us whose ministry is in our place of work to deal with the situations that come and go? No longer are we hired and fired on Lady Day and Michaelmas but perhaps at any time of year. I know that there is material out there, and I know that it is not appropriate to add it into this volume now, but I want to make a plea that someone sometime will make time for those of us whose year does not relate to the agricultural year but is still part of God's great creation, the creation in which we work and worship and in which we need help in finding material to help us to deal with situations of joy and sorrow that we come across in the rhythm of our year, year by year and week by week.

I want to thank my friends – and I hope they are still my friends – but I want to ask my friends for a bit more work.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Dr Peter Capon (Manchester): I want to say a bit about the introductions to the seasons which are new within this volume. In principle, the idea of having such introductions to give us some sort of road map through the material is useful but it poses some difficulties for us. The reason it does so is that, as has already been said, we are drawing on material from an enormous number of different sources: Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Non-conformist, the Covenant service, the Christingle service and so on. The consequence of such diverse sources is inevitably some blurring between what is entirely consonant with our understanding of Scripture, the

Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles and what has been permitted as the practice of other Churches which we are happy for those who wish to make use of.

One particular example: on page 187, we are told that on Good Friday consecrated bread and wine remaining from the Maundy Thursday Eucharist is given in Communion. Well, some here may follow that practice, and I am happy that they do; but surely that cannot be described as normative of practice or belief within the Church of England? I think that a lot of the difficulty that has already been alluded to in relation to All Saints' Day and All Souls' Day is not to do with the liturgical texts actually set for those particular days but with the introduction, which attempts to give some explanation of what those texts are about.

The difficulty is that inevitably in a volume people will tend to take these introductions and explanations as normative descriptions of what is right within the Church of England, and people will not understand the difference between authorized material and commended material. So whereas I want to be generous in providing the material, I would urge and plead with the Liturgical Commission to be extremely careful in the introductions to see that they are entirely consonant with the historical formularies of our Church, with the *Book of Common Prayer*, with the Thirty-nine Articles and with the Holy Scriptures.

The Bishop of Woolwich (Rt Revd Colin Buchanan): – terminal speech! I claim now to be the lead bishop in death because I am nearer to it than the Bishop in Europe.

Thirty-eight years ago I dissented on Series Two Communion about petitions for the departed and that led to a very good Doctrine Commission report on prayer and the departed which has now, I think, simply been ignored. Similarly in the 1960s Kenneth Ross, the Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street, a very safe title, was always concerned that John Stott at All Souls, Langham Place should have a proper patronal festival fixed into the diary for him and fought hard for that. John Stott's view on the subject was never heard.

What has emerged over the years is that those who wish to express petitions for the departed, such as we have on page 435, have always in my hearing said, 'Our rationale is not that there is a purgatory' – though I do think the Bishop in Europe got quite near to a kind of convalescent home, even if not an actual purgatory – but having said that they do not believe in an actual purgatory they then say 'We have our prayers for the dead, and, just as we prayed for my cousin yesterday – she died in the night and I go on praying for her today; that is natural – those prayers continue', although they have the form of some particular need of the dead, which is what we have on page 435. If the rationale for prayers for the dead is simply to express our continual union with them, why do we not pray for the saints? Why is there a distinction liturgically between the prayers on All Saints' Day and the commemoration of the faithful departed? The rationale will not stand with the actual texts.

It is one of the problems that I had yesterday actually, in passing, with the Bishop of Stafford about the text of 'I absolve you', that the rationale will not stand with the actual texts that we use, and therefore I suspect that the rationale is actually some dust to throw in my eyes to get me to accept that and let go that which I think is actually there for other reasons.

I go very strongly with the Bishop of Durham. We did not have a feast of the commemoration of the departed other than All Saints until within my own lifetime. I do not believe that it serves any useful purpose, and it really is open to various dangers.

Revd Canon Tim Barker (Lincoln): I believe that it was a wise decision of General Synod to include in the main *Common Worship* book both contemporary and traditional language services. Amongst the benefits I would highlight the fact that those parishes – often but by no means exclusively rural – which prefer traditional language services have been able to explore and to use some of the riches of contemporary language *Common Worship* texts within traditional language services, just as traditional language hymns, for example, can be sung in an Order One service. However, there are occasions when the old and the new jar, when they are too close together, so the provision of a range of prefaces for the Eucharistic Prayer in traditional language has been much appreciated.

I warmly and enthusiastically welcome the services in the book that we are considering this morning, and I look forward to using them; but I think that it would be a great help to many parishes if some of the liturgical provision for festivals were available also in traditional language forms. I notice, for example, that there is some addition to the *Book of Common Prayer* Litany on page 460. I accept that it would be quite unrealistic and unreasonable to ask too much of an already pressed Liturgical Commission, and I agree with the point about worship suitable for children; but perhaps we could ask for the prefaces for the Eucharistic Prayer to be provided in both contemporary and traditional language forms. Translating into mock-Tudor English on the hoof is possible but it is not really satisfactory – it was bad enough doing Greek and Latin proses.

In the *Festivals* book also, which the Commission is proposing to produce, I suggest that it would be useful if you could find space for the *Common Worship* Order One traditional and Order Two services; it would be very helpful if they could be there alongside Order One, unless a separate traditional language publication is economically viable. To do otherwise would send out perhaps slightly unfortunate and unnecessary signals to some parishes; and we are trying to avoid having too much clutter on the altar, so the fewer books we have, the better.

Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin (London): As an inner city priest I am very conscious and very aware of the great diversity of which I am in the midst, both on a Sunday morning and also in the parish as a whole in which I serve. I am therefore very conscious that if the liturgy is the offering of the people of God it is important that the offering actually reflects who the people are. So I want to make a plea to the Liturgical Commission that

when drawing from other sources can they cast their nets a bit further into the deep, and not just to the north. Can they also look to the south?

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): I have in my hand an apple and a mobile phone and I ask the trick question: which one was made by God and which one was made by man? God provided the raw materials for both and God provided the intelligence and the skills for both as well. Both can be used for good, and both can be used for evil, as Adam and Eve discovered. The point that I want to make is that, to complement the excellent material that we have in this volume for the seasons of the agricultural year, we need liturgical material for the world of industry and commerce. There is a short section of Litany on pages 463 and 464 which is absolutely excellent, covering the world of work and including unemployment and so on, but this is not enough. We need in a volume entitled *Common Worship* a festival for the world of work, for industry and commerce, so that this part of our life, which is so much part of most people's lives, is properly affirmed alongside the agricultural life.

So I suggest that we have a separate particular festival for the world of work with the material that is available in lots of other places, but drawn together and so properly affirmed. I hope that in doing this the Liturgical Commission and the bishops will continue to use the experience and expertise of the industrial chaplains and the ministers in secular employment, which include for example the chief executive of one of the largest banks in the UK, who, in their work, take, give thanks, break and distribute, as well as forgive.

I also want to say that I am disappointed that in the material for the festival for Joseph of Nazareth there is no mention of Joseph the carpenter. The Roman Church calls this festival 'the festival of Joseph the worker', and it is a good occasion to have liturgical reference to the world of work and bread-winning, just as the festivals for Mary are good occasions to include liturgical material on home-making, parenting and nappy-washing.

Fr Aidan Mayoss CR (Religious Communities): We have been hearing a lot of words about words this morning. Just to comfort Carole Cull, if you want a prayer before the OFSTED inspection of your school, go to the Psalter: 'let his children be fatherless and his wife a widow'. I would remind everybody that there is no need to turn to the Liturgical Commission to produce a form of service for every conceivable eventuality. (*Applause*) We have the Scriptures, we have books of prayers, we have computers. Dare I say it? We should DIY. The function of the Liturgical Commission is to give us pointers, to give us support, to give us ideas, but not to enable us to have a nice short-cut, to open the book and say, 'Now, we can start on page 975 and tell the congregation "Page 975, The Lord is here, page 976, And also with you"'. That is not liturgy; that is boredom and nonsense, and exceedingly unhelpful.

We have this generous production of material, with all sorts of interesting stuff. Yes, the *Exultet* is long because the *Exultet* is one of the greatest prayers of Christendom. It is

not blessing the candle: the candle is the risen Lord. It is long, OK, but one of the things you can do in Holy Week is explain why the prayer is long and what you are actually doing. Get the kids to dance during the *Exultet!* There are a hundred and one ways of making liturgy live and useful. The great danger – and I have felt it this morning – is obscuring the Word with words. Be careful. Do some homework. I would just ask the Liturgical Commission for a little more provision for St Peter and St Paul. I do not think that they like just to be numbered amongst the Apostles.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I am somewhat worried about some of the material, particularly that which falls under Rogationtide and the Harvest Thanksgiving service because, particularly in the confessions that are here, there does appear to be the implication of a political agenda which could be open to debate. Obviously I do not have time to go through examples in great detail, but I am looking at page 469, for example, on line 2 where we have ‘the poor cry out for justice’: this seems to carry an implication that poverty is always the result of injustice. That is actually something that needs to be considered quite deeply, because poverty is certainly an issue for which Christians are rightly concerned; but the causes of poverty are complex. The following petition mentions ‘inequality and oppression in the earth’: this appears to carry an assumption of egalitarianism which again is something on which Christians may differ.

It may well be that many people would disagree with my disquiet over this, but I have nonetheless spoken to a number of people in General Synod who are similarly uncomfortable with some of these petitions. Harvest Festival has always been one of my particular favourite times of year, despite the fact that I live in a suburban area, and if I encountered these in a service I fear that I would find them alienating; and, as I say, I have spoken to others who feel likewise. Liturgy is supposed to challenge but I do not think that it is supposed to alienate, and I would ask the Commission if it could look again at some of these prayers. I am sure that it did not intend to give this impression, but this is nonetheless the impression that could be given, and I would urge a second look.

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Michael Perham): This speech breaks a three-year self-denying ordinance not to speak on matters liturgical after I ceased to be a member of the Liturgical Commission. Inevitably, and quite rightly, much of this debate has been about the detail of the book. I want to come back to the broader picture. I give my own small piece of personal testimony to just how crucial and enriching for me the cycle of the Christian year has been in my own Christian formation and discipleship. I do not think that I am the only person who, over the past 20 years or so, has been enormously enriched by this rediscovery in the Church of England, and I think that we need to hold on to that in among all the detail.

When the Liturgical Commission went to work in 1981 on *Lent, Holy Week, Easter*, it was because most people did not know what else it could do, really. The ASB had appeared in 1980; that was it, as far as most people were concerned, but there was still this Commission: ‘Well, maybe they can play around with Holy Week services because

there are some people who like that kind of thing, and we will produce something for them and it probably won't be of great interest to most of the Church but some people will be pleased to have some new provision'. So we worked away. We were, to be honest, amazed in 1986, when that work came to completion, at just how that material caught on and in all sorts of places where we had not expected it to catch on, and how people then said, 'You've done a good job (quite a conservative job) on *Lent, Holy Week, Easter*. Please go to work on Advent and Christmas and Epiphany' and soon it became All Saints and the Presentation of Christ in the Temple as well, because people found that this was enriching their Christian worship but, more than that, it was touching their Christian lives.

That is why some of us then went to work after that and produced a third volume, *Enriching the Christian Year*, to complete the picture. It is not so much, though, that we wanted to enrich the Christian year but more that the Christian year enriches us, and that I believe has been a huge and wonderful rediscovery in a lot of churches in the Church of England and beyond in the last generation. To live with Christ through the events of his earthly life in an annual cycle is to be conformed to his pattern, to be made more like him, to get inside his skin and begin to understand what made him tick in his earthly life and therefore to draw us closer to him and to his Father. That reaches its climax of course in Holy Week, and the thing about Holy Week is that it is not just good fun, it is not just a happy commemoration of something important; it can be life-transforming. In the material that we are being asked to send for commendation today, in among a lot of detail, I believe that there are some texts that can help to create worship which can be life-transforming. There is more to do with our spirituality and our faith than anything else: material that can draw us closer to God. We have not mentioned God much in the past two hours, and that is not a criticism because we have been into the detail; but in the end it is all about drawing us closer through Christ to the Father.

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

'That the question be now put.'

Revd Canon Jeremy Haselock, in reply: I would like to thank Synod for a very helpful and useful debate. I personally am most grateful for it and I know that the Commission will be very pleased to read through the transcript of the debate and to read the comments of individual members of Synod when they are submitted. I would like to thank individuals.

First, Archdeacon Mansell, who welcomes our agricultural material. We are grateful to him for pointing out some of the gaps and we look forward to his perhaps giving us a text of his procession of harvest symbols which we might happily fit into our project.

Thank you, Fr Ephrem, for your poetic gifts; the Bishop of Salisbury is most grateful too! We would like to thank you for affirming the ecumenical value of our texts. One of

the great engines that has driven liturgical reform for a hundred years is the ecumenical movement, and vice versa. We hope that this volume continues to be one of the rich fruits of that fusion. We value too your comments about living liturgical time, and they too harmonize so well with what the Bishop of Gloucester has just said to us.

We are hugely grateful to the Bishop of Durham for the immense amount of time that you have spent looking through this material, and we are grateful to you for acknowledging that we have gone along with you so far but, like the importunate widow, you have come back to us, and I hope I will not be too much like the unjust judge and say that we would like to look yet again at your material and to review it; but ultimately the House of Bishops will be those who say whether this material reflects accurately Anglican teaching and doctrine and can go forward. I am still not happy with your wish to challenge recently authorized material. When we come to the question of Christ the King, the Feast of Christ the King is now in our *Common Worship* Calendar, authorized by full process of this Synod, and the Liturgical Commission has merely produced liturgical material for that particular commemoration.

We are happy to revise the seasonal introductions to which you and other members have drawn attention and we will look at this material very closely in the intervening period before the material is presented to the House of Bishops again. We do see some of the weaknesses and are very happy to look at all those seasonal introductions very carefully.

David Bird and children: we have seen your Private Member's Motion and look forward to debating it, but I have to say that the Commission still believes that fashions in children's work change and the material that you put in to feed those fashions liturgically dates very rapidly. There is out there a huge amount of children's catechetical material with liturgical provision available, and the responsible parish priest will have access to that for the time being.

Kyrie confessions: John Hartley. I do not think it is true to say that all *Kyrie* confessions have to be Trinitarian formulations. They are certainly not used that way in the liturgical formulations of other communions, and we have not followed that style and do not intend to revise those that are non-Trinitarian along the lines that you have prayed we should. We will of course look to the whole issue of prayer for the departed in more detail when we look at the seasonal introductions, and we thank you very much for your commendation of the Stations of the Cross material which we know a lot of parishes will value.

Thank you to the Bishop of Gibraltar for coming to the aid of the All Saints to Advent material, every bit of which has already been before Synod in one way or another before. We do believe that this is a way of celebrating the saints as our contemporaries and we share your unease with the Bishop of Durham's rather precise timetable of what happens after death. We want to thank both the Bishop of Durham and the Bishop of Gibraltar for their contributions, and we await the outcome of their slogging it out in the House of Bishops.

Thank you to Viviane Hall for her very detailed comments passed on about the way children relate to the Easter ceremonies. She bemoans the lack of a short prayer for the blessing of the Easter candle. Yes, in the Roman provision the prayers over the Easter candle are called a form of blessing, but the words ‘bless this candle’ never appear. If you look at blessing material throughout the *Common Worship* project, you will find more and more now that blessings are blessings addressed to God, that the effect of thanking God for something may be a blessing to us. The whole style of blessing objects and people has now changed in liturgy, and I would like to go with that. If you want to regard the *Exultet* as an extended blessing of the candle, you can, but that was not its original liturgical purpose: it is a great paean of joy and praise for the Resurrection of Christ.

Dudley Coates, thank you very much indeed for your remarks. We are hugely pleased to have Wesley’s Covenant material in our service, but this book is big enough as it is without starting to put in your alternative versions as well, and we decided for reasons of space that we wanted to go for the original version. If we have the tiniest bit of appendix we may try and go with your suggestion, but I suspect that lack of space will prevent us.

We thank Jonathan Meyrick for his commendation of the agricultural material. We are very pleased with it and we are glad to hear that the majority of Synod members seem to welcome this section.

Carole Cull, thanks for mentioning the academic year. The book is not intended primarily for a university or even school constituency but we hear her plea and we will invite her to use her Liturgical Commission experience to compile such a collection of material for us.

Yes, Dr Capon, I have mentioned the introductions to the seasons and I promise you that we will review this material very carefully; but it has already been to the House of Bishops once and it will go to them again, and it is up to them to defend Canon B 5, which I repeat: reverent and seemly material which shall be neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter. Those great bloodhounds will surely sniff out any error.

Thank you to the Bishop of Woolwich for his valedictory speech and his useful historical comments on petitions for the departed. I stress that every single prayer that we have used in this section, including those on page 435, is not new and has already been either authorized or commended by Synod.

Tim Barker: traditional language material. This book is really very big already and the *Festivals* volume to be used as an altar book will also be quite large. We will consider his request for traditional language, but I am not very good at Tudorbethan or half-timbered language, and I am not sure that we are going to find room to put in the

material that he requests. We do not want the books to be too big and we do not want them to cost too much.

Hugh Lee and the world of industry and commerce, the world of work: we would have loved to draw our boundaries in this book much wider but space constraints have prevented us and we have not included this area. There is a space for a work of private initiative, with huge commercial possibilities no doubt, in front of him.

The Feast of St Joseph the Worker is different from the Feast of St Joseph of Nazareth in the Roman Calendar. It is on 1 May and if anything was a political statement by the Roman Catholic Church that Feast of St Joseph the Worker was it.

Thank you to Fr Aidan for his remarks, for his help and for his commendation of our material. Thank you to Prudence Dailey for her remarks on the penitential material in the agricultural year. We will take note of her comments but I assure her that no political agenda was intended, and we are all often uncomfortable when we come before the judgement of Scripture on our complacency.

To the Bishop of Gloucester I give my thanks for an enormous amount of work in the past which lies behind this material that we have brought to Synod afresh today; he is one of its guiding lights. We are very pleased to have heard his testimony as to the material and its effect, I believe, on countless Christian lives within the Church of England today.

I am very grateful to all other members of Synod who may have contributed. We look forward to reading your written submissions.

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *Revd Canon Frank Dexter (Newcastle)* took the Chair at 11.33 a.m.

Diocesan Synod Motion

Drug Misuse (GS Misc 748)

Dr Helen Leathard (Blackburn): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod, concerned about the extent of drug misuse at all levels of society, urge the Archbishops’ Council and diocesan and deanery synods to hold informed and Christ-centred discussions with experienced drug workers, pharmacologists and health care professionals about the ways in which the Church can be involved with the Christian and secular agencies already working in this field.’

I stand before you to propose this Diocesan Synod Motion wearing three hats, all invisible and not one a halo. The first is the hat of a licensed Reader and a member of diocesan synod, its board for social responsibility and substance misuse group. The second is the hat of an academic pharmacologist, passionate about having the resources of my discipline – the study of drugs – applied accurately to the huge social problem of drug misuse. The third is the hat of a mother of children of a generation that has been and still is exposed and vulnerable to illegal drug supplies.

Wearing the first hat, I am aware of an urgent need to promote the application of Christ's ministry of healing in an authentic way to those suffering through misuse of drugs: not only those who misuse them but the families and friends who suffer with them and the victims of crimes committed to support their habits. The potential benefits of delivering a Christlike ministry to drug users is illustrated by a quotation from the July 1998 General Synod debate:

‘What eventually made me give up drugs then? Two things helped me: prayer and love, two things that each and every one in this room can do. Most people in the Church rejected me – they just could not be bothered – except for one person. This person looked past the drug habit, looked past the sin in my life and saw me as Jesus saw me. This person loved me with the love of Christ.’

Wearing my second hat, I am well informed to respond to the desire of young people for accurate information about drugs, a need illustrated by the following response to *Rachel's Story*, a video based on the life of Rachel Whitear, intended for use in schools. (Rachel died of a heroin overdose.) These are the comments of two girls aged 10 and 13: ‘It's not teaching you about heroin, it's just telling you about Rachel's story. It's better to know about something. Better than shocking us would be teaching us.’

Wearing my third hat, I am acutely aware of the extent to which the use of various drugs, legal and illegal, is regarded as commonplace by many young adults, among others. They know the manifest dangers of heroin and its potential to wreck lives but are bemused by the general apprehension of many older people of just anything labelled ‘drug’ and the lack of discernment regarding relative risks of different substances.

Our Diocesan Synod Motion has, therefore, been driven by two concerns identified through our substance misuse group. The first is the Christian duty of care, as opposed to nervousness about or frowning upon people with drug-related problems. Second is the need for accurate information to enable a reasoned and responsible Christian perspective to be discerned and for that information to be disseminated widely and appropriately in language and formats that are accessible and easily understood.

If we are to fulfil our duty of care we need to distinguish clearly between recreational, excessive escapist, and compulsive-addictive patterns of use. Let me explain. Recreational use: a lot of us have done this with glasses of wine and so on over this

weekend. By 'excessive escapist' use we mean weekend binge drinking, whether by teenagers in the clubs and on the streets or by stressed-out executives at home, drinking themselves to oblivion for a bit of peace. The third group are those people who are so desperate for their next fix that they are prepared to steal or worse in order to fund it.

The information that we need for informed debate includes the pharmacology of misused drugs, including their attractive properties, their immediate and long-term risks and an accurate assessment of their addiction potential, and we need to acknowledge the limited information available on several of the legally restricted drugs, especially on the combinations, substitutes and impurities found in 'street drugs'.

We need to recognize that most of us take drugs, as medicines or recreationally. They are part of God's creation, and it is not the substances themselves but the way people misuse them that causes problems. Some, such as the medicines we can buy over the counter and the caffeine that we absorb from tea and coffee, are legal and relatively safe. Others, like more powerful prescription medicines or alcohol and tobacco products, are legal but also potentially harmful, depending on the quantities consumed and frequency of use.

Drugs to many people refer to substances such as cannabis, ecstasy and other amphetamines, solvents, LSD, heroin and cocaine. These are legally restricted but nevertheless quite widely available, it seems. Their legal status is not necessarily an accurate reflection of their pharmacological activity and potential toxicity in comparison with caffeine, alcohol and tobacco, and has been influenced primarily maybe by political considerations.

As Christians, we are naturally most concerned about the harm, to both individuals and society, caused by drug misuse. So what can we do to minimize it? For starters, we can be familiar with drugs and not demonize drugs or users. We can try to see drug users as Jesus sees them (from that first quotation): as neighbours in need of loving care. We can buy *The Big Issue* and speak to the vendors and not walk by on the other side. The vendors are participants in what is called a 'businesslike approach to ending homelessness'. Although the prime criterion for becoming a vendor is being homeless, the reality is that many are also working their way out of drug-related problems, and their earned income is 70p of the £1.20 charged for each issue. We can take individual responsibility for ensuring that we are well informed before making judgements on drug-related matters, and then we can become radically politically active in seeking the eradication of poverty and the funding of effective rehabilitation programmes. Maybe some of us can also manage to help support local drug projects, not to take on work that should properly be done by experts but to help with practical support or cash.

It is easy to take on some of the things that I have suggested on our own, but for others we need support. This is why our diocese is appealing to the Church as a whole to engage in well informed discussions to discern the best ways forward. We need to know what is being done in different areas and what are proving to be effective and valuable

contributions made by the Christian community. We need to share examples of good practice and avoid investing effort in reinventing drug-related wheels.

In recent years, as a diocese we have organized drug awareness evenings and day conferences for clergy and parishioners, using local available experts to provide information and lead discussions. We have produced cards with addresses and contacts for drug services, focused at deanery level and provided so that they are there for ready reference. We have collaborated with the Lancashire constabulary to produce fact sheets on Christianity and substance misuse that are freely available to all parishes, and similar parallel fact sheets for other faiths and in different languages.

We are aware that Southwark Diocese has made a tremendous contribution in the publication of *The Chemical Generation*, as has Ken Leech in many ways but especially through *Drugs and Pastoral Care*, a wonderful book. So although the main thrust of our Diocesan Synod Motion is our desire to commit the Church to well informed and Christ-centred discussion, we also hope that the deliberations of the Archbishops' Council resulting from our motion might include some consideration of ways and means of generating a comprehensive publication containing sound information and a portfolio of examples of good practice that can serve as a resource for the whole Church. I hope that our briefing paper makes a contribution to that.

Mrs Margot Townsend (Winchester): I am speaking very briefly, as a member of a managing committee of a trust for substance misusers. Our funding from public bodies is adequate until our clients come off drugs, but to achieve our recovery rate of over 30 per cent we keep our doors open: the after-care continues as long as they need it.

Let me tell you about Terry. After a lifetime on heroin and other drugs – nearly 40 years – he took himself off last December; physically, he is a mess but he is still clear. He is running the service-user group, he is signing up for a diploma course and I have a copy here of a poem that he has written for his church's coming flower festival (and I have some extra copies if people want them). I would like to read you just three lines from *Summer Sunbeam*:

‘Maybe One Day!?! In Summer, I’ll Awaken!?!
In The Glare Of A Sunbeam So Bright!?! . . .
I’ve Awoken?!? Cor!?! What-A-Fright!?!’

We need Terry, and he knows it.

Most of our clients have got into the mess that they are in because they felt inadequate and unlovable. If the Church is worth anything, it is in its effect on the world outside the church walls. These people need loving unconditionally, and it is in healing their brokenness that our own brokenness is healed.

Dr Sheila Grieve (Chester): I do not think that I want to vote for the motion as it stands,

though I want to hear a little more of the debate; but at the moment I am inclined to vote against it because I think that the discussion requested – Archbishops’ Council, diocese, deanery and possibly parish – is an enormous demand on the input and personnel, time and energy and finance. The implications are enormous. The treatment and care of addiction is a very complex issue and requires professional skills; I do not think that Dr Leathard is denying that.

I have two experiences that I want to share with Synod. For ten years I ran a clinic for drug addicts in my general practice. I had the largest number of addicts on my list of any GP in the area, which earned me the title ‘methadone queen of Wythenshawe’. I regarded this work as the most rewarding and the most moving part of my practice, but I have no illusions about drug addicts. Rascals, ruffians, thieves, but lovable, pitiable, charming, great fun. I travelled with them through the ups and downs of their addiction and I have no illusions about what it is like to work with drug addicts. They make you cry and they give you joy, but they give you great disappointment. In my area I heard of good Christian people who opened their homes to treat addicts, to take them in, to love them, care for them and pray for them, forgiving them when they stole their goods and taking them back; but it ends in exhaustion and disappointment, and I would want to warn Synod against that kind of involvement. Again, I do not think that Helen is seeking that kind of involvement, but we need to beware of a naive involvement in this sort of thing.

My second experience is as the chairman of a secular charity providing crisis intervention and harm reduction care for addicts. It started off well and for ten years it was going all right and funding was OK; but gradually funding died down and we became dependent on the local authority and on the vagaries of political positions. Our local authority did not set its budget until the end of March and it is a nerve-racking experience for the chairman of a charity to enter the new financial year with no confidence that you will be able to pay your staff for the next three months. I was glad to be rid of that responsibility, and I would not want to wish it on any deanery or diocesan project. If you read Ken Leech’s book, you will realize that he says the same thing: that the past 40 years of involvement with projects treating drug addicts shows that they fail for the lack of secure funding. This is something again that we need to beware of. It is a nerve-racking experience. This kind of work demands funding.

So I was glad to hear that Helen wants the Archbishops’ Council to produce some material for us. I was minded to move an amendment to ask the Council to produce exactly this, and I think that, in moving, that is what she asked for: skilful, knowledgeable information from the Archbishops’ Council that can be of use in diocese and deanery.

Mrs Janet Atkinson (Durham): I share Sheila Grieve’s worries about the level of detail of the bodies being asked to address this but of course we have an amendment from Dana Delap which we can think about later.

I may look reasonably respectable – perhaps, on a good day, fairly respectable (I hear ‘No’ from my left) but I come from a very rough area just up the coast, Teesside, which used to be Cleveland. We have a lot of badges of shame. (I speak as a person who for the best part of 20 years was involved as a magistrate.) We have apparently the cheapest heroin in the country; we have drugs tourism – we have people coming by coach; we have prostitution tourism; we used to be the car crime capital of the country, though we are no longer; we have just been told that we have the worst police force. So the whole drugs scene underpins a lot of this wrongdoing that is going on.

We have heard a lot of individual anecdotes of how people’s lives have been changed. I want to give a short anecdote to illustrate another angle. A young girl was brought up in care, had a baby, was not allowed to keep it, naturally, fell in with the wrong company, was involved in the world of drugs through her boyfriend, moved on to a more seriously involved boyfriend, and turned to prostitution to support their joint habits. He was pimping for her. She had given up shop-lifting because prostitution was a quicker and easier way of making the money that they needed. She ended up in court and we were going to put her on probation, for a complicated series of reasons, and I quite forgot myself: she was over 18, but I addressed her by name. I said, ‘Louise, try and regard this as a chance.’ She was a nice-looking girl and could have been anybody’s daughter or granddaughter, and she was looking earnestly at me and nodding and smiling. I said, ‘See your probation officer as a help, a friend. You don’t have to carry on with this way of life. It’s never too late: you can turn round and make a new start.’ I may be naive but I thought she was hearing me. Then I said, ‘Speak to the probation officer before you leave court’, and she went, smiling, and I thought ‘Oh, good’. A chap who was sitting up in the gallery with his feet up jumped up and rushed out of court, and the girl’s solicitor said, ‘That’s her pimp and she’s the fifth young woman whose life has been ruined by contact with this man.’ All my hopes of the probation service being able to turn her round were probably naive.

I was also told that I was naive when I worried about the amount of drugs that are current in prisons. I remember, at a criminal justice conference, having breakfast with a prison doctor and saying, ‘I feel this is all wrong. Surely it can and must be stopped?’ and he said, ‘If the officers turn a bit of a blind eye sometimes, you have to realize it makes life easier if they keep the lads quiet’. I still felt that that was wrong. It is extraordinary that we talk with pride about drug-free wings in prison, but they do good work.

Drugs are getting into schools and, again, children are not safe anywhere with this sort of thing happening.

Drug treatment and testing orders are working very well. They keep people convicted of drug offences out of prison, so there is quite a stick as well as a bit of a carrot of rehabilitation. There are not enough places on these programmes for all the people who could make use of them, but more is being spent on this criminal justice intervention into the drugs world than there is on voluntary rehabilitation services. People are

committing offences so as to get on to a drug treatment programme. There seems to be something dreadfully wrong there.

I support the Blackburn motion urgently. Whichever way we sort out how many layers of Church hierarchy discuss it, it is vital work.

Revd Peter French (Birmingham): I manage a youth project, working with marginalized young people in Birmingham. We recently had a recovering cocaine addict to talk to our young people about drug misuse, and I think that it made an enormous difference having someone who had had that experience, rather than a vicar pontificating about it. It made a difference, and the young people responded well and asked questions. I think that they listened much more attentively.

I just want to make two simple comments about two very simple things that perhaps this Synod could do on this issue of drugs and particularly with regard to young people. First, we must listen to young people. We had some young observers sitting up there on the first two days: they could observe, but they could not speak. We went at half-past ten on Saturday night to the launch of the Church of England Youth Council. We did not hear about it in this chamber. The food and drink were very nice at the launch, I must say, but it would have been nice to have heard about it in this chamber.

We have heard quite a lot this weekend from Fathers for Justice but little from young people, and that is a shame.

I wondered whether young people from the Youth Council could be represented on this Synod. I mentioned it to my Bishop. He said, 'Oh, I don't know whether Standing Orders would allow that'. I am sure we can get past Standing Orders if it is something that we really want to do, and that is listen to what young people have to say and not just tell them what we think.

I am told also by our project workers that one of the reasons that young people start taking drugs is low self-esteem, and this is another way in which the Church can play a very small role: in increasing self-respect and self-esteem. We need to preach the message of the love of God for everybody, and the fact that we are made in the image of God. It can engender that self-respect and self-love, and if you love yourself you are much less likely to harm yourself. So we need to think about the aspects of love and forgiveness within the gospel message.

My plea to Synod is that we just take a short time to listen to young people and also, within our churches, to talk a little more about love and forgiveness and a little less about sin. So please, Synod, listen to young people. Involve them, and proclaim God's message of love enthusiastically, so that maybe there is a chance that they will make the choice not to begin the misuse of drugs which so hurts our society.

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Nicholas Reade): Obviously I want to support the

Blackburn motion, not only as the new Bishop of the diocese but, like a great number of people here, because of many years of work in the ministry of healing and also, again like most people here, through seeing the effects on the lives and families of those who misuse drugs. Only last week I visited a family centre in the archdeaconry of Blackburn, and I arrived at a time when the children were enjoying a nutritious break-time snack. The supervisor told me that their diet at home was totally inadequate and the quantity very small, and the reason was that nearly all the money in the household was going on drugs or alcohol. I was also told that some of the children in the centre did not even have any toys to play with at home. There was actually no money in the home for toys because it all went on drugs for the parents. It is very hard to conceive of children in twenty-first-century Britain not even having toys to play with. So I thanked God for that family centre in one of our churches in the diocese and for all those who work there.

It also made me realize that we must redouble our efforts to help both the many people who fall victim to substance misuse and their families. We must also call for greater funding for rehabilitation programmes and, where appropriate, be prepared ourselves to help with some of that funding.

Professor Leathard also referred in her speech to alcohol abuse. It is vitally important that, in speaking of drug misuse, we do not lose sight of alcohol abuse, which so often comes to the doors of our churches and parsonage houses. Our experience in Blackburn Diocese has been that information-sharing and education and collaboration with other concerned agencies has been of significant benefit, but we must do more. I would urge Synod to be courageous in this matter by drawing together all these resources from as many dioceses as possible, drawing them together into a publication that can resource the Church into good practice.

I think it was four or five years ago that we recognized that the ministry of healing was playing an ever-increasing part in the life of many parishes, and we went on to produce *A Time to Heal*. What a difference it has made to the Church. I believe that something similar is called for on drug and alcohol abuse, something that could serve as a resource for the whole Church. I also believe that it could be a real contribution to the Church's mission to the world.

I urge Synod to support this motion, and not only support it but follow it up with some positive action.

Ms Dana Delap (Durham): I am a lay chaplain at a women's prison in Durham. I get a lot of the women that live just round the corner from Janet Atkinson! Well over 90 per cent of the women who come into Low Newton are on drugs and are rattling. Well, it is called 'rattling' as you come down hard off the kind of drug that most of the women take, because they literally shake and sweat as they come off drugs. It takes three or four weeks before they can sleep through a night, before they can regain some kind of appetite, and before they get some recognition of pain (that may have been because they have been on heroin and they take a lot of sugar, since that is one of the things that

heroin makes you crave, and their teeth are rotten). It may be physical pain; it may be emotional pain from rape, from bereavement. There is a team of highly skilled people in our prison helping those women who want to come off drugs to do that: doctors, nurses, counsellors, psychologists, psychiatrists – the list goes on – a lot of those people that Dr Sheila Grieve was speaking about. So I value the opportunity that we have today to engage in informed debate.

Drug use and addiction happens at all levels of our society, not just among the young but among the old; not just among the poor but among the rich; not just among those who are criminals within the criminal justice system but those who are rich enough to know better. Certainly we have people in our deaneries who misuse drugs; we probably all have people within our own parishes.

However, as we debate in Synod, we have to keep an eye on the resource implications of anything that we discuss and vote on, and that resource is in terms of not just money but time. As it stands, this motion urges – I hate the word ‘urges’; I want less urging! – diocesan and deanery synods to hold discussions with relevant agencies who can inform and educate us about drug misuse. I do not think that my deanery is an appropriate place for that discussion to happen. I am the youngest person on my deanery synod. Most of the people there do not have experience of drug use. Much as I would value an educative process, I am not sure that it is the place where that would be most beneficial. My amendment is aimed at a more sensible distribution of our resources within our dioceses, perhaps to synods where appropriate but perhaps to our parishes where people might have relationships with someone or with groups of people who misuse drugs.

It is really important that we hear from experts, not just those who are listed here but many other experts who work through their professional experience and can help us to understand the significant blight of drug misuse on our society. Let us pray for them in our parishes, and listen to them, but let us do that at the most appropriate time and in the most appropriate forum.

Revd Canon Paul Nener (Liverpool): I want to support the motion and support the amendment, in particular, because I work in an urban priority area parish and can see a lot of sense in targeting what one has to do and what sort of advice Synod might want to offer to people, and targeting where people know about these things and experience them day by day.

I have to admit that I have a personal interest in this debate because I have the pleasure of working with Helen Leathard on the council of the Guild of St Raphael. I am also thrilled to see, on the back of the briefing paper, a picture of my last parish during the course of a healing service at which Bishop Jack Nicholls, who is the warden of the Guild, was preaching the sermon. The Guild of St Raphael, along with other quaint organizations, has existed since 1915, trying to promote the ministry of healing in the Church of England, through prayerful waiting on God, through ecclesial understanding,

through sacramental ministries and in particular in full cooperation with the medical profession. In many ways, that is the plea that Helen brings to us: to cooperate with drug workers, pharmacologists, health care professionals and so on. That is central to the ethos of an organization like the Guild of St Raphael.

Dr Grieve is rightly wary about some of the things that we try to say and do in this Synod, but the motion is about working alongside other people and offering Christ-centred ministry, meeting broken lives, broken families, broken communities and broken hearts. The issues surrounding drug addiction, as everybody knows, cover an enormous spectrum of dis-ease in our modern society.

What never ceases to amaze me, coming to the General Synod, is the range of expertise that is available to the Church of England in this particular body. Helen's paper is an example of that: not just an ordinary briefing paper but almost a kind of lecture to the Synod, very simply put and explaining to us a lot of things that most of us would not know.

Financial implications have been mentioned. We always go on reinventing the wheel. Clearly they have done a lot of work in Blackburn, so all the Archbishops' Council have to do is go to Blackburn and say 'Share it with us'. Other people who have spoken have referred to work being done. Reinventing the wheel is not what the Council are being asked to do. What they are really being asked to do is to support the concept of this motion and all that spins off from it.

Sometimes we have to dare in our parishes and in our ministry to confront head-on particular causes of pain in our society. We do have to be daring. There is only one healer: Jesus Christ. We do, I hope, as Christians have Christ as our centre, and we want him to be a healer for all people. Dr Grieve reminds us how nerve-racking it can be to confront somebody sometimes who is addicted to drugs and is suffering a great deal of pain and hurt and anger. It is very painful and those who have inner-city vicarages know exactly that, as do their parishioners. When my doorbell goes at two o'clock in the morning I know what I am going to confront; nearly every time it will be a drug addict or somebody seriously drunk, and it is a fight, an emotional fight. We can meet that with anger, which we very often do. We can meet it with fear, which we very often do. We can slam the door, which we wisely sometimes do because people can be hurt. What we really have to do is learn to see in such people something of our Lord Jesus Christ. This kind of exercise can only help the Church to see something of what is at the centre of our Christian ministries: finding Jesus Christ in other people.

I want to support the amendment but I also want to support the motion. I would like to add just one thing, which I think Synod might be happy for me to say. We saw on Sunday morning some very angry people, some very hurt people, some very pained people, and the tendency was to be angry and hurt and pained. The Archbishop walked towards them and spoke to them, and that was a wonderful example to us, the whole

Church and the nation of the way in which we engage with pain and hurt and dis-ease in our society. So thank you very much, Your Grace.

Dr Elaine Storkey (London): Thank you very much for the report. I found it helpful, informative, clear and extremely useful: I will be carrying it around with me and using it in a document. There are very important classifications there. However, I have some problems – following those of Dr Grieve and Janet Atkinson – with, in my case, the wording of the motion itself. It is just a small point but it really needs to be mentioned.

The motion urges the Archbishops' Council, diocesan and deanery synods, maybe the parishes to hold 'informed and Christ-centred discussions with experienced drug workers, pharmacologists and health care professionals'. Dr Grieve has pointed out the enormity of what we are asking, but I am pointing something else out: the phrase 'Christ-centred discussions'. I am very concerned about it. Christ-centred ministry and Christ-centred discussions are very different things. I wonder, if we passed this motion and then went for these discussions, what we would be perceived as asking for. If we really approached secular drug workers, health care professionals and so on and asked for a Christ-centred discussion with them, I think that they would be mystified and quite possibly terrified. I know that if I approached fellow-sociologists for a Christ-centred discussion on anything at all, they would feel (a) I was barmy and had just lost my marbles; (b) I had gone religious on them; (c) I was trying to occupy the higher moral ground; and (d) I was requiring of them some level of spiritual engagement which was alien and which they had no language for. In other words, we would not get very far in our discussion. In one phrase I would have de-skilled them by my request and, in a very certain sense, would have established a difficulty in the relationship.

I think that a Christ-centred discussion about drugs and the Church's involvement would be about as odd to my fellow-sociologists as a drug-centred discussion about Christ and the addict's spirituality might be to us.

So what are we really asking for? This is really why I am just raising this point. I am fairly sure that the idea behind the motion is that we, as Christians within the Church of England, are wanting to be involved compassionately in an area of enormous and desperate need in our society right now, and that is wonderful. We are also intending to come to these discussions and to this involvement with our own hopes centred on Jesus Christ, that we are going to be motivated by the love of Christ, that we are going to share the heart of Christ for the broken, the vulnerable, the marginalized and those who are in desperate bondage to addictive patterns, and we are going to pray that we will know the mind of Christ as we enter these discussions and as we struggle and wrestle with the issues that they involve and explore how the redemptive power of Christ can be part of what we are offering in our collaborative working.

All of this is excellent, but we are not saying that in the motion. Yet this is part of our identity and this is what we can offer. Christ's love is at the heart of everything that we

must do as Christians and within the Church of England. However, we need also to make it absolutely clear to those with whom we are hoping to have these discussions that we will require nothing from them: no religious jargon, no spiritual hoops for them to jump through, only the possibility of listening and being heard, and the wonderful privilege of having something that we can humbly offer and the enormous thrill of actually working together.

Ms Dana Delap (Durham): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After the words “urge the Archbishops’ Council” *leave out* the words “and diocesan and deanery synods” and *insert* the words “, diocesan and deanery synods and parishes, as appropriate,”’.

Dr Helen Leathard: Thank you very much to Dana for her amendment, particularly for her very moving revelation about pain in all its varieties suffered in relation to drugs and withdrawal in prison. We are quite open about this amendment. We are trying to balance the tensions in various areas that we have heard between the need for not mandating too huge an amount of work and yet fully recognizing that we need this discussion to go on in parishes and not only in deanery and diocesan synods. So we will leave it to the will of Synod.

The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd John Sentamu): I am very grateful for this motion, and I am also very grateful for the amendment because it extends it to parishes. Much as I am concerned by the whole question of ‘Christ-centred’, I hope that when it goes out into the parishes we will be able to hold discussions with people of other faiths. This has been left out. The drug problem in Birmingham is not just about Christians; it is about Muslims and Sikhs, and they have a view about drugs which is like ours. So I hope that by extending it to parishes the implication will be, because that is where people live, that the discussion will involve people of other faiths. I am not wanting to water down our Christian commitment, but in the society in which we live, in Birmingham, if you left out people of other faiths when you were dealing with drugs, guns and gangs you would not actually have solved the difficulties. So I am very grateful that the addition of ‘parishes’ will imply that extra involvement, and it may be where you and I have to see that discussion and dialogue is always wanting to find Christ in the other. Maybe that is the clue to this question of centredness: the discovery of Christ in the other, even in people who may be facing pain.

Sorry to talk again about Afghanistan, but when I was visiting there, a leading imam in Herat said, ‘We are very grateful that the United Kingdom is going to be responsible for settling the whole question of cocaine in our country.’ I said, ‘Why England?’ He said, ‘Because Christian Aid is involved, and Christian Aid is from England.’ What was being registered there was a religious dimension which is respected because of Christian Aid, and a Muslim is making a comment about the need to engage. So I hope that when we deal with this and when it goes to parishes, it will be understood to mean discussion and engagement, Christ in the other, even people of other faiths.

Sister Anne Williams (Durham): I am particularly keen on this amendment as it brings it down to the parishes. I was moved when I heard Dr Leathard relate to that speech that I heard here many years ago by the young man from the young observers group who said that he had been loved and that the person had seen beyond his problem.

A few weeks ago I went up to look round the house that I will be moving into tomorrow in Sunderland, and as I was going round I took a photograph of the church hall so that I could show my colleagues that it has no roof. After I had taken the photograph of the church hall from my bedroom window, we discovered that there were two hooded things (so it seemed at first) in the garden. Then I looked again to see that it was actually two young lads glue-sniffing at the bottom of my garden. I could not get into the garden because the diocesan gardener has the key to it, but sadly the person who was with me knocked on the window and motioned for them to get out. I am just hoping that when I go back there this week they will be back in my garden, because I want to go and talk to them. I do not want just to send them away.

I spent six weeks at the end of last year working at a Church Army project in Cardiff. It is called Ty-Bronna, 'house on the hill'. In that house there are 13 rooms where homeless and vulnerable young people find some refuge and are protected 24 hours a day by two members of staff, and I mean 'protected'. Some of them are there because they are homeless, but others are there because they have had a drug problem and they are there to be helped back into society again and into independent living. I am not sure that I quite understood what I was going to and how vulnerable those young people are, but on my second night there I got a phone call. Although I was working in the hostel, there was another house further into town and I was asked if I could get down to Danescourt because 'something's kicked off'. I did not know what had kicked off; I did not know what I was going to; and I was honestly frightened. I got down there and was able, with the other worker there, to calm the situation and keep everybody safe, but I was frightened and I had been unprepared for that. My placement supervisor said to me, 'Anne, you've just experienced what these young people experience. They are not prepared. They are not prepared for life, in many cases.'

Two days later, I was sitting in the office and one young man – I will call him 'Chris' – whom I had never seen walking at more than a very slow saunter shot past the office, dashed upstairs and went to his room. Shortly after that, the doorbell rang. I went to the front door and it was another young man, asking for Chris. So I went up to Chris's room and said, 'There's someone here for you', and he said, 'Don't you think I know that?' Chris and I had not really had much of a conversation because, to be honest, with my going into a place like that, I am older than most of their grannies and I had only been there a few days so I do not think that they were quite sure how approachable I was. I said, 'No, I didn't know. Don't you want to see him?' He said, 'No, I don't', and he was shaking. If I had met Chris on a dark night in a lonely place, I would have run for my life because he did not look the kind of young man to be frightened. So I went back down and told this visitor that he could not see Chris. Then I went back and said, 'OK, he's gone away now. What's the problem?' He said, 'I used to be on drugs and he used to sell

them to me, and he will not leave me alone. He comes here time after time, and I don't want to do drugs any more. I want to live on my own. I want to be independent and be clean of it all.'

I just put those things together and ask you to think about it. Not all drug users want to be using, but sometimes they are hounded into it and actually terrified into continuing to do it. So let us look at it in the parishes. In my training in college, as well as doing theology we did a lot of practical stuff to prepare us for our ministry. We had a day – a day is not long enough, but we did have one day – on drug misuse. We had South Yorkshire police coming in to talk to us and various other agencies coming in to talk to us, to help us to understand, and in some ways that begins to prepare us. I do urge you – sorry, Dana, you do not like the word – to encourage your parishes to look at it and to get the professionals in to talk about it. Please do not be frightened by these people, because Jesus is in them, and you will find him there.

Revd David Osborne (Bath and Wells): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and carried.

Revd Peter Spiers (Liverpool): My churchwarden, a young chap, who would not mind my saying this to you this morning, used to use cannabis; and then one day he picked up this Bible, started reading and realized straightaway that if he wanted to follow Christ he could not go on using cannabis. So he gave it up and gave his life to the Lord. He now wants to go to the other young people in Everton, many of whom did drugs with him, and simply tell them what happened to him. He has a real passion and an urgency for people to come off drugs. So I welcome this resolution, and particularly the word 'urge', because this is something that affects us all. I could add to the many stories that we have heard this morning about people who misuse drugs but if I were to do that it could easily feel quite overwhelming, and there are times when, living in inner-city Liverpool, I too feel overwhelmed by the scale of the drug misuse which I and others know about.

It is not just people who do drugs, of course; it is also people who sell drugs and peddle misery. Just very recently we have had four people murdered because of their involvement in drug dealing, all young people. When their funerals take place, the church is full of young people. Perhaps it is the only time that it is. We are all wondering who is going to be next.

So it is very easy to be overwhelmed, but I just wanted to share with you that story of my churchwarden and say that there are good stories out there. This is something that affects us all, in the sense that we live in an addictive society, where people get hooked

on to all kinds of things. If we are honest, we will admit that we all get hooked on something or other. We may not call it drugs but it is something else. I want this resolution to be passed with a huge majority, and I want this issue to remain on our agenda for a long time. We have heard from the Bishop of Blackburn about a report similar to *A Time to Heal*. Whether we can afford to do that at this moment in time I do not know, but this is something of huge importance that affects every level of society, wherever we live. So, please, support this motion.

Dr David Tweedie (Coventry): I support this motion but I would like more stress laid on the abuse of licit drugs rather than illicit drugs. The Bishop of Blackburn commented on the problem of alcohol. It is a serious problem. We heard yesterday how lives are ruined by it. It is a licit drug and yet we virtually ignore it. My son is an alcoholic. Thank God, he is now in remission, is training to be a nurse and has got his life together, but I am well aware of the pain that that can cause.

I used to be an anaesthetist and part of my task was running an ICU. I remember when I was a very young houseman in 1962, when we were in outpatients with my boss we all smoked. The consultant smoked, I smoked, the registrar smoked, anyone visiting smoked and the patient came into the room and tried to fight his way through the smoke. Professor Doll then produced his paper on smoking-related disease, particularly relating to cancer of the lung, and doctors stopped smoking. They are starting again now; that generation has gone and the new generation is starting to smoke.

When I ran an ICU much of my work was with smoking-related disease. The document GS Misc 748 gives some indication of the diseases caused by smoking, but it very much downplays them. For example, virtually every cancer has smoking at some stage implicated in its cause. It is implicated in most chest diseases and is probably a causative effect of most chest diseases. It is implicated in heart disease, probably the biggest single cause of it. It is implicated in peripheral vascular disease. I used to anaesthetize patients who were having vascular surgery to preserve the circulation in their lower limbs. I can remember one man, when our hospital became non-smoking, who had lost both his legs because of his smoking, who could hardly lie down because of his smoking, who had to be wheeled outside so that he could continue to smoke.

Alcohol wrecks relationships. Smoking is a ferociously addictive process. It is aggressively promoted by the tobacco companies, and sometimes illegally and immorally promoted. We need to remember too that smokers, although they are now demonized, are demonized wrongly. They are suffering from an addiction, just as the heroin addict is suffering from an addiction. Remember also, as we heard earlier about drug addicts, not all drug addicts want to be drug addicts, and not all smokers want to be smokers. I would like us to remember in this that there is a very large proportion of this country who are addicted to a drug, something like 27 per cent.

Revd Prebendary Kay Garlick (Hereford): Hereford diocesan synod, ahead of the game as always, has already had two major debates on the issue of drugs in the past few years.

I went to both of them and I have to say that the second was a lot more productive. I want to tell you why.

Our diocesan synod, like most, is predominantly made up of men and women of some maturity, in years at least. At the first of these meetings, we all had a presentation and then we broke into small groups to discuss the issues presented. There was a tendency for the whole thing to degenerate into a chance for everyone to focus on young people and show mostly concern, often disapproval, and almost always real ignorance about what was really going on. The second session that we had was very different. I was at that time chaplain of the local sixth form college, and I was asked to bring along some students to contribute to the debate. A few students courageously agreed to come and we started the whole session with my asking them questions about their experience of the prevalence of drugs locally, how easy it was to get hold of different kinds of drug, how expensive they were and how they were used recreationally in their friendship groups.

Certain things came out loud and clear in what they said. First, they made enormous distinctions between different kinds of drug. For instance, they were very relaxed about cannabis but well aware of the dangers of heroin. They refused to talk about 'drugs' as if they were all the same. Second, it was clear that they felt very strongly that drugs education was very important: not the sort that tries to scare you but the sort that really informs. They talked about a video that they had been shown in their secondary school, and it was about an extreme case of a girl who had died after taking ecstasy; and they know that that does not always happen, because their friends take it. (Maybe they do.) They knew that it wasn't true and therefore everything else that was told to them they thought might not be true either. It was also clear that they were very tired of the hypocrisy of a generation – my generation – who condemned the use of cannabis and yet were themselves so often regular users of more dangerous and addictive substances: tobacco and alcohol.

The most important thing about all this was that the debate and discussion that followed was so much more productive and informed, so my plea is that if we are going to encourage informed discussions at whatever level, whether at diocese, deanery or parish, we make sure that there are young people present to inform and to enliven the debate.

The Archdeacon of Coventry (Ven. Mark Bryant): I want to express just a very slight concern about the way I think this debate is going. It has focused very much on the pastoral aspects of this, and yet with the accompanying papers we had a typically excellent and provocative paper from Fr Ken Leech. Of course, in his inimitable way, Fr Ken Leech reminds us that part of what the Church is about is prophecy and part of what the Church is about must be the political process. The reality, surely, is that one of the reasons, though not the only one, that we get drug misuse in our society is because of the sheer sense of frustration and social exclusion felt by many people in the poorest communities in our country. We need to be aware that, if we are going to take this issue

seriously, it is not simply a pastoral issue; it is about how we engage with poverty and social exclusion in our nation.

At one level I want to make that point because it helps us to see that this is an issue in which we can all engage, because there is a lot of history over the past decade or so; there are many places where we as a Church are good at working in areas of social exclusion and deprivation, and we see this from the success of the Church Urban Fund. However, I think that we are missing a major point of this debate if we look at it only from a pastoral perspective and do not see that what the debate is also calling us to do is to go with a deep and often political commitment to removing some of the issues of poverty and social exclusion in our society.

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

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

Dr Helen Leathard, in reply: I would like to start this summing up by just thanking everyone who has spoken for enlarging on and illuminating in very informed and very moving ways the whole of this topic, which a mere ten minutes of my own introduction certainly did not allow me to cover. In any case, one single person could not cover it, and it has just been wonderful, moving, scary and so many other things to have so much information from so many people with really important knowledge.

We started with Margot Townsend, a trustee for a substance misuse after-care unit; she stressed how important it was that after-care and rehabilitation should go on as long as it was needed, and the need for the Church to love unconditionally, well beyond the church walls, in order to deliver its mission. Dr Sheila Grieve, I hope, may now have been persuaded to support the motion. We have passed the amendment that expresses our wish for this to be discussed in parishes as well as in the more limited bodies that we suggested in the motion. I think that one of the things I mentioned briefly in my introductory speech was that maybe one of the ways the Church could be really helpful would be to help provide funding for the various organizations such as you worked with. One of the things that we could do is help provide funding for projects, not only providing cash but working politically, as suggested by our last speaker, to try to ensure that more cash and more resources are provided for long-lasting rehab work, which is incredibly difficult and needs to be done by very well educated and experienced professionals. There is no way I want this motion to be interpreted as an invitation for naive, incompetent dabbling in an incredibly complex process.

Thank you to Janet Atkinson for your moving example that illustrated some of the real dilemmas encountered in this messy work in relation to substances and their misuse and how best to treat people with problems. Peter French manages a youth project in Birmingham and mentioned two things that the Synod can do: listen to young people

(we have heard that repeated several times) and provide love and forgiveness (very important from the pastoral point of view). I have been asked by our officers to let Synod know that Standing Orders have already been altered and from February three representatives of the newly formed Youth Council will be nominated as speaking and, I presume, voting members of Synod; so the Youth Council will have a voice. (*Applause*) It is wonderful news.

Bishop Nicholas, thank you very much indeed for your support, catching up on a motion that was well on its way a long time before you were with us. The link with the ministry of healing is so important. It is important also to be aware of the nutritional and recreational poverty of children in families where much of the income is spent on drugs – alcohol or illegal drugs – and the need for rehabilitation funding. Thank you also for endorsing our suggestion that we need information-sharing and urging – that word again – that the Church could usefully provide a resource of information and good practice, such as is exemplified by *A Time to Heal*.

This theme was followed up immediately, as it turned out, by Canon Paul Nener from Liverpool, again making the healing link and some very moving and disturbing comments about how to deal with pain when it arrives on your doorstep in the middle of the night and you are on your own and fairly defenceless against someone who is agitated and somewhat aggressive, to put it mildly. Thank you very much for that, Paul.

Elaine Storkey, thank you. I wish you had put in an amendment to get the wording right. Christ-centred discussions: it started in my own PCC, where this phrase was introduced, and it really did mean what you wanted it to mean, which is that we should be discussing it from our Christ-centredness, but I am well aware from the people we have engaged with in our diocesan substance misuse group that many of the people who are working diligently as youth and community workers and so on maybe do not come from the same faith as we do and do not have that same basis. We certainly do not want to offend them or put them off or make them think that we are on a different planet by thrusting Christ in their face in every sentence of the discussion. It is something that has to be deeply embedded in us and be the source of our motivation to do things.

That gives me the chance to pick up on the Bishop of Birmingham's comment about other faiths. Again in Blackburn we are working with the other faiths and we know the difficulty that some of the imams have in coming to terms with their young chaps, mostly chaps, dealing drugs and being involved; and an interfaith approach to this work is really very important. So thank you for reminding us of that.

Anne Williams gave us her existential, experiential account of people being pursued by dealers. That is so true. I know from our own area that that is true: so many teenagers being hounded to maintain their habits and to incur debts that they cannot repay. Thank you.

Pete Spiers: drug misuse is incompatible with life in Christ when we recognize that our

body is a temple of Christ, and we must not misuse it. Thank you for the story of the good outcome for your churchwarden, and also for suggesting that maybe the Mission and Public Affairs Division might somehow find the resources to be involved in the production of a resource, although maybe we need to await the outcome of the Archbishops' Council's deliberation to discern whether that is the best way to produce a resource for the whole Church.

Dr David Tweedie, thank you. Sometimes I am misrepresented when I emphasize the dangers of alcohol and smoking and accused of a campaign for legalizing all other drugs which can be just as harmful as the ones that are currently legal. That is not the way I want to speak. Yes, we have two incredibly dangerous groups of substances, widely used in society and causing massive expense to both the National Health Service and the social services. Alcohol wrecks relationships; smoking wrecks lives; and to some extent both do the same.

Thank you to Kay Garlick. It is really important to listen to young people. I do not want to embarrass them in public but my daughter has put exactly the position to me that you have expressed so cogently, that they do know the difference between heroin and cannabis. Young adults are very well informed because it is part of the life that they are living, being vulnerable and trying to live a straight life without the problems.

Finally, Mark Bryant mentioned political action. Again, it was only one sentence in my introductory speech: how important it is for the Church to be politically active, to encourage social inclusion, to get the right sort of action from Government by being politically active to promote social inclusion. He spoke of two main targets, the first being to work towards the eradication of poverty and the second to ensure really good, well resourced rehabilitation facilities.

Thank you all very much indeed.

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

‘That this Synod, concerned about the extent of drug misuse at all levels of society, urge the Archbishops' Council, diocesan and deanery synods and parishes, as appropriate, to hold informed and Christ-centred discussions with experienced drug workers, pharmacologists and health care professionals about the ways in which the Church can be involved with the Christian and secular agencies already working in this field.’

The Chairman: Could I just say for the record that the Standing Order changes that we agreed in February will indeed mean that three representatives of the Youth Council will be able to attend and speak at meetings of the General Synod but, like our ecumenical observers, they will not have the right to vote.

Farewell

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): There is one particular farewell which it seems appropriate to make in as full a form as possible.

I want to begin by drawing your attention to a well-known episode in the Sherlock Holmes stories. ‘I want to draw your attention’, said Sherlock Holmes, ‘to the curious incident of the dog in the night-time.’ ‘The dog did nothing in the night-time.’ ‘That was the curious incident.’ I want to draw your attention, wearing my Sherlock Holmes hat and cloak, to the curious episode in the history of Synod between 1985 and 1990, the curious episode being the involvement of Colin Buchanan in the Synod of 1985–90. ‘But Colin Buchanan was not a member of that Synod.’ ‘That was the curious episode!’ What purgatorial wildernesses of boredom members of Synod in 1985–90 had to endure in the absence of Colin we can only speculate.

Colin’s presence in Synod as a founder member of this great institution has meant that successive bishops, archbishops and other members have all been able to formulate their reactions to his involvement and comment upon it. I believe that it was one of my own distinguished predecessors who described him once as a bull who brings his own china shop with him. This is a sad and inadequate tribute to Colin’s behaviour, though I find, in the light of discussions between Colin and the chairman of the Liturgical Commission in recent years, something irresistible in the picture of an extremely intelligent, resourceful and persistent bull facing an unusually elegant matador!

It was, I think, liturgy, Colin, that first brought us together – if ‘together’ is quite the right word – since it was some time in the early 1980s that I was inducted into that formative experience, shared by so many members of the Church of England, of disagreeing with Colin Buchanan, when we collaborated on a Grove booklet. I remember that experience with the most enormous enjoyment because, as I think most members of the Church of England would agree, disagreeing with Colin Buchanan is a far more pleasurable and educative experience than agreeing with most other people.

The record of Grove books, however, is just one small part of the immense contribution that Colin has made to the intellectual and spiritual life of the Church of England over all these years. Having had also the great pleasure of working with Colin on the Doctrine Commission for several years, I know that it is not only liturgy. We worked together on *We Believe in the Holy Spirit* and once again I found that a stretching, challenging and enormously enjoyable period of my own ministry and learning. Colin’s influence on the Church has extended very directly over the life of several dioceses: Birmingham and Rochester and Southwark; but in many less easily traceable ways through the ministry of Grove Booklets, through the ministry of *News of Liturgy* which we are all going to miss very much indeed, and of course through that unique form of influence which the principal of a theological college can exert on generations of ministers.

Colin's wider concerns are – I think it is fair to say – not unfamiliar to Synod: concerns about Establishment and about electoral reform; but I would want to say that all these have always been manifestly rooted in Colin's great passion, which is that people should come to know Jesus Christ. In everything that he has written and said, in his personal witness and involvement in Synod and much more widely, it has been absolutely impossible to mistake his love for Christ and his passion for souls. Those pastoral and evangelistic passions have been at the forefront of everything that he has done.

You may just remember, Colin – I believe that it is sometimes appropriate to pay debts in public – a ministry that you offered to me at a time of some anxiety. You may remember a car journey to Croydon and the station at a time when I had some anxieties about family health. Thank you. That is the tip of an immense iceberg of pastoral concern and involvement and generosity which many others here will be able to pay tribute to.

Many years ago I remember the late Geoffrey Lampe speaking at a retirement dinner for my teacher and mentor, Donald MacKinnon. He described what it was like, sitting next to Donald MacKinnon during an examination. (They were undergraduates together.) He described how, after a great many strange noises emerging from the desk next to him, and a great deal of groaning and crumpling of paper, Donald rose and, said Geoffrey, 'left his desk not empty – because emptiness was not a word with which you would ever associate a desk with which Donald MacKinnon had been concerned – but untenanted'. Similarly I find that the words 'Colin' and 'retirement' are not words that would readily be associated in the popular mind, but I know that Synod would wish to join me in saying to Colin the warmest of thank yous for these many years of sacrificial and inspiring involvement in the life of this Synod and every blessing and good wish to you and to Diana for the future, when you will be living in this area and, I suspect, not entirely confined to it and not entirely confined to mowing the lawn. Colin, thank you and God bless you. (*The Bishop of Woolwich was accorded a standing ovation.*)

The Archbishop of York prorogued the Group of Sessions at 1.00 p.m.