



Chairman: Mr Manhar Mehta

E-Mail: chairman@mfghc.com

PO Box 2261

Salisbury

SP3 6WE

Tel: 07866 268516

E-Mail: administrator@mfghc.com

7th April 2010

Dear Colleague

Health Care Chaplaincy and the Church of England

I am writing to explain the impact on the MFGHC of the work done by the Anglican chaplaincy review group, chaired by Dame Janet Trotter. Their report "Health Care Chaplaincy and the Church of England" was published on the Church of England website on Thursday 1st April.

The report was made available to members of the Church of England's Hospital Chaplaincy Council (HCC) in mid-March and embargoed to 31st March. I was sent an embargoed copy and was concerned that the Report makes a number of allegations and criticisms about the MFGHC from sources which were unidentified. I wrote to Dame Janet on Friday 26th March and, although I have had no reply, I and the Vice-Chair have had the opportunity on Wednesday 31st to discuss these issues with Dr Malcolm Brown who was secretary to the review group.

Dr Brown told me that he had written to me inviting MFGHC to submit evidence to his group. I did not receive that letter and Dr Brown indicated that he made no further effort to contact me despite his knowing that Edward Lewis, Tim Battle and Mary Ingledew worked closely with us. It is also the case that The Revd Professor Huw Jones, who is Vice Chair of HCC and Mrs Deborah Wheeler who is a member of HCC have both been involved in our education committee for some years. Mrs Deborah Wheeler is also an HCC nominee to the MFGHC Council. Dr Brown indicated that he did examine the MFGHC website but had not discovered the information. There is no doubt that we could have been contacted.

In my letter, I suggested to Dame Janet that the inaccuracies in her report should be corrected before publication. It is quite easy to make changes via email and removing us from the report would have involved little effort. Dr Brown said that this was not possible as his time was limited in the run up to Easter. He indicated that Bishop Michael who chairs HCC had wanted the report published by the end of March and publication could not be delayed.

Dr Brown did make some changes to the final version. He has made one or two small alterations not all of which are accurate or helpful. He has not however altered the way in which he portrays our work and our governance and has continued to rely on the views of others rather than ourselves. I attach a list of the various inaccuracies in the report and a copy of my letter to Dr Brown.

This has been a difficult and disturbing series of events which I hope I have handled without detriment to MFGHC. Please will you let me know if you consider further action should be taken.

Yours sincerely

Manhar

Chair

Distribution: Members of Council, MFGHC
The Revd Professor Huw Jones

INACCURACIES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REPORT

Page	Para	Comment
9	18 (Q4)	This paragraph is part of the evidence submitted by HCC staff and is accurate. It is not clear why comments were only requested about MFGHC when there are several other chaplaincy bodies listed in the report.
9	18 (Q6)	This paragraph is part of the evidence submitted by HCC staff and is accurate.
13	21	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC. The MFGHC was established in 2002; MFGHC was not set up “following consultation with” the Department of Health. It is an independent body; Other key roles including Co-Chairs, Vice-Chair, Honorary Treasurer have not been occupied by HCC staff; The Chair’s position does not rotate – it is elected; The efforts of the MFGHC are not concerned with accreditation (as is clear from paragraph 18); Of the nine world faiths in membership of the MFGHC, only two (Christians, Jews) have such mechanisms in place; There are nine world faiths and three chaplaincy membership bodies on the MFGHC Council.
14	29	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC: MFGHC has no objective to register chaplains and there can therefore not be any overlap with HCC or UKBHC; The current MFGHC project is to establish a regulatory body for chaplains and this does not overlap with work by UKBHC on professional registration; MFGHC is able to provide advice about faith advisers in the World faiths because that is one of its functions. This is not duplicated by HCC or UKBHC; The statement that there is a “poor state of relations between the MFGHC and the CHCC and the UKBHC” is speculation and not based on evidence.
15	32	<p>The source of these comments is not clear but as the writer says “suspicion seems to fuel antagonism” and this is what will happen if this comment about MFGHC is not challenged.</p> <p>The statement in the last sentence (“<i>But, for example, the pivotal role of HCC staff in the MFG suggests how such impressions become powerful</i>”) makes no sense other than as a way to link MFGHC to suspicions about <u>HCC</u> staff. MFGHC has no suspicions about the work which HCC staff have done for it.</p> <p>The role of HCC staff in MFGHC may have been pivotal in Robert Clark’s original convening of the MFJNWP and in Edward Lewis’ work to represent MFGHC externally. The internal workings and drive are a function of honorary officers, members, <u>MFGHC</u> staff and chaplains and others.</p>
16	41	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC: The Department of Health is not “working with the MFGHC on questions of registration and accreditation”; There is no vehement dispute involving MFGHC.
17	44	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC: The Department of Health report is not referenced; The Department of Health response to the James Report agreed that the balance of the central allocation funding could be used for the other World Faiths <u>and</u> for MFGHC administration; This funding has been paid to the Church of England in acknowledgement of its support for MFGHC.

Page	Para	Comment
		The Review Group portrays only part of the funding position and fails to acknowledge its own benefit.
18	51	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC: MFGHC has not established any fitness to practice structures; Reference should be made to work on authorisation.
26	90	There are errors in this content, which was not supplied by MFGHC: Divisive attitudes have not been imported into MFGHC; Feelings are not evidence. The meaning of the sentence <i>“Too much was felt to depend upon whether individual chaplains and others were favoured by HCC officers”</i> is unclear. This sort of non-specific allegation of impropriety is defamatory and unhelpful.
37	148	The proposal that MFGHC offices should be held by rotation is against the constitution which has served since 2002 (and is due for review in 2012). The Chief Officer is an elected post. The Administrator is an appointed post and to discriminate against applicants on the ground of religion would be against the MFGHC equal opportunities policy. It is not clear why this recommendation only applies to MFGHC when other chaplaincy bodies are in the same position?
39	158	This guidance already exists and was reissued recently.
App 6		It is clear that no effort was made to follow-up the letter and none of the known HCC contacts were informed.

TEXT OF LETTER TO REVD DR MALCOLM BROWN

Dear Malcolm

Links between HCC and MFGHC

Thank you for spending time with me and Mr Mueen-Uddin to discuss the links between HCC and MFGHC on Wednesday.

It was useful to meet you and I am grateful for your assurance that our use of meeting rooms at Church House will continue. I am also grateful that our use of the joint chaplaincy database will continue. We are very grateful for the help and support which Mary Ingledew has provided and hope she may continue to do so.

We also discussed the report "Health Care Chaplaincy and the Church of England" about which I have written to Dame Janet Trotter. We consider our inclusion in this report as unnecessary and the factual inaccuracy extremely unhelpful to our work. It seems unusual that we are criticised by a partner body without any recourse to factual accuracy and this is particularly upsetting as you acknowledged that no effort was made to ensure that we could contribute ourselves.

I do not wish to make matters worse in the dispute between HCC and other chaplaincy bodies. I will however need to brief my colleagues on the MFGHC Council and such criticism will inevitably be in the public domain. I am happy to assist with any questions which arise subsequently if necessary.

Thank you again for your time. I look forward to continuing our work in partnership with the Church of England.

I am copying this note to Bishop Michael and to Dame Janet.

Yours sincerely

Chair

Cc The Rt. Revd Michael Perham, Bishop of Gloucester
 Dame Janet Trotter, DBE
 The Revd Professor D Huw Jones
 Mrs Deborah Wheeler