

**ARCIC Presentation  
Bishop Mark Santer  
10.00am to 10.55am**

---

**(Tapes 20 and 21)**

To the people who are responsible for this next session and the one after morning coffee, have been us since the beginning of the ACC so Cannon David Hamid and Father Tim Gallagher need no introductions, in fact they are the co-secretaries of ARCIC.

We have in our midst this morning Bishop Mark Santer, who from 1983 until last year was the Anglican co-chair of the second Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission.

Mark is also the busy Bishop of Birmingham. We're delighted Mark that you are able to be with us, thank you very much for making this time available for the ACC and I want now to hand over this session to our three presenters who will guide us through what they would like to do this morning.

-00-

Thank you Mr Chair. I will begin by saying a few words about why we're dealing at all with an ecumenical text today. Something about who the ARCIC is, a word about how it works and then a word about what we hope to accomplish in this morning's session.

It's quite common for Christians to become impatient sometimes with the ecumenical movement, particularly when churches are facing such profound evangelical and prophetic admission challenges. Indeed this meeting itself has been considering some of these challenges, the complexities of rapidly evolving technology and the questions of the injustice of the economic system globally, but it's useful to remember that theological dialogue on matters of faith and order cannot easily be dismissed as relevant. I would remind you of a very good quote from the 1958 Lambeth Conference that expresses this well "A divided church cannot heal the wounds of a divided world". So we're engaged in ecumenical dialogue because such dialogue is an essential part of the healing of divisions which obscure the gospel message of reconciliation and hope.

Now the ARCIC, the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission, was established three decades ago by Pope Paul 6<sup>th</sup> and Archbishop Michael Ramsey, and was a pioneer really in terms of ecumenical dialogue between Christian churches, and from the start it sought to tackle what many thought were insurmountable obstacles. It is a body to which members are officially appointed to represent the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church world-wide. It has eight to nine members aside, plus the co-secretaries and, very importantly, an observer, a very active participant really but an observer from the Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

Now how does the dialogue work? The purpose of the theological dialogue is to enable the two churches to recognise Christ in one another and to discover how, together, the faith can be expressed and lived. Because churches which have lived in separation inevitably become divided in the way the express the one faith.

So the method of ecumenical dialogue which has been followed by ARCIC since the start tries to draw us back to the scriptures and to the common tradition and it seeks to avoid the later language which has become polemical; that tries to help us express the common faith in fresh ways.

So we are at the stage in the dialogue when we have a new text before us. On the eve of Ascension Day in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey this agreed statement was released, we've all be circulated with a copy of this. It was a newsworthy event and even caused some surprise for members of both communions. But the work does not stop when the theologians and when the commission publishes the text. In fact an important phase of the work begins, a phase which must involve the whole church; layette, clergy and those who have oversight, the Bishops, in a process of receiving the text. Now we're heard from some places that when the text published last May there were some that were mistaken in reading the document as if it were already a joint declaration of the two church authorities. It is not. It's a statement of theologians officially appointed by the churches, with an official mandate but their work is now handed over to the church at large for consideration. So we have the result then of the theological dialogue before us and now we begin a process of reception. A process that I hope will involve us all studying and evaluating the text.

So the next stage, reception, is a process which can not be rushed. In the next stage over a period of several years, I hope that we will begin today a process that will set in place what needs to be done in the churches of our communion to pay attention to and to study effectively this document. In a real sense the Anglican Communion begins the process today.

The purpose of this morning's sessions really are four fold: To introduce to you this important text, to put it in context and to highlight some of its content. It is the first opportunity that the publication has been before any instrument of our communion. Secondly, it is to provide an opportunity for the members of the ACC to ask questions of clarification. There maybe language and terminology and even concepts in here which are not familiar to us all. So we have an opportunity today, particularly in the presence of Bishop Mark to ask some questions of clarification. I repeat it's not for us today really to debate the theological content of the document, but it's certainly is a good opportunity to be able to go away with some initial questions of clarification answered, so we're ready to begin to study it in depth. Thirdly, I hope we will together be able to identify the questions and the resources which the communion will hopefully use over the next few years which will help us study the text. It will be useful if, by the end of this morning's session, that we will have gathered in some of your ideas and questions that will be useful as provinces and Diasees and as parishes study the text, as well as have an idea of any particular resources or study guides or whatever that the communion might prepare in order to help this be received and studied across the church. And lastly, to agree the timing and the process and the group that will be responsible to carry this forward at the level of the communion. The Inter-Anglican standing commission on ecumenical relations will take a lead role in managing the study and reception of the statement, as is noted if you'd read my report in the convening circular.

What is good for us to establish is some kind of time frame so we know how the churches can pace themselves in this study and when we might hope to hear back in the preliminary way about how this text is being received.

So, today then we actually begin the study by setting the questions, by setting the timeframe, by clarifying any immediate issues of language and terminology and in general have an introduction to this report. I repeat it is not for us today to say yes or no to the issues and the theological content contained herein but it certainly is for us to give some guidance as to the future process and how we as a communion will respond.

Thank you.

-oo-

Perhaps I will just begin by thanking you and the organisers for asking me to participate in this. Obviously I came here and my primary role was to be the observer here, but I am very glad to have this opportunity as a member of the Commission also to talk a little bit about the gift of Authority.

Now that David has explained something about our session, what I want to do before Bishop Mark speaks is to sketch in a little bit of the context for the statement.

Some people asked, back in May, “Why is our ARCIC suddenly produced a statement on Authority?” I hope that that isn’t particularly a question in the minds of members of the ACC because I’m sure that you have been kept informed about the progress of the dialogues in previous meetings. The introduction to the gift of Authority, paragraphs 1 to 6, already give a little bit of context to what it wants to say, but I would like to take you a little bit into that to show where the statement is coming from.

First of all it’s very important to notice that the commission gave its document a sub-title ‘Authority in the Church 3’. To show that this new ARCIC statement isn’t displacing its earlier work. Indeed not, because that earlier work from ARCIC in the final report has been officially evaluated by both churches. No, the earlier statements are the basis for this one and you will have noticed that in the new statement that paragraph 1 lists some points of convergence coming out of that previous work of ARCIC, but I think it would be quite unjust to the commission’s intentions to imagine that that work can be reduced to just a list of points. Rather, I think, the opening paragraphs of the gift of Authority are an invitation to go back and re-read that earlier work which, lets remember, has been officially reflected on and evaluated by both our churches.

So ARCIC chose quite deliberately to build upon it, not to repeat it and not to try and give an exhaustive summary on it. So a question that maybe is worth considering this morning is whether this whole corpus of work on Authority might need to be made available in some way for reflection by our churches.

This dialogue between us was set up by Pope Paul VI and Archbishop Ramsey when they met in 1966. Out of that visit came a joint commission; a proprietary commission to work out what this dialogue was going to involve and how it was going to go forward and that commission specifically highlighted the issue of Authority in the church. It’s nature, exercise and implications. I quote from paragraph 20 of the Malta report as it’s known, the report that sketched out the form and direction that the dialogue ought to take. It said “A serious theological examination should be jointly undertaken on the nature of Authority. Real or apparent differences between us come to the surface in such matters as unity and indefectibility of the church and its teaching Authority, the petrine primacy, infallibility and

marriological definitions.” So you’ll notice there that many of the themes, even in the new statement, were given to ARCIC by its authorities at that point.

When ARCIC had produced statements on the doctrine of the Ucrist and on Ministry and Ordination it was to devote most of the succeeding years in that first phase to looking at this question. In 1976 the first statement looked at how the Holy Spirit keeps the church under the Lordship of Christ. The Commission claimed in that first statement to have reached a consensus. Both it said on Authority in the church, and in particular, on the basic principles of primacy. It did not say that all the problems associated with primacy, in-particularly papal-primacy had been resolved but it stated (in no. 24) that it believed that there was a solid basis for confronting them. So that’s what the commission then went on in this first phase before the publication of the final report, to do. Five years later in 1981 the Commission did three things for our purposes. First of all it published an elucidation, a document answering questions raised about the first statement on Authority that it had produced. Secondly, it published a new second statement on Authority in the church and thirdly it gathered together all that work, together with the statements on Ucrist and Ministry and elucidation’s, as the final report and submitted it to the two churches to be officially evaluated so that was a very important moment in this dialogue on Authority.

ARCIC’s second statement on Authority looked particularly at universal primacy. In the elucidation they produced at that time the Commission already stated that it had reached doctrinal agreement that “the Unity in truth of the Christian Community demands visible expression that such visible expression is the will of God and that the maintenance of unity at a universal level includes the episcopate, the oversight or leadership, of a universal primate” that’s from elucidation no. 8) and the new statement they produced at the time said that “A universal primacy will be needed in a reunited church and should appropriately be the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, that’s from no. 9 of their second statement on Authority. That statement registered further progress concerning primacy although the commission did not claim that all disagreement had been resolved.

So that was the point that ARCIC had reached in it’s dialogue on Authority by the time it concluded that first phase and published the final report.

The second phase of ARCIC’s work stated, we might say, as this work on Authority was beginning to be examined, reflected on, received and evaluated by our two communions.

I’m sure there is no need to remind you that the 1988 Lambeth conference, in it’s resolution 8.3 and the 1991 Catholic Church response, both of them after wide consultation in our respective churches, recognised that this early work of ARCIC on Authority provided a basis for further dialogue and for further progress.

Once there had been those official responses ARCIC, the commission, had a clearer idea of how it’s authorities wanted to continue this dialogue. The principle pointers that it took from those responses are those mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Gift of Authority. It’s worth perhaps recalling that ARCIC does not set it’s own agenda. It takes it’s cue from what our churches ask it to do. It doesn’t sit there thinking up what it ought to do. So by 1994 the commission was ready to continue dialogue on Authority and it spent 5 years producing the statement which was published this May, four months ago, and which you have in front of you).

Bishop Mark is going to say something about their content in a moment. I just want to conclude by adding a few more important comments which I think help to put it in its context. The first of them is that as the ARCIC commission was engaging in this further dialogue which led to this statement, both our churches in different ways were also raising up the question of Authority in new ways for themselves and for ecumenical dialogue. I'm thinking first of all of the fact that in 1995 Pope John Paul wrote the first ever encyclical letter on ecumenism \*\*\*\*\* and in it he reflected on a number of issues but for our purposes we might recall in-particular that he reflected at some length on the ministry of unity as he describes it on the Bishop of Rome and on the fact that it constitutes a difficulty for most other Christians and he appealed for dialogue on that very subject which might enable him to come to exercise this Ministry in a way open to the new ecumenical situation, paragraph 96 and 95 of the encyclical letter. There have been various responses to that invitation already. The Church of England, House of Bishops produced an extensive reflection called 'May they all be One'. Other forms of response have been taking place. Perhaps I can say that ARCIC is also providing a contribution to such a response and one that certainly presents a challenge I think to my church, for example in the expectation expressed there that the exercise of this primacy by the Bishop of Rome should be much more transparently within the context of collegiality of the Bishops.

The other way in which this issue was being raised up was of course the Virginia Report and you've heard plenty about that and I really don't think I should say anymore about that suffice it to say that it is raising Anglican questions for Anglicans about teaching Authority and indeed about how Authority might work at the Communion wide level and indeed beyond that at a universal level. So I think ARCIC was working within that, if you like, new context. The second and final thing that I want to say about the recent situation is what has happened to this statement so far. Well, in one sense, it's very early days, David's emphasising it's coming to an Anglican instrument for the first time today. It's only four months since it was launched but quite a lot has happened and I just want to mention it very briefly. First of all the only official version of this document is the English language one which was produced by the commission which works in English. However, this time we made an effort which I think has not been made in the past, to make it as widely available in some other languages as possible, so at the moment of its publication in English it was also made available in translation in French, Italian, Portuguese and in Spanish versions. They are not the official text if you see what I mean, they are translations but they are as good translations as we could get. Also they were made immediately available on the world wide web both on the Vatican pages and on the Anglican Communion pages. That's the first time that any ARCIC document anyway has been issued in that way. They were also accompanied by some comments.....

## **End of side of tape**

.....Commission offering some initial reflections that might help the reading of the document. On our side on the Roman Catholic Church, this document was sent to every episcopal conference, every Bishop's conference in the world. Not just those where Anglicans are a significant partner of the community but to everyone but also to the Papal Nuncios. One of my colleagues said that he thinks that's the first time we've ever sent a document in that kind of way to everybody at that moment of publication. We always publish these documents in a sort of house bulletin which we send to everybody but it's not quite the same thing. It was accompanied by a letter commending it for study and reflection and a similar process was carried out by the Anglican Communion office and the document was sent to every primate so it's now for our churches separately and together to begin a

process of reflecting on it's contents, discussing it and eventually, in time, evaluating whether the Commission has indeed helped our two communities to come together on this question.

-00-

It's good to be with you this morning and to see some familiar faces. I think I'd like to start with an observation I haven't written down. It's this. If all of us engaged in ecumenism realise that we're talking not about reconciliation merely of institutions or doctrines but much more about the reconciliation of people in the one family of God. Friendship is an infinite nurturing of friendship is an indispensable element of it and Tim Gallagher has been a friend of mine for 20 years ever since when I was principal of a theological college and had a sabbatical term in Rome and he was the senior student of the English college in Rome then and he was one of people who made me very welcome indeed. I was present at his Priestly Ordination and he was present at my Episcopal Ordination. That is part of the cumunism.

I'm very glad that he's set the context out so clearly. I speak as you've been reminded, as the Bishop who was co-chairman of the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission from 1983 until earlier this year.

What I want to start by saying is this, to remind you that in looking at this text on Authority we are, so to speak, standing in the middle of a stream. A stream which in the immediate view, as we've been reminded, starts with Pope Paul IV's meeting with Archbishop Michael Ramsey in 1966. From that meeting in 1966, a third of a century ago, there has followed all the work of ARCIC. Our ARCIC agreed statements, evaluated by the churches already which we've heard about in this volume on \*\*\*\*\* on Ministry and Ordination and the first two statements on Authority. Part of this ongoing stream of responses which came from our two churches which have lead in their turn to this new statement on Authority. The background of this new statement includes not only this former work but also the work which the commission did, important work and work that I think has been too little commented on and absorbed, our work on church as communion, as well as the Anglican Communion's Virginia report and the \*\*\*\*\* which Father Gallagher has just talked about. Which as he reminded us, included the Pope's invitation to the other churches to engage in dialogue with him on the question of the Payple Office as a Ministry of Unity for the whole Christian people.

But that only takes us back to 1966. There's a much wider context both of space and of time. The dialogue between Anglican's and Roman Catholics is only one stream, so to speak, in the wider river of ecumenical dialogue.

The multi-lateral dialogues focus in the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, lots of local or national dialogues and the bi-lateral dialogues between particular traditions such as ours with Alutherans or ARCIC.

The issue of Authority comes up sooner or later in one form or another, in every dialogue which addresses itself seriously to questions to community or unity. Sooner or later, if you're talking about working more closer together, you have to talk about who decides what in a way which is credible. That is the issue of Authority.

In local or national dialogues the issue of Authority comes up on a local or national level. In global discussions, as we've discovered in our own Anglican Communion the issue of Authority comes up at a global level. How do we make decisions in such a way as we can recognise that we've made them? This issue of Authority is simply inescapable. That is so to speak the dimension of space. The dimension of what it means to be in communion with our brothers and sisters throughout the world.

There is in this discussion of Authority also the dimension of time. Authority has been an issue in the church ever since the days of the apostles. It is not a new issue. The apostles had to struggle to maintain unity in the church and their own apostolic Authority was at stake in that struggle. The issue of Authority was likewise central to the story of the split in the first millennium between the East and Western parts of Christianity. The issue of Authority was central to the tensions in the church of the West in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries which lead to the seism of the reformations. Questions about Authority and obedience will be at issue in the church until the end of time. Someone said to me, Aluthern a few days ago, that we (churches the reformation) think that Authority is the issue, he thought that as far as we were concerned obedience is the issue....Worth thinking about.

Now we Anglicans tend to focus on the question of the Authority of the Pope as if that was the only difficult issue. Well that is a cop-out. The Authority of Popes is only one of the questions. Another is the Authority of Bishops. Equally problematic is the Authority of kings and other civil authorities over and in relation to the church. So is the question is who speaks for the people as a whole and by what Authority. So is the question of the local vis-a-vis the universal. What about the Authority of scholars and theologians in the church, and perhaps the deepest question of all is this: do we really believe that Christ has given living organs of Authority to his people such that when is necessary the church as a whole can recognise that it is being spoken to and spoken for in the name of the Lord.

Now if we are conscious of the dimension of ecumenism not only in space but also in time, it helps us to distinguish those elements of the church's life rooted in scripture itself which are integral to, or constituent of the nature of the church itself and ARCIC talks a lot about that in church's communion. We distinguish between those essential elements and the particular forms which the life of the church has taken from time to time. The church always has been and still is changing and so is the way in which Authority is exercised in the church.

Most of us have rather short memories, and so as far as the question of Authority is concerned we have to be very careful not to be so wedded to contemporary forms as in effect to excommunicate most of our Christian ancestors. For example, as Anglicans, we have become accustomed to synodical and representative forms of government. But if we were to insist on representation by democratic election as the only legitimate route by which the voice of lay people can be properly heard in the church, we shouldn't leave much space for the views or practice of St Paul. In other words, we must always try to see our own particular situation in the context of the life of the whole Christian community, by which I mean the community both of space and of time. We are right to attend to what the contemporary world feels are legitimate and proper political structures, but we're also right not to absolutize them.

Now what I've been saying so far helps us, I hope, to understand the nature of this text before us.

Please remember it took five years to prepare so don't dismiss it in five minutes. Five years which presupposed both a pre-history and also a story which is still to follow. There's an important sense in which this is not a finished text. It's a contribution to a dialogue which must continue, not only to

Anglicans and Catholics but between and within every Christian community which is committed to unity in Christ.

So please, this is a text which should be read with delicacy, attention and respect. Each sentence, each paragraph should be read in the context of the argument as a whole and it is a longer and larger argument than is contained between the pages of this little pamphlet.

This text should be read in the context of the wider dialogue between Christians of all communions about the nature of communion and Authority in the church. We already had some over hasty comments from people who ought to have known better.

Your task as a council I believe is to help the people of the Anglican Communion to come to a measured, reflective and responsible response which will contribute to a realisation of true unity among the whole Christian people. It's a process which is bound to take time, patience and hard work as well as a willingness to listen to our Christian brothers and sisters. We should bear in mind the question to ask as we try to evaluate this text is not so much "is this recognisably Anglican or is it Roman Catholic but is it Christian and is it true?" There's nothing at all in the New Testament about Anglicanism please remember but there is a great deal in the New Testament about the unity which is required of all who belong to Christ.

Now the commission does not claim so much to have extended the areas of agreement of consensus already set out in it's first two statements of Authority as to have deepened their agreement.

May I simply draw your attention, quite briefly, to three particular areas where I believe we have gone deeper. First, and this is great importance, some people have rushed to the end of the document and haven't reflected sufficiently so far on the first part. We have deepened our understanding of our biblical routes of the Christian doctrine of Authority in the church. The foundation of our work based on St Paul's teaching in 2 Corinthians chapter 2, is our exposition of God's yes to humanity and humanity's yes or amen to God, both given once and for all in the person and work of Jesus Christ. We do not collude with the modern Western notion that all exercise of Authority is necessarily corrupt. We insist that the Authority which Christ has lodged in his church is a gift like all of God's gifts it is subject in use to human corruption but it remains a gift given for our good. Secondly, we have deepened our understanding of the relationship between the decisions of Authority on the one hand and their acceptance or reception by the church as a whole on the other. Here I'd make one point in particular, namely this: the importance of not playing off the exercise of Authority and it's reception against one another. They are inseparable elements in once process or operation. Thirdly, at the end of our statement we invite our two churches to consider ways, in which even while our communion is still imperfect, we may exercise together the Authority for proclaiming the gospel which Christ has entrusted to his people.

This is a proposal that is lessened and not all that it sounds. In fact it's a matter of building on what we already doing in many parts of the world. Think for instance of the significance of the joint decision making which has contributed to our liturgical convergence. We talk in particular about the place of the Pope as the chief pastor of the Christian family even before the whole family is holy reconciled.

You may want to ask for some clarification on that later on.



Parts of what the commission has said will sound unfamiliar to many of our people. That's because we've all been brought up to speak the language and to think the thoughts of a particular tradition. But in ecumenical dialogue we stop talking about only talking to ourselves and the members of our own family, we start listening to our neighbours and to the ways in which they too have heard the message of the scriptures. The members of the Commission do not claim to have spoken the last word on the issue of Authority of the church, far from it but they do claim to be asking our two churches to address their minds to an issue which is inseparable from the question of unity. If we refuse to talk about Authority we are not serious about unity. Together with our brothers and sisters, and not apart from them, we are to ask ourselves what is the nature of that Authority which Christ has given to his people for the sake of their communion and unity and in what ways is it to be exercised.

As we consider this statement, as with the Virginia report, looking simply towards the issue of communion among Anglicans, we're not looking only towards the issue of communion between Anglicans and Roman Catholics, we're looking towards the horizon of visible communion of the one body of Christ between all who he has claimed for his own. Our perspective is the visible, sacramental, ecclesial realisation of the faith we proclaim every time we say that we believe in one holy, Catholic and abosolic church.

Just one final point. What you as a council now decide to do with this statement will itself be an exercise of Authority and the way in which you ask for communion to respond to it will be an exercise of Authority. The way in which you invite the communion to respond will itself exemplify an understanding or doctrine of Authority. So part of the question before us is "What's the practice and what's the theory?"

-oo-

At this point, a very initial expression of appreciation to the three members of the panel for the way in which they've introduced this matter to us. I'm now going to ask David if he will explain what the hope of the panel is for this next period. A slight realignment of our morning timetable.

We seem to be somewhat racing with the clock, and we have envisioned two sessions of small group work this morning before lunch, the first one to happen right now until coffee which will be served at 11.15. To break into the usual groups and to identify, and hopefully the group leader can note these down, identify questions of clarification about language and concepts and terminology that is contained in this statement. This is hopefully a fairly quick task and when we resume at 11.35am hopefully we will have a very quick/crisp reporting back from the 8 groups, of questions for clarification which hopefully members of the panel will be able to give to you at that time. Following that there will be a more detailed piece of group work which we will assign to you and we have papers to hand to you following the coffee break.

-oo-

We will begin our midday prayer with a moment of silence.

Oh God make speed to save us. Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit as it was in the beginning is now and will be for ever. Amen. Alleluia

Will respond with alternate verses.

Oh do good to your servant that I may live and so shall I keep your word.  
I am a stranger upon the earth, hide not your commandments from me.  
You have rebuke to be arrogant.  
Cursed are those who stray from your commandments.  
Rulers also sit and speak against me but your servant meditates on your statutes.

For from the rising of the sun to it's setting my name is great among the nations and in every place  
incense is offered to my name and a pure offering for my name is greatest among the nations says the  
Lord of hosts. The word of the Lord.

In our prayers this afternoon we remember our ecumenical relationships, we pray for our churches  
commitment to work together, we pray that we will become that community for which Christ prayed.  
A community of love and truth and justice.

Heavenly Father, send your holy spirit into our hearts to comfort us in all our afflictions, to defend us  
from all error and to lead us into all truth through Jesus Christ our Lord.

\*\*\*\*\*cycle of prayer remember the Diasees of Virginia in the Episcopal Church of the United States of  
America. We pray for their endeavour to plant new churches, renew existing ones and expand their  
youth ministry. We pray that their vision of unity, love and witness may be fulfilled.

Blessed saviour, at this hour you hung upon the cross, stretching out your loving arms. Grant that all  
the peoples of the earth may look to you and be saved for your tender mercies sake. Amen.

We remember also in our prayers the people in East Timor for the victims there and for those who help.  
We prayer for the leaders in that region and for all those whose decisions effects the lives of so many  
people.

Merciful God, you loose the bones of injustice and let the oppressed go free. Give us the will to share  
our bread with the hungry and to give shelter to the homeless poor for thus your glory will be revealed  
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Say the Lords Prayer in our own languages.

Our Father..... Amen.  
Let us bless the Lord.

-00-

Thank you Herman for that. Now comes the time where our panel will respond to the questions  
they've received. They've done some hurried consultation over coffee and over now to the panel.

Are there any other groups which haven't submitted their questions? I thought the word had gone  
around to each group that they were to be in writing?

Right, we have about 40 minutes, if needed, for this.

Here is a first question, "How do both Roman Catholic and Anglican churches define or elaborate what is meant by the term Ministry of Memory?"

Well, I think wouldn't want to say what the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches say; I can say what the Commission which was composed of Roman Catholic and Anglican theologians meant by it, and it was this. They're referring to a particular aspect of the pastoral or episcopal office which is of course they have a particular responsibility with the maintenance of communion, for each Bishop has responsibility not only for his own church but for the good of all the churches in communion with other churches. As I was saying earlier on, communion is not only a matter of being communion with a contemporary church, but in communion with a church of all ages. Therefore a particular responsibility of the pastoral office is to hold the people of God to the tradition, the Gospel, which has been entrusted to them because we all of us hear it in partial ways and Bishops singularly and together, helped by theologians and others have a particular responsibility for holding the people of God to the memory and hope that has been entrusted to them. I would say that there is a particularly powerful symbol of this in our own Anglican Ordination ceremony certainly as we have it in England in that when a new priest or bishop is consecrated or ordained a bible is given as a symbol of that Ministry of Memory. This and the churches understanding of this is what you are to hold the people of God to. That is briefly the Ministry of Memory.

From the same group there's another question here which refers to paragraph 31 of the document which begins by saying As and Roman Catholics can agree in principal on all the above which is the whole of chapters 1 and 2, but need to make a deliberate effort to attrieve this shared understanding and the group is asking what is being intended by shared understanding and I think what they're trying to get at is the fruit of this dialogue is a listening to each other and a conversation in which both sides are trying to understand how it is that we seem to have differences of emphasis and to see whether, nevertheless, behind that lies sort of fundamental understanding of the importance of Authority and how it works in the Christian community and what purposes it serves. I think that's what in essence they're trying to talk about shared understanding. The co-chairman when they presented the document to the press or to the world, I don't know which one it was, I think it was just the press, said they thought it was important to understand what the commission members attempted to do. They tried to express what they believes flows from our common shared faith. But I think the commission is also saying that because we've lived that out in different ways and particularly because we've lived that out in separation from each other, particularly in a period when there was much less interaction between us that we sometimes need to make a real effort to try and get more in touch with the fullness of that on both sides and I think that's how I would understand the answer to that question.

I think this is a shared understanding as an expansion of what we have all the time in human society, we're all different people and see different things in different ways and conditioned by the groups in which we live and when we're trying to come together we do try to have to listen to one another and appropriate each one another's experience and memories and understanding and see how far we can own them. I've been asked to follow up one something I was saying just now. This group has found us unclear on the understanding of episcopacy as watching over the living memory of the church, how does the whole body contribute to this ministry. Well I've said a little bit about that, I think it's also important to remember that you can't have an ministry without the faithful anymore than you can't

have a faithful without the ministry and what one is talking about here is the particular responsibility of the ordained ministry and of the episcopacy in particular, the ministry they're given in ordination to hold, to proclaim and hold the people to the tradition which has been given to them. But this isn't done in isolation from the people as a whole. There is a particular role of theologians in contributing to the understanding of the tradition and renewing the churches understanding of the tradition. There's the ministry of artists, there's the responsibility of Christian writers of all kinds and there's the responsibility of every Christian man and woman who tries to live by the Gospel who meditates on the scriptures and tries to live by them. We all have our part in handing on the tradition that is given to us. I heard someone saying last week that "Religion, Christianity in Russia survived because of the grandmothers" \*\*\*\*\* exercising a ministry of memory in the Soviet Union.

-00-

Group 4 asked a question. What is meant from the RC perspective by the concept of synodality which is a concept new to most Anglicans? This refers really to, in particularly to, paragraph 34 through to 40 and I think the first way to answer the question is to say that the concept of synodality is new to most people and not to, I can't speak for Anglican's, but I think it would be new to Roman Catholics as well. I think paragraph 34 introduces it quite well when it says that it's talking about common way or walking together or whatever, that it indicates the way in which believers and churches are held together in communion as they go on the way together. The commission was trying to find the over arching concept to try and draw together the different ways in which we have engaged and we should engage in this walking together in faith, so synodality doesn't simply mean synodical, it's a concept that's wider than that though synods, both in the Anglican sense, and in our sense, will be part of it. It's meant to be a concept that draws together the different ways in which we journey in faith and different mechanisms that help us to do that, so the commission talks and tries to give examples of this tradition of synodality, particularly in paragraph 39 for the Anglican world and paragraph 40 for the RC church. So it's talking about collegiality, it's talking about the performance of consultation and the ways in which a bishop is called to express the voice of his local church both to the local church and to the other churches in the communion and whether that's done in a very structured way through synods or through the more ordinary process of interaction and discussion and listening. All of those things come under this concept of synodality, but I think it's something that does need a quite a deal of reflection because I think there will be people in my church who will want to know what this is all about. It's not an Anglican problem in any way.

Perhaps I could follow up from that by trying to say something about the reference on page 29 paragraph 39 to Anglican synods as being Ucristic in nature, I'm asked what is meant by this. I think the church is Ucristic in nature, the place where the church most fully appears as church is when it assembles together around the Lords table to offer praise, prayer to the Lord and to celebrate Christ's offering on our behalf. A synod is a formal meeting \_\_\_\_\_ of a diocese by representation and therefore has the character of the local church by representation and by such, is Ucristic. It is presided over by it's chief pastor. He is the teacher of the people, the president of the flock, the president at the Ucrist. It is very important to separate out and divorce presidency at this sort of table, from presidency at the Lord's table. That is what \_\_\_\_\_ by remembering the Ucristic character of the synod that you remember that it's Christian, not just any old meeting. I think it's a great pity that in the Church of England we don't dress up for synods and look like clergy and lay people meeting as such, but that's a personal querk.

-00-

As you can imagine we have a wealth of questions here and in the short time available we obviously won't be able to answer them all, so we're sort of picking and choosing some which seem perhaps more urgent, but just to say that there have been several groups that have suggested the idea of a glossary on terminology and that's something which will be taken on board and perhaps also something that for those of you who are computer buffs, know something of a FAQ file (frequently asked questions) and there might be some consideration given to some way of being able to marshal these in some way in a FAQ file. There have also been some questions about process and that has to do very much so with the ACC. It has been asked whether there will be further chance for the ACC in fact to participate in the process and evaluation and I think the answer to that is yes, as you'll see very shortly in the resolution coming before you, we're looking at at least a six year period before we hear back in some considered way from the Stanley Commission \_\_\_\_\_ but there will obviously be a ACC between now and then and it's understood that the process evaluation throughout the church, I repeat, does involve clergy, laity and bishops together and since this is kind of body that reflects that at the level of communion you would certainly be involved in that and hopefully provide some leadership. Also, there have been some questions about some dialogue with say the Orthodox church and there has been some thoughts given to, in other Anglican dialogues, of being able to reflect on this particular statement because, as some of our ecumenical participants have said when they gave their introductions, each dialogue does in fact touch upon the other and certainly in the Anglican Orthodox dialogue there will be great interest in the implications of this statement and also in the Anglican old Catholic continuing conversations. For instance, the fact that we have a World Council of Churches Faith and Order participant in the art of dialogue is another way of making sure that there is a connection to the multi-lateral dialogue as well.

-00-

There's a pretty fundamental question about the theology here of the statement. We're asked "Why was the yes, no theology of Paul chosen as the interpretative paradigm for this report?". There are all sorts of why's aren't there. I think it was because people were working and one of our sub-groups come up with it and then it appealed to the rest of us. Another kind of why is because it seemed to us that we had stumbled upon something absolutely fundamental in the New Testament about the nature of God's yes to us, and therefore about the nature of Christ's witness as we say in paragraph 8 and therefore about the fundamentally positive character of the divine affirmation which is given to humanity in Christ. What St Paul enabled us to do, and notice there's a Christic dimension in that passage, 2 Corinthians 2, about the yes that we give to God through Christ, the Amen we give to God through Christ, it enables us both to speak of God's work to us and our response to God, both of which are given in Jesus Christ. It enables us also in a fruitful way to relate the response of the individual to the response of the whole of humanity and the response of the church which are given for us in Christ. The response to God so to speak is a song or a dance which we join, it's given to us. All those things.....

**Tape end 20 ends**

**Tape end 21 begins**

..God's affirmation and humanities response in the way in which we are held to that affirmation. I think it's almost more a matter of meditation than anything else it seems to us a very fruitful way in. I don't know whether Tim would like to say anymore on that.

-00-

I think it just seemed a very fruitful key to understanding also, in a sense, how you go from scripture to the present community of the church, trying to live in relationship to the scriptures and trying to respond faithfully to them but in changed circumstances and with the fruits of the intervening period of the churches life to live with as well. I think it seems to be just a key motif which opened up a lot of things for the Commission I would say.

Can I just make a comment on what David was saying earlier about the reception process, I think it's raised in several questions here. It's this, I didn't say it in my introduction and I don't think anyone has said it as such and that is that all the documents of the first phase were presented as the final report (as I did say) so far none of the ARCIC work from the second phase was formally presented in that way to either church and that's because up until now, and including the Gift of Authority, I think the Commission has not felt that it has completed all the work that it has been asked to do by the two authorities in this phase. So there is a question that is still around, if you like, and that is "What is the appropriate way to gather this work together?" and to present it for evaluation. Obviously there is a discussion already of trying to evaluate this document but I just wanted to say that the work of ARCIC 2 as such has not yet been through that formal evaluation process and I think we still have got to talk about all the details of how that can appropriately be done.

One model is what was done before in a sense which is to collect it all together, put a cover on it so to speak and then say here you are, but it might be that that is not the best way to evaluate a corpus of work like this because sometimes it invites people to analyse every word and every sort of full stop and semi colon, so there are questions outstanding I think that the Commission has got to address in this respect. That doesn't take from the need that we've been emphasising at all for a considered reflection and process of reception and response to this document because this is probably the most crucial document so far produced in this phase.

-00-

There is a question about what is meant by the "sensus \_\_\_\_\_" the sense of faith or the of "sensus \_\_\_\_\_" this is common understanding of the faith, that's in paragraph 29. It is an extraordinarily difficult area to deal with. One's talking about the common feeling that the people of God have for the understanding of the faith. I think Anglicans and synodically governed churches, it obviously has a relation to the way in which that faith is articulated when need be by synods, by bishops and representatives of the people of God as a whole, acting together, but it's not exhausted by it's constitutional relations, it's very important. There are a good and holy people who have a very profound sense of the reality and wholeness of a faith, who don't go near a synod and there are some who are in synods whose grasp of the Christian faith is not increased by the fact that they've been elected. It's a very sensitive and delicate relationship. The relationship between the grasp of the people as a whole and it's articulation through it's formal representatives and when we were, I remember doing our evaluation of the first work of ARCIC and also the World Council Churches text

on Baptism and Ucrist Ministry, I remember that certainly in England we found ourselves distinguishing between a process we call reception and a process we call response.

Response was the formal activity of bodies like yourselves, synods of all levels, national or provincial synods and eventually the ACC and the Lambeth Conference, that was a formal response. But there was a much wider business of the reception of a new understanding of the faith, there being taken into the blood stream of the people as a whole, through theological teaching, through prayer, through bible study, through conversations with ones fellow Christians of other traditions and so on. So response and formal response is a kind of crystallisation of a much wider business of the reception whereby the understanding of the faith is taken into and judged by the people as a whole and of course it's very easy to be cynical about bishops or others putting their finger to the wind saying "I know what the people are thinking". One can be just as cynical about synodical bodies, sticking their fingers in the air saying "We've been elected so we know what the people are thinking". The fact is all forms of government had to be used and all can be misused. We try in humility and sensitivity to listen to what the people are saying and praying and try to articulate that formally, to articulate the *sensus*. That comes very close to this other question which has been raised by what is meant by the indefectibility and infallibility of the church. This goes back to stuff in ARCIC's previous statements on authority.

All I can say really is read, very carefully, paragraphs 41 and 42.

By the indefectibility of the church, we mean our faith that in accordance with the promises of Christ, the church will persevere and be maintained in the truth. By that we mean the church as a whole will persevere and be maintained in the truth. By infallibility we mean that there are circumstances in which it is necessary and has been necessary for the church, through its organs, through synods and otherwise Roman Catholics would say through the Pope acting in communion with the whole church, to articulate the faith of the whole church in certain circumstances. He's not at liberty to say anything he feels like, he's got to articulate what is the faith of the church and it is the assurance that when he does so, he will not be mistaken in what he says, or the church will not be mistaken. If I can give some examples of what I would see as infallible exercises of the church's infallibility, one would be the recognition of the Canon of the New Testament, that is an irreversible doctrinal decision by the church that those are the documents which we recognise as giving us the testimony to Jesus. I would say that is one of the churches infallible, irreversible, secure judgements on which we can rely. Others would be judgements of the Council of Nisea and Calcedon about the persons of Christ. They're not up for grabs. The church has received them, sometimes over quite a long period, and come to recognise them as sure, reliable expressions of the churches universal faith. Those are the sort of things one is talking about when one talks about the churches indefectibility and infallibility. But Tim as a Roman Catholic theologian may wish to say some more.

-00-

I think you've probably said enough! There's a question that's been raised by one of the groups there about what is the status if you like of Papal teaching which this is from the period of division. I think I would say that this is a question that we would have to explore further still among us because it's quite clear that there are different levels of Papal teaching in any case but if we're talking about the most authoritative levels of Papal teaching they've clearly been defined and pronounced in a period of Christian division and how that's to sort of pan out is a big ecumenical question, to face not just for Anglicans but for any dialogue involving the Catholic Church including the Orthodox.

-00-

It is precisely in this context that the Commission talks about not just reception but re-reception, about looking at things again in a new and wider context. Something's become more important and others become less important I think, and some definitions which are not necessarily untrue can be seen as less than adequate in new circumstances.

Then there's this question towards the end which I did raise when I was speaking before about the last three paragraphs, Universal primacy a gift to be shared. I think it's important to remember that one of things we have discovered in Ecumenical dialogue is that there is not a simple division between, on the one hand, being in communion and on the other being out of communion. We recognise the importance of our common baptism. Signs of communion would be the sharing of biblical scholarship, the sharing of liturgical scholarship, a sign of communion and even an exercise of teaching authority a few years ago in England was when the Anglican and the Roman Catholic bishops together agreed to issue a statement on euthanasia. That was a joint exercise of episcopacy and a joint exercise in a sense of a teaching authority. We're were not in a situation when one church was saying to the other "your bishops are not bishops they're nothing" we're recognising each other in a state of partial communion and sharing in authority.

This happened when the Pope came to Canterbury in 1982 and together with the Archbishop of Canterbury, Roger Runcely then, and the \_\_\_\_\_ church leaders, blessed the people and proclaimed the faith together as an act of common responsibility. That was declaring in a way at one level, an imperfect level, a sense of shared episcopacy in a sense of a shared responsibility for the gospel. That happens when I as a bishop in a big city, together with a Roman Catholic bishop and another church leader issues statements as church leaders. We are already sharing a quasi responsibility for oversight of the Christian project as a whole. What we are saying in the report is that it is a sense in which already the Bishop of Rome does function as the leader or the chief among all the pastors of the Christian community. I remember Archbishop Runcely saying he was the only person who could have summoned, in virtue of office, that meeting to pray for peace in Assisi.

It's not a case of jumping into communion or submitting to Papal definitions or this or that, it's a case of recognising an authority and a shared responsibility which is already there and building on it both locally where we are, often in a very minority and difficult situations as many as you are, and realising we're all part of the one family of God and the pastors in particular have a shared responsibility for the family of God. There is a sense in which, and I mean the Archbishop of Canterbury, would not go to Rome and be welcomed as he is unless he were being recognised by the Pope as one of the chief pastors of the Christian family and the Archbishop would not bother to go to Rome unless there was a sense in which he was recognising the Pope as a chief pastor in the Christian family. It's building on that and making theological sense of something which in a sense is already there. That's what we're talking about.

-00-

I think sometimes in this, as we discover that it's not a question of being in full communion or absolutely no communion, you know total separation and therefore we stop using phrases, at least ones which are more common among us, to talk about separate brothers and sisters and so on. I think we



seem to find that things don't fit very neatly into categories and I think what Mark is talking about there is an example of this, because I think if you try to define precisely what's going on there it's very hard to do it but I think there is a reality there which is worthy of recognition and that is perhaps calling us to explore and deepen it.

Perhaps to give it another example, again with regard to the Pope who's a leading representative of another church not yours, wrote at an early point, I think it was '93 or '94 to say about the coming of the third Christian millennium and said something like 'no other church by itself and none of us without you can do something constructive towards this'. Now whether you agree with that sentence or not, I think it's an illustration of something that Mark is talking about there. It doesn't fit into a category, I'm sure if we start to explore other recognises universal primaries of the Pope, I think the answer would be no, but in a certain sense there is an illustration of a recognition of something there that is needed and was being located, rightly or wrongly in the Bishop of Rome.

-00-

Well a small measure of authority has been gifted to me.

The ACC needs now to break again into small groups. You've been given copies of a possible resolution and some draft questions, and you are asked in your small groups now to examine both the resolution and those questions and say are these the questions that we need to ask at this stage of the study, are there other questions, what resources will be helpful in the study and reception of the text and once again please, lets make it clear this time group leaders are asked to ensure these are recorded and handed in. There won't be a chance in plenary to work through those. David assures me that because of the way in which the panel is delighted that the ACC has engaged with those early questions that there will be an attempt to compile/collate may be write up some further answers because some of those questions remain unanswered for us.

Am I correct in reflecting that? That's quite an undertaking for anyone to make, but I think David is committing himself to that task with some help.

So, we have 25 minutes to look at the resolution and those draft questions, then to come back and we will see whether the resolution is acceptable to the ACC at that point. 15 minutes to work through and see if we can fix it. Is that clear to everyone?

25 minutes thank you very much.

Right, my hope is that we might be able to move through this resolution. I'm aware that there is at least one amendment being offered. To see if we can achieve it before lunch, and the Secretary General has advised me that he has a host of announcements so we don't have a great deal of time, but lets see if we can because the two sessions given to us at the end of the conference for resolutions are starting to fill up rapidly and we don't want to be too hurried, but if this one is not capable of being handled in quarter of an hour, so be it. We will still handle it at some point.

The resolution, as I understand it is being moved by the Chairman of ACC, Bishop Simon. Is he with us? In that case is there somebody else present in the room who is prepared to move the resolution presented to us?

David Richardson, and it's seconded by Bishop Michael Lugor. Thank you. So the resolution as it stands at the moment is before us.

Any speakers to the resolution?

Dr Baxter. Dr Baxter is going to speak to an amendment she is going to propose.

-00-

Mr Chairman, I have been consulting while the groups have been meeting with Bishop Mark Santer and with David Hamid about the fact that the ARCIC 2 documents that Bishop Mark referred to, the Church's Communion, probably the Justification by Faith document, and the document called Clarifications, have not been referred to the Communion and they would actually be glad for all the ARCIC 2 documents to be referred for comment as well. So I would like to propose an amendment which does that and I am glad to say it has Bishop Mark's agreement so under Section 1, where we say that we welcome the publication of the report entitled 'The Gift of Authority in the Church' we would add 'and all other reports of ARCIC 2 which have yet to be considered' and there would then be three consequential amendments so that every time it refers to this report it refers instead to these reports. So in Section 2 it would say '...expresses its appreciation to ARCIC for this agreement statement' it would say 'these agreed statements'. Where it says 'this report' it would say 'these reports' and in Section 4A where it says 'The Gift of Authority' we would add 'and the other reports'.

Now I have ten signatures which support this amendment, I won't read all the names out, but I would like to encourage the ACC to do this because I believe that if the provinces are asked to discuss this report without also being asked to discuss the church's communion report on which this builds, it won't make much sense to them and it is a good idea to send them all together. So I urge the ACC to accept this amendment though I apologise to you that I've only written it during the course of the session and you don't have it in typed form or on overhead projector.

-00-

Thank you Dr Baxter is there a seconder for the amendment? Bishop Mark Diass formally seconding it purposes of discussion. Thank you. Any speakers to the amendment. Professor \_\_\_\_\_.

-00-

I tried to write the amendment as it was given to us. Does it say and all other reports of ARCIC 2 which have yet to be considered? Could I then make a comment on it. We had a little bit of difficulty with the word 'commends' for Part 3 because that rather expresses a view about this document, then of course it goes back to 2 which expresses appreciation and back to 1 which welcomes the publication. Each of those expressing a positive view on this material, now if we are now adding other reports which we have not considered, are we better simply saying 'receiving' rather than 'welcomed'. That's my comment on the amendment.

-00-

Yes Mike.

-00-

Chairman I'd like to oppose the amendment. Simply on the grounds that it's going to cause confusion. It's very hard to get the phrases exactly right, so that on the one hand, one is welcoming and commending something new and on the other hand one is also drawing people's attention to the need to study foundations which have been there for some time, even if they haven't already noticed them. For some provinces which have taken the trouble to deal with earlier ARCIC 2 documents and to respond to them, this resolution may be confusing in terms of chronology and may not, as it were, give a sufficiently strong signal that this report is new and that this report is to be studied. I'd much prefer the amendment was not passed, that we pass the resolution as it is and that the Resolutions Committee come back with a further small resolution simply noting that other ARCIC 2 documents which have not yet been commended to the provinces should now be so commended as a useful foundation to this further work.

-00-

Thank you. Any further speakers?  
Bishop Newell

-00-

Mr Chairman, I'd like to support the amendment and I only raise in the light of the previous speech because I think these documents do need to be taken together and to be read together and studied together. I don't think it is possible to isolate the one and I think suggestion that I made informally is it might be considered in future editions of this Authority 3, to make sure it is printed under the one cover with the other documents because I think it is vital that they be read together. I do not think Authority 3 really makes sense if you take it in isolation and I think that what is in the amendment would help to ensure that we look at the total picture and not just part of it. Thank you.

-00-

Thank you. \_\_\_\_\_

-00-

Thank you Mr Chairman. I want to also support Dr Baxter's amendment because I think it will help me to support the main resolution which, I was having a lot of difficulty because it may be to do with the way we have handled it in the meeting, which I have found rather secretive. It has not been open and I've not understood why, the approach to this particular session has been one of secrecy. The documents being passed, questions, because I would have benefited if I had the voice over the person

and the group suggesting what questions they were proposing and so I am taking consolation in the fact that this amendment is helping me to support the main resolution, so I am saying I am supporting the amendment and would request that the members do the same. We need that as a document because when this document reaches my province, as a member of the SCC, I have to be in the forefront of introducing what we have done, but I feel that I have not benefited that much in an open discussion which would have opened me a little more to the terminology which is being used here which is highly theological, and with my very limited theological background, I was having a lot of difficulty in my group and this is one of the things I feel we have not given adequate time to the open discussion of this particular document.

-00-

Thank you. I would like to move to put the amendment if I can. We've had two points of view expressed.

Right. Do you need the amendment to be read again before I put it? It's clear to people that we're voting on the amendment? Those in favour please say I. Yes, perhaps we should adopt an English practice of showing in case we need to count. Yes, please, if you are in favour please raise your right hand.

OK. Those against, raise your right hand.

That's very clear. 39 – 3. Does anyone wish to abstain?

The amendment is carried.

We are now dealing with an amended motion. Any further discussion Bishop \_\_\_\_\_.

-00-

I don't think it's appropriate to forward \_\_\_\_\_ but there are two points on route I'm very keen to make which we hope it might be possible for those sending this amendment out. The first is that we thought it would be helpful and appropriate to have a review of the Gift of Authority and the response to it by the next ACC meeting in 2002.

The next point is rather difficult to put in a tactful way, so I'm not going to do it, but there was great concern by our members about the marginalisation of the Anglican church in some countries where the Roman Catholic churches is all pervasive and predominant. We wonder whether there was some tactful way where we could build into this process encouragement for a Roman Catholic hierarchies in these countries to initiate local discussions on the basis of mutuality and mutual respect with a very small Anglican church there.

-00-

Thank you Bishop, any further discussion on the amendment?

Bishop Newell

-00-

We wanted to make a suggestion about the discussion questions but I take it that that'll be the subject of our written reports, is that right?

-00-

Yes that's correct.

Are we then ready to vote on the motion?

Bishop Simon

-00-

Mr Chairman, are we voting on the motion for the whole clauses?

-00-

Well I was going to seek the mind of the house whether you wanted me to put it in sections. Which do you want wish to speak to Simon?

-00-

Section 3, Clause 3.

-00-

That's fine, we're still dealing with the whole motion.

-00-

May I suggest some amendment to Clause 3?

-00-

Going to move an amendment thank you.

-00-

I move that we amend Clause 3 to read 'request the provinces to engage in a period of careful and critical study of the report over the next five years'. The reason why I'm moving this amendment it is because commanding is rather stronger and suggests that we have a time to discuss the report. We haven't had time to discuss the report naturally, because it's the first time we're receiving it, and as

David said, we'll discuss it at the next council meeting, so I wanted to use the word that does not imply that it's something we have looked at it and therefore recommending it to the provinces.

-00-

I'm sure the house understands the intention we have a technical difficulty in that Clause 3 has already been slightly amended and your amendment is on the original words. We just need to do a little bit of work and this is the reason why we've asked \_\_\_\_\_ procedures for these things to be in writing. We would need, I think, to make a distinction between requesting the provinces to discuss this report and the other reports which the amendment has now included. We would need to get the wording of that correct.

Whether we can do that, seeing the time is now 1pm and there are some announcements or whether we need to get the Resolutions Committee now to consider this and bring it back in an amended form to us for consideration at another session, I seek the advice the Resolutions Chair.

-00-

I'm advised that if the amendment read 'requests the provinces to engage in a period of careful and critical study of these reports over the next five years' it would be acceptable? Is the house of a mind to accept this amendment? Is it seconded by Archbishop Glaco? Thank you.

Do you wish to speak

-00-

With due respect to Simon, the use of the word commend mean, or in anyway imply it's commending the content of the report as though we agreed with it. It's commending it in the sense that it is a worth document to study and I think frankly it'll be a little mean minded to withdraw the word 'commend' to simply put 'request'. I believe that this is well worth serious study and I want to commend it to serious study.

-00-

Thank you Bishop. Are we ready to vote on the amendment then?

It hasn't quite fitted our procedures in that there were not 10 names submitted but the Chair decided it was acceptable. That's the gift of authority! I don't mean to be flippant about that.

-00-

Mr Chairman, on a point of information if we are voting on the amendment and amended \_\_\_\_\_ because I supported it and my name is on the original amendment in Dr Baxter's name. I would not be happy to change commend to request and therefore I am in a difficulty.

-00-

No. you are clearly able to vote against this amendment because it's not in that sense associated with the other, it's ok.

-00-

So this is an amendment purely on the words by the Chairman of ACC and then we vote again on the original wording of the amendment.

-00-

We have voted on the original amendment and the motion is now amended before us. We are now going to vote on a further amendment. Is it clear to the house and what we are about to do? Archbishop?

-00-

The difficulty in our group with the word 'commend' is not because of the seriousness of the document, it's because we thought that we couldn't commend something that we didn't discuss, that's the only problem we face in our group. It's not because the document is not serious, of course it is serious but we thought that we were not in a position to really commend the document that was not the debated or discussed among us and that was the reason.

-00-

We are now going to vote on the amendment to Clause 3, which would make Clause 3 read 'requests the provinces to engage in a period of careful and critical study of these reports over the next five years'

Those in favour of that amendment, please raise their right arm.

Those opposed to the amendment, please raise their right arm.

24 in favour, 33 against. The amendment is lost.

Are we ready, can we vote now on the whole motion. Does the house wish it to be put in parts now or have we...altogether? Right, on the whole motion, as amended, those in favour please raise an arm.

Right those opposed please raise an right arm. Does anyone wish to abstain?

The motion is carried. I thank the house for that.

The Secretary General.

-00-

I have numerous announcements to make, so I beg your indulgence.

First if you would please pay at the \_\_\_\_\_ reception for any phone calls you have made and other costs that have been put on your room bill before you leave the West Park Centre. That would be very much appreciated.

Today at 1pm, that's 5 minutes ago, was the closing time for nominations for elections. Election forms are available at the enquiry desk and there is a box for the completed forms. If you have any questions please see \_\_\_\_\_, I suspect what we'll do is that if you have/want to make a nomination before....

**Tape 12 side A ends**