

The Episcopal Church House of Bishops Response to The Dar es Salaam Communiqué

Communiqué Requests	House of Bishops Response	Difference
<p>1. "(The HOB) make an unequivocal common covenant that the bishops will not authorise any Rite of Blessing for same-sex unions in their dioceses or through General Convention..."</p> <p>"There appears to us to be an inconsistency between the position of General Convention and local pastoral provision ... we understand that local pastoral provision is made in some places for such blessings."</p>	<p>1. "We, the members of the House of Bishops, pledge not to authorize for use in our dioceses any public rites of blessing of same-sex unions until a broader consensus emerges in the Communion, or until General Convention takes further action...it is important to note that no rite of blessing for persons living in same-sex unions has been adopted or approved by our General Convention. In addition to not having authorized liturgies the majority of bishops do not make allowance for the blessing of same-sex unions. We do note that in May 2003 the Primates said we have a pastoral duty 'to respond with love and understanding to people of all sexual orientations.' They further stated, '... [I]t is necessary to maintain a breadth of private response to situations of individual pastoral care.'"</p>	<p>1. The HOB's statement is accurate in saying "no rite of blessing for persons living in same-sex unions has been adopted or approved (by General Convention)."</p> <p>However, same-sex blessings continue to occur on the local level without repercussion and in the spirit of General Convention's 2003 resolution C051 which states, "...we recognize that local faith communities are operating within the bounds of our common life as they explore and experience liturgies celebrating and blessing same-sex unions." The HOB considers itself compliant because there is a loophole for private pastoral responses and no official church "rite of blessing" has been adopted. An example of this can be found in the Diocese of Los Angeles where its Bishop, John Bruno, claims no same-sex blessings have occurred with his consent. However, several documented same-sex blessings have taken place, the most recent one occurred during the HOB meeting. The HOB also limits their compliance "until General Convention takes further action" which could be as early as 2009. Nowhere in the HOB response is there an acknowledgment that Lambeth Resolution 1.10 is the standard of Communion teaching on human sexuality.</p>
<p>2. "(The HOB) confirm that the passing of Resolution B033 of the 75th General</p>	<p>2. "We reconfirm that resolution B033 of General Convention 2006 (The</p>	<p>2. The HOB clarified Resolution B033 as applying to "non-celibate gay(s) and</p>

Convention means that a candidate for episcopal orders living in a same-sex union shall not receive the necessary consent; unless some new consensus on these matters emerges across the Communion."

3. "...the Pastoral Council and the Presiding Bishop invite the bishops expressing a commitment to 'the Camp Allen principles' or as otherwise determined by the Pastoral Council, to participate in the pastoral scheme" "...in consultation with the Council and with the consent of the Presiding Bishop, those bishops who are part of the scheme will nominate a Primateal Vicar, who shall be responsible to the Council." "...the Presiding Bishop in consultation with the Pastoral Council will delegate specific powers and duties to the Primateal Vicar."

4. "The Primates urge the representatives of The Episcopal Church and of those congregations in property disputes with it to suspend all actions in law arising in this situation."

Election Of Bishops) calls upon bishops with jurisdiction and Standing Committees 'to exercise restraint by not consenting to the consecration of any candidate to the episcopate whose manner of life presents a challenge to the wider church and will lead to further strains on communion'...The House acknowledges that non-celibate gay and lesbian persons are included among those to whom B033 pertains."

3. "We affirm the Presiding Bishop's plan to appoint episcopal visitors for dioceses that request alternative oversight. Such oversight would be provided by bishops who are a part of and subject to the communal life of this province. We believe this plan is consistent with and analogous to Delegated Episcopal Pastoral Oversight (DEPO) as affirmed by the Windsor Report."

4. No response

lesbian(s)"; however, the bishops agree only to "exercise restraint."

3. The HOB endorsed Presiding Bishop Schori's "Episcopal Visitor" program and claims it is consistent with DEPO. The Pastoral Scheme was suggested by the Primates precisely because DEPO is inadequate. With Episcopal Visitors, the Presiding Bishop retains control by having authority to appoint those with oversight; the "Primateal Vicar" scheme called for those bishops who are part of the scheme to **nominate** a Primateal Vicar. Also, unlike the proposed Primateal Vicar scheme, the Episcopal Visitors will be responsible solely to the Presiding Bishop and not to the Pastoral Council. The Episcopal Visitor program does not provide for any Alternate Primateal Oversight.

4. No lawsuits have been suspended since the Communiqué and new suits have been initiated by TEC bishops.