

Friday 8 July 2011

Questions

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

House of Bishops

1. *Revd Stephen France (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What consultation will be undertaken with clergy and laity in relation to the Government's proposals to reform the House of Lords?

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Timothy Stevens): As Fr David Houlding pointed out in the debate on the agenda, there was a Synod debate in July 2001 in which the Synod called on the Government to ensure that in any reform of the House of Lords 'provision fully adequate to enable bishops to continue to contribute effectively to a reformed House be retained' and that members from other Churches and faiths be added. In making representations to the Government and in engaging with the Government's proposals, the Lords Spiritual have been and will continue to be guided by that motion and they will want to keep Synod abreast of developments as they unfold.

Revd Stephen France: I am grateful to the Bishop of Leicester for his answer but it does rather look back and rely upon something debated in this Synod 10 years ago, rather than seeking to consult at this stage, which surely must be possible by February 2012 when final submissions must be laid before the joint parliamentary committee. In the House of Lords on 21 June ---

The Chairman: Could you please come to the question?

Revd Stephen France: The Bishop quoted from the Archbishop of York that we see ourselves not as representatives but as connectors with people and parishes of England. When may that commence?

The Bishop of Leicester: Members of the Lords Spiritual connect with the people in the parishes all the time and speak out of that connection in the representations we make in the House of Lords constantly, as I think the record demonstrates. There could be opportunity for Synod to engage with this if a Private Member's Motion was to be forthcoming or if the House of Bishops or the Archbishops' Council were to sponsor a debate in order to inform our representations in the joint committee.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd John Hind): As it seems to me that there is some misunderstanding about the role of the bishops in the House of Lords in relation to this Synod, I wonder if the Bishop of Leicester could confirm my understanding that the Lords Spiritual do not represent the General Synod nor the Church of England nor

faith in general but are there as independent members, representing the whole of the communities that they serve.

The Bishop of Leicester: Yes, I can confirm that the Lords Spiritual are in the Lords as independent, individual Lords of Parliament and have been there on that basis for 600 years. That is not to say that they disregard the views, opinions and outlooks of the communities with which they have to do.

2. *Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Can the Synod be updated on the state of discussions over the representation of the Lords Spiritual in a reformed House of Lords and what the timetable for any process of reform will be?

The Bishop of Leicester: The draft Bill published by Government in May proposed that in a reformed Upper House with an appointed element the Lords Spiritual should remain, retaining existing powers on speaking and voting. The number of Lords Spiritual would be reduced to 12, proportional to the overall reduction in the size of the House. I have been appointed to sit on the parliamentary joint committee that has been created to consider the draft Bill and report to Parliament by the end of February 2012, the first meeting of which is scheduled for Monday of next week. Government have signalled that a final Bill will be introduced to Parliament in the next session.

Canon Peter Bruinvels: In thanking the Bishop, I have to say that it was disappointing to have cuts flagged of, now, more than 17. There was a suggestion of 17 and we are now down to 12. With more than 20 Cabinet ministers, how can just 12 Lords Spiritual be lead spokesmen for so many vital portfolios and also act as a moral compass?

The Bishop of Leicester: The number 12 represents the same proportion of the total size of the house if it is reduced to 300, as proposed in the draft Bill. I think that it will be difficult for us to argue for increasing the proportion of Lords Spiritual in a reduced House. As to how the 12 Lords Spiritual, if that is the final number, play their part in a reformed House, we will need to give serious attention to that but it is very clear that those who are Lords Spiritual or parliamentary bishops will need to give more of their time to their work than is possible under the present arrangements.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Has consideration been given in the representations being made to the concept of the 12 places being occupied on a varied basis, so that, although at no time would there be more than 12 bishops sitting in the House, the actual bishops could change according to the subject matter that they were dealing with, rather on the model of the Council of Ministers in Europe? The same body can have different people peopling it according to portfolio.

The Bishop of Leicester: I do not think that thought has been given to that suggestion and I think that it would create very substantial practical and constitutional difficulties, because it would be unclear who the bishops were who were the members of the House of Lords at any one time.

3. *Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Will the General Synod be given the opportunity to debate the Church of England's response to the Government's consultation on the reform of the House of Lords, as it did nearly 10 years ago on the occasion of a previous proposed reform of the upper house?

The Bishop of Leicester: Private members can seek a debate in the usual way. It would also be a matter for the House of Bishops or the Archbishops' Council to decide whether to sponsor a debate. However, the Church of England has for many years had a clear and consistent policy on Lords reform, which was endorsed by the Synod in its last debate on this subject in July 2001.

Revd Canon Robert Cotton: If we are to have a debate on this in the following few months, would you work with the Business Committee to ensure that somehow, when there is such a debate, the voices of those who are on the receiving end of the Church's contribution in Parliament are heard, so that appreciation of bishops' ministry there is not articulated only by the bishops themselves?

The Bishop of Leicester: I have already made the point that the bishops speak out of their engagement with, experience and understanding of, the communities in which they minister in the regions from which they come but do not act formally as representatives. However, I am sure that if representations are made to the business managers of this Synod for a debate that enables the issues to be discussed by Synod, those proposals will be taken seriously.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): Will you make those representations to the business managers for such a debate?

The Bishop of Leicester: I am sure people have heard what has been said but perhaps I could explain to Synod that, as a member of the select committee, I do not think that it will be for me to initiate business in this Synod; I think it may be for others to do that.

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

Now that we know from the Second Estates Commissioner that the reform of the House of Lords is to proceed with some haste and that there are many in both Houses who have little wish to see continued representation for the Church of England, what joint work by bishops, clergy and laity is envisaged to develop proposals for that representation to lay before the joint parliamentary committee by February 2012?

The Bishop of Leicester: Bishops and senior Church House staff have already had a number of meetings with ministers and those leading on the issue of Lords reform in the opposition party, and representations were made in writing to the Deputy Prime Minister before the draft Bill was produced. A statement in my name was released in response to the draft Bill on the day of its publication. Since I shall be a member of

the joint parliamentary committee, it will be for others, including the Archbishops, to decide what evidence to submit when the committee takes its evidence.

Mrs April Alexander: Would the House of Bishops undertake to publish all the documentation on work completed so far, so that members of the other two Houses can decide whether to make their own arrangements for submitting proposals to the parliamentary committee, including the possibility that others, other than bishops, may take some of the seats?

The Bishop of Leicester: As far as the material used by the House of Bishops or the Lords Spiritual is concerned, most of it is on the public record. You can see what bishops have said on this matter in *Hansard* over many years and you can also see the proceedings of the select committee, which will be published. I am sure that thought could be given to how some of that material could be made available to Synod members.

As to the question of whether representatives of the Church of England other than bishops might find their way on to the bench of the Lords Spiritual, frankly I think that it is extremely unlikely that that would be possible, simply because of the present constitutional position of the Established Church, in which the bishops are there because of their historic position and because they are those who have paid homage to the Queen and taken an oath of allegiance to her.

Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans): Will it be possible, practicable and desirable for the proposals to be submitted on behalf of the Church of England to the joint parliamentary committee to be debated first in this Synod next February?

The Bishop of Leicester: That, I am afraid, must be a matter for the business managers but, as I have already indicated, there are a number of vehicles by which that could be done and I leave it to members of the Synod to see whether they are going to press your point through the mechanisms open to them.

5. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* In view of the declared scepticism of many parliamentarians about any element of appointment to a reformed Upper House, what work is already under way to meet the suggestions of Bishop John Gladwin and others that future Church of England membership of an Upper House should be more 'democratic' and that changes should be 'radical', to demonstrate to MPs, peers, church members and the public at large that we acknowledge our Establishment privileges and seek to use them to further the kingdom in a way which they can accept as legitimate and consistent with the thrust of the current White Paper proposals?

The Bishop of Leicester: The Government's proposals envisage three non-elected components of the reformed chamber: 60 members appointed by an Appointments Commission, up to 12 Lords Spiritual and an unspecified number of Government Ministers appointed by the Prime Minister. The rest of the proposed House would be entirely elected. How bishops would be identified for service in the Lords is something that remains to be determined.

Mrs April Alexander: Perhaps I may observe that much has changed since the debate in 1991, not least the Government's declared opinion in the White Paper that the

members of the Church of England who sit in the House of Lords are not independent but are representative. That is their view. In the light of that, I wonder what the Church's proposals are so far that specifically address the misgivings of our detractors in both Houses, who may well want to vote for a 100 per cent elected solution, leaving us with no representation at all.

The Bishop of Leicester: In the debates on the draft proposals two weeks ago, three of the Lords Spiritual spoke and all of us indicated that we would be open to aspects of the reform which are laid before us and that we would apply tests to them: do they serve the good governance of the people of England? Do they protect the independence of the House of Lords from overweening party control? do they adequately define the relationship between the reformed House of Lords and the House of Commons? Do they properly reflect, as far as we are able to discern it, the will of the electorate? Those will be the tests that we continue to apply to this debate, as and when we see the draft proposals on the floor of the House in due course.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): Mention was then made of the 12, in answer to Mrs Alexander's question. Can we be clear as to whether the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Durham and Winchester will still automatically be members under the reformed House of Lords – all playing a very important role?

The Bishop of Leicester: That is certainly one option open to the Church of England to consider. Consideration has not yet been given to that question. It will properly be a question for consideration in due course. It is, of course, contingent upon the present draft proposals finding their way through the select committee in their present form and on to the floor of the House. That will give us time to consider precisely the question that you have asked. I think it is very likely to be the case that the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London at least, who have a particular constitutional position in relation to the House of Lords, will be part of the 12.

6. *The Archdeacon of Norwich (Ven. Jan McFarlane)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What consideration has the House given to the eligibility for the episcopate of those in civil partnerships?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James): As Synod members will now have seen from GS Misc 997, which was issued last Friday, the House of Bishops has decided to review the pastoral statement on civil partnerships, which it issued in July 2005 before the Civil Partnership Act came into force. That review will, among other things, address an issue on which the 2005 statement was silent, namely whether those in civil partnerships should be eligible to become bishops. To avoid breaking new ground while the review is in progress, the House has concluded that clergy in civil partnerships should not at present be nominated for episcopal appointment. The review will be concluded next year.

Mr John Ward (London): In welcoming GS Misc 997 most sincerely and the review of the civil partnership statement, will the House engage with the whole people of

God when reviewing this statement, including lesbian and gay people in civil partnerships and, if so, how?

The Bishop of Norwich: It will be a matter for the review group, when it is established, how it goes about its work. I would not want to say more than that. However, your point is well made.

7. *Mrs Sue Johns (Norwich)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Has the House considered the issues addressed in GS Misc 992?

8. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Given the legal opinion offered in GS Misc 992 ('Equality Act'), can the House indicate the following:

- a. which individuals or bodies are responsible for weighing and, if appropriate, adopting this opinion as policy;
- b. the process by which this opinion shall be weighed and, if appropriate, adopted;
- c. how these deliberations will be communicated to this Synod and candidates for episcopal appointment?

9. *Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

As we have in effect debated paragraphs 14-18 of GS Misc 992 regarding divorce and remarriage at the February Synod, what process does the House envisage to ensure that a debate on the complete paper takes place, recognizing that the circulation of a paper to Synod by the Legal Office does not create policy?

The Bishop of Norwich: With permission, I shall answer Question 7 and the related questions from Simon Butler and Rosemarie Mallett together.

The Legal Office note was produced in December and made available to members of successive Crown Nominations Commissions and to all diocesan bishops in connection with episcopal appointments. It explains the implications of the legal framework created by the Equality Act, so that those making appointments understand the parameters within which they now have to operate. It offers no policy advice. The relevant policy documents are the well-known texts referred to in the document, to which must now be added last Friday's modest supplement from the House.

The policy issue on civil partnerships is now for the review of the 2005 statement and the Church's stance on same-sex relations more generally will be addressed in the consultation document that the House will produce in the light of the listening process in 2013.

Revd Canon Simon Butler: While I welcome the House of Bishops' clarity that GM Misc 992 is not the policy of the Church, nevertheless it is the legal opinion of the Church's lawyers. Can the Bishop confirm what freedom the House of Bishops has to depart from this legal opinion?

The Bishop of Norwich: What the legal opinion seeks to do is to explain for those involved in episcopal appointments what the law permits. It simply refers back to formal statements of the Church of England’s policy, including statements by the House of Bishops on divorce and civil partnerships – and, of course, that has been amended in the light of what the Synod decided last February – but it actually offers no policy advice. The House of Bishops’ statement is about policy reviews, not prejudging their outcome.

Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett: Thank you for the clarity of your answer. As part of the review process that will now be ongoing, can we be assured that the House of Bishops will consult with members of the House of Clergy and the House of Laity before bringing the final consultation document to Synod in 2013, so that we have a truly dialogic as well as listening process between now and 2013?

The Bishop of Norwich: What we hope for in the 2013 review, which will cover matters related to human sexuality, is to try to create an account of what has gone on in the listening process, which has included clergy and laity over the course of the past decade or more. There is a sense in which quite a lot of that work has already included clergy and laity. How that review group will go about its work, I cannot say; but it would be very surprising if it did not include consultation with clergy and laypeople to produce the sort of document that we hope would be representative of the mind of the Church as a whole.

Ministry Division

*10. *Revd Canon John Witcombe (Gloucester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

How many people have attended Bishops’ Advisory Panels, and how many have been recommended for training, since September 2010? What are the comparable figures for the corresponding period in the previous five years? In the light of those figures, has the Ministry Division considered whether the new selection criteria give less scope for identifying potential in candidates and mean that more evidence is now required to support a recommendation for training?

The Bishop of Norwich:

Bishops’ Advisory Panels		
Year	Candidates Attending	Candidates Recommended
2011 so far	490	387
2010	648	515
2009	612	491
2008	612	490
2007	724	595
2006	715	594

The figures recording the number of candidates attending Bishops’ Advisory Panels and the numbers of those recommended for training over the last five years are above. The way the figures are recorded for the Ministry Division statistics are on an annual

(January to December) basis and not on the basis of September to the cut-off point in any given year.

The annual recommendation rate on the figures above show that in 2010 the recommendation rate was 79.5 per cent, in 2009 it was 80.2 per cent, in 2008 it was 80.1 per cent. So far in 2011 the recommendation rate has been 79 per cent. Thus, over the last few years the recommendation rate has proved remarkably consistent. In the light of those figures, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the effect of the revised criteria for selection on the recommendation rate.

The revised criteria are more clear and precise about what it is that the Church is looking for in candidates and, as a result, are able to provide more effectively evidence of a candidate's potential. Assessing potential is particularly important when discerning the vocations of younger people. In 2010, 21 per cent of recommended candidates were under 30 at the point of selection – the highest number of young vocations for a decade.

This shows that assessing potential remains at the heart of the selection process.

*11. *Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

In answer to a Question in November 2010 the Chairman of the Ministry Division said that the requirement of full compliance with the Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod is 'scrutinized and commented on in every inspection carried out by the bishops' inspectors'. How many inspection reports have been published since November 2008, and in how many of them did the inspectors comment positively and in how many did they comment negatively on the institution's compliance with the Act of Synod?

The Bishop of Norwich: Reports have been published on nine ordination training institutions, of which four were commented on positively, three called for more attention to this issue and two did not explicitly comment on the issue.

12. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Does the Ministry Division offer guidance to selectors at selection conferences on whether they may ask if a candidate is opposed to the ordination of women?

The Bishop of Norwich: Yes, the Ministry Division does provide guidance to Bishops' Advisers – they are now 'advisers' rather than 'selectors' – at Bishops' Advisory Panels (selection conferences) about the issue of the ordination of women. Advisers are told very clearly that the issue must not be raised by them and that candidates must not be asked any questions about their views on the issue. This guidance is provided by the selection secretary in the briefing prior to the beginning of the Bishops' Advisory Panel.

13. *Revd Jonathan Frai (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Are ordinands routinely asked whether they are prepared to serve under a woman bishop?

The Bishop of Norwich: No. Candidates at Bishops' Advisory Panels come from a range of different traditions within the Church of England and have differing views on the issue of women bishops. Candidates are not asked about their views on this issue. Indeed Bishops' Advisers are told very clearly that this issue must not be raised by them. This guidance is provided by the selection secretary in the briefing prior to the beginning of the Bishops' Advisory Panel.

14. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

If ordination candidates are asked their view on same-sex relationships, what significance is attached to their answers?

The Bishop of Norwich: I think that you may know the sort of phrases I am going to use. Ordination candidates are not asked about their views on same-sex relationships. The Ministry Division provides guidance to Bishops' Advisers at Bishops' Advisory Panels about the issue of same-sex relationships. The Advisers are told very clearly that the issue must not be raised by them and that candidates must not be asked any questions about their views on this issue. This guidance, as you now know, is provided by the selection secretary in the briefing prior to the beginning of the Bishops' Advisory Panel. There are other things that are included in that briefing, I ought to say.

The Chairman: We will set it to music, perhaps!

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): Hearing the Bishop tell us all the questions that they are not asked, what actually are they asked? (*Laughter*)

The Bishop of Norwich: They are asked about their vocation and their understanding of the Christian faith – rather different things from the matters to which I have just been referring.

Revd Professor Richard Burridge (London University): Given that that advice is given – and thank you for repeating it several times to make it absolutely clear – if a Bishop's Adviser does not follow that advice and does ask questions on these topics, what are the implications for the candidates afterwards if they feel that the answers they have given have prejudiced their selection – or non-selection?

The Bishop of Norwich: It is a matter that will be discussed with their director of ordinands, if they felt that it was influencing the recommendation that was made. In some cases, of course, it might lead to somebody being recommended for training rather than not recommended for training and they probably will not appeal against that. However, it would also be the case that, if an Adviser repeatedly declines to follow the policy of the Ministry Division, they will not remain an Adviser for very long.

15. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)*: Among the staff of theological colleges and ordination courses where Church of England ordinands are trained, how many are Black, Asian or other Minority Ethnic persons, and how many of these are full-time staff?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Ministry Division does not keep these data but will request it from the training institutions and make it available to the Synod at its next session.

Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss: For the sake of clarity, may we assume that 'next session' means February 2012?

The Bishop of Norwich: We hope so, providing the institutions reply in that time.

16. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Given that, whilst people with disabilities can have a calling to stipendiary ordained ministry, the document *Medical Screening of Candidates for Ordination* appears to limit the scope for them to exercise such ministry, what action is the Ministry Division taking (not least in the light of legal requirements) to ensure that people with disabilities can be part of all areas of ministry and worship within our Church?

The Bishop of Norwich: Far from limiting the scope for candidates with a disability to exercise stipendiary ordained ministry, the procedures outlined in *Medical Screening of Candidates for Ordained Ministry*, which is the title of the guidance, explicitly state that, where a candidate is unable to carry out one or more functions associated with ordained ministry, it should be explored whether reasonable adjustments can be made to enable the candidate to exercise effective ministry.

The Ministry Division encourages the full participation of people with disabilities in the life of the Church. All dioceses are encouraged to appoint a chaplain among deaf people and a disability adviser, to encourage the inclusion of people with disabilities in the Church. Guidelines are issued to the dioceses on the recruitment and support of clergy and other employees with disabilities, encouraging such recruitment.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): What happens if the disability affects pensionability? The Pensions Board is concerned about life expectancy and things of that nature and very often turn down people for stipendiary ministry on medical grounds. How do you distinguish between the two?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am not aware that the Pensions Board does regularly turn people down.

The Bishop of Dudley (Rt Revd David Walker): I speak as vice-chairman of the Pensions Board. Is the Bishop aware that normally the Pensions Board would not now, following the changes that were made regarding ill-health early retirement by this Synod not that long ago, be turning somebody down who had been accepted for ministry? I cannot imagine the circumstances in which that would happen. Is the Bishop aware that this is now the case?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am very grateful to you for confirming the Bishop of Norwich's own view. To have it authoritatively confirmed in that way is very helpful.

17. *Revd Chris Strain (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

Is it still the intention, as part of the overall strategic objective of maintaining diversity among theological colleges, to ensure that some have a significant relationship with the theology departments of public universities?

The Bishop of Norwich: Yes it is. The Ministry Council has recently endorsed the report of the Bishop of Sheffield's working party, to be debated at this Synod. This makes provision for some of the Church's ordinands to study in the theology departments of public universities, despite rising cost. Subject to synodical approval, it will be for the second phase of that working group to make proposals for the future. However, the consultation around this matter has shown substantial support for the maintenance of a significant relationship between some theological colleges and theology departments in universities, and not simply for the sake of diversity.

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

With a view to 'Reimagining Ministry' (GS 1815), what practical steps are being taken to develop and sustain a culture whereby all parish clergy (incumbents, team vicars and priests in charge, et cetera) routinely engage in collaborative ministry through

- (a) empowering and enabling lay people to use their 'gifts and talents' to the full in mission and ministry;
- (b) exercising servant-style leadership with lay members of their congregation with suitable skills and experience; and
- (c) across their deanery?

The Bishop of Norwich: There is plenty of encouragement for these principles from the Ministry Division, not least in the guidance it has issued last year relating to 'Continuing Ministerial Education and Development', but the primary responsibility remains in the dioceses themselves, where a range of ministry strategies and growth plans is focused on the release of the gifts of the laity in mission and ministry.

19. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

How are the affairs of the Women's Continuing Ministerial Education Trust now regulated?

20. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division:

On what dates were accounts and annual returns for the registered charity (No.1093320) known as the Women's Continuing Ministerial Education Trust for 2007, 2008 and 2009 submitted to the Charity Commission, and were these submissions in accordance with statutory requirements?

The Bishop of Norwich: With permission, I will answer Questions 19 and 20 together. The Women's Continuing Ministerial Education Trust is regulated by a Charity Commission Scheme dated July 2002, as amended by revision in July 2006. This revision made the Archbishops' Council the trustee of the fund. The Archbishops' Council's Ministry Finance Panel is responsible for managing the Trust on behalf of the Archbishops' Council. Grant applications are reviewed by an advisory panel.

With regard to the annual returns and accounts for 2007-2009, following clarification from the Charity Commission in the latter part of 2010 that these required separate submission, despite the unifying scheme of 2006, all outstanding accounts were submitted on 9 and 23 March this year.

Mr Philip French: I am grateful to the Bishop for economically answering both my questions in one reply. I am sure that we were all relieved that he did not feel it necessary to read it twice. By your leave, however, I would like to ask a separate supplementary to each of my original questions.

On Question 19, how is grant-making policy, as opposed to decisions on individual grant applications, now made, given that the Advisory Panel – being the former managing trustees – no longer meet as a body and there is no annual general meeting?

The Bishop of Norwich: I will have to come back and answer that after consultation. I am not familiar enough with the process to be able to answer you here orally.

The Chairman: Mr French, the Standing Orders permit only one supplementary per answer. It may be that the Bishop wishes to give you a bit of an answer to Question 20 to enable you to ask your supplementary to Question 20. Otherwise, you will not be able to answer a supplementary on that question.

The Bishop of Norwich: I could repeat the last bit, which was the answer to it. If the Synod understood it, I could give you a little examination on the accounts of the Women's Continuing Ministerial Education Trust – but the accounts are separated now and they have been submitted.

The Chairman: Would you like to ask your supplementary, now that you have an answer?

Mr Philip French: If I may. Noting that the compliance information published on the Charity Commission website records earlier accounts as having been submitted up to 873 days late, can we be assured that the accounts for 2010 will be submitted in accordance with what are now clearly the Charity Commission's requirements?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am absolutely confident that if that is what the Charity Commission requires then the staff will see that it is done.

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

What consideration has been given to appointing a self-supporting bishop, whose costs would only be their expenses, to oversee self-supporting ministers (under the authority of their diocesan bishop) and to develop this aspect of the Church's mission, including those who see their secular employment as a major focus of their ministry?

The Bishop of Norwich: The idea has not been formally considered. However, Teresa Morgan has recently carried out some research into self-supporting ministers and Ministry Council is considering constructive ways of following this up, specifically in relation to ministerial deployment strategies. The creation of a new see, which is what we are talking about, is a complex matter and is primarily the concern of the Dioceses Commission. It is not clear whether oversight from a separate bishop would confer any benefits to self-supporting ministers, and there would have to be compelling reasons put forward as to why the present system no longer adequately supports self-supporting ministers.

Revd Hugh Lee: What is the present system and why is it, for example, preferable to the arguments put forward in a letter to the *Church Times* in the last couple of months, comparing the relationship between stipendiaries and self-supporting ministers with the relationship between the Territorial and the Regular Army?

The Bishop of Norwich: One of the problems with this is to imagine that bishops only relate to stipendiary clergy. It seems to me of little import to all of us as bishops whether the clergy to whom we minister and who are in our dioceses are paid or unpaid. We simply see a priest as a priest as a priest. This is to create divisions in the priesthood, which I do not think would do the mission and ministry of the Church much good.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells): Would the Bishop consider that if this is a suitable way to go forward – to have a self-supporting bishop – that it might include a palace-for-duty job? (*Laughter*)

The Bishop of Norwich: I am grateful to Tim Hind for that idea. I do have a house and I do some duty!

Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee

22. *Revd Richard Hibbert (St Albans)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

What effect has the Equality Act 2010 had upon the statutory retirement ages prescribed for ecclesiastical office holders by the Ecclesiastical Office Holders (Age Limit) Measure 1975?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): Paragraph 1 of Schedule 22 to the Equality Act 2010 states that it is not discriminatory to do anything which is required by an enactment, which includes a Measure of the General Synod. Since the 1975 Measure provides that ecclesiastical offices come to an end automatically when the office holder reaches the age of 70 (subject to a very limited discretion to extend in certain cases), appointments to such offices must be made on that basis and to do so is not, therefore, discriminatory.

Revd Richard Hibbert: Mindful of the greatly increasing number of office holders reaching the age of 70 and thus retiring, if not before, and still being mostly fit and able physically, and perhaps emotionally, and mindful of the concerning lack of vocations fully to replace those retirees, what plans are being explored and prepared to address this issue and enable the pool of available ministers to continue in ministry?

The Chairman: Your supplementary question is not related to the Equality Act, which was the core of the original question.

Revd Richard Hibbert: Forgive me, I thought that my supplementary related to the fact that people were retiring at 70.

The Chairman: I am advised that your question needed to relate to the effect of the Equality Act, which it does not do. Catch the Bishop in the bar later!

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: You might ask a supplementary to the next question actually.

23. *Mr James Cheeseman (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

In view of the raising of the age at which the State pension can be received and increases in retirement age generally, will the Church be considering raising the retirement age above 70?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: As I explained in reply to Mr Hibbert's question, the statutory retirement age of 70 under the Ecclesiastical Offices (Age Limit) Measure 1975 continues to apply to clergy office holders. However, clergy may, if they wish, exercise their ministry beyond the age of 70 with the agreement of their bishop, either under licence or with permission to officiate. They are required under regulation 29 of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations 2009 to hold their licences for a fixed term, renewable by agreement.

We hope that these arrangements will assist clergy in continuing with their vocational commitment to God and the Church after reaching the age of 70. There are plans to update the existing guidance on supporting the ministry of retired clergy and these will be considered by RACSC in the near future.

Revd Richard Hibbert (St Albans): What plans are being thought of to help these people who are retiring, able and possibly fit, and with the lack of vocations coming through to be used fully and effectively within their continuing ministry within dioceses?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: There is a wide range of ways in which clergy over the age of 70 contribute vastly to the overall ministry of the Church and we are very grateful indeed for that ministry. Some of that will be, for example, in house-for-duty roles; others will be under licence in parishes. There are opportunities to do so at the moment and we shall be monitoring the way in which that continues into the future.

24. *Revd Jonathan Frais (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

As the new clergy application form for clerical posts does not ask any questions about marital status or circumstances, are such questions now to be asked verbally and if so by whom?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: The provisions of the Equality Act 2010 concerned with making appointments apply to many, although not all, clerical posts. Where the Act applies, it is not necessarily impermissible to take into account a candidate's marital status or marital history; but the circumstances under which those factors can be taken into account are limited.

Those involved in appointments should take marital status or history into account only if they are satisfied that it is legally permissible to do so in the particular case. It was for that reason that a standard question about marital status and history was removed from the form. If those involved in making a particular appointment are satisfied, on the basis of advice, that they are entitled to take candidates' marital status or history into account, then they may ask candidates questions relevant to that issue, either orally or in writing.

There will be detailed guidance in the Guide to Parochial Appointments, which is the final part of the clergy terms of service project and which is about to go out to consultation.

Revd Jonathan Frais: The part that has now been deleted from the common application form – I read from a previous one – was entitled 'Marital status' and those applicants were to put a Yes or a No against each of the seven categories of 'Single', 'Married', 'Widowed', 'Separated', 'Divorced', 'Re-married' or 'Married to a partner who has been divorced'.

Obviously this is of great interest to those parish reps who are interviewing the candidates with their bishop and patron. However, my supplementary question is this. Given that 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 say that the issues concerning oversight and leadership include their family set-up and given that Acts 5.29 in the New Testament gives us the precedent of obeying God rather than the civil authorities, did the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee consider whether it might not have been wiser to leave the question in and so, at the risk of defying the current law of the land, show that we are subject to a higher government?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: Parishes do not appoint their clergy, except in a very small number of cases. The responsibility lies with the bishops and with the patrons. It is for the bishops to explore, as they do, whether candidates fulfil the requirements of the canons and the Ordinal and any other official documents, like *Issues in Human Sexuality*, which the Church has issued for that purpose.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Could the Bishop give an example of when it would be appropriate to take this matter into account?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: It is extremely difficult to answer that particular question. It will be taken into account by the bishop in terms of the canons and the Ordinal.

The Chairman: Given that this is the only question on this topic, I will allow another supplementary.

The Archdeacon of Tonbridge (Ven. Clive Mansell): In the draft application form sent round earlier this year, the only person to be aware of the marital status was the person who was monitoring the type of applicant we were getting. The bishop, the patron, the parish reps, would not know whether or not the candidate was, for example, married before; so how could the bishop take it into account before the appointment was made?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: The bishop can check with the previous bishop of the person concerned whether it is appropriate to appoint that person to a new post. The other thing which perhaps needs to be said at this point is that the present version of the application form is itself under scrutiny and we are desperately trying to get it right in a whole range of areas, partly in terms of the Equality Act and partly in terms of its usefulness in actually making an appointment. Alterations can and no doubt will be made, therefore.

25. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

How many (a) bishops, (b) archdeacons, (c) cathedral clergy and (d) freehold incumbents have voluntarily transferred to common tenure since its introduction, and what percentage of office holders does this represent?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: These figures are still provisional, as we have yet to receive any information from 10 dioceses. So far, the numbers are as follows:

- (a) 34 bishops have voluntarily transferred to common tenure, which is 34 per cent of bishops in post. This does not include the two archbishops, who were automatically transferred under the Terms of Service Measure;
- (b) 21 archdeacons, which is 21 per cent, have transferred voluntarily;
- (c) figures are not currently available for all cathedral clergy; however, two deans (5 per cent of those in office) have transferred voluntarily; many other cathedral clergy have transferred automatically because they were previously on a fixed-term contracts;
- (d) 290 freehold incumbents have transferred, which is 7 per cent of those in post.

The percentage of clergy on common tenure will increase over time, as more appointments come under common tenure. It may also increase if more freeholders voluntarily move over to common tenure.

26. *The Archdeacon of Bath (Ven. Andrew Piggott)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

What progress has been made in the development of legislative proposals since the Synod resolved in July 2010 that, having regard to the benefits to be gained from job sharing arrangements in the deployment of ordained ministers, and particularly clergy couples, and the absence of any current provision for job sharing in the ordained parochial ministry, the Archbishops' Council should bring forward legislative proposals for the making of such job sharing arrangements?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: The existing provisions of section 61 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 and the existing powers contained in section 20 of the Pastoral Measure 1983 currently allow for ordained ministers, whether part of a clergy couple or not, to participate in various forms of job sharing arrangements. However, the current legal position remains that an office itself cannot be shared in the same way as a role in secular employment. The Archbishops' Council is continuing to explore relevant appropriate options in conjunction with its legal advisers, and RACSC will again be considering at its next meeting how to take forward any reasonable further methods by which job-sharing may take place.

The Archdeacon of Bath: Thank you, Bishop John. I would be very interested to know when your next meeting is.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: September.

The Archdeacon of Bath: September – thank you – and therefore when will Synod hear about the progress that is being made as a result of that meeting?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: Synod will hear when we have actually been able to make some progress on it. It is extremely complicated. We have looked at a range of things, including extensions of the team ministry provisions, which might be done but really do not look terribly satisfactory. I fully confess that we have not yet found a sensible way of proceeding further on this. We are doing our best.

27. *The Archdeacon of Bath (Ven. Andrew Piggott)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

How many clergy couples (i.e. where both husband and wife are ordained) (a) were serving in the Church of England five years ago and (b) are serving it now? As regards couples currently serving, how many are job sharing; and of the couples job sharing how many are serving in (i) non-parochial posts and (ii) title posts?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: The information requested is not available and could not be obtained without disproportionate cost, as the *Crockford* database does not provide details of which clergy are married to one another. RACSC is aware of the pressures on clergy couples and the wide variety of ways in which their ministry is developing, and will be considering this issue further at its next meeting.

The Archdeacon of Bath: I am disappointed by the Bishop's answer. In the diocese of Bath and Wells the number of such couples has doubled in the last year. I do not want

to make too much of that, because it has doubled from one to two! However, the reason I asked my question is that I suspect that, were this information to hand, it would reveal that there is a growing trend. I believe that this is an issue that does need to be addressed. I wonder whether I might suggest to the committee that it considers sending a memo to diocesan secretaries, who should have this information easily available.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: It would depend on the particular roles which the clergy concerned are playing as to whether diocesan secretaries actually have this. I am absolutely with you that the number is increasing and that there are serious issues which need to be taken account of. There already is advice, which RACSC has issued in the past. It does need updating and we are endeavouring to do that.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): While understanding that *Crockford* may not currently record such clergy couple deployments in an easily assimilable way, in almost all cases it will have the same surname and the same address. How hard could that be?

The Chairman: I am not sure that there was a question there.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: ‘How hard could that be?’ I suppose is a question! I have no doubt that it would be possible to do some work on trying to find the figures. I am much more interested in trying to find a response to Synod’s resolution and to the way in which we actually relate to the ministry of clergy couples and enable that to be best expressed within the Church.

*28. *Mr Christopher Fielden (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

Given the difficulties that the Salisbury diocese has had in obtaining visas for visitors from its link province of Sudan, could the Church of England negotiate an umbrella agreement with the UK Border Agency to cover such bona fide visits, which are fully guaranteed and financed by ourselves as hosts?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: Following the discussion of this topic in the House of Bishops, work has recently commenced on the consideration of short-term visa issues across all dioceses, in order to facilitate informed discussions with the UKBA at a national level. Employers who are registered as UKBA sponsors under the Tier 2 and Tier 5 points-based system are responsible for ensuring compliance with immigration conditions and the Church of England is unable to provide sponsorship under current UKBA arrangements. It is therefore appropriate that each diocese retain their individual relationship with the UKBA.

*29. *Mr Brian Newey (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

What action has there been in progressing the resolutions passed by the Synod in February and July last year calling on (1) the Council to consider the preparation of a report which describes and explores the overall clergy remuneration package, and (2) RACSC to convene a small working group to consider the effect that the pension recommendations, passed in July last year, will have on the performance, deployment

and morale of clergy and on the wider mission of the Church and, in the light of the group's findings, for RACSC to offer guidance on these matters to bishops and archdeacons before July 2012?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: RACSC has set up a working party under the chairmanship of the Ven. Ian Jagger, Archdeacon of Durham, to address the issues raised by both these motions. The group has met three times. The first draft of its report was received by RACSC at its meeting in May. A further draft will go to RACSC in September and the intention is that a final report will be presented to Synod in February next year.

Mission and Public Affairs Council

*30. *Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

How many orders have been made under Section 47 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 in each diocese respectively?

Dr Philip Giddings: To date, 12 Bishops' Mission Orders have been made in 11 dioceses, with six further projects in four other dioceses working towards BMOs. The current list is as follows:

Bradford:	'Sorted' youth church
Bristol:	Emmanuel Bristol
Canterbury:	'Harvest'
Chester:	Project in Marple
Chichester:	Immanuel Church
Chichester:	'The Point'
Exeter:	Network church
Leicester:	'Presence' (Network church)
Liverpool:	'River in the City'
Peterborough:	'Eagles Wings'
Ripon and Leeds:	'Kairos', Harrogate
Salisbury:	'Reconnect', Poole

Those currently working towards BMOs:

Coventry:	A youth-focused city centre church
Norwich:	'Tass Valley Cell Church'
Norwich:	'Fountain of Life'
Sheffield:	A congregation of people with learning difficulties
Sheffield:	A project in the city centre
Truro:	'Holy Commotion'

31. *Dr Jacqueline Butcher (Sheffield)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Why is the Church of England no longer a member of the Jubilee Debt Campaign?

Dr Philip Giddings: It is not entirely clear to me that the Church of England as such ever was a member of the Jubilee Debt Campaign. The Finance Department has no record of a membership fee ever being paid by the Church of England and certainly MPA's records do not record any decision to join.

As Synod is aware, we are very cautious about signing up to campaigns in the name of the whole Church of England. Consent for the objectives of a campaign is often more easily and convincingly secured at parish or diocesan level, and signing up to a campaign can sometimes be a substitute for effectively engaging with an issue.

Having said that, MPA continues to pursue a strong concern about the impact of debt across many areas of policy, national and international, through our formal and informal conversations with Government.

Dr Jacqueline Butcher: Are the MPA Council aware that the Church of England was listed as a member of the Jubilee Debt Campaign on its website and its literature? That the board minutes of the January 2010 JDC Board meeting referred to the MPA Council as having declined to re-affiliate to the JDC? That, because we all believed that the Church of England was a member, there is widespread disappointment among JDC members and those of us in the Church of England working on debt that the Church of England nationally is perceived to have withdrawn support, precisely because national membership is perceived as having added value? That the membership fee is only £1,500 a year and is not compulsory?

Will the MPA Council consider joining the JDC or could they advise whether a Private Member's Motion would be necessary? Do the MPA Council hear, that, in asking them to consider membership of the GB debt campaign, nobody is suggesting that the Church of England should cease to be a member of the Trade Justice Movement?

The Chairman: Just answer one of the questions, Dr Giddings!

Dr Philip Giddings: My answer to the beginning is No, I was not aware of those records of the Jubilee Debt Campaign. There is clearly a concern here. I will ask the MPA Council to consider the points which have been raised and we will look at the matter again.

32. *Mrs Joanna Monckton (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

In the light of recent reports in the media, will consideration be given to making representations to Her Majesty's Government seeking changes to the law to enable Christians to work and express their Christian views at work without the threat of losing their jobs?

Dr Philip Giddings: The law does not prevent Christians from expressing their views at work. Rightly, the law expects everyone, including those of no faith, to act with due respect for all people's rights and duties in the field of religion or belief. However, some employers have interpreted the law in ways which seem to assume that

reasonable and respectful expressions of faith are themselves offensive. This is a cause of great concern and I am grateful to Mrs Monckton for drawing attention to it.

I can assure her that we shall continue to monitor emerging case law on how far employers can lawfully limit the ability of Christians to manifest their faith in the workplace, and in our encounters with Government ministers, notably on the Big Society, we shall continue to stress the need to address the 'chill factor', which leads employers and others to assume that the law is more restrictive than it is. We have so far had a sympathetic hearing and we look forward to practical responses.

Mr John Ward (London): Would the Council consider preparing a report, comparing and contrasting why, for example, it may not be an acceptable manifestation of Christian belief to refuse to appoint a chief executive of a company, or perhaps to refuse to allow a woman to stand for appointment to General Synod, on the grounds of headship?

The Chairman: That is not relevant to the original question.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): Could I ask if the Council has made any representations to the Government concerning the interpretation of section 5 of the Public Order Act, which in some places it seems is being over-zealously interpreted by, in particular, police authorities?

Dr Philip Giddings: I will find out and let you know.

Mrs Alison Ruoff (London): Is the Chairman of the MPA aware that there is more and more marginalization of Christians in this country, which is leading to persecution, and therefore would it not be right to go to Her Majesty's Government from the Church to ask why and what can be done?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Chairman of the MPA Council is well aware that many Christians believe that to be the case and we are reflecting those views in our dealings with politicians of all kinds.

33. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

What further representations has the Council made to the BBC, in addition to the Bishop of Exeter's television appearance, to challenge the BBC's claim that the public can make up its own mind on whether assisted suicide should be made legal, as a result of seeing a television programme on the subject presented by a leading campaigner in favour of its legalization?

Dr Philip Giddings: We are grateful to the Bishop of Exeter, who participated in a personal capacity in a BBC *Newsnight* discussion on assisted suicide, having received briefings from MPA staff and others. His contribution has greatly added to an understanding of the issues surrounding assisted suicide.

The MPA Council strongly opposes any change in the law on assisted suicide in England but we recognize that public debate can play an important part in enabling

people to come to informed conclusions on the advisability or otherwise of a change in the law. The Council has not therefore challenged the BBC's claim that the public must make up its own mind on the subject, but we will continue to participate vigorously in the debate to help ensure that the public can understand what is at stake.

34. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

What steps is the Council taking to ensure that the Church of England is providing a suitably diverse range of views to the media on the desirability or otherwise of big government, taking account of Old Testament material pointing to the desirability of the State taking a minimal role, and the influence of Catholic social teaching on subsidiarity, to supplement the views expressed by some members of this Synod on the continued desirability of a high level of State intervention in many areas of life?

Dr Philip Giddings: 'Suitably diverse' is a big ask. We try. Subsidiarity requires actions to be taken at the lowest level commensurate with efficiency and effectiveness. This may sometimes mean action by central Government. There are theological arguments legitimizing a role for the state, always provided it does not over-reach itself. However, in some policy areas we accept that the balance does need to shift further towards local communities.

We welcomed the Big Society idea because of its potential for strengthening intermediate institutions, of which the Churches are prime examples. These views have been expressed informally and formally to ministers and other politicians. One of our guiding principles is that those who are already the most vulnerable should not be further disadvantaged and that the balance between centralism and localism must be judged partly by that. Getting these balances right is complex, both for ethicists and for Government. MPA reflects that complexity in its discussions and its work. Brothers and sisters, pray for us.

The Bishop of Beverley (Rt Revd Martyn Jarrett): In drawing on Catholic social theology, as the questioner asks, would the Council be careful to point out that Catholic social theology would say that, when something is rightly the prerogative of Government, for it to try to pass it to any subsidiary authority is actually irresponsible and arguably sinful?

Dr Philip Giddings: Yes.

35. *Mr Gerald O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

In the light of the report in *The Sunday Telegraph* on 26 June that the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition 'has insisted that parents do not need to be wed before they have children and that marriage may not be right for all couples', what steps have been taken to make clear that these reported views are the antithesis of the teaching of the Church of England?

Dr Philip Giddings: We continue to support bishops and others who speak for the Church of England in the task of making our teaching clear. We have therefore

advised the Second Estates Commissioner on Parliamentary Questions about marriage, most recently on 30 June. The Bishop of Chester sponsored a very lively debate on marriage in the Lords during Marriage Week 2011, when he put very clearly the Church's teaching on marriage. The MPA Division is an active member of Marriage Week UK and we would encourage parishes to use this opportunity to promote marriage. It comes round every year – the week in which Valentine's Day occurs. Pastoral opportunities such as baptism preparation, parent and toddler groups and parenting groups are ideal opportunities for parishes to explore with unmarried parents the possibility of formalizing their relationships in marriage.

Mr Gerald O'Brien: May I thank the Chairman for that very full reply to my Question but ask whether he is aware that many of the wider public may regard the opinions of the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition as having more theological weight than is in fact the case and that therefore an emphatic refutation of those opinions may help to clarify the Church's teaching?

Dr Philip Giddings: On the first part, yes; on the second part, perhaps.

36. *Revd Stephen Pratt (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

In the light of the commitment to numerical and spiritual growth contained in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Presidential Address in November, what progress is being made on appointing a new Officer for Mission and Evangelism?

Dr Philip Giddings: Since 2008, when Paul Bayes as National Mission and Evangelism Adviser committed much of his time to the Weddings Project, Dr Rachel Jordan has fulfilled the bulk of the mission and evangelism job description, first as Associate Adviser working under Paul's direction and, more recently, reporting to the Director of MPA. Dr Jordan continues to fulfil this function very effectively.

In the last few weeks, unforeseen changes elsewhere within the MPA staff team have opened the possibility of committing further resources to an expanded mission and evangelism brief, and I am delighted to be able to tell Synod that, following careful consideration by a small panel, Dr Jordan has been confirmed in this post from September this year.

Revd Stephen Pratt: If my maths serves me right, that means there has been a reduction of half a post in the Mission and Evangelism Department. If that is the case, will the new officer be given the time and the resources to be able to carry out her job effectively and grow the Church numerically?

Dr Philip Giddings: I think your assumption is not correct. It is partly not correct because the mission and evangelism task is not limited to one particular officer or group of officers. The mission and evangelism task is shared with the whole division; indeed, with other divisions in the National Church Institutions, as well as with dioceses and parishes. We are committed to giving as much resource as we possibly can, consonant with our other commitments to this Synod and the Archbishops' Council, in this very important work, particularly following *Going for Growth*. I am very confident that Dr Jordan will do a very good job in this post.

Business Committee

37. *Mrs Pamela Bishop (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Chairman of the Business Committee:

Has consideration been given to the production of a short and clear introductory leaflet explaining the key points of the Anglican Covenant, to help laity in our churches to access and cope with the extent and complexity of the current documentation?

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson): The Article 8 reference document approved by the Business Committee included a brief summary of the varying perspectives on the Covenant, and also said that further resource material could be obtained from the Archbishop of Canterbury's Secretary for Anglican Affairs. Other material is also available in the public domain. It would not be right for the committee to issue additional material part-way through the reference to the dioceses, on which two dioceses have already voted.

Mrs Pamela Bishop: If we look to the future, is there any commitment in principle to producing concise, clear information materials which we can use with laity to help them understand the work of General Synod, to make the bridge between what is happening here and the pews, particularly where there are significant and controversial issues in debate?

The Archdeacon of Dorking: The view of the Business Committee was that that which was sent out was clear and concise. Your comment is heard. There is a whole host of other resources that laity can turn to and, of course, dioceses are free themselves to produce local material. I know of one diocese in particular that has chosen to do that.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I am sure that the Anglican Communion Office, their website and all their staff would be only too delighted to help any laity who wish clarification of any of the Covenant documents. There is actually a commentary on their website.

The Chairman: Could you give us a question?

Canon Elizabeth Paver: Are you aware, Acting Chairman of the Business Committee?

The Archdeacon of Dorking: Yes, very aware.

*38. *Brother Thomas Quin (Religious Communities)* asked the Chairman of the Business Committee:

What are the relative and absolute costs of groups of sessions held at Church House, London and York (a) to central funding bodies and (b) to dioceses in aggregate?

The Archdeacon of Dorking: We can only estimate such costs, as no aggregate records are held concerning diocesan expenditure in connection with General Synod meetings. The estimated cost of a five-day group of sessions in London and York,

including preparation of material, travel and subsistence for staff and members, and venue and equipment hire, is set out below:

	National Church Institutions £000s	Dioceses £000s
London	75	150
York	115	220

These figures do not provide a like for like comparison. The Synod does not have to pay for the hire of Church House, Westminster, but there is an opportunity cost to the Church of England of commercial income foregone by the Church House Conference Centre while Synod is meeting there. If that is taken into account, the overall costs to the Church of meeting in the two venues are broadly comparable.

In addition, the cost of staff time spent preparing for and supporting a five-day group of sessions is estimated at £100,000 for the National Church Institutions and £30,000 for the dioceses.

Faith and Order Commission

39. *Mr Gerald O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Faith and Order Commission:

In February 2010, following my Question on confirmation, the Bishop of Bristol advised me that the Faith and Order Advisory Group was undertaking further work on Christian initiation. Now that this further work on Christian Initiation has presumably been completed, can the Commission please explain what it understands the purpose of confirmation to be and what effect it understands being confirmed to have on the candidate?

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd John Hind): The Faith and Order Commission has been reflecting on the process of Christian initiation as a whole, including confirmation, and continues to uphold the balanced approach of the Book of Common Prayer, which remains the standard of Church of England teaching. The Book of Common Prayer states that ‘There shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed’.

It presents confirmation as for ‘the edifying of such as shall receive it’ and to this end links the rite specifically to catechesis. Confirmands renew the solemn promise and vow made at baptism and ratify and confirm them in person. The divine action sought is strengthening with the Holy Spirit and the daily increase of the manifold gifts of grace.

Mr Gerald O'Brien: Will the Faith and Order Commission give consideration as to what might be done to ensure that those receiving bread and wine do not do so in ignorance of the significance of the elements?

The Chairman: That is not strictly relevant to the question.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): In the Commission's work to reach this point, did the Commission have any face-to-face discussions with Anglican liturgical scholars who might have come to a different conclusion to that which the Commission itself reached?

The Bishop of Chichester: Some members of the Commission are themselves members of those discussions.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Could the Chairman of the Faith and Order Commission confirm that it remains the view of the Commission and of the Church that there is real value for those who are baptized as adults, on profession of faith and following catechesis, in nonetheless also receiving confirmation?

The Bishop of Chichester: Speaking as a diocesan bishop, therefore a chief pastor of a diocese, I cannot conceive of somebody being baptized as an adult without being confirmed at the same occasion anyway. Having said that, the answer to your question is quite clearly yes, I do agree.

40. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Chairman of the Faith and Order Commission:

Fr Thomas Seville CR, 'of the Faith and Order Commission of the Church of England' was welcomed as a 'participant and observer' at the Provincial Council 2011 of the Anglican Church in North America in Long Beach, California. What was the status of his attendance from the point of view of the Faith and Order Commission?

The Bishop of Chichester: Fr Seville attended the Anglican Church in North America Provincial Council as an observer at my request, following a resolution of the General Synod in February 2010. The Archbishop of Canterbury had subsequently highlighted certain questions on which he and the Archbishop of York would value the thinking of the Faith and Order Commission in preparing the requested report.

As Fr Seville is one of the two members of the Commission most closely associated with its work on continuing churches in the light of a resolution of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, he attended as an observer on behalf of and reporting to the Commission in order to assist our work in advising the Archbishops.

Ms Susan Cooper: Would the Bishop please clarify how Thomas Seville's visit to the ACNA Provincial Council was funded?

The Bishop of Chichester: It was entirely funded by the Anglican Church in North America.

Liturgical Commission

41. *Revd Professor Richard Burridge (London University)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

During this year of the 400th anniversary of the King James Version of the Bible, can it be confirmed which translations and versions of the Bible are authorized for use and reading in services of the Church of England?

The Bishop of Wakefield (Rt Revd Stephen Platten): The supplementary material of the canons clearly state that the following may be used in Book of Common Prayer Services, with permission of the PCC, instead of the Authorized Version of the Bible and the Psalter in the Book of Common Prayer: Revised Version, Jerusalem Bible, Revised Standard Version, Good News Bible (Today's English New English Bible Version), the Revised Psalter, the Liturgical Psalter (*The Psalms: A New Translation for Worship*).

Any version of the Bible or Psalter not prohibited by lawful authority may be used with Alternative Services and Commended Services. No such prohibitions currently exist. It is assumed that the default version of the Bible to be used in the context of *Common Worship* is the New Revised Standard Version. Also worth noting is that 'versions of the Bible' does not mean the same thing as 'paraphrase', and so a publication such as *The Message* would not be authorized.

Revd Professor Richard Burridge: Thank you, Bishop, for confirming the translations which are authorized for use and that paraphrases are not authorized for use. What steps can be taken in Church documents and pronouncements such as your own answer to avoid possible confusion arising from the habit of referring to the 1611 King James Version by the popular but inaccurate description of 'the Authorized Version'?

The Bishop of Wakefield: What is the question, please?

Revd Professor Richard Burridge: What steps can be taken to avoid possible confusion, given that you have told us that many are authorized and others are not authorized, by singling out one of them by the inaccurate description of it as 'the Authorized Version', when it is quite properly known as the King James Version?

The Bishop of Wakefield: My short answer would be to say 'Good teaching from our universities and the theological faculties'. (*Laughter*)

42. *Revd Professor Richard Burridge (London University)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Given the variety of versions and translations of the Bible which can be read in public worship, can it be confirmed who is responsible for deciding which versions can be read, both in regular services and in occasional offices and special services?

The Bishop of Wakefield: A note by the House of Bishops from 9 October 2002 entitled *Versions of Scripture*, GS Misc 698, states that decisions about which version of the Bible to use on which occasion are best made as locally as possible. This we assume to mean the incumbent or, in absence of an incumbent, the PCC. In non-parochial situations, the Ordinary would have the final decision, but I am sure that Professor Burridge would be well qualified to make such decisions in his own particular context.

Revd Professor Richard Burridge: Thank you for your confidence in both me and in GS Misc 698, but could you also confirm that, according to the canons of the Church of England, subsection 2 of Canon B 1, the Confirmation of Worship reads, ‘It is the minister’s responsibility to have a good understanding of the forms of service used and he shall endeavour to ensure that the worship offered glorifies God and edifies the people’? That it is therefore the minister’s responsibility to be clear as to which version of the Scripture to be read he thinks will glorify God and edify the people?

The Bishop of Wakefield: I can confirm that.

43. *Revd Chris Strain (Salisbury)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission:

Whilst there are many more liturgical resources than before *Common Worship*, would consideration be given to commissioning a reasonably priced attractive congregational booklet of, say, 100 pages, with more options than in the green Morning and Evening Prayer on Sundays, with accompanying PowerPoint slides, for use in Services of the Word?

The Bishop of Wakefield: I am very happy to invite members of the Liturgical Commission to discuss this idea. I suspect that, given the flexibility within the framework of Services of the Word, this may be something for the *Transforming Worship* website.

Revd Chris Strain: In recognizing the importance of good liturgy, and now 11 years on from the beginning of *Common Worship*, would the Commission consider some kind of survey on the use of paper and projected resources in non-eucharistic worship, and seek to act on its findings and address shortcomings?

The Bishop of Wakefield: It sounds to me like rather a complex process, and the danger would be that it might in itself use very significant supplies of paper.

Church Commissioners

44. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners:

The Octavia Hill Estates have now been transferred entirely to Grainger PLC, a private landlord, with no safeguards for present tenants and all future lettings at market rent. The Crown Estates have recently transferred their very similar properties to the Peabody Trust, safeguarding present tenants’ rights and ensuring that nine out of ten future lettings will be to key workers. What lessons did the Church Commissioners learn from their chosen method of disposal of the Octavia Hill Estates and its consequences?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner (Mr Timothy Walker (ex officio)): I am answering on behalf of the First Church Estates Commissioner, who was prevented from being present today.

The recent sale by Genesis Housing Group of its share in the estates to Grainger was subject to the residents’ leases, and the rights and obligations contained in these

remain. Grainger has said that, for assured shorthold and assured tenancies previously granted by the Commissioners, rents will continue to reflect the Government's affordable rent policy. They have also assured us that tenants 'will continue to receive the same high level of commitment and attention that they have always had'.

In terms of lessons learned, the sale of the estates in 2005-06 underlined the Commissioners' fiduciary duty, as set out in a High Court ruling, to maximize their returns and their support for all their beneficiaries. This sale, at the top of the market, represented the best price reasonably obtainable. The Commissioners sold these properties as part of reducing their overall investment in residential property to reinvest in a range of asset classes and reduce financial risk in the portfolio.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I thank the Third Church Estates Commissioner for replying on behalf of the First Church Estates Commissioner. I am posing this supplementary in the absence of Giles Goddard.

Given the experience of the Crown Estate in their transfer to Peabody and given that the new Government's affordable rent policy now permits affordable rents to be charged up to 80 per cent of market levels, what efforts have been made by the Church Commissioners to learn the impact of the sale of the Octavia Hill Estates on those most directly affected, namely the tenants, and also on the reputation of the Church of England?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner: I have explained that the residents' leases remain. There has been no change in them and, for shorthold and assured tenancies previously granted by the Commission, the rents will continue to reflect the Government's affordable rent policy. I might say that it is decisions such as these that have enabled the Church Commissioners to make available to the Church as a whole approximately £26 million every year more than is the benchmark for funds such as ours, and I think that is extremely creditable.

Mr Peter Haddock (Southwark): Given that some believe that the Church Commissioners have suffered reputational damage in their actions over the sale of the Octavia Hill Estates, would the Church Commissioners consider taking, some years now after the event, further legal advice as to what their fiduciary duties are with the current state of law, bearing in mind that we now have a Legal Advisory Commission with 28 lawyers on it, who apparently do it for nothing?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner: We frequently take advice, as necessary. The judgment in the Harries case was absolutely clear and we abide by it.

45. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Church Commissioners:

What are the circumstances in which the right of presentation to a benefice may be suspended by a diocesan bishop?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner: Section 67 of the Pastoral Measure 1983, which includes the bishop's power to suspend the right of presentation to a benefice, makes no specific provision regarding the circumstances in which it should be used. However, the code of practice to the Measure, to which bishops are expected to have

regard, recommends that it should in the main be confined to benefices where pastoral reorganisation is under consideration or in progress and, occasionally, where a change of parsonage house is planned.

Mrs Mary Durlacher: Given the rather vague definition of ‘pastoral reorganization under consideration’, you will not be surprised perhaps by my supplementary question, which is this. What recourse is available to PCCs, patrons and others, who consider that the guidance in the code of practice has not been complied with in the case of a proposed suspension?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner: The Commissioners have no jurisdiction under the Pastoral Measure to adjudicate on a proposal to suspend rights of presentation or to intervene, except where there are existing proposals of the changes to benefices and formal objections have been received; but I am sure that you can make representations to your bishop if you are concerned.

Ethical Investment Advisory Group

46. *Revd Dr Miranda Threlfall-Holmes (Durham and Newcastle Universities)* asked the Chairman of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group:

Following my question after the EIAG’s Synod presentation in February about alcohol abuse in Durham, what progress has been made by the EIAG in its review of ethical investment with regard to alcoholic drinks, which was referred to in the group’s Synod presentation in February?

Revd Professor Richard Burridge (London University): We were grateful to hear from Dr Threlfall-Holmes in February about alcohol misuse in Durham and the lack of supermarket support for the university’s efforts to combat it. The EIAG’s new alcohol policy has been agreed by all the national investing bodies and was announced on 29 June. It received wide press coverage and is now on the Church of England website. Unlike the old policy, the new one covers supermarkets as well as specialist producers and retailers of alcohol. In only the last couple of days, some supermarkets have started to dialogue with us.

The EIAG will engage forcefully with supermarkets on pricing, which you raised in February, as well as issues like labelling and own-brand products. The EIAG will be able to recommend its ultimate sanction, exclusion from investment, when a company covered by the new policy does not implement minimum standards of corporate responsibility after a period of engagement. We look forward to discussing this and other issues at our fringe meeting on Sunday lunchtime.

Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): ‘Drinking in the last chance saloon’ is a phrase often used about journalists. Will the group be offering advice to the Church Commissioners about disposing of holdings in News International?

The Chairman: That is not in order on the question – as I think you knew perfectly well before you asked it!

Revd Professor Richard Burridge: If Stephen would like to buy me a drink in the last chance saloon, I will be able to tell him the answer.

The Chairman sought leave of the Synod to extend the sitting by 10 minutes.
(*Not agreed*)

Archbishops' Council

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

Would the Archbishops' Council consider reviewing the governance arrangements for budget approval throughout the Church of England in liaison with the House of Bishops, in order to explore the prospect of introducing a level of consolidated oversight of administrative expenditure by diocesan church houses and the National Church Institutions in addition to single body approvals, with a view to reducing the extent of time and money spent on duplicated activities?

Mr Andrew Britton: GS Misc 995 states that one of the next steps in meeting the challenges for the new quinquennium is trying to release energy by simplifying our Church's internal structures and processes. However, it must be recognized that each legal entity in the Church is autonomous and free to set its own budget, hence prospects of securing a consolidated administrative budget across the Church are not promising.

Taking targeted action should be more productive. The Dioceses Commission has been looking at the scope for streamlining administration. In terms of procurement, we have recently appointed two national officers to identify ways of buying products and services more cost-effectively, with the goal of saving the Church at least £10 million per annum. The recent initiative to develop a web-based system for capturing annual parish returns (soon available to all dioceses) is another example where collective action can lead to significant efficiency gains.

48. *Mr Nick Harding (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

In March this year, young people, bishops and others gathered in Sheffield for the Regeneration Summit, organised by the Church Army and the Archbishop of York's Youth Trust. What lessons have been learned from this and what plans does the Archbishops' Council have for following up on those lessons learned?

Mr Mark Russell: The Regeneration Summit asked how can the Church better resource young people to reach their own generation? How does church need to change to accommodate young people? What are young people's perceptions of church? The young people talked about the importance of church being open, friendly, real and loving. They talked about social justice and making a difference in local communities. The material from the working groups, on paper and film, is currently being analysed and recommendations will be distilled within the next few weeks. Church Army will circulate these to all members of Synod later this year.

The delegates signed a pledge, which can be read on the summit website, www.regenerationsummit.org. Council is committed to listening to young people as part of its Going for Growth strategy and will study the Regeneration recommendations very carefully.

Mr Nick Harding: Thank you for that answer. As part of that commitment to listen, are there any plans, by the Archbishops' Council or others, to repeat this form of consultation with children rather than teenagers?

Mr Mark Russell: Not yet, no, but we will consider it.

Sister Anne Williams (Durham): As a long-time member of Church Lads' and Church Girls' Brigade, which is the Church of England's own uniformed youth organization, may I ask if consideration can be given to how that as an organization can help with this process? We have been very excited by what came out of Regeneration and would like to do more to help, but would also like a little bit of help in promoting our organization as well. It is doing a lot of good work in many places but not enough places.

Mr Mark Russell: What the Regeneration Summit told us is that one size does not fit all and that we need a portfolio of options to try to reach and disciple young people across this nation. CLB and CGB is one of those important options. I have heard what Sister Anne has said and we will consider that carefully.

49. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Since the group of sessions in February 2011 and, in particular, the 'take note' debate on GS 1815,

- (a) what actions has the Archbishops' Council taken to turn the rhetoric of lay involvement into reality (paragraphs 81 and 82 of GS 1815);
- (b) what further such actions are planned in the next six months; and
- (c) how will progress be monitored and success measured?

Mrs Mary Chapman: The paper circulated to members as GS Misc 995 sets out a number of steps to which the Council and the House of Bishops have committed. This includes commissioning new resources on discipleship and the Christian way of life to support lay witness at work and in the community.

We will also be reassessing current policy and resourcing for the recruitment, training, deployment and development of authorized lay ministers, with a view to sustaining and growing a Christian presence in every community. Measurable progress with the spiritual and numerical growth of the Church and with contributing to the common good are dependent on the rhetoric being turned into reality at diocesan and parish levels as well as national level.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Thank you for the answer. Does the Archbishops' Council have a clear vision of what the Church will look like when the rhetoric of lay involvement has been turned into reality? If so, when will you be sharing that with us? If not, would the Council like some help from the House of Laity to develop this vision?

Mrs Mary Chapman: Taking the last part first, I am sure that all help is welcome on a topic and a mission as big as this one. I cannot answer specifically when a vision may be articulated. The vision, though, is very closely linked to the aims of the new quinquennium of growing the Church spiritually and numerically. As you can see in GS Misc 995, we are focused on developing indicators of that growth.

The following Questions were answered in writing.

50. *Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Is it intended to recommend in the Council's proposed guidance to dioceses on parochial fees that those conducting funerals who are not in receipt of a stipend should receive remuneration irrespective of whether the funeral service is held in a church or at a crematorium?

The Archdeacon of Lewisham (Ven. Christine Hardman): The ministry of those not in receipt of a stipend is vital if we are to continue to offer to the nation a universal ministry around the pastoral services.

The DBF fee will be legally owned by the DBF and it will be for the DBF to decide what remuneration might be offered to those ministers not in receipt of a stipend, and for what services they should be offered it.

Proposals for the draft guidance have suggested that 80 per cent of the fee level be offered to such ministers in regard to funeral services. Issues regarding fees were discussed at the February Synod and the Council requested that the Fees Working Group take these into account in the preparation of guidance. However, the final content of the proposed guidance to dioceses regarding parochial fees will depend on what decisions are taken by the Synod tomorrow when the fees item is scheduled.

51. *Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Since the Church Representation Rules, especially when an Annual Parochial Church Meeting approaches, are one of the most regularly required pieces of ecclesiastical legislation for parishes, and since the internet is most people's first port of call, it is regrettable that they are not readily available online. Will the Archbishops' Council undertake to publish the current version of the Church Representation Rules on the Church of England website by the end of 2011, so that it is available without charge in advance of the 2012 round of APCMs?

The Archdeacon of Lewisham: The current electronic publishing policy for Church House Publishing identifies a range of categories of document that should always be available free on the Church of England website, including Acts of Synod, GS and GS Misc papers, House of Bishops' Statements and the *Canons* of the Church of England. Along with key reference resources such as *Crockford* and the *Church of England Year Book*, Church Representation Rules currently falls outside these categories.

A review of this situation will be carried out before the end of the year. Any revised policy will, though, still need to strike a balance between keeping the cost of providing publications to the end user to a minimum while recognizing that the process of updating, developing and publishing such resources is not 'free' and needs to be funded by some means.

52. *Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Can consideration be given to the possibility of publishing in *Crockford* a list of all clergy of the Church of England who have left the Church of England and submitted to the Holy See – given that, so far as Anglicans are concerned, those clergy remain ordained in the eyes of God, whether or not re-ordained subsequently?

The Archdeacon of Lewisham: *Crockford* does not claim to list everyone who is ordained in the eyes of God; rather, those clergy who are eligible to receive a licence for ordained public ministry in the Church of England, the Church in Wales, the Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Church of Ireland.

53. *Revd John Cook (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Can it be confirmed that it is the intention of the review into higher education funding changes that theological colleges will not receive less than 50 per cent of the university fees imposed upon them from September 2012?

The Bishop of Sheffield: The Sheffield Report makes a number of recommendations regarding the reimbursement of university fees. For the majority of routes which are not high-cost pathways, university fees will be met in full by Ministry Division. For high-cost pathways, it is recommended that Ministry Division will pay up to 50 per cent of the maximum fee levels that universities can impose.

54. *Revd John Cook (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Will consideration be given to making use of the training reserve of £2.7 million in order to assist with a smooth transition to the new higher education funding system?

The Bishop of Sheffield: The 2012 Vote 1 budget includes an addition to reserves of £100,000, which may be used if required to meet the additional costs of university fees.

55. *Revd Eva McIntyre (Worcester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

The answers to Question 7 and its supplementary at the February 2011 group of sessions stated that national statistics on clergy ethnicity would be reported with the 2010 clergy statistics, due to be published 'before the summer', but the answers were less clear about 2011 and subsequent years. Will national statistics on clergy ethnicity be published with the clergy statistics for 2011 and every subsequent year?

The Bishop of Sheffield: The Research and Statistics Department have carried out a supplementary survey of recently ordained clergy, to enable trends in clergy ethnicity statistics to be included in the paper before this session of Synod, GS 1844, entitled *Unfinished Business: A Pastoral and Missional Approach for the Next Decade*.

More detailed results will be formally included in *Church Statistics 2009-10*, to be published later in the summer. It is our intention to encourage diocesan directors of ordinands to collect this information more rigorously, so that the Church is able to monitor this aspect of the diversity of its clergy. This being said, we anticipate including regular updates of ethnicity alongside current information on age and gender in *Church Statistics* on an annual basis.

56. *Dr Cherida Stobart (Bath and Wells)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Is the Statistics Unit able to provide data to confirm the impression that the overall demographic profile of those attending Church of England churches is increasingly biased towards the older age groups with decreasing numbers in the lower age ranges?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Research and Statistics Department carried out a comprehensive survey in 2007 to monitor the ethnicity, age and gender of the English dioceses' core parish congregations. This unique exercise was requested by Synod, so it is not possible to establish any statistical trends, but the results revealed an older profile in core Church of England congregations across all the dioceses. Whilst this challenges the Church, it would be unwise to make deductions directly from this regarding the future viability of core congregations.

The 2007 exercise was not able to monitor the demographic profile of less regular churchgoers or fringe congregations. Consequently, attenders at, for example, special family services, occasional community services and Christmas carol services were not included in this survey by most participating parishes. Evidence from independent surveys points towards a lower age profile at such services, with the consequent missional challenge of incorporating them into further committed participation.

57. *Dr Cherida Stobart (Bath and Wells):* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Is the Statistics Unit carrying out any modelling of demographics (taking account of mortality rates) in the Church of England to enable it to forecast if and when church attendance, and the associated income, will fall? If not, can such forecasting be included in the Unit's future work?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Research and Statistics Department carries out demographic analyses to provide projections of stipendiary parochial clergy numbers but it has not undertaken similar exercises of parochial congregations. Forecasts in PCC donor income and giving levels utilize past trends and are affected by economic factors, in addition to congregational demographics. In 2007 the age, gender and ethnicity of English core parish congregations was monitored for the first time, but there is as yet no information to indicate how this demographic profile will change over time.

There is sociological evidence that people are more open to churchgoing later in life and independent surveys show that younger people attend special worship services and church services that are held less regularly. Any forecasting model would need to examine trends in the churchgoing habits of younger people to incorporate congregational joiners as well as leavers.

58. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Will the Council ensure that it and its committees and working groups resume the previous practice of inviting comment from the chair of CMEAC on reports when they are still in draft, with a view to avoiding the making of errors or omissions relevant to CMEAC's work?

Dr Philip Giddings: The volume and variety of reports produced by the various sub-committees of the Council on issues ranging from stipends and pensions policy to church buildings, to schools issues, to ministry and mission issues, to ecumenical affairs and so on, mean that a general rule of the kind suggested would quickly collapse under its own weight. However, the Council needs to ensure that the minority ethnic dimension is properly addressed in important documents and I accept that there has been at least one recent occasion when we should have done better.

I shall discuss with the chair of CMEAC and Council members whether there are procedural changes that would help, including sharing more papers with the chair before they are finalized.

59. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Co-operative Fortnight 2011 ends tomorrow. As part of this year's campaign, Co-operatives UK, Church Action on Poverty and other organizations have put their names to a petition calling on Her Majesty's Government to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor by supporting action to share ownership and wealth in a co-operative way.

Given that one half of the UK population now owns just one per cent of the wealth in this country, whereas a generation ago they owned 12 per cent, will the Archbishops' Council join me in signing this petition on behalf of the Church of England and work with Co-operatives UK and others to bring this petition and the issues it raises to the attention of parishes and, importantly, Her Majesty's Government?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Archbishops' Council is extremely cautious about signing up to other people's campaigns, especially where they are pursuing an agenda on which Christians may legitimately differ. Whilst most Church members will be well aware of the social costs of increasing material inequality, it is quite another thing to promote particular means to reduce inequality as if the gospel gave us clear pointers to concrete policies. Research on the social impact of inequality has found its place in a number of MPA's submissions to Government, but this is not an issue on which we believe a campaigning stance is appropriate for the Church of England at national level – although individual parishes and even dioceses may wish to join the campaign.

60. *Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Can the Archbishops' Council comment on the process by which it reached the decision embodied in Item 18 on the Agenda, given the reservation expressed in the course of the debate at the February 2011 group of sessions about a member of the House of Bishops serving as chair of the Business Committee?

Dr Philip Giddings: The Archbishops' Council had a long and careful discussion on 17 March, following the Synod debate. It noted that Standing Orders require the chair of the Business Committee to be chosen from among the six directly elected members of the Council, two of whom are bishops.

The Council concluded that, with such a small field to choose from, it should appoint the best-qualified candidate, without favouring members of some Houses over others. It judged that the Bishop of Dover, who has already served on the committee for five years, was best qualified; but it also acknowledged the reservations expressed in February and decided both to make this a two-year appointment and to launch a review of the Standing Order. That will be able to look at how the field might be significantly widened and whether bishops should still be part of it.

61. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

A year ago, the General Synod was informed (in GS 1780) that the Archbishops' Council was putting in hard work to explore in some detail how a hybrid pension scheme for the clergy might work. This work was being undertaken by the Archbishops' Task Group on Clergy Pensions. Can the Synod now be informed what progress the task group is making and when it expects to submit its report to the Synod?

Mr Andrew Britton: The mandate to the group was to produce for the Archbishops' Council by the end of this year a report which would then come to the Synod. The group has had a number of meetings and has taken expert advice. We are on track to report to the Council later this year. It is important to remember that this is in the nature of sensible contingency planning, and it remains my hope that conditions will enable us to avoid further changes to the present scheme.

62. *Mr Adrian Vincent (Guildford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:
Noting that:

- (i) the Archbishops' Council 2012 Budget (GS 1842) records on page 46, paragraph 5, the decision to propose to continue to freeze the level of the Church of England grant to the World Council of Churches;
- (ii) paragraph 6 of that document records the decision to propose to increase the Church of England grant to the Conference of European Churches

(CEC) by 3.5 per cent in 2012, on top of the 2 per cent increase in 2011; and

- (iii) the 2009 Response to the CEC CSC Work Programme by the Baptist Union of Great Britain, the Church of Scotland, the Church of England's House of Bishops' Europe Panel, the Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church criticized CEC's strategy,

has the Archbishops' Council considered freezing the level of grant to CEC until such time as the criticism of CEC's strategy made in 2009 has been considered by CEC and, if valid, addressed?

Mr Andrew Britton: Taking into account the achievements so far in addressing CEC's objectives with greater transparency and accountability, as well as the ongoing work reviewing CEC's future strategy, in which the Bishop of Guildford is closely involved, the Council considered that an increase to the grant broadly in line with inflation was appropriate.

63. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In view of the resolution of the General Synod in 1982 supporting the phasing-out of chancel repair liability and its eventual extinguishment, which has still not been reflected in changes to the law, what steps does the Church intend to take to encourage an Act of Parliament to tidy this matter up once and for all?

Mr Andrew Britton: In February 1982, the Synod was informed that chancel repair liability operated in a way that was arbitrary and inequitable and that the Law Commission intended to recommend legislation. The Law Commission reported in November 1985, recommending that certain types of chancel repair liability should be abolished in 10 years. Parliament did not implement the recommendations.

However, in 2003 the Government legislated so that chancel repair liability would cease to apply to land purchased after 12 October 2013 unless the liability was expressly recorded on the registered title of the property.

That will mean that, in a little over two years' time, anyone purchasing property will know definitively whether it is affected by chancel repair liability. Concerns that the liability might operate in an arbitrary and inequitable way have therefore been addressed, albeit in a different way from that envisaged by the Synod nearly 30 years ago.

64. *Mr Christopher Pye (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

Next year will see the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. Her coronation was witnessed by thousands of her subjects through the then new technology of national television. Now, many of our churches have multimedia systems which could be easily adapted to receive television. Has permission been sought from Her Majesty's Government for a one-day exemption from the TV licence fee to churches on the day of the service of thanksgiving, so that people may join in that service in the place where they normally worship; and, if not, can consideration be given to doing so?

Mr Andrew Britton: My understanding is that the chances of a special one-day exemption for churches are small and that the normal requirements in relation to television licences are likely to apply. However, the Communications Office will make enquiries and issue a guidance note.

65. *The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Nicholas Reade)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

In view of the fact that the Archbishops' Council's budget for work among deaf and disabled people is to be cut by almost 90 per cent from the end of 2012, and also in the light of the widespread dismay this has occasioned among deaf and disabled people, can the Council confirm that an impact assessment was carried out before this cut was agreed, and if so what were its findings?

66. *Revd Ruth Yeoman (Bradford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

As a result of cuts in the budget of the Archbishops' Council, the Committee for Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) is preparing for the possibility of a budget cut from £80,000 to £10,000 – a cut of almost 90 per cent in the funds available to support vulnerable groups. Are any of the other committees of the Council facing such a percentage cut?

Mr Andrew Britton: The Council's financial strategy for 2010-2015, debated by Synod two years ago, envisaged a real-terms reduction of around 11 per cent in its Vote 2 budget over that period. It was considered that some areas of work would come to a natural end and others would be more effectively accomplished at local level with a much-reduced national input. The CMDDP's work was identified as one such area. Other areas which have recently experienced significant reductions include those of Hospital Chaplaincies and the Liturgical Commission.

The 2012 budget includes around £80,000 funding towards the CMDDP, of which the majority will be met from one of the Council's restricted funds (rather than Vote 2) to facilitate the move to a more local focus for this work. Decisions regarding funding for the work beyond 2012 will be considered by the Council next year.

67. *Revd Ruth Yeoman (Bradford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

A budget cut across the board in the NCIs of 80 per cent – representing a cut of the order of magnitude incurred by the Committee for Ministry of and among Deaf and Disabled People – would involve the almost complete loss of staff input at Church House. In the light of that, what options other than the wholesale removal of staff posts have been considered as part of the process for determining how budget cuts should be made?

Mr Andrew Britton: The Council's financial strategy envisaged a real terms cut of around 11 per cent in the Vote 2 budget over five years. As staff costs make up around three-quarters of the Council's budget, achieving that target was inevitably

going to require a reduction in the number of staff posts. However, we are looking to achieve efficiencies in non-salary costs too. A recent example is in accommodation, where several departments have recently moved to enable us to hand part of the second floor of Church House back to the Corporation for letting to external tenants. This will reduce our rent and service charge costs by around 6 per cent.

House of Bishops

68. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Since the February 2011 group of sessions, how much further progress has been made by the working group established by the House to prepare a draft of the code of practice that would be required under the draft legislation to admit women to the episcopate?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich: The group has held a further two meetings since the February Synod (four in total so far), and members of the group engaged with the House of Bishops at its May meeting. We are due to meet with the Steering Committee on the fringes of this Synod session and are on track to submit our report in time for the House's December meeting.

69. *Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Can it be confirmed that the Women in the Episcopate Code of Practice drafting group established by the House is not considering anything that was rejected by the Revision Committee or by the General Synod?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich: The group's brief is to produce a code that is consistent with the draft Measure, as revised by the Revision Committee and the General Synod. By definition, therefore, the group cannot propose including in the code to be made under the Measure anything which, as a result of decisions made in the revision process, would be inconsistent with the Measure.

70. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In its work to date in considering the terms of the proposed code of practice under the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure, has the working group established by the Standing Committee of the House of Bishops received any indications from individuals for whom arrangements are intended to be made in accordance with section 2(1) of the draft Measure that such a code of practice will meet their legitimate conscientious needs? If not, is it aware of any such individuals or groups within the Church of England?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich: While the group has not sought representations, it contains a cross-section of views within the Church of England and is well aware of the standpoint of those who have stated that no version of a code will meet their needs without changes to the legislation. As I have indicated already, the group's task is to work within the terms of the draft legislation that has been through General Synod.

71. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Since, subject to the quorum requirement, PCCs can act under the Church Representation Rules notwithstanding any vacancies in their membership, will the working group established by the House to make proposals for the drafting of the code of practice under the women in the episcopate legislation consider including a section on how a bishop should respond if she or he receives a Letter of Request from a PCC with perhaps only two or three members?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich: I shall be happy to bring this matter to the attention of the group.

72. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House considered, or will it consider, what impact the Regeneration Summit (at which over 30 bishops consulted with 150 young people in March) has had on the priorities and ministries of the Archbishops and those of the other members of the House who attended?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thanks to the Church Army's generosity and vision, the Regeneration Summit was a strategic and fruitful consultation exercise. Young people and their concerns are not simply a topic in themselves, peripheral to the Church's vision; they are at its centre and must participate in discerning and implementing our priorities.

Several bishops have indicated their intention to arrange similar events and to find more ways to involve young people in the decision-making structures of their dioceses. It will be important for the House to ensure that young people are engaged with the quinquennial themes of growth, the common good and reimagining ministry. In this, we will want to build on the Going for Growth report supported by General Synod in February 2010.

73. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What plans are in place for an official celebration in 2012 of the 350th anniversary of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer?

The Bishop of Wakefield: The Synod is, of course, very well aware of this important anniversary. I am therefore delighted to be able to commend the Prayer Book Society's anniversary celebration service to take place on Wednesday 2 May 2012 at 5 p.m. in St Paul's Cathedral. The Lord Bishop of London, Ecclesiastical Patron of the Prayer Book Society, will preside and the Patron, His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, will be in attendance.

In 2012 there will be a new publication from CHP, entitled *Words for Worship: Prayers from the Heart of the Church of England*. This is an educational resource with the aim of commending classic Anglican prayers – including, of course, many from the Prayer Book – to a wide readership. The Liturgical Commission will look at other possible ways in which the Church of England can officially celebrate this important anniversary.

*74. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House considered whether, subject to health and safety considerations and pew configurations (where these have not been replaced by more flexible seating), cart-wheeling down the aisle is an appropriate celebration of a divine service well executed?

The Bishop of Wakefield: No, but a happy medium exists between formality and spontaneity, and there are sound biblical precedents – e.g. 2 Samuel 6.14 – for exuberance of this kind. It was after all a great day, was it not?

75. *Revd Stephen Pratt (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What steps are being taken by the House to enable the Archbishops to respond to the resolution passed by the Synod in February 2010 on a motion moved by Mrs Lorna Ashworth in relation to the Anglican Church in North America, given that the Archbishops' report requested in that resolution is due this year and there may not be a group of sessions in November?

76. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

What steps has the House taken or will it now take to enable and encourage the Archbishops to respond to the Synod's invitation, in a resolution passed on Wednesday 10 February 2010, 'to report further to the Synod in 2011' in relation to the desire and aspiration of those who have formed the Anglican Church in North America to remain within the Anglican family, and to the necessary further exploration by the relevant authorities of the issues raised by that aspiration, in respect both of relations with the Church of England and membership of the Anglican Communion?

The Bishop of Chichester: I should like to answer this question and a similar one from Mr Clive Scowen together. As indicated in my earlier reply to a question from Ms Susan Cooper, the Faith and Order Commission is undertaking work on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the faith and order aspects of any development of relations between the Church of England and ACNA. This work will help to resource a report from the Archbishops to members of Synod that will be sent out before the end of the year.

77. *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Can the House provide further details about the House's recent discussions and decisions following up the report *Talent and Calling* (GS 1650), approved by the General Synod in July 2007; and in particular, what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of Chapter 4, 'Fostering Diversity'?

The Bishop of Leicester: Discussions at the House of Bishops focused on two particular areas: the need for a more consistent approach to the identification of those ready for senior appointment and improving the preparedness of those appointed to senior office. The House supported a framework which will provide greater clarity to both appointers and possible candidates. It also affirmed the responsibility of diocesan

bishops for ensuring that appropriate learning and development is in place for those identified as having the potential to take on these roles and discussed the practical arrangements this might require.

With regard to Chapter 4, the monitoring arrangements recommended are in place and it is hoped that the work just mentioned will provide a platform for widening the possibilities for those in under represented groups. During 2010-11 particular work has focused on BME clergy in senior roles and we will hear more about this in the debate on Monday.

78. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

In the light of the House of Laity's discussion about more involvement being asked from laity and the letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the chairs of the Houses of Laity, what plans are there to encourage bishops to work with their lay leaders so that this objective may be achieved?

The Bishop of Norwich: Bishops regularly work with lay leaders. Locally, the 'bishop in synod' model of governance is an expression of their commitment to work with laity. Nationally, senior laypeople regularly address the House on issues of national and international significance and input from expert laypeople plays an important part in the Continuing Ministerial Development (CMD) programme for bishops.

Currently, working groups consisting of bishops, clergy and lay members of the House of Bishops and the Archbishops' Council are working together to address the challenges for the new quinquennium in the areas of contributing to the common good, going for growth and reimagining ministry.

*79. *Professor Anthony Berry (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops:

Has the House considered whether, in the event that a training provider had failed to give effect to a recommendation made nearly five years ago that it should appoint an ordained female to its staff, that would represent a ground for the House to consider withdrawing its recognition of the training provider and its support of its ordinands?

The Bishop of Norwich: Following an inspection, the training institution draws up an action plan which is approved by the senior inspector, who then conducts a follow-up visit and reports on it. If progress is not satisfactory, a further visit will take place. Reports on follow-up visits go to the House of Bishops and are published on the Church of England website. The House reviews all reports through the Bishops' inspection group which, in the event of substantial lack of progress, would in turn make a recommendation to the House of Bishops. The House would then take appropriate action which could include withdrawal of recognition.

Secretary General

80. *Mr David Ashton (Wakefield)* asked the Secretary General:

In the event a PCC has exhausted its funds, do the individual members become liable for its liabilities, e.g. the cost of demolishing a fire-damaged and dangerous church building where there is no, or not sufficient, insurance cover?

The Secretary General (Mr William Fittall): The liabilities of a parochial church council are liabilities of the body corporate, not of the individual members. The only circumstances in which members of a PCC might be personally liable would be if they had acted in breach of their duty as charity trustees to act in the best interests of the charity. There is a Legal Advisory Commission opinion, last revised in 2003, which considers in some detail a PCC's obligations in relation to insuring buildings.

*81. *Mrs Lois Haslam (Chester)* asked the Secretary General:

Is there any face-to-face training available for clergy, rural deans and archdeacons who are struggling to interpret the concept of the qualifying conditions for the purpose of the Church of England Marriage Measure 2008?

The Secretary General: The Weddings Project team has to date worked with 33 dioceses, and the training provided for clergy on weddings has included some information on the Marriage Measure 2008. There is also guidance from the House of Bishops on the Marriage Measure on the Church of England website and useful background material on GS 1436. If in doubt about the application of the law to a particular case, clergy should consult their diocesan registrar.

*82. *Revd Alastair Cutting (Chichester)* asked the Secretary General:

What steps need to be taken to allow members of religious communities to be permitted to anoint the sick with oil blessed by the bishop under Canon B 37.3?

The Secretary General: Canon B 37 (Of the Ministry to the Sick) provides, in paragraph 3, that if any person who is sick or in danger of death so desires, 'the priest may lay hands upon him and may anoint him with oil on the forehead with the sign of the Cross'. A member of a religious community who was a priest, and who had the requisite authority to minister in a particular place, would therefore be allowed to anoint the sick in accordance with the Canon; but a member of a religious community – or anyone else – who was not a priest would not.

The canonical provision accords with the understanding, set out in the Ordinal, that ministering to the sick and preparing the dying for their death is a particular ministry of priests. Any proposal to amend the canons would need to be considered carefully by the Faith and Order Commission and the Liturgical Commission and the House of Bishops.

83. *Revd Dr Mark Beach (Coventry)* asked the Secretary General:

Given the development in standards of charity governance in recent years and the much wider understanding that PCCs are charities and that their members are in the position of trustees, will consideration be given to bringing forward legislation to repeal the requirement that real property and investments be held by the 'diocesan authority' rather than by a PCC?

The Secretary General: There are currently no plans to do so but if Synod members believe that the subject should be considered, the Private Member's Motion on this subject from Mr Hobbs provides a vehicle for signalling their support for a debate.

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

What steps would need to be taken to enable one of the Provincial Episcopal Visitors for the Province of Canterbury to be added to the membership of the House of Bishops, so that he could participate in General Synod debates?

The Secretary General: The membership of the Upper Houses of the Convocations is regulated by canon, so an amendment to Canon H 3 would be necessary. Every five years the Business Committee establishes an elections review group and then decides whether to bring to the Synod proposals for change to the electoral rules and the composition of the Synod. It is open to members of Synod to make proposals to the review group which is about to be established.

85. *Mr John Ward (London)* asked the Secretary General:

Can a person ordained a priest by a woman bishop in one of our partner Porvoo churches be given permission to officiate or be licensed as a priest in the Church of England?

86. *Revd Dr Miranda Threlfall-Holmes (Durham and Newcastle Universities)* asked the Secretary General:

Can a person ordained a priest by a woman bishop in another Anglican province be given permission to officiate or be licensed as a priest in the Church of England?

The Secretary General: Overseas clergy may officiate in the provinces of Canterbury or York only with the written permission of the relevant archbishop, given under the Overseas and Other Clergy (Ministry and Ordination) Measure 1967. That requirement applies whether they are from elsewhere in the Anglican Communion, from a Porvoo Church or from another Church with whom we are in communion or whose orders are recognized and accepted by the Church of England. As a matter of policy, the Archbishops do not give such permission to clergy whose orders were conferred by a female bishop, given that the Church of England has yet to admit women to episcopal ministry.

87. *Mr Martin Dales (York)* asked the Secretary General:

The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 having received Royal Assent over a year ago, do we know when the Government expects concessionary charging schemes for churches, scouts, sports clubs and others, pursuant to the guidance under the Act, to be put in place; and what happens to disputed charges in the meantime?

The Secretary General: The most recent information that we have was given on 26 April in a parliamentary answer from the Minister to a question by Mr Jim Cunningham MP. A copy of that answer will be placed on the notice board.

Written Answers to Questions
Tuesday 26 April 2011
Utilities: Concessions

Mr Jim Cunningham: To ask the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs how many utility companies offer concessionary schemes for surface water drainage charges for community organisations; and how many community organisations are using such schemes. [50638]

Richard Benyon: Four water and sewerage companies charge for surface water drainage by reference to the impermeable surface area of the site being drained:

United Utilities;
Severn Trent Water;
Northumbrian Water; and
Yorkshire Water.

Two of these companies offer concessionary schemes for community organisations.

United Utilities has 3,314 customers on concessionary charges. Severn Trent Water currently caps the surface water drainage charges for community premises and charges places of worship on the basis of rateable value, which in most cases is zero. Severn Trent does not know the number of customers that currently benefit from these charges. It will investigate this and assess the costs before consulting its customers on permanent concessions for these groups under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

Northumbrian Water started its concessionary scheme on 1 April 2011 and expects to accept 1,768 customers onto the scheme during this charging year.

Clerk to the Synod

*88. *Revd Stephen France (Chichester)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

What arrangements are in place to welcome Rt Revd Victoria Matthews, Bishop of Christchurch, New Zealand, during this group of sessions?

The Clerk to the Synod (Dr Colin Podmore): When overseas bishops are present in the public gallery (for example, having been invited to address a fringe meeting, as in this case) it is customary for them to be welcomed from the Chair.

At the request of the Presidents, Bishop Matthews has been invited to give a short address during Evening Worship on Sunday evening.

89. *Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

Are there any plans for crèche facilities to be provided for members during Synod sessions?

The Clerk to the Synod: The Business Committee last considered this issue in May 2010. It noted that there are legal difficulties with the provision of informal child care arrangements and that a professional service would be expensive. It was suggested that Synod members could apply for assistance to their dioceses, some of which were prepared to offer a child care allowance, on an individual basis.

90. *Lieutenant Commander Philippa Sargent (Forces Synodical Council)* asked the Clerk to the Synod:

The Armed Forces Synod recently debated and voted on the legislation to ordain women to the episcopate, only to be informed, on submitting the results, that the vote would not be ‘counted’ as those of dioceses were, although it might appear in an appendix to the report. Could the Clerk to the Synod explain the standing of the Armed Forces Synod within the Church and particularly with respect to Article 8 business, given that, like a diocese, it is expected to elect representatives to General Synod and required to pay a not insignificant amount of money for the privilege of doing so?

The Clerk to the Synod: The Armed Forces Synod is referred to in the canons and the Church Representation Rules as the Forces Synodical Council. It was granted the right to elect members of this Synod at its own request, and it makes a financial contribution to the budget. The members it elects have full voting rights, including the right to vote on Article 8 business.

The Armed Forces are not a diocese and accordingly the Armed Forces Synod is not a diocesan synod. Its voting is therefore not relevant to the requirement in the Constitution of this Synod that (in summary) Article 8 business must, before final approval, be ‘approved by the majority of the dioceses at meetings of their diocesan synods’.

I will report votes on Article 8 business by the Armed Forces Synod to this Synod, so that members can take them into account when deciding how to vote at final approval.

Board of Education

91. *Revd Dr Mark Beach (Coventry)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

How is the National Society encouraging the development of Christian school leaders, and what provision is there for academic and professional training courses endorsed by the National Society?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd John Pritchard): The National Society has initiated a number of projects with the National College for School Leadership designed to identify and develop leaders for Church schools, including

- supporting dioceses in developing succession strategies
- encouraging leaders from BME backgrounds
- NCSL funding for diocesan programmes focusing on Christian distinctiveness.

With funding from the Jerusalem Trust, the National Society has also addressed succession planning in rural primary schools and issues for leaders of Church academies.

With the Church foundation universities, the National Society has developed an endorsement process for leadership qualifications offered by HE institutions that indicates the suitability of the course for Church of England schools. In the first year of operation two courses have been through the process and there are a number lined up for the next phase.

92. *Mrs Sarah Finch (London)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

What is the position of the Church of England on the maximum percentage of children attending Church schools who should come from Christian families?

The Bishop of Oxford: Synod members will have had the opportunity to read the revised Advice to diocesan boards of education on admissions to Church schools. The Advice confirms that Church schools continue to seek to provide education for both children of Church families and also from the wider community. It also recognizes that the exact balance between those categories will vary according to the circumstances of each school. No specific percentages are identified in the Advice.

Link to Advice:

<http://www.churchofengland.org/education/church-schools-academies.aspx>

93. *Revd Jeremy Fletcher (York)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Following the answers given to Questions at the February group of sessions, what further action has the Board taken to ensure the preservation of RE as a core subject in schools, and how will the Board ensure that the law about the teaching of RE will be upheld?

94. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Following the very successful Celebrating RE month, and the Early Day Motion about RE still to be debated in Parliament, has the Board considered what more can be done to ensure that this vital subject continues to be given high priority in schools?

The Bishop of Oxford: The Board has continued to make representations to the Government over issues to do with the status and quality of RE, including through our formal response to the consultation on the English Baccalaureate and in meetings with the secretary of state and the schools minister.

To encourage Church schools to maintain RE as a core element of the curriculum the National Society Council approved a statement of entitlement, laying out a minimum level of commitment. This is being consulted upon over the summer.

Recognizing the issues of quality in the teaching of Christianity, the National Society is seeking funding to develop a major resource for Church schools to improve understanding of and engagement with the Christian faith.

Church Buildings Council

95. *Mr David Ashton (Wakefield)* asked the Chairman of the Church Buildings Council:

Does the Church Buildings Council provide any advice to PCCs which are unable to pay insurance premiums for full reinstatement value of the church building?

Mr Timothy Allen: The Church Buildings Council provides advice for PCCs on insuring church buildings on the Churchcare website. This does not currently include specific advice for PCCs that are unable to meet insurance premiums and there are no central funds available, though some dioceses offer help with insurance premiums. The Legal Advisory Commission has published an opinion on PCCs and insurance.

The basic position is that the PCC is under a duty to insure the church against all the usual risks. But the duty to insure is not unqualified. In deciding how much to spend, a PCC must take account of other proper claims on its income. Ideally, churches should be insured against the costs of fully restoring them in the event of destruction; but the opinion recognizes that in the case of many ancient or large buildings this may be an unattainable ideal.

Council for Christian Unity

96. *Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford)* asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity:

The work of ARCIC III will include an exploration of ‘How right ethical teaching is determined at universal and local levels’. What consideration is being given by the Council for Christian Unity to involving the local Church, through discussion in the General Synod, in this process of exploration, so that the role of the General Synod is not restricted merely to receiving a report about ‘localism’ produced by a central body?

The Bishop of Guildford: After initially publishing agreed statements, the first ARCIC issued further statements and elucidations in the light of criticism from both Anglicans and Roman Catholics – including comment from General Synod.

ARCIC III has already committed itself to considering criticism and comment on the work of ARCIC II. This will, of course, include all the responses of the General Synod. Moreover, ARCIC III has said in the published communiqué from its recent first meeting – and I speak also as a member of ARCIC III – that ‘It intends to find ways to consult with members of its Churches at many levels as its work matures’.

After the closing act of worship, the Session was adjourned at 10 p.m.