

# **Report of Proceedings 2020**

## **General Synod February Group of Sessions**

**Monday 10 February 2020 –  
Thursday 13 February 2020**

**Church House, London**

**Transcribed by  
AUSCRIPT LIMITED  
Central Court, Suite 303, 25 Southampton Buildings, London WC2A 1AL  
Tel No: 0330 100 5223 Email: [uk.transcripts@auscript.com](mailto:uk.transcripts@auscript.com)**

## **Full Synod: First Day Monday 10 February 2020**

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

### **WORSHIP**

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* When we get to the worship, where it says “please stand”, or whatever else it says, obviously, that is where it is convenient and comfortable and possible, and if you want to ignore those instructions or are not comfortable with them, please do so. We have to find a better way of doing that. The Chaplain will now lead us in worship.

*Revd Michael Gisbourne (Chaplain to the General Synod)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

### **ITEM 1**

#### **INTRODUCTION AND WELCOMES**

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, Michael. We very much appreciate the work you do in preparation of the worship here. In a moment I am going to read out the names of new members of Synod. Please would they make themselves known, either by standing or raising a hand, so that we can greet them all with applause at the end?

The Rt Revd Richard Jackson, Bishop of Hereford, House of Bishops, replacing the Rt Revd Richard Frith; the Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin, Bishop of Dover, House of Bishops, replacing the Rt Revd Trevor Willmott; the Rt Revd David Williams, Bishop of Basingstoke, House of Bishops, replacing the Rt Revd Jonathan Frost, formerly Bishop of Southampton, now Dean of York; the Revd Stephen Corbett, Diocese of Blackburn, replacing the Ven. Michael Everitt; the Revd Alicia Dring, Diocese of Derby, replacing the Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor; the Ven. Philip Andrew, Diocese of Gloucester, replacing the Rt Revd Jackie Searle; the Revd Simon Morris, Diocese of London, replacing the Revd Jane Morris; the Revd Dr Benjamin Carter, Diocese of Newcastle, replacing the Revd Canon Dagmar Winter; the Revd Fiona Gibson, Diocese of St Albans, replacing the Revd Steven Wood; the Revd Dr Helen Dawes, Diocese of Salisbury, replacing the Revd Canon Thomas Woodhouse; the Revd Stuart Grant, Diocese of York, replacing the Rt Revd Sarah Bullock; Ms Julie Withers, Diocese of Chester, replacing the Revd Lucy Brewster; Mrs Siân Kellogg, Diocese of Derby, replacing Mrs Rachel Bell; Mr Rhodri Williams, Diocese of Derby, replacing Mrs Hannah Grivell; Mr Richard Denno, Diocese of Liverpool, replacing Dr David Martlew; the Revd Martin Smith, Diocese of Oxford, replacing the Rt Revd Martin Gorick; the Revd Canon Jeremy West, Diocese of Oxford, replacing the Revd Francis Orr-Ewing; Ms Rebecca Chapman, Diocese of Southwark,

replacing Mr Nicholas Levy; Ms Theophilia Shaw, Diocese of Southwark, replacing Miss Carrie Myers; Mrs Katrina Thomas, Diocese of Southwell & Nottingham, replacing Ms Tracey Byrne; Mr Andrew Selous MP, Second Church Estates Commissioner, replacing the Rt Hon Dame Caroline Spelman; Mrs Maureen Cole, Archbishops' Council, replacing Mrs Mary Chapman. Please may we greet them all.

I would like to welcome the ecumenical representatives attending for the first time and the Anglican Communion representatives: the Revd Graham Sparkes, Baptist Union, replacing the Revd Professor Paul Fiddes; Fr Patrick Fitzgerald-Lombard, Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, replacing the Revd Canon John O'Toole; the Most Reverend Zacharie Masimango Katanda, Archbishop of Congo and Bishop of Kindu. *Vous êtes bienvenue.*

The other two representatives are making their way having been diverted by strong winds: the Most Reverend Stephen Than Myint Oo, Archbishop of Myanmar and Bishop of Yangon; and the Most Reverend Héctor Zavala Muñoz, who answers to "Tito", Archbishop and Primate of the Anglican Church of Chile. May we welcome them all.

I would also like to welcome the following: Mr Gareth Mostyn, newly appointed Secretary of the Church Commissioners; Canon Chris Newlands, newly elected Prolocutor for the Province of York; Louise Connacher, Provincial Registrar and Registrar of the Convocation of York; and, although it is not on my list, the Community of St Anselm. Please may we welcome them.

That concludes our introductions and welcomes and I accordingly now hand over to the Chair of our next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 2.47 pm.

## **ITEM 2**

### **REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2151)**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. We come now to Item 2 for which you will need GS 2151, the Report by the Business Committee. It will be of course followed by the usual opportunity for questions and comments. I give advance notice that these will be confined from the outset to three minutes, so, if you are thinking of making an intervention, bear that in mind whilst Canon Booy is talking. I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee now to move the Business [Committee] Report. Canon Booy may speak for up to ten minutes.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Welcome to London for the last time in this quinquennium and a particular welcome to those who have joined us for the first time, perhaps especially baby Jedaiah, who I can see straight in front of me. We hope that you

will begin to find your feet and that your experiences will be an encouragement to stand in the elections later this year.

We are at the beginning of a group of sessions in which the Business Committee has scheduled every type of business it is possible for us to consider. I anticipate that the forthcoming debate on the agenda and Questions later this evening will more than fulfil their purpose in this particular group of sessions, giving members the opportunity to challenge and question decisions and actions relating to the work of the Synod. I welcome this kind of accountability.

One of our primary purposes when we meet together is to pass legislation and we have several significant items on our agenda. I should mention, in particular, the Channel Islands Measure, which the Business Committee has agreed will be taken in its entirety at this group of sessions, with First Consideration later this afternoon and the Revision Stage and Final Consideration on Tuesday and Thursday respectively, if things proceed as we have proposed. It is unusual to handle legislation in this way, but the Committee was persuaded that this expedited procedure was in the interests of all concerned. Since it is important that members of the Synod understand this business fully, the Committee has agreed that a presentation by Bishop Richard Chartres, who chaired the Commission, will precede this item of business.

Other items of business bearing on the way we lead our lives together include First Consideration of the Cathedrals Measure, the Allocation of Seats in the next quinquennium and the Act of Synod for the Clergy Covenant. Legislation focused on Diocesan Boards of Education and a debate on Children and Youth Ministry ensure that we have a proper focus on the young people of our communities and churches. As ever, motions from our diocesan synods and from private members will help us to focus on a range of issues about justice and care for the communities in which we live and in our global community. They range from paupers' funerals to calls for our commitment to issues around climate change and the Windrush legacy.

When the Business Committee met to arrange this agenda we were clear that we wanted to be able to bring you a wide range of debates from the heart of church people, alongside the legislative business, which is our purpose. We had hoped, for example, that the Election Rules were sufficiently practical to be taken as deemed business. But as there has been a call for debate, I am expecting to need to ask the Chair to vary our business to take account of this, and also we will need to allow more time than expected for farewells. I hope you will look upon these requests with your customary sympathy. It is possible that this will mean delaying Prorogation on Thursday, and, if this is the case, I would like to take this opportunity to apologise because I will have to leave at the appointed time in order to meet a group of young people at Heathrow Airport.

Turning from the agenda to more general items, I should like to express the Business Committee's thanks to the Environment Working Group of the Synod for their

engagement with us and commend to you the excellent paper Top Ten Tips for an Eco-General Synod which you will find at the top of the fliers section of the app. May I draw your attention to tip number 1: switch your document preferences. In addition to the environmental impact going digital will have, it will also have a significant impact on the money Synod spends and asks from your dioceses on paper, printing and postage.

May I also extend our thanks to those who submitted questions to the online Questions session in November. It would be most helpful to receive feedback that enables us to judge the usefulness of this in relation to a fairly significant cost. The Synod app has seen some amendments thanks to your feedback and you will now receive an automatic confirmation message when you submit a request to speak, but please remember that the request to speak does not come directly to Chairs on stage, and so do make those requests in good time. If you do want to make a point during a debate and have not put in a request to speak, please do raise your hand or stand. Contributions that emerge in the context of a debate are welcome and useful.

If you want to update your app, do click the Church of England logo at the top left of your screen. As ever I must draw your attention to the Third Notice Paper which contains important security and emergency information.

Before I conclude this speech, I should like to extend my thanks and yours to the Synod staff. I am sure you will be delighted to hear that the Clerk Jacqui Philips will be returning to her role in time to prepare for our July group of sessions, but you should know how much we owe to Jeremy Worthen, Acting Clerk, Jenny Jacobs, Head of Governance, and Alvin Lee, Executive Officer, who have worked with great commitment to the Synod alongside the Legal Team in challenging times.

Those thanks recorded, it simply remains for me to extend my thanks to my colleagues on the Business Committee and invite you to take note of our Report standing in my name, GS 2151.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. It is now open to members of Synod to make comments and ask questions. May I remind you that the purpose of these questions and comments should be to deal with the ordering of the agenda and not mini-debates on issues that we have not yet reached on the agenda, or that you wish were on the agenda and are not. It is very much about the ordering of the agenda.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield):* I want to thank the Business Committee for this Report and also for the work they undertake on our behalf, behind the scenes, to facilitate our meetings. However, I also wish to raise a real practical concern about the late final confirmation of actual dates for this and other groups of sessions. I phoned Synod Support on 11 December last year, the day before the Business Committee met,

endeavouring to find out the finalised dates, to be told very politely to wait. In recent years we have debated changing the pattern of dates and I thought the actual dates might be towards the end of this week rather than the beginning.

Why does this matter? Well, I suspect, like many members, I juggle Synod commitments with the rest of life. I happen to work in the public sector, the NHS, where there is a mandatory minimum notice period for leave. I need to not only apply for annual leave to be here but also to agree swaps with my colleagues to provide on-call cover during my planned absence. The less notice there is the more challenging the conversation is, particularly when we could know the precise dates well in advance, unlike the death of a parent or illnesses that happen, with which my department is also juggling. I do appreciate there is a balance to be struck between allowing as much time as possible for completion of the necessary work on the proposed agenda and also confirming the dates.

The current situation may give the impression that our administrative processes do not belong in the century in which we live and are not a good advert for the Church of England to colleagues. *Setting God's People Free* was not intended to liberate the laity from serving on this Synod, but the way the system seems to work may mean that some of us come very close to not being here.

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester)*: I wish to ask the Business Committee why no airtime is being given in this Chamber to the recently published Faith and Order Commission Report entitled *God's Unfailing Word: Theological and Practical Perspectives on Christian-Jewish Relations*. It is hugely important and equivalent in our denomination to the Roman Catholic *Nostra Aetate* of 1965, which dealt with the relationship of that Church with Judaism as a whole. It is hugely important with regard to prevention of anti-Semitism, and also of our own self-understanding, and it conforms to two of the categories of Synod's business, the ordering of the life of the Church for us and the Church of the world. Because I see nowhere it being endorsed at this higher level, I wish to ask: please could we give this very important thing some air time, some discussion, some debate in this Chamber, if not in this session but in future sessions?

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells)*: I am aware that not all of us, members of Synod, manage to read all our Notice Papers when they get sent to us, so I just wanted to thank the Business Committee but also draw our attention to Notice Paper VII (much rustling of papers and fiddling about with computers) where the Business Committee have set out some modified rules about photography during Synod. You may recall at York we had a bit of an upset about whether we were allowed to take pictures during sessions or not. I am aware of certainly half a dozen members of Synod who blog about what we do and many, many more who tweet. Since these things became common currency, taking photographs is very easy. I just want to draw your attention, if I may, whether you blog or not, whether you tweet or not, to Notice Paper VII, which in the centre has two pages of very practical advice from the Business Committee about how you can take photographs and various things you should try to avoid doing.

I was thinking during our worship about the worship (of course) but also about what an interesting picture it would make of the screen and everybody singing and all that. However, I took the view that taking pictures during worship was not a good idea whereas taking pictures during debates probably is. If you are one of those with a smartphone or a blog or have a tweeter personality, do have a read of that. We are grateful to the Business Committee for taking up the issue when they had it drawn to their attention, and giving some sensible advice.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* I cannot be the only one here today who is amazed by the timings associated with some of the debates. I recognise the importance of items such as the Clergy Covenant, the IICSA Report and Climate Change. However, given that this Church is supposed to be trying to change attitudes towards the marginalised in society, and given that we have still a Herculean way to go in terms of cleansing our stables, particularly the disgraceful way in which we treat our LGBTI community of clergy, and are continuing to fail those who seek to live in faithful loving partnerships through the legal mechanisms that are available to them according to the law of the land, can I ask whether we are genuinely spending our time wisely and appropriately in having two and three-quarter hours planned to deal with the transfer of the Channel Islands to the Salisbury Diocese, a deal which, although it has generated more heat than light on social media, I understand is wanted by all parties concerned?

This Synod, for all its attempts to change the legislative nature of our Church over the last six years or so – and I agree that this transfer is important to be done in a single set of sessions – Synod still has the effect of making the Church look like a tanker with the engine of lawnmower. Please, Business Committee, we can do better than this.

*Canon Peter Adams (St Albans):* I want to ask that the Business Committee review the way that Standing Orders are used to determine the acceptability of amendments to motions. Many of you will know from last week's *Church Times* that both David Lamming and I had amendments to our safeguarding debate on Wednesday ruled out of order. This was on the grounds, "The motion is narrowly drafted and that inevitably means that any amendment having to comply with Standing Order 28 must relate directly to the response of the Archbishops' Council and the five recommendations of IICSA".

Let me first say that I am very grateful that an amendment close to my heart, and to David's, I understand, has been accepted, but I believe we need to learn a lesson here. I accept the need for good governance and the role of Standing Orders and the Chairs of our debates to conduct our affairs by them. However, my concern is that this ruling reflects what both lawyers and theologians will regard as the prioritisation of law against spirit. There are times when the views of lawyers need to engage with the views of pastors.

As with so much of the engagement around the massive failings of the Church in regard to sexual abuse in its midst, I suggest we are faced with two realities: in essence, the Church as establishment and the Church as a redemptive reconciling community of God's people. I do not want to pit these two things against each other unnecessarily, but I do believe it is helpful for us to recognise the duality we are looking at as we handle abuse in the Church, and that we do that in our conduct of debate as well as in the motions we pass. My own involvement with safeguarding is in the missional context of a poor multi-cultural town where day-by-day our churches and our social services deal with abuse. I am privileged to do that as part of a working group of Muslim and Christian leaders engaged, determined to change ---

*The Chair:* May I interrupt you and remind you to focus on the ordering of the agenda very clearly, please?

*Canon Peter Adams (St Albans):* When the story began to show in social media on Friday in response to the *Church Times's* article, a variety of safeguarding professionals, Muslim colleagues and church members contacted me, askance at the decision and what at that time it said about the Church. At the same time survivors were rolling their eyes, fed up with words. Hopes that have been lifted, hopes now denied – again. Synod, our business, its conduct and what is not discussed here is not just our business; it is conducted in the eyes of the world. Let us not let that world or our survivors down. We cannot allow Church's establishment ---

*The Chair:* Sorry, you are out of time now.

*Canon Peter Adams (St Albans):* --- to interfere with the Church's place of healing redemption.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* Chair, at the start of our session back in February 2017, in a debate almost identical to this one, I asked, "What takes a lifetime to earn yet can be spent in a second; is completely priceless and yet can never be bought?" Trust was and is still the answer. I went on to state that I thought that this Synod was bankrupt of trust. Three years on, and following the events of the past few weeks, it appears the situation has only got worse. Indeed, the pain and hurt felt by those of us in the LGBTI community, pawns of the powerful, have only increased. You see, we dared to believe that those in positions of power to effect change in our Church had truly listened and not just heard. We trusted that you had taken on board our concerns and criticisms, aired in this chamber back in February 2017 about a report that had caused deep offence for its tone and its lack of pastoral understanding and the impact it had on real people's lives.

We chose, against the express desires of many, to bow to your desire for a moratorium on debates on sexuality until the work of the Living in Love and Faith Report was completed. We have instead been served presentations such as that we will have tomorrow, with minimal opportunity to question or debate together here, and have felt

managed and muzzled throughout. It has been a costly wait. I speak not only of the £600,000 of resources but also of the cost of LGBTI lives impacted, young and old, who live and, yes, die in hope of acceptance.

Chair, we need to urgently address the question of our broken trust in this Chamber. We now need actions, not just words. We need open debate, indeed a take note debate in our July Synod as a minimum, for without that it will be difficult to see how we the Church can move forward. For we need to be able to scrutinise and discuss the Report together; to look for any bias presented as balance. We await with interest the publication of *Living in Love and Faith* and the hard evidence of a radical new Christian inclusion to replace the tired fig leaf of calls for more understanding and discussions. We have had that for nearly 50 years. It is time now for action. It is time at last to be the radically inclusive Church of God.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I want to draw Synod's attention to Item 6 on the Agenda which will be debated tomorrow, Term Limits for Deanery Synod Lay Representatives. Speaking as a member of the Business Committee, I want to emphasise to members that this is a two-stage process. Tomorrow we are asking you to approve in principle that we move forward to prepare legislation which will be brought before you in July. It is a two-stage process. You need to be patient and you need to understand that if you vote in favour tomorrow then legislation will be brought forward in July.

The reason for bringing this is because there was a very significant consultation with the wider Church last summer which produced a massive response: 928 responses. If you look at the answer to question 88, which will be considered tonight, you will see that this is described as the largest number of responses. I do not know whether that is ever, but certainly in recent years. It was a huge response from the wider Church that we make this very simple change. Two thirds of those who responded wanted the new rule amended or reversed completely. Members of Synod, please bear that in mind when we come to debate this simple item tomorrow after the Cathedrals Measure.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* May I start, Chair, and members of Synod, by endorsing what my colleague Peter Adams had to say about the amendments we sought to move to the Safeguarding motion. May I say, without in any way seeking to go behind the ruling of the Chair under Standing Order 15(2), we both think that Standing Orders need to be interpreted sometimes in a more flexible way than happened in this case. However, that said, we are both pleased that now in Notice Paper VIII, on page 2, you will find the text of an alternative set of amendments to the Safeguarding motion which we hope will command widespread support. Those amendments are now to be moved by the Bishop of Huddersfield.

Having said that, may I thank the Business Committee for the opportunity given last November to pose questions? It was something I raised in a previous Business

Committee debate, an opportunity which had not previously been afforded to Synod members since 2008. I would like to say to you, Sue, that it was useful. It would be interesting to know what the actual cost was. You mentioned a significant cost in your speech a few minutes ago.

May I also ask that time be given, if necessary later in this group of sessions, if we can find it, for any carry-over of the Questions session this evening – we have 121 questions – if we do not succeed in getting through all those questions tonight. May I thank you also for the new protocol about photography and endorse what Stephen Lynas said about that a little earlier.

Finally, a couple of questions for you which I think come within the purview of the Business Committee. Firstly, when are we going to be able to access the Report of the Proceedings at York? It is not yet on the website. And, secondly, when is the website going to be updated so that we can access to pre-2012 Synod papers?

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* Point of order, Mr Freeman.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* After the next speaker are you minded to consider a motion for closure?

*The Chair:* That has my consent. Let us hear the next speaker and then we will test the mind of Synod. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I am very pleased to be following the previous speaker because what I want to draw attention to is one of the papers that was sent out, GS Misc 1214, I think, which listed the number of speakers who spoke in the last February session. I am very pleased to draw attention to this because I was not there. However, I note with some sadness that St Edmundsbury & Ipswich more than punched above its weight. I hesitate to draw particular attention. However, the point is this: it does seem to me that in many of our debates the same old faces get up every time and say the same old things.

If we are trying to listen to the Spirit and not be bound by the lawyers – and not be bound by the lawyers – I try and educate our team at St Edmundsbury & Ipswich, of which I am the senior member, to only intervene twice in a Synod, at a maximum, and only a third time if you really do know what you are talking about, and the Spirit has told you to speak. I would like to introduce this as not a rule, but perhaps as safeguarding for both the Synod, its humour, its content and its ability to listen to what God is saying and actually share it amongst ourselves.

*The Chair:* The Chair of Laity has risen to speak.

*Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield):* Madam Chairman, I do apologise for standing at this particular moment, but I do think there is a point that has already been made by Jane Patterson that must not be lost on this Synod. We are in the year when a new Synod will be elected and I am sure in all the dioceses you are looking around for people who may well make up the next Synod. We all want that to be truly representative and particularly we want the young people, who are probably in full-time work at the moment, to be able to come here and make their contribution personally.

It is very, very important that when dates are decided, actual days and times are given at the very earliest opportunity, so, please, I do hope the Business Committee will take that particular point very seriously.

*The Chair:* We have had a proposal for a motion of closure. I would like to test the mind of Synod on that.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* In that case I now call upon the Chair of the Business Committee to respond to the comments that have been made. Thank you. You have five minutes, which might stretch to six, but five really.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Five is fine. Thank you, Synod. I think if this were a school report, I would need to take away a “could do better”, despite some of the thanks people have offered us. I want to start with the practical concern about knowing when Synod is, and I have to tell Miss Patterson that actually if she had been answered on 11 December, the answer would have been the wrong one because the draft agenda that we considered the following day was substantially changed and you would not have been here to make your point if we had taken that agenda. We do our best, but we are one in a pecking order of meetings that have to happen before we do and we get the information to you as soon as we can. We have looked at this before. If we can find another way, we will do our best.

Lisa Battye, thank you. We have heard what you have said and doubtless those who might bring it to our attention as the Business Committee to schedule that debate on the agenda have heard as well.

Tim Hind, a “could do better”. We have done our best with the timings associated with debates and the need for being both the legislative body and bringing a variety of items of business to the agenda. I am sorry that you were disappointed.

Mr Adams, in some ways it is hard to know how to answer you because the Standing Orders are not in the purview of the Business Committee, and so I cannot comment on

that. But I would say that I hope we will all take your advice to send a strong message about our care and concern during Wednesday morning's Safeguarding debate.

Jayne Ozanne, you asked for a take note debate in July, again boringly, and not necessarily happily, this is out of my hands. We would all love to be able to wave the magic wand and have the Synod we personally would love, but there is a difference for all of us between what we would like to happen and what we are able to achieve.

Adrian Greenwood, thank you for your helpful commentary on tomorrow's business. Mr Lamming, I am afraid I cannot answer your question about cost, which is mostly in staff time, but I am sure that if you send a message, and it does not take too much of the same staff time, we can give you an indication of the cost of that November Question time.

As far as the Report of Proceedings is concerned, our apologies. We had a quick look at the website, pre-2012 papers are on the website, I can certainly see some from 2000, but we will just check on that and if you could give us more detail we will try and make sure that is put right.

As always, Stephen Lynas and Jonathan Alderton-Ford, my friends you give us words of encouragement. Jonathan, I believe you have one more speech to go this Synod. I shall be counting.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The motion before the Synod is "That the Synod do take note of this Report".

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Before we move on to the next item of business, I invite the Chair of the Business Committee to address the Synod on a detail of the ordering of the agenda.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you Chair, this is one of a number of times, I suspect, that I shall be asking the Chair to test the mind of Synod about a variation to the order of business. As I indicated, we had not expected quite such an avalanche of detail in some of the legislative business and we note that tomorrow, Item 506 on the Church Representation Rules is likely to crash into an important debate on the Windrush legacy. So I would like to ask, through you, if we could insert in the agenda a request for timed business for that Windrush debate of 5.30 pm.

*The Chair:* Thank you. That has my support. May I test the mind of Synod on this? All those in favour of designating the Windrush Report as timed business of no later than 5.30 tomorrow afternoon.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Thank you very much for your attention during this item of business. Please do remain in the Chamber for Item 3, which is the Presidential Address.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson* took the Chair at 3.25 pm

### **ITEM 3 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, everyone. We come to Item 3 on the agenda, which is the Presidential Address given by Justin Welby, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Thank you.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Good afternoon and thank you, Chair, for asking me to speak. 2020, both for the Church of England and the global Anglican Communion, is a significant year. In 2020 in the Church of England we will publish, in the next few months, before the July Synod, *Living in Love and Faith* and we will move forward to a church-wide engagement and participation from every part of the Church, of all views, inclusively, also setting up a working group to pursue this work to its conclusion.

In 2020, we will play our part – a significant part – in COP26 in Glasgow. In 2020, we say farewell to the Archbishop of York and we will welcome his successor. In 2020, as the Church of England, we will set our direction for the next quinquennium, both in the elections for General Synod and in establishing new visions and goals based, I hope, around the Five Marks of Mission.

In 2020, at the end of July into early August, we look ahead to the Lambeth Conference where we will be welcoming bishops from all over the world to consider prayerfully the direction and the mission of the Anglican Communion. To date, out of 985 bishops, about 660, just under, have registered for the conference. Three Provinces have said they are not coming and the other 37 are sending people.

The theme of the conference is God's Church for God's World, with a sub-title of Listening, Walking and Witnessing Together. The theme reflects a simple theological reality, that God has established the Church for worship and for witness, to be Jesus in the world, to declare the wonderful works of Him who drew us out of darkness into His marvellous light. The text, as that last sentence hints, of the Lambeth Conference will be the First Epistle of St Peter. Its themes of love and suffering, of resilience, of holiness, of witness and how to live in a hostile environment so that Christ is truly Lord, are key themes for today for most of the Anglican Communion.

In Chapter 5 of his First Epistle, Peter draws on the ancient image of the Good Shepherd, and speaks to the leaders of the churches, saying he is a fellow shepherd to them. A key moment in what he says in that chapter, and what he writes, is the warning that they are to be alert and watchful for their enemy the devil prowls like a roaring lion seeing who

may be devoured. In this Synod we quite often talk about elephants in the room, but Peter talks about lions. I may revert to elephants later.

Three weeks ago, I was in Kenya, and I was listening to Archbishop Jackson Ole Sapit, a Maasai by origin, who grew up in a small village and by some missionaries received his education after his father died at the age of three. Archbishop Jackson told those of us who were listening a story from when he was a young man, 13, 14 years old, a herder, and he was on his first guard duty at night within a thorn fence, looking after the flocks and herds. His friends – so called – told him that when a lion roared it was preparing to charge, and he had spent the entire night terrified because he could hear a lot of lions roaring. The joke, of course, was that lions are dangerous when they are silent because they are stalking you. When they roar, they are wandering around looking for the prey that they will then stalk. His friends told him that in the morning.

Shepherds, in other words, says Peter, need to have their wits about them, because to protect their sheep they need to know what might threaten them – the lion that poses a danger to the flock. The Lion of 1 Peter 5 is a warning to the churches, all together, not merely to individuals, as we so often interpret it. We can so easily turn or perceive other people or ideas into that lion and consider them a threat, even an enemy. We can make a lion out of the shadows, or we can be assailed by the lion that has snuck up on us quietly that we failed to pay attention to. We as a Church, as this Synod, need to be aware and yet not so cautious that we are paralysed with fear and communicate that fear to one another around.

The lion of our time has many faces, some of them modern, many of them as old as the Church itself. Notice that in 1 Peter 5, it is described as your enemy, the devil. Not your enemy, the people who disagree with you; not your enemy, those who troll you on Twitter; not your enemy, those who say nasty things in Synod, – which would never happen; – not your enemy because they are of a different church or form of churchmanship; it is your enemy, the devil. It echoes Paul in Ephesians saying we do not fight against flesh and blood; our enemy is the principles and powers in the heavenly places, says Paul.

The lion, as I say, has many faces, but they are not the faces that we see around us. They are not human enemies. Some of them have been around forever – – culture, cruelty and the lack of love are pre-eminent – and we can aid the biting of the lion through social media in a way that we have never known before.

The Lambeth Conference will be an opportunity for the bishops, as shepherds, to reflect on the world in which we Christians find ourselves, to refer to 1 Peter 1, as “resident aliens”, aliens and strangers, and how we have to learn to live as aliens and strangers that faces up to the reality of that status boldly. Perhaps the events of the last three-and-a-half years have taught us something about being aliens and strangers, something where we see those we know and love becoming aliens and strangers, or feeling they are. We have to learn, at the Lambeth Conference, what it is to live alongside our brothers

and sisters, not just as hosts in a sort of patronising “how nice that you’ve come to see us” way, nor just as British Anglicans, as though that was the foundation of everything, but as fellow foreigners, resident aliens in this world, citizens of heaven and yet residing on this Earth.

We will, at the Lambeth Conference, and we should as the Church here, as shepherds gathered together from around the world, recognise and name the face of the lion in each place. Within the Church, that face may be fear of sharing the Gospel, of witnessing or of worshipping. It may be climate change. It may be gender justice. It may be poverty, modern slavery, peace and reconciliation, and how we encounter those who are LGBTIQ+. Underlying all of these are issues of identity and they underly many others, and what it means to be a human for whom Christ is Lord, what it is to be human in relation to other human beings, but where for us Christ is Lord.

Then there are other animals, shadowy ones in the dark, whose noise we hear, and we are beginning to distinguish their shapes but we do not yet identify them. We cannot just assume them to be the face of a lion. Scientific change, biotechnology, information technology, artificial intelligence, machine learning – with biotechnology, the ability to shape the human being so that they come out in the way we want them to – what a government can do with that in the future, and what we can do to one another go back to those different questions of identity.

Do we say that we will reshape human beings, so there is no one with a disability? What does that say about the humanity of those who have different abilities? Some of these forms of learning may yet be aids to the shepherd. They may be useful elephants if rightly used, but they may be the lion which transforms our world into greater injustice and inequality. These themes will run through the Lambeth Conference, the science, not to be frightened of, not to run away from, but to engage with, to be informed about, to learn from.

We will seek at the Conference to renew our discipleship and commitment to witness an evangelism in a way proper to each context. A disciplined and alert discipleship must not be ashamed of the good news of Jesus, and it must see that it is foundational to the beautiful vision of the living stones of the Church in 1 Peter. Every stone, whatever its nature, its ethnicity, its abilities, sexuality, is a living stone. And as we share in fellowship here and at the Conference with our fellow Anglicans, with whom at times we may disagree profoundly, who in past years in some cases have been described – I am talking here about Anglicans in sub-Saharan Africa – as one generation away from barbarism – that was said about 15 years ago. – As we disagree profoundly with one and other, we must remember two things that counter the asininity and the sin of that kind of statement, the inward-looking-ness.

First, that we love one another. We are bound together by Christ’s sacrifice and our mutual recognition of the face and work of God in one another. Second, we cannot

change the culture or even the minds of other people anywhere near as easily as we can change ourselves.

Shepherds who spend all their time arguing how best to protect the sheep, or indeed what a sheep is, may look up to find the flock has been eaten, not hearing or being aware of the lion that was stalking. If we are going to expect much of the shepherds, lay and ordained, we must express our love towards them. Love is seen in 1 Peter as assuring, making sure of hope and resilience and is expressed in integrity and with forgiveness and mercy. I have to say I am not sure in our social media age that forgiveness is a word that features often in messages of 240 characters.

The Ordinal is worth going back to. I speak as one who never really read it properly until I had to use it. There is a confession for you. The Ordinal sets out what love looks like as a shepherd, for deacons, priests and bishops. To be a church that expresses love institutionally we have to consider the wellbeing of all. Today, with the pressures to spot the lion, to listen to the lion, to see the danger, as we know well, there is a great burden on clergy and bishops as well as laity – all three. I want to think especially for a moment about clergy, particularly in the context of the Clergy Wellbeing Covenant, which we will be discussing later in these sessions.

The Very Revd Dr Francis Bridger, in his theological reflection on the guidelines for the professional conduct of the clergy, reminded us that the notion of profession is deeply rooted in religious values, to profess, to vow. By means of a theology of vocation, Bridger says, it becomes possible to reinvest the idea of professionalism with a transcendent moral dimension. It means that the professional is aligned with the vocational both for lay and ordained as a response to God's love. When the clergy are supported, nourished and able to flourish, the whole Church can flourish.

With my doubtless well-deserved reputation for managerialism, I hesitate to mention the rather dull, bureaucratic sounding context of professional standards. I love that phrase – professional standards – I say it last thing at night to myself to keep myself content, like a mantra really. Yet professional standards should be love in action. Professional standards, again, whether for lay or clergy, call us to love and serve one another so as to liberate to each other the gifts that each has received.

Jesus was showing professional standards when he washed his disciples' feet. For the Church to live as the People of God we must be shepherds to one another, recognising that we both have a duty of care and a duty of responsibility, and setting that within a framework that supports and upholds the clergy as part of responding to the modern world and living out our lives in service to Christ. Our present forms of pastoral care are neither pastoral nor caring.

The recent Sheldon Hub Report on the CDM made that amply clear. It does not help reconciliation. It is weaponised. It is stressful for complainant and the person complained

about. It does not aid safeguarding. In changing the way we do things like clergy discipline, clergy must feel as though they are treated fairly, complainants must feel that they are heard, and all need to be provided with the resources and support they need while holding accountable those who fall short in their duties of care.

In establishing the Covenant for Clergy Wellbeing, we emphasise that a covenant is more than a contract with one another – it is a promise, based in grace and gratitude. It is about going beyond the minimum, in good faith, acting out of love rather than legalistic obligation. It is a mirror of Christ's pouring out of his own blood to build a new covenant with God's people. We must be willing, as Jesus did, to do the unthinkable out of our love for one another. We will still set boundaries. We are loved children of God, who signal the arrival of God's people by the way we live and the standards we uphold for ourselves.

The Covenant is one aspect of seeing the culture of the Church. The job of the clergy is, by its very nature, an impossible one. So also is the call of the laity, and, indeed, of every single Christian of any age and type. It can only be lived in the grace of God. Our baptismal covenant sets out for us our ordination as laity. I know all too well that that covenant is one that we cannot carry out on our own. It is easy to wake up weary when the work of a broken world seems so great and God's Kingdom seems so far and feels sometimes that this is just a burden. When you are on the front lines, as so many of you are, of hurt and loss, doubt and pain, confusion and sorrow, being pulled thanklessly in every direction, it is so easy to feel disheartened.

However, there is something about being a Christian that is about changing that attitude. We must say, "we are not going to let this be done to us. We are not going to let the darkness overwhelm us. We are going to take hold of the Gospel of Christ together and use it to make His light known to the whole world". Together, not biting and snapping at one another. If we all, lay and ordained, look at ministry as a gift that God has given us to make His word known to everyone, perhaps on those dark mornings we can unwrap a little more of His limitless gift and in so doing discover new depths of God's unconditional love for us. Perhaps then we can find the strength to be more united, more alert to the lion roaring, and less inwardly focused.

As a Church, Anglicans – all Anglicans but particularly the Church of England – always have been and always will be prone to shoot ourselves in the foot, quite often while the foot is firmly in the mouth. When that happens, and one might say, in fact we have said though in perhaps more elegant terms, that it happened recently, we can turn towards the Christ who promises: "Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest". When we keep Jesus Christ at the centre of our lives, we can find our brokenness and our uncertainty is tended to, that there is a balm and that we are cared for. Perhaps not when we would like or how we would like, but we trust that Christ will provide us with His perfect peace, in His own way and His perfect timing. We remember 1 Peter's advice to the shepherds, "cast all your anxiety" on God, who will always be big enough to handle it. So much of the anxiety which leads to our arguments, divisions and

party politics in the Church comes from anxiety and fear. They in their turn come from not casting our anxieties on Christ.

And here is a secret that we all know and keep from ourselves and from each other: – we do not have to be perfect all the time. We minister and witness through our broken humanity, despite our mistakes, because then we point to the perfect wholeness of Christ. So much of reaching our potential, the flourishing, is knowing that we are supported, that we have others who understand and care, who will encourage us when we are low and remind us of God's promise when we have forgotten. The whole context of 1 Peter is about the body of Christ, the temple in which each stone is fitted together and supports each other.

We have hope that through us God will make huge changes in our society and in our world – hope in the Christian sense of a certain expectation – because we see in the Gospel the small changes to people's lives every day. We have hope that the Church can grow because we see people transformed by the power of God who loves us. And so we have confidence, not necessarily in the Church of England but in the word of the Gospel and the faithfulness of God.

I know all too well that it feels sometimes as though the task is daunting and the lion will be overwhelming. I know that many of us hold hopes and dreams for the Church in our hearts that we hardly dare hope might be realised. And I also know very well that all of these hopes are not the same for all of us. But I believe that we have at least one prayer in common: that God makes us instruments of His peace, comforts those of us who are hurting and encourages those of us who are searching, in this year and beyond.

Each of us has a role to play in this, the wonderful work of building God's Kingdom. We step together into God's extraordinary project, which is not and never could be about our own work but only about the glorious generosity and power of God. We can pray for each other, even – and perhaps especially – – for those with whom we disagree. We can love one another with the love that "covers a multitude of sins". Of course, there will be days when there are burdens. We all need to go on being alert for the lion, but I want us all to think about the joys and blessings as well. If we cannot genuinely enjoy the reality of the gift we have been given, then, well, why are we here?

This year and the years to come are years to achieve change, to make progress in the mission of God, – to be a light to the world. This is a God-given chance for us to work together with God as God breaks into our world and makes himself ever more known to us. So let us continue to recognise that in this Synod we see not just each other but we see the hand of Christ proffered to us. Let us join hands with our fellow Christians and together, in our brokenness and our faith, walk with God towards a world where justice and righteousness reign, and the love and peace of Jesus is found in every heart. Amen.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much indeed. That concludes this item of business. We will now move to the next item on the Agenda, Item 4, in a moment.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 3.54 pm.

#### **ITEM 4**

### **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S COMMISSION ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE CHANNEL ISLANDS TO THE WIDER CHURCH OF ENGLAND (GS 1241)**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. We now move to Item 4 on the agenda, which is the Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on the Relationship of the Channel Islands to the Wider Church of England. I hope that you have all read and enjoyed GS Misc 1241, which has lots of lovely historical and interesting facts in it. I am now going to invite the Rt Revd & Rt Hon Lord Chartres, the former Bishop of London, to give his presentation to Synod. Bishop, you have up to ten minutes to make that.

*The Chair of the Commission (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Lord Chartres):* Thank you very much indeed. It is virtually 40 years to the day that I first found myself seated in this chamber as Archbishop Runcie's Chaplain. And now, courtesy of the Business Committee, I am here again in the springtime of my senility.

I had very little knowledge of the Channel Islands when the Archbishop asked me to chair the Commission, and I suppose that was one of my qualifications. Fortunately, I had fellow Commissioners with greater experience, and I would like to pay tribute to them: Baroness Judith Wilcox, distinguished parliamentarian, and Sir Christopher Clarke, who as judge and former member of the Court of Appeal in the Islands brought invaluable insight into their unique legal arrangements. We were also very fortunate to have the assistance of our local legal advisers, Mark Temple, Solicitor General in Jersey, and Sir de Vic Carey, sometime Bailiff of Guernsey. Sir de Vic drives a car whose number plate proudly displays the numbers 1066, just in case we have forgotten. They have guided us through the complexities of Norman customary law and much else. The composition of the Report and the careful recording of views of witnesses owes a great deal to our able Secretary, Jonathan Neil-Smith.

The ambition of everyone involved in this exercise has been to achieve a structured relationship between the Church and the deaneries of Guernsey and Jersey and the rest of the Church of England, a relationship conducive to mutual flourishing. The 36 parishes of the two deaneries share similarities, of course, with parishes in English counties, but their history as the only surviving part of the Duchy of Normandy still under the British Crown and their relative geographical isolation throughout many centuries has led to the development of distinctive legal and cultural traditions. They are self-governing Crown Dependencies. Church and civic life are more intertwined than is the case in most of contemporary England. Many churches and rectories are maintained by the ratepayers.

There are no PCCs or church schools, and the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey, who I am delighted to say are present among us this afternoon, have acknowledged status as leaders of the Christian community beyond the Anglican Church. The Dean of Jersey is, indeed, an ex officio member of The States [Assembly], Jersey's Parliament.

There is an understandable determination that the distinctiveness of Island culture should be recognised and the consequences of not doing so is described in a delightful novel entitled *Bedlam in the Bailiwicks*, a fictional but realistic account of the fatal attempt by a government minister to merge the Islands with an English county. But just as the distinctiveness of the Channel Islands should be acknowledged, it is also vital to recognise the extent to which the responsibilities of bishops have been recently enlarged following the General Synod's very proper response to the safeguarding issue and to other aspects of clergy discipline.

In these changed circumstances, it was inevitable that relations between the deans and their diocesan bishop would have to be clarified and revised. The Commission's terms of reference did not include any responsibility to apportion blame in the sequence of events which led up to the breakdown of relations between Winchester and the two deaneries. It was evident, however, from the weight of evidence that we received, that the break with Winchester was extremely painful for all involved. So painful, in fact, that we came to the conclusion there was no realistic possibility of embarking on any discussion on the reset of relations with the degree of mutual confidence necessary to achieve a positive result.

We heard many calls for reconciliation, which is, of course, what any Christian must desire. But we came to the conclusion that a fresh start with another diocese might actually create the conditions most conducive to reconciliation. In time I very much hope that it may be possible once again to celebrate the historic partnership between the Diocese of Winchester and the deaneries. But, as we meet today, the Islands have been in episcopal limbo for over six years. We received many expressions of gratitude for the outstanding pastoral care provided by Bishop Trevor Willmott during this period and for the support of the Diocese of Canterbury, but now is the time to grasp the nettle. We need to end the ad hoc arrangements and enable the necessary reset of relations which will allow the Islands to move on under settled episcopal oversight.

The work to be done is set out in the recommendations of the Report, and it is very heartening that progress has already been made with most issues. There is a readiness to learn the appropriate lessons from a very painful breakdown and to enable oversight to function in a way that both respects the proper role of the diocesan bishop, especially in the light of recent synodical legislation, and at the same time recognises the pastoral context in the deaneries and a long tradition of legislative self-determination.

The Commission identified a future attachment to the Diocese of Salisbury and the oversight of its diocesan bishop as the way forward. We were not the first to propose this

link. Pope Alexander VI issued a bull to this effect in – I think it was – 1496, and the very first post-Reformation bishop to visit the Islands to conduct confirmations was Bishop John Fisher of Salisbury in 1818. Our case, however, is not based on gossip from the muniment room. There is relatively easy access by sea and air, and we heard suggestions in the Islands that a link with the facilities of Sarum College, in particular, would be beneficial. With two suffragans, the Diocese of Salisbury also has the episcopal capacity to undertake the new work.

This proposal has already received the unanimous backing of the Islands, two deanery synods and also the support of the Salisbury Diocesan Synod. This consequential legislation is being promoted by the Archbishops' Council and I very much hope that Synod members will feel able to support the Measure before you later this afternoon.

Although the proposed link with Salisbury has attracted most attention, members of Synod will also be aware of the other recommendations designed to ensure that synodical Measures passed here, notably in the fields of safeguarding and clergy discipline, are applied in the Island deaneries. The Island authorities have already initiated the necessary steps to adopt these measures through their own established mechanisms. There are also discussions at an advanced stage to clarify the crucial relationship between the diocesan bishop and the deans and to produce a Memorandum of Understanding setting out the situation in an unambiguous way.

To conclude, one of the many things which impressed the Commission on our visits to the Islands was the minimal support for any “going it alone” solution, and the affection we found for and loyalty to the Church of England and the desire of parishes in the Islands to contribute to our joint mission. I share the concern of those who are hostile to excessive legislation, but I am convinced it is necessary to take this modest but significant step of establishing a new connection with Salisbury so that the Church's mission in the Islands can go forward and we can all benefit from a renewed partnership in the Gospel. Thank you for your patience.

**ITEM 502**  
**SPECIAL AGENDA I**  
**LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS**  
**DRAFT CHANNEL ISLANDS MEASURE (GS 2152)**

*The Chair:* I should have said that there is not an opportunity to ask questions after that. We are now going to move seamlessly to Item 502 on the Order Paper, which is the Draft Channel Islands Measure. This is the First Consideration stage for the draft Measure. For this, members will need the draft Measure GS 2152 and the Explanatory Notes GS 2152X. There is also a Financial Memorandum, and I draw your attention to the comment on this item at paragraphs 6 to 7 of the Financial Memorandum that you have received.

I therefore call on the Bishop to the Forces, Bishop Tim, to address us on the Channel Islands Measure to be considered for Revision in Full Synod. The Bishop may speak for not more than ten minutes, please.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (The Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* Isn't it wonderful to hear those dulcet tones again, members of Synod – 'Beloved...'. I am sure it was not any part of the Archbishop of Canterbury's thinking to try to save money when he asked the Lord Chartres to chair this Commission, thinking that he would not need to go across to the Islands but could just speak forth from his home where he is now. It has been wonderful to hear him. Following his marvellous scene-setting presentation, it falls to me as Chair of the Steering Committee for the draft Channel Islands Measure to introduce the Measure itself.

Can I just crave your indulgence for a moment, members of Synod? I wonder if it would be helpful for us at all if I could ask you to raise your hands if you have had experience of living in the Channel Islands. Could you show us how many people have lived in – not gone to – the Channel Islands? Thank you. I think it is important to note that and notice very carefully what Richard was saying to us about the differences that there are between there and here, and about the wonderfully careful work that the Commission has done for us in setting this debate this afternoon.

As members may have seen, the Measure set out in GS 2152 is actually a very brief and focused piece of legislation. While it has its genesis in the work of the Archbishop's Commission, it essentially gives effect to the central recommendation that the two Island deaneries be attached to the Diocese of Salisbury. As I have said, Lord Chartres has, in his own inimitable style, eloquently set out the rationale for that, amplifying paragraphs, in particular 33 and following of the Report, which is attached to GS Misc 1241. The Measure also makes new provision to simplify the process for applying the existing Measure to the Islands and various consequential amendments to other legislation.

I am very pleased, as Richard himself mentioned, to state and confirm that this Measure comes to you with the full support of the deanery synods of both Guernsey and Jersey, and the Salisbury Diocesan Synod, as well as that of the Archbishops' Council. You may well ask: what about Winchester? I understand that many in the diocese have substantially moved on from the painful events described in this Report. I draw Synod's attention to Bishop Tim Dakin's helpful statement on its publication that he 'welcomed the proposal for the Island deaneries to be given a fresh start with the Diocese of Salisbury'. While I accept that we should not legislate unless we have to, in this case I do believe that this is the right way forward and I stress the reality is that all the key players support this direction of travel. I do not believe, echoing the words of Richard again, that now is the time to look back; rather now I encourage us to embrace a future that should provide a secure foundation for the Church's mission in the Islands.

And as we debate this Measure and think about this particular Measure following this particular Report, can I ask all members of Synod to think carefully about the law of unintended consequences in what it is that you may be wanting to say. Very important and valid points that you want to make about other matters, I hope, will not prevent us from seeing what this particular Measure is trying to do in a particular and specific case.

I wonder if I could also say a little about why you are being asked, as it were, to 'fast track' this Measure, as Sue mentioned in the Business Committee Report. I realise that this is a little unusual, but the Measure is, as I have said, short and to the point, with one central provision enabling the attachment to the Diocese of Salisbury. There really is not much to revise, and it is hard to see what value would be added by prolonging consideration of this proposal. Indeed, I understand from both the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey and other people that there is much to be gained by getting this proposal through and getting on with all sorts of other matters which we know should be discussed.

Synod rightly cares about the mission of the Church. In this instance, the painful and complex events of 2013 have rather cast a shadow over the Church's ministry in the Islands. While all have been immensely grateful to the active pastoral care of Bishop Trevor Willmott and the professionalism shown by the staff of the Canterbury Diocese, these were only ever intended to be ad hoc arrangements.

It is time now to enable all to move on and set in place long-term arrangements for episcopal care and administration, so that decisions can be made with confidence about future mission priorities. The Islands have been in a form of limbo, as you have heard, for over six years, so I hope Synod will feel able to play its part now in moving them on.

Some of you may be wondering why this Measure is not also the vehicle for applying the other recommendations of the Archbishop's Commission. I draw your attention to paragraph 5 of GS Misc 1241, notably to the fact that the Islanders will themselves be taking responsibility for applying the provisions relating to women bishops, safeguarding and discipline. That way they will be embraced in their own Canons and laws. Clause 3 of the Measure makes provision to facilitate this. I am assured that there is no policy difference on these matters and, that being so, this is the best, Synod members, and fastest way forward. I further understand that moves are already being put in place to ensure these steps are taken. I also know from my colleague Bishop Nick Holtam that he has already embarked on discussions leading to a new Memorandum of Understanding between him and the Island deans and deaneries.

In agreeing to this Measure I believe that Synod will be playing its part in closing a painful chapter in the relationship between the Islands and the wider Church, and thus open the way to healing and reconciliation, but founded on a new legal reality that all concerned hope and pray will come to fruition. I commend this Measure very strongly indeed and hope you can support this Measure wholeheartedly, especially given all the parties directly concerned are positive about the direction of travel. Thank you.

*The Chair:* This motion, Synod, is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 51 speeches must be directed to the general purport of the Measure rather than to points of detail. I call the Bishop of Salisbury first of all, followed by Revd Prebendary Simon Cawdell. A five-minute speech limit is in place at the moment.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* Thank you very much for calling me early in this debate, Chair. This item has come to Synod with high hopes and expectations. You have heard the support that has followed the Commission's Report. I am really touched that Bishop Tim came to sit with me through this debate. We are functioning together on this. He has responded, as Bishop of Winchester, very positively to the Commission's Report, because he too sees the need for the churches in the Islands to have a fresh start and to flourish within the Diocese of Salisbury.

Let us be clear, this is not a case of choosing your own Bishop. To be honest, I think if the Channel Islands were able to do that, they would not have chosen me. It is about how you belong to be part of the Church of England. It is about the building up of the body of Christ.

Since the publication of the Report we have begun to build that relationship. The Deans have visited Salisbury and will be coming again soon. Our Diocesan Secretary, who is in the gallery, and I visited the Channel Islands of Guernsey and Jersey on the Feast of the Epiphany and the day after, not three but two (not necessarily) wise men. There were an astonishing number of informal relationships with the Diocese of Salisbury, particularly through Sarum College, which has been mentioned. Everyone spoke with thanksgiving for the historic relationship with the Diocese of Winchester, but it is clear at this stage there is no going back. They were warmly grateful for the transitional care provided by Canterbury, and particularly by Bishop Trevor Willmott, the former Bishop of Dover, but these were always transitional arrangements. We met a deep longing to arrive in a formal, settled way of belonging within the Church of England. We have begun to draft a Memorandum of Understanding and to work through all seven recommendations of the Commission's Report.

As was mentioned by Lord Chartres, there was no episcopal visit to the Channel Islands for confirmation from the Reformation until 1818. In 1818, the 77-year-old Bishop of Winchester being infirm, a visit for confirmation was undertaken by the then 70-year-old Bishop Fisher of Salisbury, who sailed from Weymouth with his family and confirmed 4,000 in Jersey, 2,400 on Guernsey and visited Alderney and Sark, where he confirmed others. The intention was to confirm only the adolescents, but the parents were so moved that they too wanted to be confirmed. I very much look forward to my first episcopal visit to the Channel Islands.

The Commission has made a proposal which has been welcomed globally. There is now a desire for the Islands to become part of the Diocese of Salisbury and there is a desire

on the part of the Diocese of Salisbury for that to happen. It is about how they are part of the Church of England, how they belong to the body of Christ, and I strongly support and welcome this proposal.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I am Pro-Prolocutor and member of the Business Committee, but here in a personal capacity. Last month I had the privilege of attending the confirmation of election of our new Bishop of Hereford. It was a quaint service at which Archbishop Justin spoke movingly and personally in his charge to his colleague. He talked, not unlike today, about the monster that can creep up on people as they inhabit the office, and indeed, status of Bishop. It creeps up quietly until the office suddenly overwhelms the identity of the person in Christ. He reminded us that it is that from which we have our very essence. That monster has many guises and in the Measure before us I really fear, and I am sorry to be a party pooper, that we may have one of them.

The monster appears when we face a solution that is so immediate, so pragmatic and so obvious that we cannot but agree to its course, but then we wake up the next morning and discover that we have sold our souls and abandoned key principles which underpin our faith, our theology and our ecclesiology. This Measure, so reasonable in its content, so welcomed, I am afraid, seems to represent bad theology, bad ecclesiology and I fear will be administratively detrimental to boot. I will deal briefly with each in turn.

It is bad theology because in its genesis, as the report says, there is a painful dispute between the Island deaneries and their Bishop, a dispute leading to great pain. An incumbent with whom I corresponded describes the sense of exile resulting. But a dispute is not a good place to propose a Measure. That should be about facilitated resolution – however hard – and a real striving from the Gospel of Christ to be allowed to do its work. Recall that passage from Philippians, Paul pleading with Euodia and Syntyche to agree with each other in the Lord, and inviting the Church to come around them in doing so. Are we saying the Gospel is inadequate in this case, that Christ cannot reach in?

The Report suggests that there are those who seek reconciliation and, from what I have heard, that is true, and there is indeed a continuing and evident affection for the Diocese of Winchester. Secondly, to pass those deaneries to another diocese without this resolution is in danger of kicking a can down the road. What happens when a future Bishop of Salisbury, or indeed this one, is faced with an unpopular course of action? The precedent might suggest another dispute, another exile, another soul-searching move. Where to now? Exeter. This Measure causes a wound to our theology of reconciliation.

Secondly, it is terrible ecclesiology. GS Misc 1241 makes it plain that this unfortunate matter has a personal ring to it. The Measure lamentably confuses the person and office of the Bishop, and the precedent set will have appalling consequences at this time when the Church has other contentious issues before us. What happens in other situations, for example, if the Welsh parishes in Hereford fall out with our new Bishop, or the Deanery of Berwick-upon-Tweed falls out with Bishop Christine? Do we wring our hands and pack

them off to another diocese or province? For all the Islands' different legal and national status must be acknowledged, they were deliberately made part of the Church of England and, of course, in 1569 the Bishop of Winchester lived mostly in London, south of the river, and conveniently close to the root of power in case of difficulty in troubled times, to enforce royal writ if needed.

To pass this Measure will be to acknowledge that in case of dispute with a particular bishop it is possible to choose another. Of course, local and ad hoc arrangements for easier church management have happened over the years, but this permanent transfer confuses the person and the office of the Bishop, which contradicts our Canons and those of the wider Church, from Nicaea onwards.

Thirdly, it is administratively difficult. The Report makes a suggestion about the future relationship of dean and bishop. It is good to know that that negotiation is going on, but would it not be better to have that in the Measure now? Measures cost money and it would demonstrate the support of the Church – the whole Church – around that solution. As it stands, to me this Measure sadly represents poor theology, worse ecclesiology and is therefore infelicitous. The Archbishop talked earlier about the faces of the lion. I believe one, sadly, can be found in this Measure and there must be a better way. Regrettably, party pooper that I sound at this moment, I will be opposing it.

*Ven. Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester):* Bishop Tim asked and partly answered the question: what about Winchester? I have served as Archdeacon in the Diocese of Winchester through the entirety of the precipitating events that have brought us to our Measure today. I speak on behalf of the representatives and Diocese of Winchester; equally humbled and honoured to do so. I do so to welcome and thank Bishop Richard and the Commission for their work and to welcome also and to urge your support for the Measure that is before us today.

Many in this House will have lived with broken relationships, either as a personal experience or as a pastoral privilege of ministry and accompaniment. And you will have recognised in that work, and in this experience, that reconciliation at its heart is not our work but the work of Christ. As we are reminded in 2 Corinthians 5, Christ stands at its heart. We may be handmaids to that work but we do not make it. Only Christ makes it.

As we journey through times of difficulties in relationships, there is prayer, there is conversation and those things have happened between those most deeply involved in the painful events of our recent past, but there are also important structural steps; steps that reposition people and places, so that encounters that have been difficult in the past may be re-approached and people may re-encounter each other and re-find each other in new ways, and relationships may be refreshed.

In our view, to pass this Measure is to provide such a crucial structural step in which we may encounter one another again, to find reconciliation and redemption. We would

encourage you to see in this Measure not a denial of reconciliation but rather a constructive step on the journey of reconciliation; an invitation and a willingness on our part to work with and under Christ. We thank and offer our love and prayers to our friends in the Channel Islands and our thanks to our friends in Salisbury and, with our whole hearts, we commend this Measure to Synod.

*The Chair:* Ian Le Marquand for a maiden speech followed by Clive Scowen. Clive, I will be reducing it to three minutes from when you speak.

*Mr Ian Le Marquand (Channel Islands):* Thank you for calling me to speak on a matter that is very close to my heart. And thank you for almost pronouncing my name correctly; I know how difficult it is. I am a former judge and a former Deputy Chief Minister in Jersey (for which you can read Deputy Prime Minister), and so I think I am well qualified to speak in relation to Jersey matters.

I feel very thankful. Today I want to thank a lot of people for where we have got to here. I want to, first, thank past Bishops and the Diocese of Winchester for their support for almost 500 years, and, indeed, Canterbury: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Diocese of Canterbury and particularly the former Bishop of Dover, as has been mentioned before, for seeing us through a difficult period. I want to thank the members of the Commission. I think they have produced a tremendous Report. It was wonderful to hear the Chairman speaking today. I cannot bring myself to pronounce his name in the anglicised way so I will call him former Bishop Chartres. Thank you also to the Business Committee for bringing this matter on so quickly and trying to take it through all the stages so rapidly.

I would confirm that the Jersey deanery synod, of which I am a member, voted unanimously in favour of the move to Salisbury. The truth is that we are looking forward with confidence to a new relationship within the fellowship of the Church of England. However, to understand Jersey, you need to know that we are not part of the United Kingdom. We are different. If I may use a French phrase: *vive la différence*.

We have, as has been said, our own Parliament, our own laws, even our own Canon law. That is important to understand because, although there is a route for bringing Measures from this Synod into our legislation, it is better to do it through amendments to our Canon Law. It is a more effective and efficient way. We have had our own Canon Law and our own institutions. We have 12 parish churches which are owned and maintained by the secular parish in tremendously close links between the secular parish and the ecclesiastical parish. In more recent years the Jersey Deanery has even been managing its own finances. We also have in our Dean a Crown appointee, with an unusual set of responsibilities and powers, which are set out in his appointment letters, Letters Patent as they are called, and that was necessary, of course, historically for the reasons set out: the distance from England, the difficulties of travelling and so on.

It is important to note that we have never been part of an English diocese. It has been

said before, and it is painful to remind you, of course, that we were on the winning side in 1066, but, notwithstanding that, we chose to remain with the English Crown. We were part of the Diocese of Coutances in Normandy until the early 1500s, when, as it is said, the Pope decided that as we had an English king perhaps we should have an English bishop, so we were moved to being attached to Salisbury for a short period. Nobody did anything about that at all and so it was changed and we were attached to Winchester and ended up staying there for a much longer period.

Why are we attached to rather than part of a diocese? The reasons are not just historical; the reasons are legal. We have a different legal structure. Different laws apply and the Bishop, whoever he may be, when he is in Jersey is subject to the law of Jersey and not to English law.

I must hasten because the colour is changing very rapidly. Jersey people are friendly and welcoming by nature, but we are independently minded and have fiercely defended our institutions and our constitutional position for more than 800 years. However, we are also a multinational and multiracial diverse modern society, with strong international links, and a strong record of financial support for poorer countries.

Which brings me to Salisbury. We are profoundly grateful to the Bishop and the Diocese of Salisbury that they want to have us. We believe they are the right place and with their three bishops, they can provide for our needs as well as their own. Please help us to move forward today by voting for this Measure.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I want to support Preb. Cawdell's opposition to this Measure as it stands and to plead that we should not institutionalise division and relational breakdown, as this will inevitably be seen to do. I would like us to consider what it will say to our nation, and, indeed, to the rest of the Church of England if we do. God has commissioned us as ambassadors for Christ in trusting to us the ministry of reconciliation. The Gospel message which has been entrusted to us is that all people can be reconciled to God through faith in the Lord Jesus and His death on the Cross. Reconciliation to God places us in Christ as brothers and sisters. Paul tells the Ephesians that Christ is our peace, who by the Cross has broken down the dividing wall of hostility between Jews and Gentiles; one of the greatest hostilities of his day. He tells the Galatians that there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female. All those divisions and hostilities are broken down and all who trust in Christ are made one in Him.

But if we go down the road (which this legislation would enable) we will be saying, loud and clear, or at least we will be heard to be saying loud and clear, that there are limits to the efficacy of the Gospel. Yes, Jews and Gentiles, slave and free, men and women, all can be fully reconciled, but the Channel Islands and the Diocese of Winchester? No, that is too difficult. The Gospel of reconciliation does not stretch that far. Is that really what we want to communicate to our nation? Should we not rather confess our faith that there

are no limits to the reconciling power of Christ? No situation, however difficult and painful, that He cannot transform, and where He can break down the deepest divisions between people. What precedent does it set for the Church?

Preb. Cawdell has already touched on this, but just imagine hypothetically a deanery or even a parish at the eastern edge of the Diocese of Salisbury which finds itself in serious dispute with its bishop or with the diocese over any matter really. Having set this precedent for the Channel Island deaneries, why should that deanery or parish not demand they too be allowed to secede, in this case from Salisbury and join Winchester? Is that really a precedent we want to set in the times in which we live?

I recognise that not going down the route of this legislation is messy and it will take time, but I believe that we need to resolve, to trust that, by God's grace, full reconciliation between the Channel Island deaneries and Winchester will be achieved, and that is the way in which we should proceed.

*Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester):* I stand not just as a General Synod member for Winchester but also as lay Chair of the Winchester diocesan synod, and in that capacity I want to express my own very deep personal deep sadness for the breakdown in our relationship, and regret that we have not found a way to be reconciled.

I have no intention of rehearsing the painful situation which has led us to this point. I think it is now the time to move forward. I have prayed over the past six years for reconciliation and healing, but I am now accepting, somewhat reluctantly, the recommendation from the Commission that there is no way back and that this new relationship with Salisbury offers a positive way forward, as Bishop Tim has expressed. I have great sympathy for Preb. Cawdell and Mr Scowen's points, but I think we need to be pragmatic for the sake of mission. We have a limited amount of energy and resource – each of us – and now is the moment to look outwards for the sake of the gospel, rather than inwards.

But I wish that we could be reconciled. When I went to the Commission, I asked the representatives from the Islands was there anything I could do to help bring reconciliation, and I was told there was not. If we are to be the Church, the body of Christ that Archbishop Justin spoke of, then we need to be reconciled. It is that reconciliation that I would like to ask for, please, not that we would become one diocese again, but that we would find a moment to express our sadness, to share forgiveness and to pray together in a formal way in order that the Channel Islands might move on well to the relationship with Salisbury.

My friends in the Channel Islands, I want to take this opportunity to wish you well. The Bishop of Basingstoke preached yesterday on 1 Thessalonians 5: "So encourage one another and build one another up". That is what I think we need to do here. My prayer is that your relationship with Salisbury would be lifegiving to both you and Salisbury. I pray that you would be filled with hope and that the Church on the Islands would flourish

and grow and that you would know afresh the joy of the Lord and the power of the Spirit. May God bless you in this new phase of your life, and I very much hope that we will find a way to continue to be friends in Christ and to build his kingdom together as part of the Church of England.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter):* I speak as a member of the Business Committee and understand the need for the fast-tracking of this Measure. I want to say what a joy it was to hear Lord Chartres. He talked about the Measure as being a “modest but significant” solution and Bishop Tim talked about having “high hopes and expectations”. I fully support having high hopes, I fully support having a fresh start, but I just want to urge Synod to pay attention to what Clive Scowen and Simon have said, although I would not go as far as them. I am aware – how could you not be – as anyone who has read GS Misc 1241 of the huge amount of work that has gone into trying to effect a reconciliation.

I just want you to consider how it appears to the person in the pew, the person who nearly 17 years ago stood for Synod, for Guildford Diocese then, with the firm commitment to having the needs of parishes always in mind. It appears to the people in the pew, I think, and people who I have discussed it with, that we have come to have this Measure today; it is necessary because with, all the best efforts, reconciliation has not been possible. Very sadly, it seems to me that that is another example, to lay people, of the Church protecting the institution and the senior leaders of that institution. That is dispiriting but, having said all that, I recognise, too, that the Measure has the full support of all those people who will be affected by it, and so I will be supporting this, but I just urge Synod to consider how this looks to the people in the pew.

*The Chair:* His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury followed by Tim Barker.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* At Lambeth I am only called your Grace when I am in trouble. It is like calling your children by their full name.

I would like to begin by thanking all those who have been involved in this: the Bishop of Winchester, Bishop Tim, Bishop Nick of Salisbury, Lord Chartres and his whole Commission, and Bishop Trevor. Particularly Bishop Tim and Bishop Nick have made a point of working very, very closely together and with great graciousness and kindness, and Lord Chartres and his colleagues have worked immensely hard and with thorough and painstaking care.

I was a little worried at one point that we were going to end up having to make a decision on whether the bull of 1496 was valid or the subsequent one which went to Winchester, but Lord Chartres resisted that temptation, I think with some difficulty. Bishop Trevor has worked extraordinarily hard and will come to the end of his time this year before Easter. We owe him a great debt of thanks as we do to the staff at Canterbury Diocese.

I want to say a very brief word about reconciliation. Reconciliation is very seldom, except

as a long-term outworking, institutional; it is relational. It is often necessary, in fact almost invariably necessary, to find new ways of relating in order to rebuild relationships that have suffered from severe and destructive difference. We find that in the Scriptures in the Council of Jerusalem where there was a need to reshape how the working of the Church was done. Once you have reshaped and created space, you can use that space to find a new relationship.

Picking up on something that was said in the debate on the agenda of the Business Committee, this is a case of grace over law. Law says we apply the system as it has been for 500 years, regardless of what the outcomes are. Grace says let us make space to find a new way of relating to one another.

I would say to Clive Scowen and Simon Cawdell, whose views I listened to with great attention and much respect that, with great respect, I differ from them. I think this is, in fact, the very sign of reconciliation, not a sign of an impossibility of reconciliation. I think it is a way of saying, "We can do this; we just need to do it in a different way."

When you change your relationships you do not forget the previous way. You re-found the former relationship in a new way, and this is what we are seeking to do now. I think Alison Coulter got it absolutely right in the way she described this and the hopes she described for a process of reconciliation. Therefore, I hope very much that the Synod will vote for this, that it will support the quick process of getting it done and, in doing so, it will support both the Channel Islands, all of them, and also the Diocese of Canterbury, Winchester and Salisbury. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Tim Barker and then after Tim I am going to test your minds about a closure on this debate.

*Very Revd Tim Barker (Dean of Guernsey):* I think I probably have a declaration of interest to make. Much of what I might have wanted to say has already been said and I will not repeat it. Suffice it to say at this stage that I would like to quote from a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury which the Channel Island deans and our lay chairs wrote to the Archbishop in January 2018 asking for the establishment of the Commission. We wrote this: "We look forward to finding a resolution of the current and interim arrangements that will best allow the flourishing of the deaneries of Guernsey and Jersey and their parishes, and an appropriate relationship with the wider Church of England so that we can be places of growth in discipleship and life-enriching engagement with God, whom we know through Jesus Christ".

It is our belief that the Measure before us is the best way of allowing that, and we hope that it will have the support of Synod so that the Channel Island deaneries, all our islands, can flourish and grow and contribute and be part of the life of the whole Church of England. I hope you will support this Measure.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 502 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 502.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I therefore call upon the Bishop of the Forces to reply. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* Thank you very much indeed, and can I thank all members of Synod who have taken part in this debate. Can I also, through you, Chair, repeat the thanks that the Archbishop of Canterbury gave on behalf of Synod to, in particular, Lord Chartres and all the members of the Commission and to Jonathan Neil-Smith for the extraordinary work that they have done in putting this Report together.

I do not intend to go through all the speeches as so many of them, I am pleased to say, were very helpful and supportive and I think spoke for themselves. Suffice it to say that we are all looking forward to the report of Bishop Nick Holtam's first visit to the Islands the 4,000 people he is going to confirm. So that is very good news.

It would be, I think, right for me to focus, perhaps, on what Clive and Simon were saying and also the point that Anne Foreman made about how does this look from people in the pew. If I may say so, I was helped in what I might say, probably for the first time in my life, by what the Archbishop of Canterbury said in his speech. We quite like each other really. I was going to make a similar point in that it would seem to me that what is going on here is actually an example of how reconciliation does work for most of us, and I speak, obviously, only for myself in terms of thinking about families and friendships, and in that sense obviously I was thinking of that friendship I used to have with the Archbishop of Canterbury! Reconciliation is not a one-off event, it is a process, and it seems to me that actually what we are doing here today is something really significant.

And if I may say something – he says, about to be patronising – not in a patronising say, but it did take me back, listening to some of the speeches being made, to the time when I was a diocesan bishop, in that wonderful county and nation of Cornwall, because when you have to talk to parishes and deaneries about parish share, it can sometimes sound to you as if people are talking about being members of different churches. I do remind you that we are sitting here today as one General Synod of the Church of England and in front of me I see, as Nick himself said, Nick and Tim sitting next to each other. So the Measure we are passing today will not somehow take the Channel Islands right away from the Diocese of Winchester, they will still have to deal with the Diocese of Winchester, they will still have to relate with the Diocese of Winchester, as we all have to do, here in this diocese.

When Simon was speaking, I do not see this as being bad theology at all, bad theology, I feel, is imposing something that is not appropriate on people. Good theology is listening to what is being said, working with and certainly not, as Clive was suggesting, somehow giving in and saying that is the end of it. Of course, we want to work to reconciliation. Let us be honest, gentlemen and ladies of Synod today, we recognise that beneath all this were some very painful things that did go wrong.

But we also recognise, as the Commission says, that we need to make some changes, and some of those changes need to be made in the Channel Islands, which we have heard several times. I will not try and pronounce the name of the gentleman who made that really good maiden speech. I am from Yorkshire and not allowed to speak French. He made the point that the Channel Islands are different jurisdictions and therefore I believe one of the things that we are doing through this Measure is allowing the Channel Islands to make some of the changes we know they need to make and then to allow the reconciliation process to continue.

As Alison Coulter said, I do hope and pray also that the time will come when we can have that proper reconciliation, but, members of Synod, I believe firmly and strongly that if we can pass this Measure – this Measure – then that will allow this process to continue. You are not somehow saying that we are not into reconciliation and we do not believe in it. You are saying that we do believe in reconciliation, you are noting with sadness what went wrong in the past, we are not pushing it under any carpet, we are recognising that things have gone wrong and saying that through this Measure we hope and pray under God we find a different structural way forward to allow that reconciliation to continue.

So, I would like, therefore, to propose that this Measure entitled the Channel Islands Measure, be considered for revision in full Synod.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 502, “That the Measure entitled ‘Channel Islands Measure’ be considered for revision in Full Synod”, to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* The Measure now proceeds to the Revision Stage in full Synod. This will take place during tomorrow afternoon’s sitting. That completes this item of business and I would encourage you to remain where you are for the next item. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 4.54 pm.

## **ITEM 505**

### **SPECIAL AGENDA I**

## **THE CLERGY COVENANT FOR WELLBEING ACT OF SYNOD 2020 (GS 2153)**

*The Chair:* This is Item 505, The Clergy Covenant for Wellbeing Act of Synod. Members will need the paper from the Clergy Wellbeing Working Group, which is GS 2153. With the concurrence of the Archbishop of York, who has indicated his concurrence in writing to the Registrar, I move “That the Clergy Covenant for Wellbeing (set out at paragraph 20 of GS 2133) be solemnly affirmed and proclaimed as an Act of Synod”.

I am now going to open the motion for debate, and I am first going to ask the Reverend Canon Simon Butler to speak. I will give him six minutes. At the end I will ask Jacqueline Stamper to speak, as they are the Chair and Vice Chair of the Clergy Wellbeing Working Group. After the debate, Item 505 will be put to the vote and a simple majority of the whole Synod will suffice.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Thank you. I was going to say Your Grace, but I had better not now. The Archbishop of Canterbury has already mentioned lions. Members of Synod, Acts of Synod are rare beasts in our jungle. Since joining in 2005, there has been one, and the previous one to that was the well-known Act of Synod of 1993. The use of this rare device occurred to me at an early stage of the development of our work on clergy care and wellbeing because I have seen too many reports get lost deep in the jungle as soon as they have been debated in this Synod.

I was determined to do what I could to ensure that the vital work that we began in July of promoting clergy care and wellbeing, something which has to be the corollary of renewal and reform, of safeguarding, and the many other aspects of our ministry and mission, that all of this was embedded in our common life. What the Working Group, through the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, are asking you to do today is to express the current mind of the church about clergy care and wellbeing.

We are not asking you to create a huge programme of work. We are not asking you, as GS 2153 makes crystal clear, to create a legal precedent that will creep up and bite the bishops like the aforementioned lion. And we are certainly not asking you to provide a blueprint for how every ordained minister should care for themselves or how each congregation or diocese should care for its clergy.

We are asking you to say to the whole Church of England, from the tiniest parish in the country to Lambeth, Bishopthorpe and Church House, that it is vital to have in mind the care and wellbeing of the clergy in the way we go about doing and being church, and for that we believe an Act of Synod is the perfect vehicle. So, what happens next?

If the Act is proclaimed and affirmed today, it will in due course be proclaimed in every diocesan synod and here are some hopes of mine that might flow from this. I hope that the simple and attractive resources we are about to make available, based on the text

that you have in GS Misc 1246, will provide a basis upon which every congregation, chaplaincy and clergyperson can reflect on and speak to one another of their own needs and approach to clergy care and wellbeing. I hope that many dioceses will take the opportunity, if they have not done already, to promote the use of these resources and the Covenant by the clergy and people of those dioceses.

I hope that many of the diocesan synods which proclaim the Act will use the opportunity to have a debate on the issues we have brought to this Synod and which affect their local clergy. I hope that as we embark or continue on the many national programmes of work, of diocesan strategies and of local mission action plans, that the Covenant will encourage us all to think about how these vital things impact upon the clergy and the resources they need to do what they are asked to do. And I hope that the next Synod will return to these matters in years I think we all know are going to be challenging for the whole Church for many reasons, with a sense that our clergy are better equipped and trained to care for themselves, congregations and parishes are more aware of the pressures on clergy and what they can do to help, and dioceses ask the right questions to provide the right resources for their clergy.

I think I would also pick up from the Archbishop's Presidential Address that I hope that that sort of reflection on what it means to profess may mean that the Covenant sitting alongside the Guidelines for Professional Conduct may add a basis for further thinking and reflection in a number of different areas.

Writing on the ViaMedia website a couple of days ago, the Dean of Chelmsford asked a question: "Is all well with the Clergy Wellbeing Covenant?" In the main article, he seemed to be arguing that the Covenant seems to be for an organisation that does not exist. A covenant, he said, is not the sort of thing that is appropriate for the sort of thing that a church is. He asked who is the Covenant between, and he argued that the Church is not an organisation but a relational culture. Well, all well and good.

I agree with Dean Henshaw that the church is a relational culture, but it is also a relational body. The metaphor of the body implies structure and differentiation of role, and, therefore, as in any living thing, systems of regulation, control and support.

As such, what we are proposing this Synod does today in making an Act of Synod is to make clear and unequivocal in the mind of the Church on a simple statement of commitment to one another in our different roles, in our ministries and responsibilities. From such a statement, we believe that the potential for much good can come and much good fruit can emerge.

Lastly, I just want to pay tribute to the Working Group who have proved such wonderful colleagues in this work over two-and-a-half years. In particular, I want to thank the lay members of this group. This, as we have said before, is not special pleading for the clergy, it is a plea for care for people with a particular shape to their caring. There is much

to do for the health of the whole body in pastoral care and wellbeing that can be done, as Archbishop Justin said in his Presidential Address a few minutes ago.

For your time, friends, and the encouragement and support you have given and will continue to give to your clergy, deacons, priests and bishops, we owe you a huge debt of thanks, and the promise of our service to the whole body in the years to come.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. Bishop Pete and Lisa Battye, followed by the Bishop of London.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* Chair, I am very grateful to the Working Party for what they have produced and I want to pay tribute to Simon Butler, who has really championed this and steered it through Synod in a very helpful way, it seems to me. He has done it out of his own experience and at some personal cost in his own life, and I think we ought to pay tribute to him for that. This is something which is deeply in him as something that he believes in and something which he and the Working Party have championed.

I raised a couple of points in July about the questions around this and I am grateful that the Legal Office, in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 and 8, have tried to address the question of the legal obligations that are laid on us. I still have a worry because I know how many legal cases are coming to us these days and employment tribunals seem to me to be rife in the life of the Church. I am very glad that there is a very robust legal objection, which I am sure our legal advisers will put when this Covenant is first prayed in aid at any employment tribunal. We know the arguments, we believe that is what they should say, but I am still concerned that we teeter in our understanding between the different sorts of ways in which clergy are not employed, office-holders, not office-holders, not employed, and all the rest of the things that go on.

I do worry that the Act of Synod as we proclaim it will sound as though we are adopting something which is not necessarily true, so there is a legal question there which I know we have addressed. There is an underlying question, which is about whether common tenure really works and actually adopting this flushes out the question that probably common tenure is not really fit for purpose either, but it is all we have got.

Secondly, I do think that there is a question of it promising more than it will fulfil. The Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy are much quoted but very seldom referred to, and the worry is that this will be the same. Actually, we are all in a big discussion across the Church at large and in our diocese about clergy wellbeing; the Covenant will help us with that. But what do we think we are promising to our clergy? I hope if you ask the clergy in the Willesden area whether I am someone who believes in their wellbeing they would say yes, but they might not.

The question about what we think we are putting out there has been very starkly raised by the research done by Sheldon on the CDM, that was alluded to earlier, and we need to say we probably cannot get all this right straight away, let us not pretend that we can, let us be very humble in the way in which we implement this.

The last thing is I think I agree with the Dean of Chelmsford's concerns that he raised. I am still not sure that something based on the Armed Forces Covenant is quite right and fit for purpose for what we are doing in the Church. I would prefer the Ordinal. I would prefer the sense that we are basically a spiritual body and a body where there are problems about how we order our life together, but this may not be the right way of doing it. However, we have gone this far, I am not going to draw back now, I will vote for it, but I think that we ought to put on the table our concerns that this may not help us forward as much as we think it can, but let us try and make it work anyway.

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester):* As a member of the Working Group, I read every single submission. I am not saying that to say how great I am, but, by Jove, the things that jumped out at me were those submissions where the clergyperson concerned had "suffered under the CDM Measure". I want, in particular, to honour one person who asked me to plead with General Synod to ask for a complete review and not a tinkering round the edges in the ongoing review of CDM that, if passed, the principles in this Act of Synod will immediately be applied to that review of CDM. It has caused a great deal of suffering, and those of us who have not been in the process perhaps do not realise this, so thank you for letting me share that, and thanks for calling me.

*The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally):* Can I also thank all those who put time into this piece of work. It is well overdue and I certainly take seriously the wellbeing of the clergy under my oversight and I also know I do not get it right. So, anything that helps us in that direction is important. In a sense, I want to reiterate Bishop Pete's comments, but maybe coming from a slightly different angle.

Research demonstrates that occupational stress is reduced when there are clear role expectations, clear lines of accountability, clear boundaries, a clear appraisal and feedback system, and there are clear expectations. Therefore, we should probably not be surprised that clergy are particularly vulnerable to accumulating excess stress levels because of the nature of their ministry, which often involves multiple roles and responsibilities, unrealistic expectations of others, a lack of boundaries that are associated with the role, and often little collegial or line management support.

Last year, many will know that St Luke's Healthcare for Clergy found that around 12% of clergy who responded said they were struggling or barely coping, and two-thirds of those said that they frequently considered giving up their role in the church because of stress. Whilst I support the Covenant which we have before us, I do wonder whether something that is based on purely moral provision is going far enough, and I wonder whether it is

time for us to really face the issue of our accountabilities and responsibilities and whether actually what is required is legally enforced rights and obligations. Therefore, I too wonder whether it is time to review or look at common tenure.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*A speech was made by a member at this point which has been removed from the report due to legal reasons*

*The Chair:* Liz Paver and then Andrew Dotchin. Then I will probably be seeking to bring this discussion to a close.

*Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield):* May I add my thanks to those who have contributed to this long overdue piece of work and welcome the fact that we have reached the point of proclaiming it as an Act of Synod. As someone who was actually in this chamber for the last two Acts of Synod, I do see it as a tool that this Synod can use and make its own decisions. I am particularly grateful that throughout the work the needs and pastoral care of clergy households have been recognised.

At a recent deanery synod, a conversation with a clergy widow whose husband had died in service greatly troubled me. She spoke to me movingly of the hurt she felt that the lack of pastoral care from her diocese through the senior staff and clergy had left her feeling cast aside and worthless after she had worked alongside her husband for many years in their mission and ministry for the Church.

As we consider at diocesan and parochial church council level all the questions and suggestions in the document and reflect on the actions that are asked, please take some time to consider our response to spouses and partners who are bereaved. Let us look forward to working through this document, I feel sure that it will give many in our congregations real food for thought. I give wholehearted support to this motion to make this an Act of Synod.

*Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I would like to limit my comments to the Clergy Discipline Measure and how it will work out in this. The challenge of having only a hammer as your tool is that everything begins to look like a nail. I think that is one of the challenges of the CDM in its current form. I welcome this Act of Synod because it hopes that we will be more pastoral and caring in the future.

There are a few things though I would ask of those dealing with this going forward. Please do not rush forward without fully receiving and applying the excellent research done by the Sheldon Hub and Aston University and my thanks go to them. Knowing that the current CDM process does not serve us well and we are in the process of revision, please may we ask that it is only used in its current form in cases of gross misconduct. Please do not go ahead without being as transparent as possible and consulting as widely as possible. Please do not go forward with the presumption that a simple reworking of the

CDM will be the answer when what may well be needed is a complete replacement.

*The Chair.* Mr Dotchin, the subject is not CDM, it is the Clergy Covenant.

*Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I see it as part of the process though.  
Can I finish?

*The Chair.* Briefly, please.

*Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Thank you. But please do go forward because things cannot continue as they are. On Sunday, when talking to newly promoted NCOs in my air cadet squadron, I reminded them to lead means going beyond the rules and regulations. Anyone can follow the rules. Anyone can do the correct thing. Not everyone will go one step further and do the right thing as well. Let us decide to do the right thing and replace our hammer with a whole canteen of cutlery which the Church may use to help feed the Body of Christ.

*The Chair:* I am conscious we have Questions coming up in this timed business at 5.30 and so I wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 505 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 505.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* A point of order, yes, and then I am going to ask Jacqueline Stamper to wind up for us, please.

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* I do this with great hesitation but I have been very concerned by the variety of subjects brought in during this short debate: the concern about common tenure; the concern about CDM; in fact, it is slightly improving, but the relevant emptiness of the chamber before we do something solemn that we only do about every ten years, and so I propose asking whether we might consider an adjournment until these things can be considered together rather than passing this and laying one part of a complicated picture into an Act of Synod.

*The Chair:* Wait while I take advice, please. Are you moving the adjournment?

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* Yes.

*The Chair:* Would you like to give a date for resumption?

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* I am content to leave that for the Business Committee.

*The Chair:* Given the time and the importance of Questions, the motion has been moved that the debate be now adjourned. I do not consider that the motion for the adjournment of the debate needs to be debated further. I, therefore, put the motion to the Synod.

*The motion was put and lost on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Jacqueline Stamper, please, to close the debate.

*Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn):* Thank you very much, everybody, for your contributions to this debate. A number of the issues raised are well above my paygrade, I can tell you. I hope that we are going to be moving forward on this, as it is, I believe, part of our shared discipleship. Bishop Pete, thank you for raising some of the questions that I thought you might be going to raise. Indeed, there are issues there where we were very much working from the guidelines, from the Ordinal.

Although I can remember that when we initially discussed the idea of a Covenant for Clergy Wellbeing, the Armed Forces' Covenant was mentioned in our deliberations in the Working Group, that really was never a consideration. We recognised that this is a completely different body with completely different kinds of relationships and it was not appropriate to follow the Military Covenant, as you will discover if you read it.

Lisa, thank you very much for raising the points about CDM. This is a much bigger issue, but I do sincerely hope that if the spirit of this Act of Synod is upheld in our parishes in all environments there will be fewer CDMs because we shall be moving to a much more relational culture and improving the relational culture that the Dean of Chelmsford was talking about.

Thank you to Bishop Sarah. Yes, one of the things that we were particularly concerned about in the Working Group was ways of creating realistic expectations on clergy, looking at things like role descriptions, person specs and parish profiles when appointing and also at inductions and institutions, making it clear that this was a partnership and that there was a realistic expectation we were all doing this job together and not one person was expected to do the whole thing.

April, that is an appalling personal story both for her and for her rector. I know that there was concern in the Sheldon Hub discussion as the Covenant was moving forward, a fear that it might encourage bullying of the clergy by parishioners. Again, I am hoping that by the kinds of conversations and the resources that are going to be coming out, some of which you already have in your pack, those kinds of conversations will actually reduce that kind of bullying behaviour because we will have a better relationship. We will have sat down together and talked about doing the discipleship that we all share.

Liz, thank you for mentioning clergy households. That was a major concern in our deliberations, the importance of clergy households to the wellbeing of the clergy and, again, I do not dare go further on the issue of CDM. In GS Misc 1246 it talks about ordained ministry being about relationship, partnership, professionalism and accountability. I see this Act of Synod, as I sincerely hope it will be very shortly, as that kind of relational culture which is precisely what the Clergy Covenant is trying to encourage. Yes, it is carefully and costly work to nurture but this is intended to be a key stage in that development, that being fully present, that watching over.

I asked a clergy colleague of mine in a meeting the other day what they would want to see out of the Clergy Covenant. What they would want to see is, actually, with their senior clergy, having time to sit down where people were indeed fully present and they were talking face to face as individual to individual, understanding their respective roles in the ministry of Christ.

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* Point of order. Given the interest in this and the importance of this matter far beyond this House, would you consider a count of the Synod?

*The Chair:* I will order it if I see 25 members indicating by standing or waving. I do not see 25 members standing or waving, therefore I shall now put Item 505 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* The motion having been carried, I shall now ratify and confirm it for the Province of Canterbury. That is done. The Archbishop of York, as I have said, has already indicated his ratification for the Province of York, subject to it being passed. I have signed the Instrument of Proclamation and, please, read it.

*Revd Alexander McGregor (Head of the Legal Office):* The Clergy Covenant for Wellbeing Act of Synod 2020: WHEREAS the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the General Synod of the Church of England assembled at their Synod in Westminster did on the tenth day of February in the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty solemnly affirm and proclaim as an Act of Synod the Clergy Covenant for Wellbeing set out at paragraph 20 of GS 2133 being word for word annexed hereto.

NOW THEREFORE WE JUSTIN PORTAL WELBY by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury and JOHN TUCKER MUGABI SENTAMU by Divine Providence Archbishop of York do hereby RATIFY AND CONFIRM the said Act of Synod for Our respective Provinces and do hereby PROCLAIM to each and every of Our dioceses THE CLERGY COVENANT FOR WELLBEING as an ACT OF SYNOD and do instruct the Clerk to the General Synod to transmit a copy of the said Act of Synod to the secretary of each Diocesan Synod requiring that it be formally proclaimed in the Diocesan Synod at the next session.

DATED this tenth day of February in the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Twenty.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Alex. The casual informality of our language always shocks me. The Act of Synod will now be sent to the diocesan synods. That completes this bit of business.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 5.32 pm

## **ITEM 5**

## QUESTIONS

*The Chair.* Synod, we now come to Item 5, Questions, for which you will need your full Questions Notice Paper and the Tenth Notice Paper with the errata on it. A year ago, a colleague sat here and informed Synod that we had met a record number of questions with 120, or a record for quite some time. Well, you will be pleased to know you have outdone yourselves and, as a result, we have got 121 questions today. I would like to note that that, therefore, means that the Synod staff have also outdone themselves with huge amounts of work on our behalf, so thank you.

Please may I remind Synod that this is an item not for speeches but for questions only. There are opportunities for you to ask supplementary questions to the answers that are given. In order to cover as much as we can by seven o'clock – and there are a large range of topics upon which we have questions – can I ask you to be as brief as possible in your supplementary questions. I shall ask you to be as gracious as I shall be strict on making sure that happens.

Could you please be ready at the podiums if you have a supplementary that you would like to ask. Can I remind members to please state your name and Synod number when you get to that point. Can those members, who have been waiting for this item with supplementary questions ready, listen really intently because it may be that you are able to hear the answers to the questions perhaps posed by other members and that might enable us to get a little bit further through the booklet of questions and answers today.

## REMUNERATION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE

1. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The Central Stipends Authority Report makes reference to a forthcoming review of clergy remuneration. Can the Chair please confirm the methodology of this and whether, as with the Report 'Generosity and Sacrifice', comparisons will be made with other professions when assessing the reasonableness of the overall package of stipend, housing, pension and benefits in return for the service given by office holders?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster)* replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Work is underway on the review of clergy remuneration, which will take place during 2020, reporting to Synod in February 2021. The review will consider the adequacy and appropriateness of the package. The review will adopt a broad approach, drawing on a range of methodologies and making full use of existing research and data to inform conclusions. The overall package will be considered in the context of other earnings, but a straightforward comparison with other professions is problematic given the nature of the clergy role, other elements of the package, such as the non-contributory final salary pension (now a rarity across other professions), and the house provided for the better performance of duties. Further, it

would no longer be straightforward to make the specific comparison with the salary of a primary school headteacher as recommended in 'Generosity and Sacrifice' because of changes in salaries and remuneration in education.

## **MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL**

2. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What reading and other resources can the MAPC commend so that members of General Synod can better understand (a) what factors and influences led the Pilgrims to sail to the 'new world' (b) what lessons of that time, if any, are relevant for the Church of England and British society, more widely, at the start of the 2020s, and (c) how the Church of England can in this season set an example of seeking and promoting the 'commonwealth' of society while respecting individual conscience in religious belief and worship?

*The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith)* replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: A number of excellent books have been written in recent years on English 17th century religion and the experience of the Pilgrims. These include Alec Ryrie's *Protestants: The Faith that Made the Modern World* (2017), Susan Hardman Moore's *Pilgrims: New World Settlers and the Call of Home* (2007) and Stephen Tomkins' *The Journey to the Mayflower: God's Outlaws and the Invention of Freedom* (2020). Each has enduring lessons about the experience of, and necessity for, religious freedom and the difficulties of living out a vision of Christian society in practice.

MPA is developing several strands of work addressing questions of religious freedom, domestically and globally. We are also working with other partners on wider issues of religious understanding, including the Near Neighbours and Together Network programmes. We will be asking the Business Committee to consider a debate on global freedom of religion and belief for a forthcoming group of sessions.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood*: Thank you, Bishop, very much for your very helpful answer and I look forward to the further work streams that the MPA are developing on religious freedom. May I also commend to you *The Mayflower Pilgrims* by Derek Wilson and reflecting the fact that the actual boat, the Mayflower, sailed from Rotherhithe, which is part of the deanery which I represent. I am asking him to agree that it is worth attending a series of lectures being organised by the Rotherhithe and Bermondsey History Society, details of which are on their website.

3. *Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In 2016 General Synod passed the following motion (GS 2019A):

That this Synod:

(a) request the Church of England Public Affairs Council to evaluate, with others as appropriate, the impact of sanctioning upon benefit claimants; and

(b) Call on Her Majesty's Government to implement recommendations numbered 58 to 63 inclusive made in December 2014 by the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry Report into Hunger in the UK 'Feeding Britain' in respect of the use of sanctions upon benefit claimants.

What progress has been made by the Church of England Public Affairs Council and Her Majesty's Government?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* MPA is closely monitoring the impact of sanctions and other welfare policies, as well as supporting Bishops in lobbying for policies to reduce poverty and destitution. The overall rate of sanctioning has continued to decline since its peak in 2013 and is now similar to the period prior to 2010. However, benefit sanctions remain a significant contributor to food bank use, according to The Trussell Trust's State of Hunger report. Two specific concerns remain: first, the average duration of sanctions is still significantly higher than previously, following the introduction of longer sanctions for more severe or multiple non-compliance; secondly, converting hardship payments from grants to loans has reduced uptake. As a result, many sanctioned claimants are having to survive for longer and on even lower incomes. At the same time, there is growing evidence that sanctions are largely ineffective in their stated aim of promoting employment.

*Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie:* I am grateful for the answer, but the sanctioning system as it stands continues to bring misery and despair into lives already being lived on the edge, on people with no financial savings or resources and it really hits them hard. My question is, as well as monitoring, is anything being done now or being planned for the future by Church or Government to make this system of sanctioning less draconian?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* Thank you for the question. The answer is that the purpose of the monitoring is to make sure that we are placed to make the interventions at the appropriate time at Government level, through the Lords Spiritual particularly, but it also impacts own Government relation contexts. As you will be aware, there is some rumour and expectation that there will be a reshuffle and, therefore, where the representations will best be made will become clearer, probably by the end of the week.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* More than 17,000 sick and disabled people have died while waiting for welfare benefits. In relation to sanctions, I just wondered how the MPA have considered this matter and responded to Government?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* We are continually in dialogue with the Government on that, as I answered previously. The detailed specifics, Sam, I would have to come back to you on outside of this, if that is okay.

4. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Following the debate in July 2019 on the motion *No easy Answer* concerning serious

youth violence, what progress has been made by the bodies concerned in implementing the work called for by that motion?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* In discussion with secular and faith partners, we are now exploring development of training resources to help inform and support church leaders and church communities in the prevention of, and responses to, Serious Youth Violence (SYV).

We are learning and collecting information from dioceses on their efforts to tackle SYV, for example the Southwark Diocese Board of Education (SDBE) carried out research on school exclusions and the impacts on SYV.

The London diocese is working on an initiative that will bring together the greater London dioceses, secular and community partners to establish a SYV forum that will work collaboratively at policy and action levels.

*Ms Josile Munro:* Thank you for the answer and for the examples of good work being done by London and Southwark. As the issue of serious youth violence, including knife crime, affects many more dioceses, will there be a follow-up report on the work that has been done so that we all might learn?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* The answer is, yes, we are currently working with a number of external agencies to produce training that will be of use to all 42 dioceses available and certainly we will report back to Synod when that is clearer how that is moving forward.

5. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What progress has been made following the debate and motion passed in February 2019 on *Centuries of Marginalisation, Visions Of Hope: Mission and Ministry Among Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Communities?*

6. *Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: At its February 2019 group of sessions, Synod passed the following motion with 265 votes in favour, one against and no abstentions:

‘That this Synod, mindful of the Church of England’s commitment to combat racism in all its manifestations:

a) call upon the Church’s leadership, including the Lords Spiritual, other bishops, senior staff, the Mission and Public Affairs Division and others, to speak out publicly against racism and hate crime directed against Gypsies, Irish Travellers and Roma, and urge the media to stop denigrating and victimising these communities;

b) request every diocese to appoint a chaplain to Gypsies, Travellers and Roma, to provide pastoral care, harness the potential for church growth among these communities and help combat racism in the Church and wider communities;

c) request the Mission and Public Affairs Council, in its forthcoming work on housing, to evaluate the importance of provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers in wider housing policy, and recommend Church bodies to play their part in lobbying for and enabling land to be made available for such sites; and

d) request the Lords Spiritual and staff of the National Church Institutions to meet with representatives from Her Majesty's Government and Loyal Opposition, as well as leaders from Local Government, including the Local Government Association, to co-ordinate and collaborate on shared plans to make traveller stopping points available across England, to develop community cohesion.'

Could the Mission and Public Affairs Division advise Synod what progress has been made towards delivering on each of these resolutions or, if it is not known what progress has been made, what steps will be taken to find out?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:*  
With permission Chair, I will answer Questions 5 and 6 together.

MPA and CMEAC are working with the Churches Network for Gypsies Travellers and Roma (CNGTR) and have:

- devised a GTR chaplaincy role description which was sent to all diocesan bishops;
- developed and delivered a learning day for chaplains and those providing pastoral care with and among gypsy, traveller and Roma communities. More than 40 people attended;
- created a 'road-show' on offer to dioceses and faith communities to raise awareness and understanding of GTR culture.

MPA, through contacts in the dioceses, is monitoring the incidence of community tensions of all kinds and working with staff in the Home Office to build a national picture.

Our work on housing and homelessness policy includes consideration of clause (c). Both government and opposition are still settling down following the General Election and discussion on this and other topics will be possible once it is clearer who is responsible for what.

*Ms Josile Munro:* Thank you for your helpful answer. Can you tell me how many dioceses have appointed a chaplain to Gypsy, Traveller and Roma people?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* No. I would very much like to be able to. Obviously, it is a matter for dioceses. We are talking to them on a regular basis as you will be aware, Josile, but I know it is work in progress with many dioceses so I cannot give you a precise number at the moment.

Ms Josile Munro: When will you be able to give us a list of people who are chaplains?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* We will publish a list. I will give that a priority and we will give you a current state of play. I have no doubt that you will want to bring a question in July and I will look forward to answering that in more detail then.

*Ms Josile Munro:* Thank you.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* Since the decision was made in 2019, we have had a new government elected and the government has made proposals in relation to criminalising Roma and Gypsy people in relation to unauthorized encampments. I wondered whether, now that this has come about, the MPA has considered this and whether there was a response given to the government consultation on this matter?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* Whether there was a formal response or not, I cannot tell you. I know there was an informal response but, once again, with a cabinet reshuffle expected this week, we hope to know soon who in Government holds that portfolio and we can make further representations.

7. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Given the likely positive benefits of local churches taking a proactive role in community tree planting within their area, such as: reducing carbon emissions; boosting the wellbeing of people involved; demonstrating active concern about the environment; and providing opportunities for discussion with people who don't belong to a church; in what ways is the council encouraging churches to engage in community tree planting, including by providing guidance on the issues involved?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* Our principal concern is to encourage the care and maintenance of the C of E's large existing tree stock. This can provide opportunities to involve local communities and we encourage the understanding that the Church's trees are the Community's trees. New plantings on Church land depend on the support of Archdeacons and can involve faculties and planning consent. Some dioceses are looking into possible new plantings on Glebe Land. It is always important to choose appropriate types of tree and to ensure that there is sufficient means to manage and protect young trees. Discussions are currently taking place with the organisers of successful plantings of small orchards in Scottish churchyards to see whether similar initiatives can be undertaken in England particularly in urban areas. These projects include training in tree management. The Archbishop's

Lent book and the two #Live Lent booklets encourage an awareness of the importance of trees and tree planting.

8. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: As a Christian whose faith is significantly driven by reason (logic), I am full of admiration for the work that scientists do in unwrapping God's technology. What is the Church doing to help explore the scientific basis for spiritual reality, particularly in recognition of the gravitational nature of unseen dark matter and dark energy which floods the universe, so closely aligned with our understanding of the divine nature of unconditional love?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio)* replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: MPA is a partner with the Universities of Durham and York in a major project addressing the gap in understanding between science and religion. The Bishop of Kingston is also a partner. This programme, Equipping Christian Leaders in an Age of Science, has been running for four years and has just been awarded £3.4m by the Templeton Religion Trust for its next phases. Although many in the Church will be starting further back than the example suggested in the question, and the programme covers a wider range of scientific disciplines in their relation to theology and Christian ethics, building and strengthening the connections between scientific and spiritual perceptions is among the objectives of the work.

## **BUSINESS COMMITTEE**

9. *Mrs Margaret Sheather (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: When an item of Synod business is to be dealt with by means of a presentation followed by questions, it would be very helpful if at least an outline of the points to be addressed in the presentation could be provided with the Synod papers. This would enable members to consider in advance what questions they might want to raise. Can this please be arranged?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)* replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee will consider this suggestion at a future meeting to see if this can be accommodated at future Groups of Sessions.

10. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Will the Synod be asked to Take Note of the Living in Love and Faith report?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)* replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee will make a decision when it receives a request for a debate, but as yet no such request has been received.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* Would the Chair of the Business Committee, noting the urgent need to rebuild trust which I spoke of earlier and the lack of any debate during this quinquennium on sexuality, convey to the Presidents the strength of feeling regarding the

need for a take note debate in our July Synod and could she clarify that, indeed, the Report is going to be available ahead of that July debate, please?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy*s: I am sure the Presidents have heard you and I convey that to them. On the second point, I am reliably informed that the material will be in the public domain before the July Synod.

11. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: The House of Bishop's *Growing Faith* document debated in February 2019 commended thoroughgoing attention both to the voice of children and young people and to the implications for children, young people and households of Church strategy and decision making. It concludes

“General Synod may also want to consider committing itself to always assessing the impact of its own policy, practice and priorities through the same lens.”

What consideration is being given to making such a commitment?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy*s (*Oxford*) replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The bishops' vision for *Growing Faith* was supported enthusiastically by Synod and the bishops will continue to lead the vision for *Growing Faith* here. The Business Committee responds positively to requests for agenda items on ministry with children and young people.

The *Growing Faith* adventure is supported in each diocese by a *Growing Faith* Champion. The network of *Growing Faith* Champions is a positive forum where ideas and resources are shared. Champions are expected to continually challenge their diocese to consider the impact of any policy or decision on the wider mission with children and young people. Where those champions are also members of Synod we would expect that they will also ask Synod to consider its work through that lens. We hope each member of Synod, in the spirit of *Growing Faith*, will consider the impact of everything we do upon our mission with children and young people.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond*: Thank you for the answer. Unlike *Growing Faith*, there is no mention of commitments and no mention of attending to the voices of children and young people and so I ask what else could be done so that General Synod could itself practise what we preach, commit to attending to the voices of children and young people and commit ourselves to *Growing Faith*?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy*s: Dr Richmond, I think it would be great if there were more *Growing Faith* champions in Synod calling us to account in the way that you have done in this question time. I draw members' attention to all the ways in which they can get matters of concern to the floor of this House as well as asking questions, namely by

putting down private members' motions or by going back to their deanery and diocesan synods and bringing motions from those places.

12. *Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Given the desire to broaden the range of membership of General Synod, has the Business Committee given any thought to ways in which those who have young children, or who wish to start families in the near future, could be supported in attending sessions in London and York, so that such people can be encouraged to stand for election or re-election?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)* replied as Chair of the Business Committee: There is currently no fixed policy for the support of parents with young children. However, I am aware that in a previous Quinquennium arrangements were made to support a mother with young children to make space available for the children and a family carer, so that parent and children could spend time together in the margins of the Synod. I am sure that staff would be willing to help with similar appropriate arrangements if they were needed in future.

*Professor Muriel Robinson:* Thank you for your answer and it was good to hear of the informal, positive approaches which have been taken. However, given the importance of encouraging younger people to stand for General Synod, would the Business Committee consider whether a more proactive and well-publicised approach could be developed so that prospective members of General Synod are aware of the support available?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy:* My experience of the last few days talking to Theo, the mother of baby Jedaiah, is actually that people's needs will be different. But I am sure the Business Committee would like to be proactive in ensuring people who stand for Synod, if they come with children, we will do our absolute utmost to accommodate them. Something more formal would be something that we would all need to consider in terms of cost. That does not mean we cannot do it, but it does mean that it might be slower and, of course, that cost would go back to your dioceses. You may want to talk to your diocesan secretaries about it, even before we think, because you could then feed back to us.

## **FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION**

13. *Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: What plans are there ensure that the recommendations of the recent Faith and Order Commission report, *God's Unfailing Word: Theological and Practical Perspectives on Christian-Jewish Relations* are embedded in the life of the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth)* replied as Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: The Presence and Engagement team at Church House are

developing a two-year strategy to support seminars, workshops and training events across dioceses and TEIs relating to God's Unfailing Word, to follow on from the launch in November at the Queen's Foundation Birmingham. One such resourcing event has already taken place at Southwark Cathedral, which included discussions with Jewish rabbis. We would encourage leaders across the Church to welcome and partner in such initiatives as they are proposed in the coming months.

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye:* Thank you for the work done on this incredibly important Faith and Order Commission Report. Thank you also for your response. Given the importance of this Report for the wellbeing of millions of Jews as well as our own self-understanding, as I mentioned before, why do the plans for learning from it not include a determination to embed this new approach in the curricula within our training institutions as well as provide one-off events for them?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Thank you very much, Lisa, for your support of this Report. It is a very important piece of work and I am very glad that you have asked the question. I think that would be a really good thing. If the TEIs get hold of this, I think that will be one of the most important applications of it. I am right behind you. I hope that that will happen and, I think, as TEIs engage with this material they will feel that this is really worthwhile in providing a whole lot of useful resource for them.

*The Chair:* Questions 14 and 15 to the Pensions Board to be answered by Mr Clive Mather.

## **PENSIONS BOARD**

14. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Is it the policy of the Pension Board to refuse essential improvements to their properties where either one or both of the occupants now have significant medical needs, for example the provision of stair-lifts and walk-in showers for those who are incapacitated?

*Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board:* The Pensions Board assists its existing customers in gaining access to support with their local authority, enabling them to remain within their homes when it is appropriate. We draw on the expertise of health care professionals in adult social care teams, making referrals on behalf of our customers in order for them to be assessed by an Occupational Therapist (OT). In some cases, we will make use of our own appointed OT.

For existing customers, we do not install any equipment without the input of a professional OT. With some properties, however, OT's may advise that the home is not suitable for adaptations or will not meet the long-term needs of the resident and recommend rehousing. In these situations, the Pensions Board would work with the resident to find suitable other accommodation, this may also include through other housing providers.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford:* Again, I do not wish to sound aggressive but, in the answer, is the person who has given this answer aware that there is anecdotal evidence that requests from local authorities and health services are being ignored and the reality of moving people often takes over two years before they get adequate facilities, and it takes them away from their care networks, friends and supporters and also from a reasonable quality of NHS care which in the new area is less than the one they already have.

*Mr Clive Mather:* All circumstances are individual. I would love to pretend that we could imagine a policy which extends to everyone, and it does not. Some cases are routine but many are quite exceptional, because people's circumstances change with age and with their own events in life. What we strive to do is to help everyone as best we can. We honour and respect their situation. We seek to connect them with providers which can give them what they need. In some cases we will offer to relocate. If I look back at the work of our Housing Team in Church House, I am simply staggered at how many examples there are of people's needs being met out of the ordinary into quite extraordinary situations. If there are individual circumstances which you know of which do not fit that, please let me know and we can connect on them.

15. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Where it is clear that improvements to clergy retirement properties are essential for the wellbeing and safety of its occupants, who has the responsibility to finance such alterations: is it the Pension Board or the local authority?

*Mr Clive Mather (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board:* Minor adaptations such as grab rails and mobility aids are usually facilitated and paid for by the local authority with no cost to the customer or the Board.

For major adaptations, including wet rooms and stairlift installation, (where the cost is in excess of £1,000), we assist our customers in applying for a Disabled Facilities Grant to help fund the works. The grant is means tested.

If they do not qualify for grant assistance, owing to the level of their income and/or savings, we will assess their circumstances and meet the full or part of the costs.

We do not believe that the charitable funds should be used to subsidise the state where it may have a responsibility to fund works.

General aids and adaptations are included as a matter of course in the refurbishment of a vacant property.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford:* Thank you for the last answer, which fits nicely into my next one, in that could we have some information freely available about waiting

times for the inclusion of these improvements, the number of times people have been moved, and how long it has taken because, while I am sure they are doing a very good job, if one clergy family has to see its partner defecate in a bucket because they cannot get to the toilet, that is a shame, and we should not have to burden our retired clergy with extra worries when often they are caring for a mentally ill or physically ill partner.

*Mr Clive Mather:* I agree with that, and personal circumstances can indeed be distressing. I share that. I simply do not have that information that you request. I will certainly talk with our housing people as to what information we have, to see if there are recurring patterns which require our attention. The one thing I would commend to you is that we are in the process of installing an up-to-date, fit-for-purpose digital electronic system which will capture much more thoroughly the individual circumstances. That will not be in until next year. When it does I think it will be really helpful to us in following through on quality standards in all of our work.

*Rev Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford:* Would you allow one further supplementary, please? Could they make sure they do not refer to our pensioners as “customers”, because they find it offensive? Can they be referred to as “pensioners”, or better, “valued members of our clergy”?

*The Chair:* I am advised that that is a request for an opinion and not in order.

*Rev Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford:* I know but I stuck it in anyway.

*The Chair:* Duly noted.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I declare an interest as Senior Treasurer of the Clergy Support Trust. May I invite the Pensions Board to work closely with us as a charity which is very well aware of the many needs of pensioners so that we can provide information to the Board that they may not otherwise readily have?

*Mr Clive Mather:* Yes. Thank you for that and I certainly commit to that. I did in fact meet with them very early on in my appointment and I think we have a date in the diary, even for February, so I will certainly do that.

I would just say I know titles may seem amusing, but it is really important to us that, on the one hand, we respect the status of all of our members and beneficiaries and clergy and, equally, inculcate a customer mindset in the delivery of our services. But I take on board your point.

*The Chair:* Questions 16 to 32 are to the Archbishops’ Council. Questions 16 to 26 to be answered by Dr Jamie Harrison.

## **ARCHBISHOPS’ COUNCIL**

16. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The quinquennium has seen a proliferation of overlapping new initiatives from the centre, some with catchy and not so catchy titles, such as *Motivating the Million*, *Setting God's People Free*, *Evangelism and Discipleship*, *Growing Faith*, and *Everyday Faith*. What plans are there to co-ordinate and consolidate new initiatives so that central strategy can be comprehensible, communicable and focused?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* A series of reports and proposals passed through General Synod in recent years has affirmed the need to focus on a number of key areas of work to support the nurturing of faith for individuals and congregations. However, this has also led to the proliferation of project and report names which may mean little to our congregations. We plan to simplify, consolidate and better co-ordinate these by being clearer in our use of language and graphics. Outward-facing communication will increasingly focus on those things which have the endorsement of Synod and are therefore national priorities. This includes *Everyday Faith* (implementing part of the Report *Setting God's People Free*) and our connection with young people through *Growing Faith*. Other initiatives will be in service to dioceses' own strategies and priorities or involve a high-quality offer (such as *Follow the Star*) in which parishes can freely choose whether to participate.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond:* Thank you for the encouraging answer. I am glad to hear that *Growing Faith* is a major priority and I am asking is Council formally committing itself and the General Synod to attending to the voices of children and young people, and committing ourselves to *Growing Faith*?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* As you know, we had a very good debate last July on *Setting God's People Free*, and I think there is a huge synergy between the *Everyday Faith* element of *Setting God's People Free* and *Growing Faith*. I think this is what we are trying to do across the whole sector with this very helpful question about how many types of programmes there are, or what initiatives we have to bring them together. My answer would be personally absolutely yes. How we do it is one of those things that is ongoing within *Setting God's People Free*. On the steering group we have representation from folk in *Growing Faith*, and we want to work together.

17. *Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: I note the helpful information on the parish resources website. Would you provide guidance on the Church of England website as to whether it is a legitimate activity under GDPR (and therefore permissible) for names and contact details of elected lay members of deanery and diocesan synods to be shared among other elected members of that synod for the purposes of contacting each other on synod matters?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* We consider that there is a proper lawful basis for names and

contact details of elected members of deanery and diocesan synods to be used for the purpose of carrying out their official duties. We have published a privacy notice in connection with the processing of personal data in connection with electoral rolls which sets out the lawful basis for processing for GDPR purposes. It makes clear that certain data about individuals on the roll will be made public including addresses. It is available with guidance on the Parish Resources website at: <https://www.pariahresources.org.uk/pccs/apcms/>.

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* Thank you very much for your answer. Could I ask you to clarify a bit further please where it says in your answer 'data about individuals on the roll will be made public, including addresses'? Could you say a bit more about how they will be made public? For example, will they be published on the diocesan websites?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* I think you are going again beyond my capacity to know the full answer to that. I think the Legal Office may wish to put something out on that. As you know, these details relate to the parish website so, in a sense, extrapolations to deanery and diocesan synods is a further extension, and I would not want to give an answer that I cannot be sure of.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* In light of the answer already given, will instructions now be given that contact details of members of this Synod will again be provided to members on request (preferably in the document we used to get) so that we do not have difficulty in communicating with one another?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* Again, I am afraid that goes beyond the answer here, which relates to deanery and diocesan synods, but that has been heard and we will give you an answer.

18. *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Can the Archbishop's Council please publish information in table form showing, together with the amounts each received, which Dioceses received in 2017-19:

- a) Lowest Income Communities Funding
- b) Transitional funding
- c) Sustainability Funding

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: A table of the Lowest Income Communities Funding and Transitional Funding grants received by each diocese in 2017-19 has been placed on the noticeboard.

The Diocesan Sustainability Fund mentioned in GS 2140 did not start until 2020. The first step of any diocese considering applying for these funds should be a discussion, initially with the Strategy & Development Unit, about the background to the potential

application and whether this is the most appropriate approach to address the needs the diocese has identified.

*Ven. Pete Spiers:* Thank you for your answer. Given that these figures show that the LInC funding given in 2017 to the six wealthiest dioceses in terms of historic resources, amounting to £362 million, was slightly more than the LInC funding given to the six poorest dioceses in historic resources, amounting to £30 million, can he tell us when the formula for its allocation will be reviewed to make it more just?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* I think I thank you for that question, Pete. Obviously, the LInC funding – the Lowest Income Communities Funding – relates to the levels of deprivation within the whole diocese. In other words, as you know, when we split the previous Darlow funding which went generally to the diocese, we then divide it into LInC funding and into the ability to bid for Strategic Development Funding. You are quite right the whole area of historic assets is something that is up for discussion and review. At the moment, the review of the LInC funding from 2019 is being reviewed in this year 2020 and when we come on to Sustainability Funding we may be able to talk a bit more about the issues around historic assets.

19. *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given one of the conclusions of the Strategic Investment Board Annual Report GS Misc 1227 is that "the financial challenge facing dioceses is more significant than it was when the first peer reviews took place"; what are the criteria used in awarding Sustainability Funding?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The aim of the funding is to support major change programmes which enable dioceses to develop a thriving and sustainable future ministry model, which will, in turn, provide a platform for growth.

It is expected that the funding will support a relatively small number of dioceses, targeted on those with the least historic and current resources.

The first step of any diocese considering applying for these funds should be a discussion about the background to the potential application, and we anticipate that most potential applicants will require capacity support to develop the case for a more substantive programme of change.

In advance of applications, the Strategic Investment Board is proactively analysing all the financial information to assess which dioceses are most likely to be eligible for sustainability funding.

*Ven. Pete Spiers:* Thank you for your answer. When will the SIB have finished their financial analysis to determine exactly which dioceses are eligible for Sustainability Funding?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* I do not think that is necessarily our direction of travel. What we are keen for is for dioceses to look at the process of bidding for the new 2020 to 2022 Sustainability Funding. In that Sustainability Funding the issues of historic assets will apply, as well as things such as church attendance and the structure or strategy of the diocese in terms of seeing sustainable growth. There are a number of parameters, if you like, that dioceses are being asked to respond to. A particular one is, if they are in financial difficulty, how can they undertake a major restructuring programme that provides a platform for the Church's sustainable growth? I am not directly answering your question, but I think it is more complicated. We are looking for dioceses to come to the Strategic Investment Board, which is a sub-committee of the Archbishops' Council, to say, "This is what we are thinking, this is what we need; can you help us to work out some form of application process?"

20. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Could an explanation be given as to why the Society of St Wilfred & St Hilda was awarded £140,100 of Strategic Capacity Funding in October 2019 when such awards are usually reserved for dioceses?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Archbishops' Council made £1m of Strategic Development Funding available for non-diocesan bodies in 2017-19, for proposals which could make a significant difference to the growth of the Church, and which would complement activity undertaken directly by dioceses.

The overall aim of this specific award is to support a Mission Co-ordinator to help identify, promulgate and develop examples of good missional practice which is leading to growth, in those parishes where the Bishops of the Society of St Wilfrid and St Hilda offer sacramental and pastoral care under the House of Bishops' Declaration.

The postholder will be employed and funded through a diocese, to provide HR and line management support, in partnership with the Society.

*Canon Jenny Humphreys:* Thank you very much for your answer on behalf of the Presidents. Could General Synod members please be informed where the information is advertised outlining which non-diocesan bodies are eligible for receipt of this funding and also the criteria for their complementary activities?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* Thank you, Jenny. The non-diocesan element of the funding from the Strategic Development Funding was between 2017 and 2019. That funding has now ceased. You might be interested to know that this has supported a number of non-diocesan areas, mainly of missional or mission agency type. We have supported the Mothers' Union, HeartEdge, the St Martin-in-the-Fields network and the Estates Evangelism Group, so the money has been used more for organisations, particularly

those with a missional element or network rather than individual parishes, because the dioceses are the places to go to for parishes.

The Innovation Fund, which will be the new name for this non-diocesan funding, is in the process of being set up, and again, as I say, the application will be either for an organisation, particularly a mission organisation, and as yet we have not published those criteria, I do not think.

21. *Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Whilst accepting the principle that SDF funding should be directed to projects that have the biggest impact per head of population, is it the intention to exclude rural areas entirely from SDF funding, even if they seek a smaller grant to reflect the fact that a project might reach a proportionately smaller target cohort?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In targeting the funding towards large urban areas, the Strategic Investment Board has stated that it will consider funding for other areas, which could include rural areas, if a particularly strong case is made.

Such a case would still need to reflect the wider aim of the funding, which is to support major change programmes, which fit with dioceses' strategic plans, and make a significant difference to the diocese's mission and financial strength; and to reflect the aims of targeting funding on one or both of deprived communities or younger generations.

*Revd Stewart Fyfe*: Thank you for your very helpful response. What measurements does the Board apply in assessing what makes a particularly strong case for major and ambitious change in rural areas that have deprivation and isolated younger people?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison*: I think there are two main issues. One is how will this money be used effectively for the area? Can we see a growth both in the depth of discipleship and the number of new disciples, for instance, and the maintaining of those disciples we have, but also what difference this will make to the diocese as a whole?

We have had some applications where it has been clear what the local context will be benefiting from this, but it has been unclear how this will improve or help the whole diocese. Those are the two things together. There is the criterion of what impact it will have locally, and how whole dioceses can benefit, and also what learning we can take, which we will use elsewhere. It is quite clear that the rural issue is not the only issue, but rurality is a factor, and we welcome applications from more rural areas but with clarity about the purpose.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)*: Thank you, Dr Harrison, for your reply but, following the earlier speaker, why is it that a particularly strong case has to be made? I understand

that priorities need to be made, but is it simply because there are fewer deprived areas and younger people in rural areas, because they do exist?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* It is a form of rebalancing perhaps. If you look at the answer to the next question, in a way, where we have looked for prioritisation is where we think it has been less prioritised in the past. Generally, large urban areas have not had the same level of ministry input. And in relation to young people and areas of deprivation, obviously the LInC funding – the Lowest Income Communities Funding – is meant to be specifically targeted at those areas of deprivation. We are very much encouraging and beginning to ask the 25 dioceses which received LInC funding, ‘How are you spending it? Is it going in the right direction?’ For those dioceses which do not have that funding, that is a more difficult question for us to ask. I do not think we would hold to that position that you have suggested, but we are conscious we have to somehow make decisions against what we are asked to do.

22. *Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: What evidence was taken into account in reaching the decision taken to restrict SDF funding to the largest urban areas?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: The sums available for award in 2020-22 represent a lower level of funding compared with that awarded in 2018 and 2019.

In considering how best to focus the limited funds on the Church’s strategic challenges going forward, the Strategic Investment Board was informed by data which showed that the proportion of population attending church is significantly lower than average in large urban areas, among younger generations, and in deprived communities; and data on the levels of ministry investment per capita in those areas. The concern to develop church attendance among these areas and groups was supported by the Triennium Funding Working Group, whose members were drawn from the House of Bishops, Archbishops’ Council and Church Commissioners.

The larger urban areas covered by the criteria contain 62% of the population of England, 84% of the most deprived areas, and ministry investment per capita in those cases is some 30% lower than in the rest of England.

23. *Revd Canon Ruth Newton (Leeds)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: Given the statement that “Strategic Development Funding supports major change projects which lead to a significant difference in dioceses’ mission and financial strength” (C of E website Jan 2020); is it the intention, under the new SDF funding criteria, to adversely affect the mission and financial strength of dioceses such as Carlisle and Truro, which have very few centres of population large enough to qualify for a grant?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* No. The primary responsibility for resourcing mission and finance rests with dioceses: the overall goal of Strategic Development Funding is to support diocesan investment in the growth of the Church by making additional funds available – not to fund it in its entirety.

Representing around £21m a year of the Church's overall economy of £1.6bn, the SDF available in 2020-22 was never going to be able to resource every missional need in every community. The hope is that, over time, the learning will inform how wider diocesan budgets are applied.

Strategic Development Funding also needs to be considered as a ten-year programme. Of the £130m awarded to date, we estimate that £18m has been targeted at rural contexts. This represents a significant investment in helping develop rural ministry for the future. Carlisle and Truro were awarded funding for two programmes each in 2014-19, plus Capacity Funding, totalling £2.6m and £3m respectively.

*The Chair:* Questions 24 and 25 to be answered together.

24. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What policy and criteria, if any, does the Archbishops Council have for determining whether a TEI will receive financial support if it encounters financial difficulties?

25. *Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Will the criteria which were applied when the decision was made to provide financial assistance to Westcott House be communicated to the governing bodies of other TEIs to allow them to make applications for financial assistance when circumstances require it?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* With permission I will answer questions 24 and 25 together.

It is not the Council's policy to lend to TEIs or other Church institutions. Where requests are made, these are considered on a case-by-case basis. As indicated in the answer given to Dr Newcombe's question, we were responding to a particular situation in a humane and Christian way.

The Council, through the Ministry Council, has commissioned a review of the financing of ministerial formation which will consider, amongst other issues, the real need to move to a viable TEI sector which is more sustainable and collaborative. With this in mind, we are reaching out to TEIs to understand their finances better and to see how longer-term plans can be developed that will also align with the Council's Vision for Ministerial Formation.

*Revd Charles Read:* Question 24 seeks to elicit a list of criteria. Since there do not appear to be any, could you explain how decisions are made on a case-by-case basis to ensure parity of response to different institutions and different TEIs?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* Yes, as you note, this is in relation to Westcott House, I think you will find, and one of the issues here is where we have had a request for a discussion in relation to the possibility of a loan. It would require a number of features. First of all, they would be asked for clarity on what the loan was, what it was for. It would be under commercial regulation in terms of the interest charged and it must be secured against particular assets. At the moment, as I say, this is a case-by-case basis. We are not putting out a particular pro forma or expectation and, inevitably, when we get a request we have to take it seriously.

*Ven. Luke Miller (London):* I declare an interest as a member of the Council of St Stephen's House TEI. Thank you very much indeed for your written answer and also for the remarks that you have just made. Has the Archbishops' Council considered the effect on TEIs as they seek to fundraise of the impression that the Council is acting as a bank of last resort for these institutions, and what, further to the answers that you have given, could be done to contradict that view in order to support their fundraising attempts?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* At the moment there is nothing decided in relation to Westcott House. There have been discussions and they are ongoing and this will come back to the Archbishops' Council should Westcott House wish to proceed with this in due course. In one sense, there is no done deal and the idea that we are the lender of last resort is in the air, but I do not want to go as far as that.

What I would suggest is that all TEIs have the opportunity to approach their own bankers and other providers of financial help, and we are perhaps one of many conversations. In the past, I should note that other TEIs have received grants or loans of a much smaller sum perhaps than might be envisaged here for such things as disability adaptations or a new heating system when it goes suddenly wrong in the middle of winter. I think we have a certain flexibility. Any decision that you make is an active decision. Not to take a decision is equally active. If we choose to respond that is one thing; if we choose not to respond that is another. These are balances which the Council took extremely seriously recently and which we continue to take very seriously.

26. *Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Is it now the policy of the Archbishops' Council to use its funds to guarantee all TEIs against financial failure? If not, what criteria were applied when the decision was made to provide financial assistance to Westcott House?

*Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Archbishops' Council does not have a general policy regarding loans to TEIs or indeed any other Church institutions.

In considering whether to offer Westcott House an interest-bearing secured loan facility, the Council recognised the importance of ensuring continuity for ordinands currently at Westcott and the Trustees' on-going work developing a revised business plan. A key condition of the offer was the provision of adequate security.

The Council seldom provides loans and will need to sell investments to fund any drawings on the facility once it is in place. Interest needs to be charged on the loan as the Council uses income from its investments to reduce the sum requested from dioceses by way of the diocesan apportionment.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I am a member of the Archbishops' Council. Just for clarity, Jamie, could you confirm that the Council has not yet made a decision to award funding to Westcott House and that the premise of the question is incorrect?

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison:* Thank you, fellow member of the Archbishops' Council. Yes, as I think I noted, no decision has been taken on either side. Discussions continue. Westcott House are an independent charity and they have their own thinking and approaches. If you go to their website you will see some very helpful responses by the College very recently in terms of appointing new interim acting principal Bishop Tim Stevens and also they are beginning to appoint some new trustees and I understand certainly increasing their governance and other activities. I have great confidence in their ability to respond. We as a Council, as you say, have taken no decision as yet.

27. *Revd Charlie Skrine (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In GS2141 the 2020 Budget for the Archbishops' Council forecast the number of ordinands starting training in 2019/2020 as 545, representing a 7.2% decline year on year but a cumulative increase in total numbers training of 15.7% since 2016/17. Please would you publish (on the website and the noticeboard) the actual number for 2019/2020 and any available adjusted forecasts for future years?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: There were 552 ordinands beginning training in 2019 of whom 547 were funded through Resourcing Ministerial Education. Budget forecasting is on the basis of a 6.5% rise per year for the next four years which would lead to 587 starters in 2020. A clearer picture of actual numbers tends to emerge in late Spring of each year. However, it must be noted that this is the final year of the current discernment system and that the Shared Discernment Framework will begin implementation from September 2020. For this reason, linear growth will be unlikely and these figures will be under constant review. Estimates beyond 2020 are tentative and are generally aspirational.

*Revd Charlie Skrine:* Thank you for the answer to the question. Could I ask when,

particularly at the mention of the new improved discernment criteria, we might hear when the encouraging increase towards 50% will be sustained?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I am slightly caught on the hop here. Since I do not have a brief on this I am going to answer off the top of my head, which is to say that we are in the process of looking quite closely at the increase and the figures in terms of ordinands. One of the things that we have done, which had not been done before, is to disaggregate between those candidates for self-supporting ministry and those candidates for stipendiary ministry. What seems to be emerging, and I cannot give you a definitive answer on this, so I will save that and we can do that at a later point, is that there has been a significant increase in stipendiary candidates to the extent that we may well be fairly close to that 50%. The worrying trend seems to be in self-supporting candidates. It concerns us to try to understand why that increase has not matched that for stipendiary.

28. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What percentage of the apprenticeship levy paid has been spent in the last 12 months on training for clergy or Church staff in respect of (i) the national clergy payroll (ii) the National Church Institutions payroll?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The relevant percentages are:

- National clergy payroll: nil
- National Church Institutions' payroll: 32% in respect of 11 apprentices

We have approved in principle the transfer of levy paid to fund the training of five apprentices employed by 'associated employers' within the Church.

We continue to vigorously engage at all levels with the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education and others to develop ways in which larger amounts of apprenticeship levy can be deployed in service of the Church's ministry. A Church Minister apprenticeship has been approved, but the maximum funding band allocated is lower than for any comparable degree apprenticeship and is not sufficient for this to be viable. This decision is being actively challenged.

The Church of England is by no means unique among levy-paying employers in finding it difficult to make use of the money it is paying. The Government expects levy-paying employers on average to recoup 50% of their contributions.

*Mr Sam Margrave:* In response to the question, I just wanted to say that it may be the case that innovative pedagogy in curriculum design could potentially bring down the costs. While that is an opinion, having myself been involved in delivering degree apprentices and university development programmes, I wondered whether somebody from Archbishops' Council would be prepared to meet to discuss your work in this area

and whether there are any solutions that I or others on Synod could support you with.

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I think we would welcome that. I am quite concerned that this significant tranche of money for the apprenticeship scheme is currently being unused, basically. I thought it was giving us an opportunity to develop particular ways in which we looked at IME2, so what sort of support and training we got during curacy. If there were ways through this I am sure we would welcome that and I would invite you to be in touch with me and I can connect you with the appropriate staff.

*The Chair:* Questions 29 to 32 to be answered by Mr Sheard.

29. *Revd Canon Mike Booker (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given the significant differences between teenagers and toddlers, what recent progress has been made in enabling more detailed statistical recording of the Church's engagement with different age groups of children and young people across the 0-16 age range?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* In recognition of these differences, the annual Statistics for Mission return asks for numbers of a church's worshipping community in the age groups 0-10 and 11-17. Looking forward, the Big Church Survey will be run across all dioceses in May/ June 2020. This will collect individual ages of those in a church congregation, enabling for the first time a finer breakdown of ages of children and young people.

*Revd Canon Mike Booker:* Given the value of the Big Church Survey in delivering a snapshot with significant information in it, what is the mechanism by which learning from that snapshot can be woven into how an assessment of how statistics for mission can be significantly improved in the future?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* That is a very good question indeed. There are a number of bodies that meet to consider the work of the Research & Statistics department, and they will be looking very closely at that. I am sure it will not surprise you to know that it is a matter of considerable interest to us on Archbishops' Council in terms of our objective to growing disciples and so on, so we will be looking at it very closely in that forum as well.

30. *Mr Jonathan Cryer (Leicester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Church of England continues to collect statistics on the numbers of children and young people attending church only on a Sunday morning. Many young people are engaging with the Christian message and showing a commitment to Christ, but in other places such as schools, colleges or youth clubs and at other times in the week. Can the Church find a way to count these young people, thereby recognising and valuing their existence and validating the efforts of church youth workers?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Recognising the importance of midweek attendance, the Research & Statistics unit has, since 2000, collected, through the annual Statistics for Mission return, attendance figures for children and young people at both Sunday and midweek church services and other acts of worship each October, including asking specifically about attendance at fresh expressions of church and services for schools. Churches are also asked each year about their work leading acts of worship in schools. In 2018 a one-off question about youth provision was included. The figures are published each year at national and diocesan aggregate level in the annual Statistics for Mission Report, and detailed church-level figures are made available to churches, dioceses, and others to support their work.

31. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Can the Archbishops' Council update the Synod on the Government's intentions with regard to regulations for the registration of marriages under the Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths (Registration etc) Act 2019?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Following discussion with the General Register Office throughout 2019, staff met the then Minister to discuss GRO's proposal for a two-stage process involving a Registration Document later submitted to the Registrar who would then issue a Certificate. We continue to object to a proposal which involves an additional complication for couples, means that church weddings would no longer be a "one stop shop", and risks creating a perception that the issue of the Certificate, rather than the wedding service, would be the "real" moment at which a couple were married. However, that Minister left Parliament at the General Election. Staff and GRO met again after the Election, and it was clear that they intended to lobby brief an incoming Minister about their existing plan.

We therefore ensured that the incoming Minister received a carefully prepared document setting out the Church's position. To date, we have had no response from the Minister.

32. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Have consultations with HM Government with regard to regulations for the registration of marriages under the Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths (Registration etc) Act 2019 included discussion of the fact that many clergy are not properly equipped to make judgements about whether or not a person who does not hold a British passport has British nationality and thus whether or not they are entitled to be married after banns?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Discussions with the General Register Office have focused entirely on arrangements for marriage registration. They are not concerned with ecclesiastical marriage preliminaries (banns, common or special licences) which will be unaffected by any changes made to the way marriages are registered. However, the Law Commission is planning a comprehensive review of marriage law, from preliminaries to registration,

and that will be an appropriate place to raise concerns in this area. Staff are in touch with the Law Commission review panel and will ensure that this concern is voiced clearly at the proper time. In the meantime, guidance for the clergy on the documents which the parties must produce as evidence that they are British, European Economic Area or Swiss nationals is provided by the General Register Office in its Guidebook for the Clergy. All clergy should be aware of the Guidebook and refer to it as necessary.

*The Chair:* Questions 33 to 84 are to the House of Bishops. Questions 33 and 34 are to be answered together by the Bishop of Newcastle.

## **HOUSE OF BISHOPS**

33. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops Is the House of Bishops aware that many members of General Synod are grateful that their recent Pastoral Statement on Opposite-Sex Civil Partnerships has upheld the Church's existing teaching; believe that it would have been wholly inappropriate for the House to have refrained from publishing the statement because of the impending publication of Living in Love and Faith; and wish the Prolocutors' demands for the House of Bishops to apologise for publishing the Statement to coincide with the advent of opposite-sex civil partnerships to be refused?

34. *Mr Andrew Bell (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Many people have appreciated the reiteration of the Church's doctrine of marriage in the recent House of Bishops' statement on Civil Partnerships. Can the House confirm its support for the document?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops is aware of the nature and breadth of views among all three Houses in General Synod over these questions, and of the hurt that these differences cause. In particular, they are aware that there are many who feel strongly that it was helpful to reaffirm existing teaching. Nevertheless, whilst the statement simply restated existing teaching, the House acknowledges that the manner and tone of its publication caused very deep hurt and offence. The Archbishops have already apologised on behalf of all bishops for the way in which this has damaged trust.

*The Chair:* Question 33, a supplementary.

*Mr Clive Scowen:* Can we be assured that the apology as to the manner and tone of the statement does not, in any sense, constitute a withdrawal of the substance of the statement?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I can confirm that the teaching of the Church has not changed at this point, but as members, Archbishops and Bishops, we recognise that in the way this teaching was expressed in its tone and in its timing a great, deep hurt was caused to

many people. In the House of Bishops we believe that it is very important for us to note this and for us to express the teaching, which has not changed, with grace, kindness, generosity and regard for those it will affect the most.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* So it begins. Thank you for your statement in your answer about the damaging of trust, Archbishop Christine. It struck me more than any other statement that it is not just the LGBTI community but the grannies of England who are pretty miffed and fed up with this. In terms of building up trust, how does the House propose to take steps to rebuild trust with both LGBTI people and the grannies of England?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* You make a very good point, Simon. Most families and individuals in this land are affected by these deep issues of what it means to be a human being and what it means to be a sexual human being. I hope we will all manage to keep faith with the Living in Love and Faith project and the preparatory work that the Pastoral Advisory Group have done. I hope that the approach in the project and using the Pastoral Principles will help us explore these deeply important issues for all of us.

35. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In view of the widespread reaction to the upholding of established Church of England doctrine concerning marriage and celibacy, as seen in the response of the Prolocutors of the Convocations to the House of Bishops' Statement on Opposite-Sex Civil Partnerships, will the House of Bishops take steps to set out in similarly clear and unambiguous terms what the established doctrines of the Church are, so that the lay leadership who find themselves increasingly tasked with the oversight of parishes where vacant incumbencies will not be filled are suitably equipped to affirm and uphold with sensitivity the established teaching of the Church?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: According to Canon A 5, "The doctrine of the Church of England is grounded in the Holy Scriptures, and in such teachings of the ancient Fathers and Councils of the Church as are agreeable to the said Scriptures. In particular such doctrine is to be found in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, The Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal". Canon B 30 sets forth the Church of England's doctrine of marriage. Within these parameters, Anglicans may have differing views on some matters. How to hold, discuss and embody doctrine sensitively is a crucial issue at the heart of the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group and Living in Love and Faith. The Pastoral Principles, designed by PAG and available on the C of E website, are an initial resource for all in the church to explore how to relate better across deep difference.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* Thank you for your answer. It encapsulates the difficulty between upholding the doctrines of the Church of England and leaving a foot in "not yet", as you just said at the beginning of your first answer. The difficulties are multiple. Just seeing the reaction to those statements and counter-statements ---

*The Chair:* May we have your question, please?

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* How can we equip those who have to look after the parish when their pastors have gone and the flock are left? It is very difficult on behalf of the grannies of England, who love the Lord's words, and believe and trust them, seeing them upheld across the ages, to find challenge and differences, and how do we guard and uphold those doctrines in an age of such change?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* Thank you, Mrs Durlacher. Those who have care for a parish in a vacancy carry a huge burden and in the Church of England we owe much, particularly to our churchwardens in this regard. In terms of helping a parish, whether it is in vacancy or not, I can only commend the use of the Pastoral Principles for living well together to help us understand more deeply the complexity of the issues we are considering. In terms of the plea to have a set-out doctrine in an easily accessible place, that just is not the kind of church that the Church of England is. We are not a confessional church in that sense, with a set of doctrines to which we can assent. Our doctrine is expressed in our liturgy, in our creeds, in our historic formularies, and to set out doctrine in a separate document would be to depart from the very nature of Anglicanism.

36. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the House of Bishops' recent declaration that marriage consists of "a lifelong union between a man and a woman, contracted with the making of vows," what advice can the Church of England expect on the status of marriages within the Society of Friends (conducted without vows under English law since 1753) and in the Orthodox churches (also without vows)?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England recognises that the law of the land enables people to marry under a variety of arrangements and does not dispute that they are married in law. Civil partnerships are explicitly not marriages and the arguments advanced in the Supreme Court included the desire to ensure that the connotations of marriage itself, not just religious marriages, should not apply. While it is true that Churches express differently in their liturgies the couple's acceptance of the divine gift of marriage and the human responsibilities that flow from it, the making of vows that characterises this acceptance in the case of the Church of England is a clear marker of the difference between marriages and civil partnerships.

37. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: If the recent pastoral statement by the House of Bishops on civil partnerships, made public in January 2020, reflects the doctrine of the Church of England; what discipline is there for bishops and clergy who encourage and promote sex outside of marriage?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Discipline of the clergy is provided for by the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 and the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003. Proceedings in relation to matters involving doctrine, ritual or ceremonial are governed by the 1963 Measure; other proceedings are governed by the 2003 Measure. It is not possible to say more than that in answer to the question without expressing an opinion on a question of law or providing a solution to a hypothetical problem.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* Are disciplinary proceedings been pursued therefore against Bishops who actively and publicly promote an understanding of marriage contrary to the Church's liturgy and doctrine, including but not limited to the Bishops of Liverpool, Salisbury and Buckingham?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* Mrs Williams, I believe you are asking me to express an opinion and I cannot do that.

*The Chair:* That is not in order, I am afraid.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* Bishop, I ask this in all seriousness. Can you please define for me what sex outside marriage actually means for a lesbian such as myself?

*The Chair:* Also not in order, Ms Ozanne.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* It is the root of the problem.

*The Chair:* That is an opinion.

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* Jayne, it is a very good question, but in the context of Questions you are asking me to express an opinion and I am afraid I cannot do that.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* I am asking you to define it.

*The Chair:* No, you may not.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* In exactly the same vein, I wonder if the Bishop could define how many whiskers constitute a beard?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I think also you are asking me, Dr Paul, to express an opinion.

38. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Does the House of Bishops agree with the Nashville Statement by the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The House of Bishops has not considered the Nashville Statement. It is not the House's custom to comment on doctrinal statements produced independently from the Church of England by other Churches or groups of Christians. The LLF process is considering, in detail and within the framework of Anglicanism, the matters raised in the Nashville Statement.

39. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: For me the recent pastoral statement from the House of Bishops concerning civil partnerships has been helpful, reminding me of the Church's teaching on marriage and of sexual relationships outside of marriage and how that should be dealt with in my life if I am to honour God in that regard. However, I would be grateful if the House of Bishops could clarify the comments at Paragraph 29 & 30 where it states that "... lay people who have registered civil partnerships ought not to be asked to give assurances about the nature of their relationship before being admitted to baptism, confirmation and communion." Would the House of Bishops please outline their reasoning for these paragraphs, particularly in light of the rubric to The Order for the Administration of The Lord's Supper or Holy Communion within the Book of Common Prayer?

<https://www.churchofengland.org/prayer-and-worship/worship-texts-and-resources/book-common-prayer/lords-supper-or-holy-communion>.

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The matters referred to in the rubric are now covered by Canon B 16. A person may be refused admission to Holy Communion only "by reason of malicious and open contention with his neighbours, or other grave and open sin without repentance". A person who has registered a civil partnership is not, merely for that reason, a person to whom the Canon applies. As the House's statement explains, the legislation leaves open the nature of the commitment that a couple choose to make when forming a civil partnership; it is not predicated on the intention to engage in a sexual relationship. We also said, "The Church should not collude with the present assumptions of society that all close relationships necessarily include sexual activity." The laity are not asked to give assurances about other matters, and we do not consider that the position in relation to civil partnerships is materially different.

*Mr Chris Gill:* Thank you for the answer. In the light of Canon B 16 and the importance of repentance and forgiveness in our relationship with God, I would have expected laity to be asked to give assurance about other matters, where applicable. When was it decided not to apply Canon B 16 and who made that decision?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* There are differences in terms of Canon Law for the expectation on members of the clergy and for the laity. That is the nature of Canons imposing particular obligations on the clergy as to their manner of life, and they are not imposed on the laity. Also, if we look at the original *Issues in Human Sexuality*, published in 1991, there is explicit commitment in paragraphs 5.6 and 5.23 that laity should not be

subject to such interrogations and should find a warm, open and welcoming place in the Christian community

*Revd James Dudley-Smith (Bath & Wells):* Thank you for your answer about where Canon B 16 does not apply. But does it apply then to those who might be in civil partnerships, or indeed in other relationships which are not marriage, and who actually do not need to be asked to give assurances because they come to us perfectly open about the fact that their relationship does include a sexual aspect?

*The Chair:* I am afraid that is a request for an opinion and so you need not answer. Questions 40 and 41 will be answered together.

40. *Prof Muriel Robinson (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: By what process did the House of Bishops agree the tone, content and timing of the recent Pastoral Statement on Civil Partnerships, particularly in the light of the fact that the Living in Love and Faith report has not yet been published?

41. *Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What was the process that led to the recent statement on civil partnerships between members of opposites sexes, in particular in relation to its drafting, its endorsement and its being issued?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission I will answer questions 40 and 41 together.

Following the Supreme Court ruling on opposite-sex civil partnerships, the Delegation Committee considered a paper later discussed at the House of Bishops' May meeting. The House agreed that the 2005 advice on same-sex Civil Partnerships be adapted to cover the new legal context, reflecting the current teaching of the Church. The Delegation Committee considered a draft which went to the House as deemed business. One Committee member and two members of the House requested minor changes. In December, the House agreed the changes and asked for the advice to be published. It subsequently became clear that the timing and nature of publication had not been discussed as fully as needed. At the January College of Bishops, both Archbishops took responsibility for the timing, acknowledging failures in process, and that the tone did not reflect the significant learning of the Shared Conversations, LLF and the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group.

*Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham):* Is it possible to have further clarification as to where the original draft of that document originated?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I do not believe it is. The document was a document owned by the House of Bishops. I think it is extremely important that, as members of the House of Bishops, we take ourselves full responsibility for it. It is deeply regrettable.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Thank you for your answer in which you say that the House asked for the advice to be published. The House met in early December. The publication was on 22 January, three weeks after the law changed. I wonder if you can inform us of the circumstances in which the document came to be published on 22 January and who made that decision.

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I cannot give you the exact answer to that question. I was not part of the particular group to which that decision was delegated.

42. *Mr Simon Friend (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What checks and balances can be introduced to ensure that statements, such as the recent one from the House of Bishops on Civil Partnerships, do not get released without full consideration of the implications?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The College began to consider how to improve processes at its January meeting and will do further work in the months to come. Going forward, an appropriate member of the House should always be consulted immediately before the final decision is made to release a statement on behalf of the House, even if agreement had been reached at an earlier point. More robust discussion and feedback needs to be encouraged, as well as changes in clarifying exactly how statements should be released and used. Relevant consultation also needs to be extended, such as further consultation with LLF and PAG on matters relating to sexuality and marriage.

*Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester):* Given that the pastoral statement seems to have been dropped in a rather clumsy manner and in an ill-advised way, to what extent is the House of Bishops in its review preparing to draw on independent media expertise, such as that provided by TBI Media, to help you review your processes?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I think our need to review our processes goes beyond media presentation, if I can be truthful.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* Given the importance of media coverage, for example on national radio and in national press, what provision is made and what plans are in place to have episcopal spokespersons available to the media to give a first-hand account of these – assuming that the general process is improved?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* Certainly with regard to the forthcoming publication of the LLF resources, and also the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group, attention is being given to make sure that there are people, including bishops, who are being equipped to make such public representation.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* Wonderful. Thank you very much.

43. *Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Why was the pastoral guidance on civil partnerships issued before the Church has received and discussed “Living in Love and Faith”?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Pastoral guidance on civil partnerships was already in existence, and existing guidance was updated to include opposite-sex civil partnerships. This guidance is meant to answer potential questions within the current teaching of the Church. The LLF process aims to foster better, more informed and generous, discussion of these deeply contested questions in the rapidly changing context of contemporary society. Any change in official doctrine would pre-empt the work that is being done, though it is hoped that both LLF and PAG would enable a change of culture and tone.

44. *Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Was the Pastoral Advisory Group consulted before the pastoral guidance on civil partnerships was issued?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Although the pastoral guidance was considered as Deemed Business before the House of Bishops, which includes bishops involved in both PAG and LLF, it was not considered by the whole Pastoral Advisory Group. The statement published by the Archbishops takes responsibility on behalf of all bishops for the failures involved in the process.

*Ms Christina Baron:* What use did the Delegation Committee and the House of Bishops make of the seven Pastoral Principles produced by the Pastoral Advisory Group and explored by Synod last July?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* I am afraid I do not have the answer to that question, Ms Baron.

*Ms Christina Baron:* Could I ask for it to be sent later perhaps?

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* The answer?

*Ms Christina Baron:* The answer.

*The Bishop of Newcastle:* Yes. Is that possible?

45. *Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many female bishops are members of the House of Bishops Delegation Committee?

*The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: One. The Right Reverend Karen Gorham, the Bishop of Sherborne.

*Canon Robert Hammond:* Thank you, Bishop. When will there be another?

*The Bishop of Blackburn:* Membership of the Delegation Committee is decided by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and they appoint the Bishops to the Delegation Committee.

46. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What procedural or other steps are taken at meetings of the House of Bishops to ensure that matters agreed by the Delegation Committee have the confidence of the full House?

*The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops' Delegation Committee is a committee of the House of Bishops constituted in order to relieve the House of the full volume of business otherwise before it. It considers matters appropriate to its terms of reference agreed by the House, which includes business referred to it by the House or the Standing Committee. Either the Standing Committee or five members of the House may remit a decision from the Delegation Committee to the House of Bishops. A summary of the Committee's business is reported to the House, including in person by the chair of the Committee.

47. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Please could you advise the Synod how decisions about what constitutes appropriate business for the Delegation Committee are made?

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Delegation Committee is a committee to which business is delegated in order to relieve pressure on the business considered by the whole House. Any matter may be referred to the Delegation Committee by the House of Bishops and by its Standing Committee, except Article 7 business, especially some items of policy to be considered in detail. Areas routinely considered by the Delegation Committee (and covered in its terms of reference) include business arising from the Council for Christian Unity, the Ministry Division and Ministry Council, the National Society and the Education Division, and the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee.

48. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Paragraph 22 of Paper GS Misc 1238 (Summary of decisions by the House of Bishops and by its delegated committees) reveals that the recent pastoral statement by the House, "Civil Partnerships – for same sex and opposite sex couples," dated December 2019 and published on the Church of England website on 22 January 2020, was agreed by the House of Bishops' Delegation Committee (HBDC, comprised of 9 bishops: 5 diocesans, 3 suffragans and the Bishop at Lambeth) on 22 November 2019 "as deemed business for the House" and, accordingly, was not considered by the whole House when it met from 9-11 December 2019. Please explain the procedure for the

House dealing with matters as “deemed business” and for members of the House to require that items designated by the HBDC as deemed business should, rather, be considered and voted on by the whole House.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Deemed Business for the House operates in a similar way to matters that are deemed business for this Synod. For a matter of deemed business to be debated requires five members of the House to indicate to the Secretary of the House of Bishops by the due time that they wish it to be considered. In the case to which Mr Lamming refers, the draft pastoral statement was circulated to members of the House with their agenda indicating that it was deemed business, and notification was required by 5pm on Friday 6 December 2019. No request for debate was received. In fact the statement was briefly considered by the whole House, as the Chair of the Delegation Committee proposed a small drafting amendment to the Statement, which the House voted to accept.

49. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Given the discontent around Pastoral Statements and Guidance from the House of Bishops, does the House of Bishops have any plans to revisit the December 2018 Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition (<https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-12/Pastoral%20Guidance-Affirmation-Baptismal-Faith.pdf>), particularly given the increasing number of people now reported to be de-transitioning?

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* As I indicated in my answer to Mr Caskie’s question in November, the status of the Pastoral Guidance has not changed, and the House does not have plans to revisit it. The Living in Love and Faith resources will invite the Church to engage in further learning, among other things, about matters related to gender identity and transition. A period of discernment will follow the whole Church’s engagement with the LLF resources after they are published. It is not possible to pre-empt what will follow from this process.

*Mr Chris Gill:* Thank you for your answer. Does the House of Bishops acknowledge that it may have been insensitive for the December 2018 Pastoral Guidance to have been issued whilst Living in Love and Faith was still under discussion and that publication of the discussion caused significant hurt and offence to many within the Church?

*The Chair:* I am afraid you are asking for an opinion again.

50. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* As the Living in Love and Faith project enters its final months, how does the estimated total cost of the project compare to the amounts paid out in compensation to survivors of abuse in the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The total cost of the LLF Project is currently estimated at £600,000. Survivors of Church-related abuse may currently obtain financial compensation which can include sums to cover treatment, usually paid by insurance or the Church Commissioners where claims are not insured. The provision of restoration or redress to victims of clerical abuse is complex and forms part of the work of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse whose recommendations we await in summer 2020, which will inform next steps, including budget setting. The National Safeguarding Team does not collate statistics which record the amount paid out to victims or survivors of clerical abuse because that information is not available to it. Most claims which allege clerical abuse in the Church of England are brought against parishes and are handled by the relevant insurer in each case without the input of the National Safeguarding Team.

*Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby:* Thank you for the answer. Can we expect in the near future that work on a national overview of the amount spent to compensate survivors will be done and we can know those figures?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* My understanding is that there will be greater attention to it, or particular attention to the question of compensation and financial claims after the IICSA process has been completed and there will be a greater supply of data in order to be able to do what you are asking.

51. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the anticipated cost of the Living in Love and Faith project and how is this being funded?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The estimated cost of the Living in Love and Faith project across 2018-2020 is £600,000. This has been funded from a variety of sources: the diocesan apportionment, an Archbishops' Council restricted fund, the Church Commissioners, and a grant from a charitable trust. These financial figures do not take into account the very substantial "in kind" contributions of over 40 people to the production of the resources.

*Revd Simon Talbott:* Thank you, Bishop Christopher, for your reply. In addition to this substantial investment, what provision has been made beyond 2020 to ensure that dioceses and parishes can be sufficiently resourced to engage with the provision once LLF material has been published?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Thank you very much, Simon, for your question and for that supplementary question. That is under consideration at the moment, but I am grateful for your question because our work at the moment with LLF is to provide these resources that then will need to be used – and used well – in order to be able to enable the discernment and decision-making process that they have been set up to effect. So thought is being given to it, and it is critical, as you say.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* Given that the cost of LLF, combined with the previous cost of the Shared Conversations, is now approaching £1 million, not including all the additional time in kind, what consideration has been given to the opportunity cost of this whole exercise? In other words, what other things might we have been able to do if we were not preoccupied with this?

*The Chair:* I think that is a request for an opinion.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* My question was: “What consideration has been given to the opportunity cost?”

*The Bishop of Coventry:* My wife is doing quite a lot.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* My sympathies to your wife.

*Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield):* Which charitable trust has contributed to the funding of Living in Love and Faith, and did they have a specific intent?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Only a proportion of the funding has been received from a particular fund. And no, there was no intent behind it. It was a fund that was available for this sort of purpose, and so we saw that fund and sought to make use of it. It was particularly for the production of the wider set of resources. A lot of the attention of Synod and myself has been on the book, but there are a lot of other resources that have been produced to enable accessibility.

52. *Mrs Jay Greene (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In what way will the recent research into the correspondence received by the Bishop of Grantham be taken into the LLF process?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The recent research into the correspondence received by the Bishop of Grantham will be referred to in the LLF resources as, among other things, it will describe the current situation with regard to human identity, sexuality and marriage both in the Church of England and wider society.

53. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The phrase “faith and practice of the Church of England” appears in the draft Cathedrals Measure (clause 4(1)(a)) and the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure (clause 2(1)(a)) and, I am informed, other legislation. Given the special role that bishops have, individually and collectively, in teaching and upholding the faith and practice of the Church of England, of what resources is the House of Bishops aware to which Deans and Cathedral Chapters, or Directors and Boards of Education, may refer for guidance on what constitutes “the faith and practice of the Church of England”?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* According to the Preface to the Declaration of Assent, the Church of England “professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, The Book of Common Prayer and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons”. With regard to the Church of England’s practice, ecclesiastical law and forms of service that are authorized or commended would also be relevant.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood:* Thank you very much for your answer about faith and practice in the Church of England. In the last sentence of your answer, which deals particularly with practice, you refer to ecclesiastical law. For the avoidance of doubt, does ecclesiastical law include the Canons?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Yes.

54. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Whilst appreciating that the Church is obliged to develop doctrine to deal with many challenges of modern life, what plans are there to help people develop a better understanding of their God-given conscience and to include this in our teaching throughout the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In 2016, the House of Bishops approved and commended for study Communion and Disagreement, a document published by the Faith and Order Commission. It includes in chapter 2 a discussion of conscience, which is developed in more detail in the supporting paper also available on the Church of England’s website, “Communion, Disagreement and Conscience”, written by Professor Loveday Alexander and Professor Joshua Hordern.

*Mr Gavin Oldham:* However, the papers treat conscience as a rather static entity, rather than one which is more dynamic and developed objectively by teaching and mentoring. Should I take it from your answer that there are no plans to help people develop a better understanding of conscience and to include this in teaching throughout the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* What I can say, if you do not mind me referring back to the LLF work, is that that is giving attention to the place of conscience in the formation of Christian decision-making and relating that to the place of Scripture, the place of the Church’s tradition, that which we perceive from creation, convictions, prayer, trying to consider the role of conscience in relation to other means by which we discern the mind of Christ. So there will be some help there.

55. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the withdrawal of PTO to the Revd Jonathan Fletcher in the context of abuse allegation, investigation, and victim support costs to the Church of England, what steps have been taken, by letters to clergy or otherwise, to ensure that churches known to have historically welcomed and promoted his ministry, neither permit him to worship without a comprehensive Safeguarding Agreement in place, nor hold him out as teaching with the authority of our Church and under its insurance cover, formally or informally?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: When the Revd Jonathan Fletcher no longer held the Bishop of Southwark's Permission To Officiate, those known to be intending to use Jonathan Fletcher as a preacher were informed that he did not have the Bishop's authority to preach. The Diocese of Southwark is continuing to seek a comprehensive Safeguarding Agreement with the Revd Jonathan Fletcher, which would stipulate arrangements for worship and all other involvement in any Church of England church in the Diocese and beyond.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* The context of my carefully drawn question was that evidence seemed to arise that Jonathan Fletcher was continuing to engage with those who might be at risk from him, and I wonder if you could tell us what the date was that people were notified, because one needs to ascertain whether people were innocent or whether there are delinquent congregations out there.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* Martin, your question was indeed very well devised. I think when you talk about "formal" and "informal", one of the things your question does do is just shows and exposes the weakness of what the Church can and cannot do, so I am grateful for your question. With regard to this particular question, no, I do not know the detail of those dates. I am sorry that I do not.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* Can you let us know later?

56. *Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the extensive coverage in the Telegraph in late December of the allegations against the Revd Jonathan Fletcher, has there been a formal and public response from the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Diocese of Southwark, working with the Church of England Communications Team, responded with a full statement to the questions asked by the Daily Telegraph and other media outlets.

*Dr Yvonne Warren (Coventry):* Given the enormous influence on those going both into ordained ministry and being ordained, and therefore the huge influence on laity

throughout the years of people like Jonathan Fletcher and those who have been accused and sentenced for abuse, has the House of Bishops ever thought about having a day of prayer and repentance throughout the nation?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* It is something which the Archbishop and I, and others, have talked about. I think finding the right time and place would be important. In my conversations with many victims and survivors that I have spoken to, they have said that at the moment – and this is only those who have spoken to me – it would be inappropriate because the Church has not yet demonstrated enough resolve and enough progress, and they feel that until the Church has really made that further effort and made the necessary changes that such an act of prayer and dedication might seem to be either half-hearted or tokenistic. I will talk to both Archbishops about it. I think it is a very serious question that you have asked us at Synod to consider.

*Revd Julie Conalty:* While I am grateful to Southwark Diocese for taking point on this matter, given the profile of the Revd Fletcher and the wide reach of his ministry – way beyond the bounds of Southwark – why was it decided not to release a response from the national Church?

*The Chair:* I am afraid you are asking for an opinion.

*Revd Julie Conalty:* I am asking why.

*The Bishop of Bath & Well:* I think, if I can try to answer it – and the Chair was trying to make sure that I answer it properly – this has not been a national case. It is something that has been led with Southwark diocese. The National Safeguarding Team has been fully co-operating with Southwark. There will be lessons to be learnt from it. We are grateful to the Emmanuel Church, who have taken the responsibility and the initiative, but certainly when that review has taken place the National Safeguarding Team, on behalf of the Church, will look very seriously at any findings and recommendations.

57. *Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: While the announcement that *Thirty-One: Eight* has been commissioned by Emmanuel Wimbledon to undertake a Learned Lessons Review in relation to the allegations against the Revd Jonathan Fletcher is welcome, is there any intention to commission a wider review to look, in particular, at allegations of attempts to silence or manipulate victims by Anglican Church leaders?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The nature of the learning lessons review process is determined on a case by case basis and once the *Thirty-One: Eight* review has reached a conclusion, there will be dissemination of all learning. Decisions regarding further review work will be taken at that point, and also take into account other learning lessons reviews due to report

in 2020. We would urge victims and anyone with any information for the review to come forward to their DSA or via the helpline.

*Mrs Carolyn Graham:* Thank you for your answer. Can you assure us that there will not be any cover-up of any cover-up and that after the *Thirty-One: Eight* report has been received we will be actively holding to account any leader within any of the churches who has either attempted to suppress the story or put the Church or a particular part of the Church's reputation before the wellbeing of any victims?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I think one of the real purposes of our learning lessons reviews is to make sure that lessons are learned. Certainly there will be questions in this review – as in all reviews – that deal with questions of openness and honesty and the problems of secrecy, so I am very sure that those questions that you have in your mind as you ask me that question will very much be addressed.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* In relation to the Report, when it comes, will you or your successor take steps to ensure that the report – what it says by way of recommendations – is brought to this Synod for debate?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* That will not be a decision I am able to make, but I can assure you that when that work has taken place it will be very thoroughly reviewed.

58. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: There are currently three inquiries under way into the activities of the late John Smyth QC by the Church of England, Winchester College, and the Scripture Union. A fourth may be commissioned by the Titus Trust when litigation is ended. What protocols (if any) exist between the organisations, to avoid the re-abuse of victims/survivors by requiring them to retell and re-live their experiences multiple times?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: We are very much alive to the need to ensure that the review process does not cause further harm to victims and survivors. There is no formal protocol between the organisations, which would have taken time to agree, but we have taken steps to liaise with those organisations to enquire whether we can share the work product of their reviews, with the consent of survivors, rather than ask survivors to re-live their experiences. We have also suggested that the review team should draw on existing evidence, where available, such as where survivors have given their accounts to police or local authorities, so long as this can be done in a way that is consensual and protects their rights.

59. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Without compromising appropriate confidentiality, can you outline the nature of the problems presented by the GDPR regime which substantially delayed the commencement of the Makin inquiry into the allegations against the late John Smyth?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The commencement of Keith Makin's review was delayed for several reasons, including communication between a number of institutions in order to explore whether they would participate in the review and consultation regarding the terms of reference. We take our data protection obligations seriously and it has been necessary to resolve some complex data protection questions. In particular it has taken time to design and implement appropriate data security measures and to provide appropriate template documentation in order to allow the review team to make lawful requests for data sharing of survivors and third parties.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* It is about the timing, please, as to the Makin report because the GDPR delays were substantial. Graham, the complainant, has only had his comprehensive statement taken last week – eight years after coming forward. The concern we have is what this is going to do to the Makin report being delivered. It was hoped to be done, I understand, in 2020. Is that going to be feasible?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* As someone who has been looking on in this process I understand the frustrations there have been about GDPR. It has been much more complex than I think any of us had envisaged. I hope Synod can be reassured that some of the lessons that we have learnt in this case will certainly help to speed up reviews going forward, so Synod needs to be reassured of that.

With regard to your particular question, when I last spoke to the reviewer he was of a mind that certainly by autumn of this year – he cannot be held to that because it will depend on information that comes forward; it needs to be a deep and thorough review – he hoped to have his review written. But even after it has been written, then there are considerable questions about how it has to be redacted, the whole process of maximalisation; it has to be produced. So, even after the reviewer has done their work, there is a considerable amount of data protection thinking, particularly about the survivors and the victims – we need to protect them and their identities – and that takes time and it needs to be done thoroughly. I cannot give you a guarantee at this stage, but I am very willing to ask that this be updated at the next July Synod.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* Thank you for that and everything you have done.

60. *Revd Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Would the safeguarding team be able to give a number of victims/survivors of clergy abuse that are currently actively seeking compensation and redress from the church?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The National Safeguarding Team does not collate statistics which record the number of victims or survivors of clerical abuse who are seeking compensation or redress because that information is not available to it. Most claims which allege clerical

abuse in the Church of England are brought against parishes and are handled by the relevant insurer in each case without the input of the National Safeguarding Team.

*Revd Canon Peter Adams:* Thank you, Bishop Peter. Bearing in mind the assumption that it will be useful for the Church to have numbers of victims of clergy abuse and numbers claiming compensation and redress, are there plans by the NST to gather such numbers using data from past case reviews, et cetera, and for future reporting?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* Since this question has been asked I have, in addition, further information to give you. It is this. I understand there are approximately ten claims which have been intimated or brought where compensation is yet to be agreed and which are likely to be met by the national Church.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* This question is statistical but potentially relates to questions 61 and 62, and possibly question 63 as well.

*The Chair:* We are on question 60.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* But I am asking in relation to question 60. So the National Safeguarding Team does not collate statistics, and you have just given some numbers there, Bishop. However, it has been reported in the press that psychiatric or psychological assessments on a desktop basis have been undertaken on survivors, and I wondered on that basis how many desktop evaluations have been undertaken on survivors and what is their number.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I am not in a position to answer that, I am sorry.

61. *Revd Valerie Plumb (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How much money has been set aside in this year and next year's budget for restoration and redress for victims of clerical abuse?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Survivors of Church-related abuse may currently obtain some redress in a number of ways: by way of financial compensation which can include sums to cover treatment, usually paid by insurance or the Church Commissioners where claims are not insured; apologies; and, where requested, provision for therapeutic support and counselling where we are able to do so. We are considering whether we could offer more, but the provision of restoration or redress to victims of clerical abuse is complex and forms part of the work of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse whose recommendations we await in summer 2020, which will inform next steps, including budget setting.

*Revd Valerie Plumb:* Regarding question 61, thank you, Bishop, for answering that as clearly as you could. I note halfway down I see the phrase: "We are considering whether

we could offer more..." Good, you should, but the question I want to ask is "What does that look like?" Can you clarify what that might mean?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I am trespassing into the answer, I think, under question 63 from Rosie Harper. You may recollect there were some indicative, speculative figures that the Bishop of Durham gave. I think all we can learn from that statement is that the Church is taking this very, very seriously. Provision of restoration and redress is a very important matter and a very pressing matter and the Church is taking it very seriously.

62. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Many survivors of Church abuse find that disclosing their abuse to the Church results directly in loss of income, housing difficulties and a precarious future. One survivor of rape and abuse by a senior clergyman and a bishop has calculated that they have lost over £70,000 over the past five years as a direct result of disclosing. Does the Church agree that no survivor should be financially disadvantaged because they have disclosed their abuse?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I cannot comment on the specific details of any case without knowing the facts, but the Church of England is working to put in place guidelines and processes which will address these situations. Whilst it is too early to say what the outcome of that work will be, the principle which lies behind this question is one that has already been raised and is something that will need to be considered.

*Revd Canon Rosie Harper:* I wonder if there will ever come a time when the answers to my questions does not take me to Groundhog Day. You always say, "We are looking at it", "We are considering it", "We are working on it". I would like to ask when? On what date will a formal, concrete policy actually be sorted out for survivors to get some tangible measure of justice?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I would like the answer to that question. I do not have the answer to that question, but I do not want Synod to think there has been no work or no conversation or no thought or no research taking place over the last few years. This is something the Church has been considering. I regret that it has not got, as yet, to a position where I am able to answer your question more directly.

63. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of a figure of £200 million mentioned by Bishop Paul Butler to survivors and referred to on 21 March 2018 at IICSA in Archbishop Welby's evidence, how much money has actually been allocated in the AC or CC budget this year and next, specifically for the care and restorative justice of survivors of clergy abuse?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As I explain in my reply to question 61, the National Church is looking at this issue and awaits a recommendation from IICSA whose hearings underlined the

Church's poor response to survivors of abuse. Survivors of Church-related abuse may currently obtain some redress in a number of ways: by way of financial compensation which can include sums to cover treatment, usually paid by insurance or the Church Commissioners where the claim is not insured; apologies, and, where requested, paid provision for therapeutic support and counselling where we are able to do so. The Archbishops' Council has made specific financial provision for the Safe Spaces project which will, when the service is in place, provide an independent support service for survivors of church-related abuse.

*Revd Canon Rosie Harper:* Given that Safe Spaces is really rather a red herring, it is still not anywhere near implementation, please could you tell us in actual monetary terms how much money has been earmarked from the Archbishops' Council or the Church Commissioners to provide full, just and honourable redress for survivors?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I am afraid I cannot answer that. I cannot speak for the Archbishops' Council.

64. *Revd Canon Wyn Beynon (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Are changes being proposed to national safeguarding guidance to draw attention to the potential of some theologies to cause harm or promote a culture of abuse?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The significance of theology for addressing abuse within the church was explored in *Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse*, published by the Faith and Order Commission in 2017.

*Revd Canon Wyn Beynon:* Thank you for the answer. Could the NST attempt to ensure that all-male headship congregations make their view on the place of women in the Church absolutely and unambiguously clear on their websites and other publicity to avoid the serious pastoral mistakes in the treatment of many women, sometimes resulting in hurt and trauma, now becoming increasingly recorded?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* With the Chair's permission I will answer that more generally than specifically if I might, which is to say I am reminded of the fact that Jesus spoke about taking the log out of our own eyes before we scrutinise what is in the eyes of others. I think, whatever theological position we have, whatever theological language we treasure, we need to ensure that the language we use and the convictions we have are not misused by anyone else who is seeking to either legitimate or perpetuate abusive behaviour, and to make that more positive so anything that we do and say and the way that we act makes it very clear that those actions are unacceptable.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* It strikes me that the amount of reading that there is now is becoming increasingly available – including this Report. Is there anywhere, or perhaps the NST might consider providing a list of required reading for each

level of safeguarding training, the things that people really must read in order to develop their understanding as their responsibilities increase?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* That is a helpful suggestion and one I shall take back.

65. *Revd Canon Andy Salmon (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse has finished hearing from the Church of England, are there plans for a pastoral letter from the Archbishops to help churches implement the lessons learned about safeguarding?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Both Archbishops welcomed the interim report published in May 2019 and urged all those in the Church of England to read, reflect and learn from it. The Archbishops will similarly welcome the final report published by the Independent Inquiry, which is expected in 2020. The findings of this final report will also be disseminated, and its key messages communicated across the whole church to ensure that the lessons are learned and shared about safeguarding.

66. *Revd Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Recommendation 1 of the Interim IICSA report is leading to clear rulings for recognised Church of England religious communities, including a new generation of neo-monastic communities. However many such communities are both ecumenical and never take on formal structure, both aspects making them particularly attractive to potentially vulnerable young people. Moreover many other schemes providing discipleship for young people involve camps that sit outside the formal structures of the C of E, and yet draw upon our resources and leaders and serve our members such were the Iwerne camps. What work is the Safeguarding team doing with its ecumenical partners to ensure these usually admirable projects sitting in “safeguarding no man’s land” are suitably safeguarded?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: We are only able to extend the Church’s safeguarding provisions to officers who fall within the formal structures of the Church of England. Under section 5 of the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 all authorized clergy, bishops, archdeacons, licensed readers and lay workers, churchwardens and PCCs must have “due regard” to safeguarding guidance issued by the House of Bishops. The Parish Safeguarding Handbook also provides that PCCs must ensure a safeguarding addendum to a hire agreement is always used when any person/body hires church premises (i.e. a church building or a church hall) for activity that involves children, young people or vulnerable adults. The National Safeguarding Team does investigate allegations of a safeguarding matter or refer them to the relevant Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor for investigation, where groups may be affiliated to the Church of England.

67. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since the launch of the C4 Safeguarding Training for Senior Leaders course, how many people have been required do the course because of the office they hold?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There are approximately 1,700 senior leaders at any one time who have to undertake the C4 because of the office they hold.

68. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since the launch of the C4 Safeguarding Training for Senior Leaders course, what percentage of people required to do the course (because of the office they hold), have actually completed the course?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Out of the 1,700 people required to complete the C4 safeguarding training, 88% of people or 1,493 attendees have completed this course. Furthermore, of the 271 Bishops, Deans and Archdeacons, 93% or 253 attendees have completed C4. Plans are in place to ensure that all those who are required to do C4 complete it.

69. *Mrs Karen Galloway (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In November 2019, in answer to a question (Q27) from Mrs Kat Allread (Derby) asking for a brief update as to progress on the “long-awaited” Safe Spaces Project, the Bishop of London stated:

“The invitation to tender for the Safe Spaces project has taken place and an evaluation panel for prospective providers happened on November 11th. This Panel included both officers and survivors. The recommendations of the Panel evaluation will be discussed at the next Safe Spaces Management Board in November and next steps determined.”

On 21 December 2019, a statement posted on the C of E website, “Update on Safe Spaces following Media report” (being a reference to a report, “Not a prayer...” on page 38 of Private Eye No 1512) by “a spokesperson for the National Safeguarding Team,” regretted and apologised for the delay in progressing the proposed support service (first officially discussed in 2014) and stated:

“No money from the £592,000 grant has been spent to date, and no new company has been set up. Pre set-up costs, procurement, project management and development are separate to this and the cost is being shared across both Churches [i.e. the C of E and the Roman Catholic church].”

In the light of the Bishop of London’s answer and the above media statement, can the House of Bishops provide Synod members with an update on the progress of the project

since November 2019, including the amount so far spent from each relevant funding source?

*The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The evaluation panel that was held on 11 November unanimously agreed that the applications received were not of sufficient standard to identify a provider to deliver the project. Following the Safe Spaces Board referred to above, work was directed to canvas other providers in the market including some who had originally expressed interest in the tender and not made a subsequent bid. This work revealed that some organisations expressed interest in submitting further bids through a revised and streamlined process. These subsequent bids needed to have been received by 4 February. We will then identify a partner to take on the contract, involving survivors in that selection process and the subsequent partnership development. Money from the relevant funding sources allocated to the project contract (£592k combined from the All Churches Trust, the Roman Catholic Church and the Archbishops' Council) has not been spent.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Can we know the actual amount that has been spent to date on pre-setup costs, procurement, et cetera, and who has funded that?

*The Bishop of London:* I do not have the details, but I could bring that to you. Some of it is difficult because it is time that has been spent by the National Safeguarding Team, some time is much clearer, but I am sure we could find it for you.

*Mr David Lamming:* And that can be appended perhaps to the Record of Proceedings?

*The Bishop of London:* Yes.

70. *Mr James Lee (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What training is given to new bishops and archdeacons in the exercise of their patronage duties under the Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986 and other legislation?

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The two Provincial Registrars cover the Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1986 and other legislation in some detail with each new bishop as part of their induction training. Archdeacons receive a range of training on both their specific and general legal obligations from their Registrars, and through national training organised via the Archdeacons' National Development Officer.

71. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In November 2019, in answer to a question (Q15) from Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby), the Bishop to the Armed Forces stated that the CDM Working Party was:

“...now well under way and at its next meeting in December it is hoped that we can map out a timetable both for some issues that may well be addressed relatively quickly and for the more significant potential changes which may well have to take longer given processes that will be needed.”

More recently, in their determination on 20 January 2020 in the case of *Lodge v Bulloch*, the Bishop’s Disciplinary Tribunal for the Diocese of Chelmsford, chaired by the Revd His Honour Judge Mark Bishop, concluded their 40-page judgment by expressing their “concerns about how a case of this kind is to be dealt with under the current CDM procedure” (para 113). They stated (para 115) that cases such as the one before them required “much more investigative work before being prosecuted.” The Tribunal concluded (para 119):

“We acknowledge that the issues raised in these concluding remarks go to the structure of CDM proceedings and no doubt also to the question of resources provided by the Church to investigate matters of this kind.” (See also the report in the Church Times, 24 January 2020, page 7.)

Taking into account the concerns expressed in the *Lodge v Bulloch* judgment, can Synod please be informed of the timetable mapped out by the working group for addressing the various issues identified by the working group or others as requiring reform, whether by way of amending legislation or otherwise?

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Working Group chaired by the Bishop to Her Majesty’s Armed Forces will take into account the comments made by the Revd HH Judge Mark Bishop, alongside concerns expressed by the Sheldon Community and other groups and individuals. The Working Group hopes to host a series of public consultations around England after Easter 2020, at which the Group’s proposals will be presented. Following this, the Working Group will convene to finalise its proposals. Some of these proposals may involve implementing policy decisions over the summer to allow the current legislative framework to work more effectively as it currently stands. Some proposals will however require legislative change in the longer term. The Working Group thinks that the need for urgent reform needs to be balanced against the due time and consideration that must be given to such legislative change to ensure identification of a sustainable long-term solution.

72. *Mr David Kemp (Canterbury)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Six thousand clergy have responded to the independent academic research survey into the lived experience of the CDM organised by the Sheldon Community in collaboration with Aston University. What steps will be taken to learn from the research findings, and what plans are in place for the replacement of the CDM with a process that is fit for ministry in the 21st century?

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: A Review of the Clergy Discipline Measure is being chaired by the Bishop to Her Majesty's Forces. Although separate from the work being conducted by the Sheldon Community and Aston University, this Review has taken a keen interest in Sheldon's work, and awaits its results with anticipation. It is hoped that the ongoing work of the Review will be informed by Sheldon's findings, incorporating practical responses to these findings into its proposals for reform, particularly in relation to clergy wellbeing. These proposals will be presented and honed in a series of public consultations held throughout England later in 2020. The Working Group have been considering setting regulation and discipline within the framework of professional standards. It is hoped that this approach will allow for underlying issues to be dealt with proportionately rather than imposing discipline in what is often felt to be an unresolved situation.*

*Mr David Kemp: The terms of Reference of the CDM Review Group require the Group to "identify amendments to be made to the CDM". In view of the growing demand that the present CDM should be replaced by a new process, can the Bishop confirm that the Review Group will seriously consider this option?*

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces: Yes.*

73. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In July 2017, during the debate on Clergy Wellbeing, the Archbishop of Canterbury observed:*

*"I have to say that my own experience over the last few years in dealing with people who may have gone wrong on the CDM process has often contributed very badly indeed to their wellbeing. The process has been a punishment, not the outcome."*

The Sheldon Hub briefing paper on Project CDM (14 January 2020) states that "completely replacing the Measure is essential" due to the negative effects on clergy wellbeing and parish ministry. What plans do the Archbishops' Council and House of Bishops have in place for when the final results of the research being done by the Sheldon Hub are published?

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: A Review of the Clergy Discipline Measure is being chaired by the Bishop to Her Majesty's Forces in his capacity as Bishop at Lambeth. Although separate from the work being conducted by the Sheldon Community and Aston University, this Review has taken a keen interest in Sheldon's work, and awaits its results with anticipation. It is hoped that the ongoing work of the Review will be informed by Sheldon's findings, incorporating practical responses to these findings into its proposals for reform, particularly in relation to clergy wellbeing. These proposals will be presented and honed in a series of public consultations held throughout England later in 2020.*

Following public consultation, the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops will have opportunity to consider and respond to the Review's proposals.

*Dr Megan Warner (London):* Bishop, thank you for your answer. Can you give an account of the breadth of experience of members of the Working Group and, in particular, the proportion of members of the Working Group having significant expertise in fields other than safeguarding?

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces:* Off the top of my head I would be struggling to get every single person, but there are a large number of people on the Working Group who have expertise way beyond the safeguarding area. As well as the members of the Working Group, we are talking to a wide range of organisations and experts who cover a wider range than that, so there are bishops, legal people, pastoral experts, human resources people, as well as those who have experience specifically in safeguarding, but even those obviously have experience beyond as well.

74. *Mr Simon Friend (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Regarding action following review of historic cases of sexual abuse by clergy where mandatory reporting and an independent safeguarding body have been called for; can clarity be given if terms of appointment for clergy will be reviewed for a change from a vocational model to contractual model in order to facilitate a more effective disciplinary procedure?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Clergy Discipline Measure is being reviewed by a Group chaired by the Bishop at Lambeth, which is investigating the intersection between clergy discipline and safeguarding. That group is best placed to make recommendations about changes to the disciplinary procedures for clergy arising from the past cases review. There are currently no plans to change the legal basis on which clergy hold office.

*Mr Simon Friend:* In respect of the last sentence of the answer, my question is "Why not?" Why not put in place a plan to review the legal basis on which clergy hold office? I believe I am in good company now on this as the Bishop of London referred to common tenure in the last debate. One of the recurrent themes from abuse survivors' stories is a sense of powerlessness when faced with someone who is called by God, who has a divine vocation. This dimension can be very damaging and cause much spiritual suffering. Why not review the legal basis on which clergy hold office?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I think we have heard from earlier discussions various pieces of evidence that say that this is a review that needs to take place. I can assure you that there are various of us who are beginning to be engaged in this process, albeit a hugely complicated one.

75. *Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is the House of Bishops aware of any formal action being taken where clergy have been invited to preach or lead church services following the removal of their permission to officiate?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Action of this nature would be a matter for the diocese concerned. The House, as a body, would not normally be informed of such action or become formally involved.

*Revd Julie Conalty*: How – by which I mean by what mechanism – if information like this is retained only in individual dioceses, as it were in silos, will we measure the effectiveness of the House of Bishops' guidance in closing the loopholes that manipulative abusers exploit?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich*: I am not sure I know how to answer that question for the reason that you have given. I will take that away and we will have a look to see how we can do that.

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)*: Bishop, might you partly give a response in terms of updating us on the progress of the single national clergy database, which could, after all, be consulted in such circumstances?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich*: I would be out of my league if I were to try to do that. Somebody else can give you the answer to that.

76. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In relation to Canon B 16 and the knowledge that some clergy have got into trouble as they seek to reassert a measure of marriage discipline in their churches: can an openly known, long-term adulterous relationship be grounds for exclusion from Holy Communion?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: This is a matter covered by Canon B 16, concerning admission to Holy Communion. The example cited is potentially covered by Canon B 16, which however requires the minister concerned to report the matter to the bishop of the diocese and obey the bishop's directions in the matter.

*Revd Canon David Banting*: The answer given appears simply to quote back Canon B 16, and that does not seem to be an answer. I took legal advice to ask this question, and Canon B 16 has already been referred to at length in the answer to question 39, so I have to ask the question: what guidelines or parameter does the Bishop use, does he universally recognise, to give his direction to apply to Canon B 16?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* If this were to come to me, so if I am imagining a situation like this in my own diocese and a priest brought this situation, then the guidance that I would follow would be threefold, I think. First of all, I would want to make sure that the situation was fully understood and that some process had been gone through, which the Bishop may then want to pursue themselves, in terms of engaging with the people concerned and trying to understand what is going on. So this is a sort of Matthew 18 process. Secondly, I would want to come to a view that took the seriousness of the sin into account with, I suppose, the pastoral context in which you are operating. You have to look at every situation case by case. That would be the sort of process that I would want to engage with. I suppose always at the back of my mind would be the fact that I am sitting there as a sinner myself and I need to be attentive to my own sinfulness as I reflect on the seriousness that the case would be implying.

77. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In relation to Canon B 16 and the knowledge that some clergy have got into trouble as they seek to reassert a measure of marriage discipline in their churches: can an openly known, long-term adulterous relationship be grounds for exclusion from roles of leadership or responsibility in the Church (including ordained ministry)?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* So far as Canon B 16 itself is concerned, I would refer Canon Banting to the answer to the previous question. As to leadership roles, only persons the bishop knows “to be of virtuous conversation and good repute and such as to be a wholesome example and pattern to the flock of Christ” may be admitted to Holy Orders. A person in an adulterous relationship would not qualify for ordination. The minister who nominates a person for the office of reader must satisfy the bishop that the person is, among other things, “of good life”. A person in an adulterous relationship would therefore not qualify.

*Revd Canon David Banting:* You can see that it is closely related, but it is talking about a different area of application. I am sorry that the answer is so clerically orientated as to ordination or even Readers. I am thinking of membership of a PCC, or a teaching role to children or adults, Sunday School, lay education, that sort of thing within the local church, and for lay people. I am trying to get at what Canon B 16 talks of as a “grave and open sin without repentance”. PCC membership, teaching within the local church?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Since this is not about excommunication, I think this probably resides with the local priest, but I would expect them to have perhaps some conversation with the archdeacon or with the bishop concerned. I think for me the important thing is to try to understand what is going on and then to be able to respond appropriately for the sake of both the people concerned and for the congregation concerned. Without a very specific case, with specific people – this is a case by case issue, but with a serious ---

*Revd Canon David Banting:* But I am not allowed to ask a question about specific cases and specific people.

*The Chair:* No, you are not.

*Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford):* You are imagining, as if it was asked to you. I will leave it there. Thank you.

78. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England has a number of times made the statement:

“The Church of England combines principled opposition to abortion with a recognition that there can be strictly limited conditions under which it may be morally preferable to any available alternative.”

What are the “strictly limited conditions” where it is “morally preferable” to intentionally kill the unborn child?

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The General Synod resolved in 1983 that “in situations where the continuance of a pregnancy threatens the life of the mother a termination of pregnancy may be justified and that there must be adequate and safe provision in our society for such situations” and in 1993 that “In the rare occasions when abortion is carried out beyond 24 weeks, ‘Serious foetal handicap’ should be interpreted strictly as applying to those conditions where survival is possible only for a very short period”. In 2005 the General Synod received a briefing paper from the Mission and Public Affairs Council summarising these resolutions: “The Church of England combines strong opposition to abortion with a recognition that there can be – strictly limited – conditions under which it may be morally preferable to any available alternative”.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* Government statistics published on 13 June 2019 show that a staggering 196,083 lives created in the image of God were prematurely brought to an end by abortion in 2018. Of these, less than 2% – that is in England and Wales ---

*The Chair:* May we have your question, please, Mrs Williams?

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* Less than 2% were carried out because of a possible risk to the mother’s life. Can the House of Bishops confirm that, by those statistics, 98% of all abortions carried out last year are by their own definition immoral, and what specific steps will the House of Bishops now take to address this pressing concern?

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* Mrs Williams, I think you are asking me for an opinion there, which I am unwilling to give. I am very aware of the depth of feeling aroused by this subject. I

am very aware of its extreme sensitivity, and I am very grateful for your concern and for your question.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* I have quoted the statistic. You can go to the report issued by the Government of 2018. So it is not an opinion.

*The Chair:* Mrs Williams, you need to allow him to answer.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* It is not therefore an opinion.

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* I fully understand the question. The Church of England's position is very clearly that the particular situation in which the lesser of two evils, as we would regard it, of abortion is where the mother's health and life particularly is in danger, and that can extend to her mental health as well.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams:* Yes, 2%.

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* I appreciate it is 2%. We are very concerned to bring the number of abortions down. I do not know all those other circumstances, but we would be very concerned to offer compassion and care to all those who are involved in these very, very difficult situations and particularly to offer support and proper information for those who are facing difficult pregnancies.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* Thank you very much for your answer, Bishop. How has this understanding of the doctrine of the Church of England and the concerns of the House of Bishops you have referred to been reflected in the actual voting patterns of Bishops in the House of Lords?

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* I am afraid I have no idea of the answer to that.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* I would be very happy to receive an answer in writing.

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* Certainly.

79. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is the House of Bishops considering any detailed advice to churches were the pandemic outbreak of the coronavirus to spread to the UK – for instance the use of a single cup in administering wine in the Service of Holy Communion?

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There are no plans at present (3 February) to issue any detailed advice to churches with regard to 2019-nCoV, but the situation is being closely monitored

and, if a UK epidemic were to be deemed likely, following consultation with the Chief Scientific Officer and Chief Medical Officer; advice will be published.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* This is a question of a fairly urgent nature. I know you kindly gave your answer on 3 February, which is some time back. It has now been declared a major emergency. In the interests of not having to get that phrase “lessons will be learned”, we really do need to get some advice on what to do should it really become a frightening and affecting situation.

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* Thank you for the question. It is a very important one. We are monitoring the situation very closely. We are taking advice from the relevant medical authorities. We have got advice which can be issued. People will probably remember the advice that came out back in 2009 where it was possible for the sharing of the chalice to be suspended, or Holy Communion to be received in only one kind, or the priest to intinct wafers personally. There was a notice for all churches about proper hygiene that was to be put up in all churches. If the situation continues to get worse, that sort of thing will certainly be issued. I think one of the key things in all of this is common sense and hand washing, just as in hospitals, because that is the main thing that prevents the disease spreading. We are looking at the possibility of extreme circumstances. If there is a real danger, the Legal Advisory Commission has said that good sense could mediate the necessity for a priest to celebrate Holy Communion on Sundays and major feast days. I sincerely hope we will not be in that position.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* We pray.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Bishop, you referred to the 2009 advice, which was that it was better to have Communion in one kind only rather than to permit the administration of Communion in individual glasses as some other denominations do. I wonder if further consideration could be given to that, if further advice is now required, as to whether it would in fact not be better in those exceptional circumstances to allow Communion to be administered in individual glasses rather than being denied the cup at all.

*The Bishop of Carlisle:* Mr Scowen, you are absolutely right that previously it was suggested that individual cups were not to be recommended. I am quite happy to discuss that further with others.

80. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In a response to a supplementary question in 2018 regarding ministry to children and also their fathers, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated: “We have in the last few weeks written to all Bishops, through the regional meetings, asking them to have a fresh look at this area. We will certainly take account of that evidence”. How have specific pieces of that evidence been utilised by bishops in taking a fresh look at this area?

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The letter which the Archbishop of Canterbury referenced was the start of the work which has since become encapsulated in the bishops' vision for *Growing Faith*, debated in Synod last year and now seen as a major priority for the Church. Evidence which informs our thinking about *Growing Faith* reveals that families need help to develop the confidence to normalise conversations about faith and promote patterns of Christian discipleship within the home. *Growing Faith* is focusing on the intersections between church, school and households in order to develop confidence in that ministry with children and young people.

81. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What progress has the House of Bishops made towards amending its policy regarding the licensing of lay ministers/ Readers over the age of 70, so that they will be able to continue in licensed ministry if they, their incumbent and their PCC so wish?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* It remains House of Bishops' policy, as expressed in the Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry, that Readers over the age of 70 should apply for the bishop's written permission to officiate. We are aware however that different dioceses are now applying the Regulations in a variety of ways and therefore the Central Readers' Council will be reviewing the Regulations and making recommendations to the House of Bishops in the near future. The Central Readers' Council itself has changed its constitution to remove all age restrictions.

*Mr Clive Scowen:* Will the House ensure that Readers and/or LLMs, however they are designated, will be consulted on the Central Readers' Council's recommendations before the House considers them, and will the House have due regard to the responses to such a consultation?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Yes, I would expect that that consultation is being undertaken by the CRC. I will check that. If it is not, then I will make sure that there is a consultation process following that.

82. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: It is now two years since Professor O'Donovan reported in great detail about how Synod should conduct its elections to the CNC and about how the Crown Nominations Commission should conduct itself. Only one clutch of proposals has come to Synod and that was defeated. What plans are there for bringing back those proposals to Synod and for making the other changes which the Professor put forward?

*The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The oversight group set up to monitor the progress on the discussion and implementation of the recommendation set out in "Discerning in Obedience" (GS Misc

1171) has presented two reports to Synod: GS Misc 1209 and GS Misc 1232. These reports explain the progress that is being made and set out the plans for the future.

It is anticipated that the CNC Election Process Review Group will report to Synod in July 2020. Other standing order work, such as reviewing the process for a vacancy in the See of Canterbury, will be the focus after this. Work is also progressing in relation to other recommendations such as earlier engagement with dioceses, ways of working and managing episcopal lists. Some of these will require engagement with Synod. There are currently no plans for bringing the proposals defeated in February 2019 back to Synod.

*Mrs April Alexander:* May I refer Synod to the amendment to question 82 in the Tenth Notice Paper. The debate to which I refer in my question was disappointing in many respects, including the lamentably short time devoted to it. Moreover, the Synod, by and large, had no knowledge of the processes which it was debating because of the secrecy surrounding them.

*The Chair:* May we have your question?

*Mrs April Alexander:* In view of all this, will the House of Bishops review its plans to include a rerun of this debate?

*The Bishop of Lichfield:* Can I first apologise to Synod, both for the error in the original answer – the correct answer is set out in the Tenth Notice Paper – and also for the inadequacy of my voice, which is largely left somewhere in a ditch in Staffordshire. As far as I am aware, the central members of the CNC have no plans to bring this back to Synod, but it is of course open to a diocese or to individual members to consider doing so if they would like to.

83. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church Times last week (24 January 2020) reported an example of egregious behaviour by a lay person in Chelmsford Diocese and alleged bullying by lay people in Diocese of Norwich. As a very recent victim of lay on lay bullying and having observed bullying of clergy at very close hand, what efforts are being made to put discipline for lay people into effect (e.g. banning them from a particular church and its activities)?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I am very sorry that you have experienced bullying. Legislation is a blunt instrument for resolving conflict, as shown by the Clergy Discipline Measure cases you mention. A review of the CDM under Bishop Tim Thornton is looking at the issues of malicious complaints by the laity, and it would be best to await the outcome of that review before considering the possibility of a Laity Discipline Measure with legal sanctions on lay people. This would be a substantial project, as sanctions could only be imposed on lay people in accordance with natural justice which would involve thorough investigation,

checks and balances, and the right to be accompanied, and to appeal. In the case of serious bullying, the police should be informed.

84. *Mrs Enid Barron (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Noting the motion on Climate Emergency (ref GS 2159) if he would update the Synod on progress on implementing the provisions at (c) and (d) of the London/Truro Environmental Programmes Motion passed by Synod in February last year, and on any further progress in strengthening the Church of England's Environment Programme?

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam)* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Of 42 dioceses, 35 have Diocesan Environment Officers and 28 have designated members of the bishop's staff.

We are aware that many of the DEOs are thinly resourced and often volunteers. Their workload has increased with the (very welcome) growing priority on the environment within the Church.

The Environmental Working Group has recently updated its plan, geared to accelerating progress.

The Energy Footprinting Tool for churches is being piloted with four dioceses, aiming for a national roll-out in March 2020.

Communication between dioceses is encouraged through the regional networks of DEOs, an online forum, and the annual conference of DEOs and DACs.

Staff resources at Church House have been increased.

We are promoting a co-ordinated environmental Lent Campaign, the environment is a key theme at Lambeth2020, there will be a focus on the Season of Creation in the autumn, and we are working towards a strong faith voice at COP26

The Dignity at Work guidance published in 2008 encourages dioceses and parishes to adopt anti bullying policies and promote a culture of mutual respect throughout the Church.

*Mrs Enid Barron:* I want to thank the Bishop for the very encouraging and full answer, which shows great progress since this time last year on environmental issues. My question relates to the first part of the answer on Diocesan Environment Officers where we are told there are now 35 dioceses with Environment Officers. I would just like to ask how that figure breaks down in terms of resources dedicated within each diocese to the environment, meaning how many full-time salaried DEOs are there, how many part-time salaried DEOs, how many Environment Officers combine that role with quite a lot of other responsibilities, and how many voluntary DEOs there are.

*The Bishop of Salisbury:* What a wonderful question, Enid. The work of DEOs is a really significant way in which we are delivering the environmental programme of the Church of England. They are an extraordinary group of people, many of whom are volunteering their time and only some of whom are employed. I cannot give you the breakdown of figures that you have asked for, but I am very willing to bring that breakdown of figures to the environmental debate taking place on Wednesday so that you get the measure that this work is depending on a very large number of people doing this across the Church of England in a great variety of ways, actually pretty effectively, and I am really grateful for them. I will bring you the breakdown of figures that you ask for on Wednesday.

*Mrs Enid Barron:* Bishop, I would be delighted to see those figures. I am grateful to everybody too.

*The Bishop of Salisbury:* They are available and they have been gathered at various stages. It is, of course, like dealing with a blancmange, inasmuch as it changes shape almost daily.

*The Chair:* Dealing with a blancmange. Synod, we have reached 7.00 pm.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Point of order. Given the time, and given we have another 40 questions still to go, and given that the Chair of the Business Committee has indicated already this afternoon that there may have to be some rescheduling over coming days, I wonder whether she would consider looking to see whether a second session of Questions could be slotted in to deal with the remaining questions.

*The Chair:* I am advised that that is not a matter for the Chair and that, if it wishes to respond, the Business Committee will do so in due course, at another time. So it is 7.00 pm. That now concludes this item of business. Please do stay in the chamber as closing worship will be led by Revd Canon Leah Vasey-Saunders. Following our closing worship this evening, the Archbishop of Canterbury will dismiss Synod with a blessing. Thank you.

*Questions not reached during Synod*

## **SECRETARY GENERAL**

85. *Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester)* asked the Secretary General: In the light of the recent General Election and the ongoing Brexit saga, has the motion we passed in July on Anna Chaplaincy and Dementia been forwarded to the Government yet?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* A letter outlining the relevant part of the Synod motion was sent to the Secretary of State for Health on 23 July, with a reply then

received dated 8 August. In it, the Secretary of State commented on progress made in addressing the Government's 2020 Dementia Challenge and on its commitment "to working with a range of stakeholders to develop a new strategy for 2020–25".

86. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Secretary General: What has been the cost, in terms of finance and staff time, of producing GS Misc 1241 the Archbishop of Canterbury's Report of the Commission on the Relationship of the Channel Islands to the wider Church of England?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* The cost of this work borne by the NCIs was just under £3,000.

The cost of staff time within the Archbishops' Council allocated to this work in 2018 and 2019 is estimated at £30,000.

87. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Secretary General: GS Misc 1241 makes reference to a number of Measures that have not been enacted within the jurisdiction of the Channel Islands, including the legislation enabling women to become bishops, safeguarding and disciplinary arrangements (see §27). Before the proposed Channel Islands Measure (GS 2152) is discussed can the Secretary General advise the Synod what assurances and been sought and given, and by whom, about the future timely enactment of such legislation within the jurisdictions of the Channel Islands given that is has not yet happened?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* One of the recommendations of the Archbishop's Commission was that 'the Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure 2014 and the Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 should be extended to the Islands as soon as practicable' (paras 30 & 31 of the Report). As indicated in GS Misc 1241 (para 5), Island representatives, including the Deans of Guernsey and Jersey, have indicated that they fully support the provisions of these Measures. I understand that there is no fundamental policy disagreement about adopting their provisions but that their implementation needs to take account of distinctive features of the Church in the Islands – such as the absence of PCCs – hence the proposal that the Islands progress them expeditiously but in a way that takes these fully into account.

88. *Mr John Wilson (Lichfield)* asked the Secretary General: There were responses from 928 individuals to the consultation on Deanery Synod Term Limits for Lay Members which ran from May to July 2019. That seems a lot.

How does this number compare with

(a) the number of responses from individuals to the original Measure when it was remitted to Revision Stage in February 2017;

(b) other consultations of a similar nature in recent years?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* The response rate to this consultation was significant and we believe that this prompted the largest number of responses. The largest previous response rate was 297 in relation to the draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure in 2009. More recently, a consultation under the Legislative Reform Order relating to the Patronage of Benefices Measure received 90 responses. In comparison, at the Revision Committee stage for the Measure there were 15 submissions from members and four from non-members.

89. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Secretary General: Further to indicating – in his response to my February 2017 Question about General Synod communications (Q72) – that the National Church would be giving further consideration to how best Synod proceedings can be communicated to the wider Church, what progress has been made developing an easily-readable factual summary of the business carried at each Group of Sessions that Synod members could circulate within their diocese, such as to deanery synod and PCC members?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* The Central Secretariat has engaged with Diocesan Secretaries in advance of the February group of sessions to produce a briefing note which can be shared with stakeholders. This was circulated on Friday 24 January.

There will be a post-Synod briefing which will be sent to diocesan secretaries, and this can be circulated to Synod members as well.

90. *Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells)* asked the Secretary General: Further to the helpful answer to my Question (No 37) in the November Questions: now the General Election is out of the way, have there been further discussions with the General Register Office and the Government about the practicality and timing of changes to marriage registration procedures as they may affect Church of England parishes; and, if so, what has been the outcome?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* Once the Election was over, staff met with a representative of the General Register Office. It was clear that the GRO intended to lobby an incoming Minister with their existing plan for a two-stage process involving a Registration Document later submitted to the Registrar in order for a Certificate to be issued. We continue to object to that proposal as it involves an additional complication for couples, and because it risks creating a perception that the issue of the Certificate, rather than the wedding service, would be the “real” moment at which a couple were married.

Staff therefore ensured that, as soon as he took up office, the incoming Minister received a carefully prepared document setting out the Church’s position. To date, we have had no response from the Minister and no further conversations with the GRO.

91. *Revd Charlie Skrine (London)* asked the Secretary General: Thank you for publishing last year the names of the 680 churches with 25 or more under-16s, and for the excellent GS 2161 for this Synod. Noting that the data in GS 2161 is based upon an updated list of 903 parishes, would you please publish (on the website and the noticeboard) the names of those 903 parishes (perhaps alphabetically within each of the three different attendance bands as before)?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* Yes. The information requested is on the noticeboard.

## **CLERK TO THE SYNOD**

92. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: Based upon the total number of lay persons on electoral rolls by diocese and the total number of licensed clergy by diocese, and assuming that the total number of seats in the Houses of Laity and Clergy are as at present, how many members of each House would be allocated to each diocese on the basis that (a) seats are allocated between the provinces on a purely proportional basis, (b) each diocese has a minimum of one seat in each House, and (c) seats are allocated between the dioceses on a purely proportional basis?

*Revd Canon Dr Jeremy Worthen replied as Acting Clerk to the Synod:* Appendix E in GS 2162 shows the number of seats allocated on a purely proportional basis.

Currently, the Church Representation Rules specifies that each diocese must have at least three directly elected members, with the exception of Sodor and Man which is to elect only one member (49(2)). Canon H 2 specifies that the total number of proctors directly elected and specially elected from the dioceses in the province shall not exceed 133 in the case of the Province of Canterbury, 58 in the case of the Province of York, and no diocese shall have fewer than three directly elected proctors except the diocese of Sodor and Man which shall have one proctor.

However, the allocation of seats based on a minimum of one seat has been placed on the noticeboard.

93. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: Bearing in mind the cost of General Synod to the dioceses and the need to keep costs as low as possible compared with the relatively high costs of equipment hire for those hosting fringe meetings, has consideration been given as to whether such costs could be absorbed into the overall costs of the use of Church House by General Synod so as to make it easier for a greater variety of voices to be heard by members?

*Revd Canon Dr Jeremy Worthen replied as Acting Clerk to the Synod: Costs relating to fringe meetings as set by the Corporation of Church House are currently borne by the organisation that books them. There are no plans to transfer these to the Vote 2 budget or to the costs that are re-charged directly to dioceses.*

## **NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL**

94. *Dr William Belcher (Gloucester) asked the Chair of the National Society Council: What assessment has the National Society Council made of the Relationships and Sex Education (RSE) resources recommended by the Department of Education in so far as they relate to sexual activity outside marriage and with multiple partners, and the use of condoms?*

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Acting Chair of the National Society: The Department for Education has an indicative list (not recommendations) of some of the resources that are available to support schools in this area of the curriculum. We support the department's view that each school should carefully assess each resource they propose to use to ensure they are appropriate for the age and maturity of pupils and sensitive to their needs. We have produced a Charter for RSE to encourage all schools to deliver RSE in a way that respects the faith and beliefs of all the families they serve. Schools are also signposted by the DfE to the resources and model curricula provided by the Catholic Education Service.*

95. *Dr William Belcher (Gloucester) asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Will the National Society Council recommend resources that prioritise safeguarding children, such as those produced by Alive to the World, Lovewise, Fertile Heart and others, which, as required by the law, match the religious background of pupils?*

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Acting Chair of the National Society: The Education Office has been consulted by many of the main providers of Personal, Social, Health and Economic (PSHE) resources (for example, Jigsaw, Coram, Heartsmart, Love and Sex Matters) to support them in making their resources suitable for Church schools. As with other areas of the curriculum we leave the decision as to which resources to use to the professional judgement of teachers and leaders in our schools as they are best placed to make this decision, being most aware of the needs of their pupils in their context. We are also working with some individual dioceses to determine how their own curricula guidance in this area can be made more widely available. In setting out a Church of England Charter for RSE <https://www.churchofengland.org/more/education-and-schools/church-schools-and-academies/relationships-sex-and-health-education>, we have made it clear that schools should promote faith-sensitive RSE and also ensure that when they consult parents they provide examples of the resources they plan to use.*

## **CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL**

96 *Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: There is a concern that a disproportionate number of applications for the closure of church buildings has occurred in areas characterised by social deprivation. What research has the Church Buildings Council conducted into this, and where are the results available?

*Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry replied on behalf of the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* Decisions to close a church are made by a parish with its diocese. The Council provides advice on the heritage interest of churches being considered for closure or whose future is under consideration. This will draw attention to opportunities for development of the building that could help it find a sustainable future.

The Council has recently undertaken research on this subject. It found that just under half of the churches which seek a report close within five years. Churches in areas characterised by social deprivation are more likely to seek advice on their future and more likely to go on to close. The findings are published on the Church of England website.

The Council strongly encourages dioceses to take a strategic approach to the place each of their churches takes in delivering the mission and ministry of the church. Resources are available from the National Church Institutions to help them.

97. *Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: What uniform & transparent criteria are used by Diocesan Advisory Committees (DACs) in both English provinces to consider applications for changes to church buildings to support mission in the 21st century?

*Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry replied on behalf of the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* All DACs must have due regard of the role of a church as a local centre of worship and mission. As faculty replaces listed building consent for churches, DACs must balance the mission and worship benefits of proposals with their impact on the building.

The Church Buildings Council monitors its own decisions and publishes these as 'policy and precedents' on the Church of England website. These are shared with dioceses and the Council encourages DACs to refer to this document or establish a local equivalent to support consistent advice.

Changes to the online faculty system coming into force on 1 April will make it easier for everyone to see papers associated with a faculty application. Making documents public will encourage consistency.

## **COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY**

98. *Revd Canon Geoffrey Harbord (Sheffield)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: Are any events being planned to commemorate the 90th anniversary next year of

the Bonn Agreement between the Church of England and the Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht?

*The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner) replied as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:* The Council for Christian Unity is not aware of any such events but would be glad to be informed of them.

99. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: What was the involvement of the Church of England in the Enabling Group of the Churches Together in England's decision to request the Fourth Presidency Group refrain from enacting its Presidency?

*The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner) replied as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:* The Church of England has three members on the Enabling Group of CTE. All three were present and participated fully on the first day of discussions. On the second day, when the decision was taken, only one could be present. There is no verbatim record of what was said during the deliberations that led up to that decision as much of the discussion was in small groups under 'Chatham House Rules'. The decision was made by secret ballot.

## **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

100. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: In the interests of clarity, consistency and comparability of diocesan board of finance annual accounts, what guidance is provided to dioceses on their accounting practices both in general and on specific aspects such as (a) the frequency with which land and buildings should be revalued and (b) the categorisation of funds as permanent endowment/expendable endowment/restricted/etc?

*Mr Carl Hughes replied on behalf of the Chair of the Finance Committee:* As registered charities, DBFs must prepare their accounts in accordance with accounting standard FRS102 and the Charities SORP (Statement of Recommended Practice). Land and buildings can be valued at historic cost or be revalued regularly: the Charities SORP gives the example of once every five years for operational assets. The value of investment assets must be reported at 'fair value' so require an annual revaluation.

The Diocesan Accounts Group, a group of diocesan finance directors and accounting experts, have produced the Diocesan Accounts Guide which provides advice to dioceses on the recommended accounting practices, including model accounting templates. Detailed guidance is given on the accounting treatment of funds governed by Measures such as the Diocesan Pastoral Account and Diocesan Stipends Fund. Valuations of land and property are in accordance with FRS102 and the SORP.

101. *Revd David Tolhurst (Durham)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: Further to the decision taken in the February 2019 Session with regard to the Parochial Fees Measure, in particular the removal of a PCC Fee for services held in Crematoria or Cemetery Chapels; can the Archbishops' Council, once 2020 data is available and with and feedback from Deaneries, assess the impact this change has made (1) financially in parishes, (2) pastorally, including the numbers of these services being undertaken by parochial clergy?

*Mr Carl Hughes replied on behalf of the Chair of the Finance Committee:* Since the DBF fee was increased by the same amount as the previous PCC fee, there has been no overall financial impact on the total fee level. Dioceses have the freedom to mitigate the effect of this change on parishes through whatever means they feel appropriate. The NCIs will continue to review the data that is available on income from fees and the number of funerals. However, this data is collected at an aggregated level and it is likely that several factors affect the trend in the number of funerals undertaken by parochial clergy, creating difficulties in measuring the impact of this change in isolation.

102. *Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: In drafting the Parochial Fees and Scheduled Matters Amending Order 2019, what consultation was undertaken to establish the impact of reducing the PCC fee to zero, in several cases, on deaneries where the administration of occasional offices is devolved to a lay administrator funded by assignment of such PCC fees to the Deanery?

*Mr Carl Hughes replied on behalf of the Chair of the Finance Committee:* General Synod approved this Order last February. The Fees Order was proposed by the Archbishops' Council on the recommendation of its Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee and the Council's Finance Committee was consulted. These bodies included Archdeacons, parish clergy, Chairs of Diocesan Boards of Finance (DBF), diocesan secretaries and PCC members. So although no specific consultation was undertaken, a range of stakeholders had the opportunity to provide their perspective on the draft Order. Whilst the PCC fee was reduced to zero, the DBF fee was increased by the corresponding amount. DBFs have the freedom to mitigate this change in whatever way they feel appropriate and we understand that some dioceses have already done so.

103. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: Are there any central resources that could be available to support Diocesan Investment Committees in their risk assessment of potential investments, for example in relation to the new emerging environmental sector?

*Mr Carl Hughes replied on behalf of the Chair of the Finance Committee:* The provision of investment advice is a regulated activity. None of the National Church Institutions is authorized to provide investment advice on potential investments.

In making their investment decisions Diocesan Investment Committee will find the Charity Commission publication “Charities and investment matters: a guide for trustees” (CC14) of assistance.

As reported in GS 2140 the Council is preparing to start a social impact investment programme and I hope in time the general learning points from this can be shared.

104. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: The recent review into Low Income Community Funding (LICF) raised a number of questions including whether dioceses in receipt of LICF money are consulting with lowest income communities in decisions around funding and also in the resourcing of the Church in these communities. To what extent are those dioceses in receipt of LICF implementing this recommendation?

*Mr Carl Hughes replied on behalf of the Chair of the Finance Committee:* The request to dioceses, on behalf of the Strategic Investment Board, on how they have used their Lowest Income Communities Funding in 2019, included a request to hear how dioceses had engaged their parishes serving the lowest income communities in the distribution of the funding.

The responses are still being received and analysed, but so far reveal a range of progress on this issue. There are some very encouraging examples of good practice, but most dioceses are in the process of considering about how they can target the funding on their lowest income communities better. That includes how best to engage parishes which serve those communities in that process (for example, in some cases this will be at deanery level).

The Strategic Investment Board will consider this issue as part of the wider analysis and review of the Lowest Income Communities Funding later in the year.

## **MINISTRY COUNCIL**

105. *Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What were the numbers going into training for ordination, by diocese, and in each diocese by training pathway for stipendiary ministry and by training pathway for non-stipendiary ministry?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The response to this question is presented in a graph and a table on the noticeboard.

106. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Regarding the 552 ordinands who began training in 2019, please provide a numerical breakdown for each diocese, with each diocese divided into numbers on each Training Pathway?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The response to this question is presented as in a table and a graph on the noticeboard.

107. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: For each diocese over the last five years, how many curates on appointment to their first incumbent-status position

- (a) had served their curacy in the same diocese as that first appointment;
- (b) transferred in to the diocese having served their curacy in another diocese; and
- (c) having served their curacy in the diocese, transferred out to another diocese for that first appointment?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* This information is not currently collected nationally by the Ministry Council and would require a detailed survey of each diocese to obtain the figures.

108. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: The latest Ministry Statistics provide a global breakdown of the current ordinand intake, by gender and in five-year bands. What are the equivalent figures (by gender and in five-year bands) when separated into the three different modes of ordination training: full-time residential, mixed-mode, and part-time?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The response to this question is presented as a graph on the noticeboard. The same information is not readily available in five-year bands but has been presented in RME Bands.

109. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: The latest Ministry Statistics show that 590 ordinands entered training in 2018 (54% women and 46% men). How much of the Ministry Division training budget is invested per capita in female ordinands compared to male ordinands?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The information requested is not readily available and could not be obtained without disproportionate cost. The RME block grant allocations is identical regardless of gender and is allocated only by reference to age of the ordinand at the start of training. Dioceses then have discretion on how to allocate their grant giving them flexibility to agree alternative pathways/ durations for their candidates.

110. *Revd Anne Stevens (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: As part of the annual Ministry Statistics exercise, can dioceses be asked to supply data on how many women and how many men are leading new worshipping communities?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* This information is not currently collected. Without further research it is difficult to say whether this question could be answered effectively by dioceses, the first task being to define ‘new worshipping communities’ which is, in itself, a complex question. With appropriate resources we could explore this question further.

111. *Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What help is the Ministry Division able to give to dioceses in improving their support of vocations of candidates from underrepresented groups (such as those from ethnic minorities and those who are disabled), including by providing measurement of the diversity of candidates sponsored for training for ordination in recent years?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* Each diocese is encouraged to appoint an ME (Minority Ethnic) vocations champion and a Young Vocations champion. At present 36 dioceses have appointed an ME champion and 34 dioceses have appointed a Young Vocations champion – we encourage remaining dioceses to do so. These groups are then co-ordinated and supported by the national vocations team. Regional conferences, involving groups of dioceses, are continuing to encourage BAME ordained vocations. There is a national mentor directory aimed specifically at encouraging ordained vocations from all underrepresented groups (any new mentors from General Synod are welcome and full training is provided). At present we measure regularly in relation to gender and BAME representation amongst ordinands. In 2018-19, 54% of new ordinands were women and 8.4% were of BAME heritage. A new measurement project around lay vocations is underway. We are currently undertaking research into different methods of measuring social diversity (we refer to Q112). A national strategy on encouraging vocations from those with disabilities is seen as a priority and will become a future stream of work although it is not yet fully scoped.

112. *Revd Peter Kay (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What metrics does the Church of England Research and Statistics department use for understanding and monitoring the social classes of clergy, ordinands and ordination candidates, and what numbers and trends have they seen in recent years?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* Social class is a complex and fluid aspect of diversity and has historically not been measured. The Ministry Division is collecting some quantitative and qualitative data in this area through the Living Ministry cohort study and a project is currently underway in the Vocations team, in collaboration with colleagues from the Research and Statistics team and the NECN (National Estates Church Network), to establish nationally agreed metrics for social diversity. We see this as an important step in increasing the diversity of our clergy in terms of social, educational and economic background.

113. *Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Is there any central advice given to dioceses to help them to support peripatetic people discerning a vocation who may have to move around during the discernment process from other dioceses by nature of their stage of life, family circumstances et cetera; for example something like the system for those discerning a call through the Armed Forces?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Advice is not offered centrally. At present this is usually dealt with directly between the sending and the receiving diocese on a case by case basis.

114. *Mr Mike Stallybrass (York)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given the thrust of *Setting God's People Free*, we should expect there to be a growing number of parishes, benefices, and deaneries who wish to enable and support lay vocations through employment. What strategic steps are being (or should be) taken to ensure that the Church as a whole is, and can be seen to be, a good employer with respect to such lay vocations, given that the necessary skills and knowledge of employment legislation, or even the legal ability to employ, are often not available today at the parish, benefice, or deanery level?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Whilst the thrust of *Setting God's People Free* lies in seeking to enable the whole people of God to be more engaged in living out their faith in everyday life, this task is necessarily supported by ministry roles – both lay and ordained. There are currently no national employment guidelines produced for Church employers. The terms and conditions of service are determined by the individual employer, who, in the case of someone pursuing a lay vocation, is likely to be a DBF or PCC. Most DBFs will have their own diocesan HR adviser who will be able to provide advice on how to be a good employer, and some dioceses have produced guidance for their PCCs. The Lay Ministry Advisory Group is currently carrying out work to collate and recommend resources for good practice in employment.

In November 2012, the Synod strongly encouraged all Church of England institutions to pay at least the 'Living Wage'.

115. *Revd Canon Andy Salmon (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What reassurances can you give that there are robust procedures in place to ensure that ordinands receive good quality Safeguarding training as part of their ordination training?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Ordinands must take the Basic (C0) and Foundation (C1) training modules before they come to a Bishops Advisory Panel and then the Leadership (C2) Safeguarding training module before they are ordained. This is in line with the House of Bishops' practice framework. The quality of this is assured through the annual self-

evaluation process undertaken each year by TEIs and the Periodic External Review process. Additionally, final reports to Bishops written by TEI Principals declare that this training has been completed and engaged with for every ordinand. From Autumn 2019, a national reporting process has been set up which has asked dioceses to submit the dates of completed safeguarding training for all those who have been ordained.

116. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What action has been taken to increase and support the number of ordinands who are defined as disabled under the Equality Act?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: There is a national mentor directory aimed specifically at encouraging ordained vocations from all underrepresented groups. A national strategy on encouraging vocations from those with disabilities is seen as a priority and will become a future stream of work, although it is not yet fully scoped.

Theological Education Institutions are responsible for making reasonable adjustments to enable ordinands with disabilities, including specific learning differences to access training appropriately. Currently, some national funding is available to support costs involved in diagnostic assessment and in providing additional support. The Council recently commissioned a report to suggest a new policy to give ordinands, TEIs and dioceses greater clarity over responsibilities and the financial support available. We are currently consulting over the report's recommendations. However we plan to have a new policy in place this year, which should give confidence to potential ordinands with disabilities that the church welcomes and will support them.

117. *Mr James Lee (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given the number of ordinands studying biblical languages in any given year (as stated in the answer to Question 25 in November 2019's Synod Questions), what steps are the Ministry Council taking to increase the number of ordinands studying biblical languages as part of their ordination training?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley)* replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: As stated in the answer to Question 25 in November 2019's Synod Questions, the Ministry Council's Quality and Formation Panel continues to encourage the provision to ordinands of good opportunities to learn the biblical languages in its scrutiny of curriculum proposals. Curricula are designed by TEIs who have to make difficult decisions about how to balance the different areas about which we would like ordinands to learn, while ensuring all ordinands are enabled to meet the Formation Criteria agreed by the House of Bishops.

118. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Why has the Ministry Council stopped listing numbers of independent students at TEIs (e.g. in the Ministry Statistics document) and will it consider doing so again?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* Information received from TEIs on these student numbers was found not to be sufficiently consistent and therefore potentially misleading. Work is underway to explore obtaining this information through the Moodle Virtual Learning Environment which hopefully will prove to be a more reliable source of information.

119. *Revd Canon Gary Jenkins (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What specific training do new Archdeacons receive to fulfil the different areas of their new and considerable responsibilities?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* New Archdeacons receive local induction training from their Registrar, Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor, Diocesan Secretary, DAC Secretary, and other colleagues on legal, procedural and safeguarding issues. National support is provided by the Archdeacons National Development Officer (ANDO) who provides 1-2-1 support; a new Archdeacons' Conference which covers legal, HR, pastoral and spiritual development; identifies mentors; and, facilitates training and development courses. Other training is available through the Ecclesiastical Law Society, CPAS and others, and these are signposted to Archdeacons by the ANDO.

120. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr QC (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: For more than 15 years the Revd Bassi Mirzania has worked tirelessly as founding Chaplain to the Persian/Iranian community in Great Britain and witnessed a remarkable growth in converts. She has ministered to thousands. Following her formal retirement, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York have decided not to appoint a successor. Who, specifically, is now ministering to this very significant group of converts?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* Clergy who hold particular posts, sometimes described as chaplaincies, are under the licence and care of the Diocesan Bishop and not the authority of the Archbishops. It will be for diocesan bishops to decide whether to continue such appointments. Ministry to Persian and Iranian Christians is very important and a number of bishops are already involved in this work.

121. *Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What did the most recent inspection report on Westcott House say about its governance, in particular the quality of its leadership and its financial position?

*The Bishop of Berwick (Rt Revd Mark Tanner) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Ministry Council:* The Periodic External Review report on Westcott House, published in September 2019, commented on the need to "increase the strategic and financial skills available to support the college" and recommended that the Council work with their new chair to do so. The Report noted with concern that the college was clearly running its

core business at a loss. The reviewers saw this as an issue not only for the college but for the Church's wider review of funding structures for ministerial training. In addition, the lead reviewer alerted senior Ministry Division and Archbishops' Council staff to Westcott House's financial situation although the urgency of this was not known until after the Report was published.

*Revd Canon Leah Vasey-Saunders* led the Synod in an act of worship.

## **Full Synod: Second Day Tuesday 11 February 2020**

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 10.30 am.

### **ITEM 501 SPECIAL AGENDA I DRAFT CATHEDRALS MEASURE (GS 2136A)**

*The Chair:* Good morning, members of Synod. We come now to Item 501, the Report of the Revision Committee on the draft Cathedrals Measure. You will need the Report of the Revision Committee, which is GS 2136Y, and the draft revised Measure itself, GS 2136A. This item also has a financial implication and you can read about that on Notice Paper VI.

I now call upon the Chair of the Revision Committee, the Dean of Southwark, to move the motion "That the Synod do take note of this Report". You may speak for no more than ten minutes.

*Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark):* Chair, it was recently reported that Britain, with its wonderful castles and coastline and cathedrals, came second in *Lonely Planet's* recommendations for best places for people to visit this year. If you are interested in who beat us to the top spot, it was the Himalayan Kingdom of Bhutan, which, I have to admit, even the loveliness of Durham Cathedral perched on its promontory would find it hard to compete with.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Rubbish.

*Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark):* Thank you. We all know that our cathedrals are part of the rich heritage of this country, national treasures that we have the privilege of caring for and day in, day out, open for the people of England to visit, to worship in, to encounter God in. But, friends, we need to be fit for purpose in the 21st century, with robust governance structures, healthy finances and excellence at every level.

It was for this reason that the draft Cathedrals Measure received First Consideration at the July 2019 group of sessions, following Synod's request in July 2018 for a draft Measure to be brought forward to implement those recommendations in the Cathedral Working Group (CWG) Report that required legislative change. The Revision Committee, which was set up after the July Synod, and has met on five occasions, was aware that each of the 42 cathedrals is different and operates within its own particular local circumstances. Therefore, when considering amendments to the draft Measure, the Committee sought, where possible, to strike a balance between the need to provide consistency across all cathedrals and the freedom for cathedrals to make the adaptations they need to flourish in their particular situations.

We favoured enabling clauses over prescriptive requirements and have sought to keep the legislation as light touch as was practical, using guidance where possible. Finally, we have tried to provide clarity on the separation between the governance role of the chapter and the operation and management roles of clergy and staff.

You may well remember that I was less than complimentary about some of the recommendations of the CWG Report and some of what was then included in the draft Measure when it first came before us. I now want to wholeheartedly commend the Measure to you at this stage of the process, and to thank Eva Abeles for her amazing work and that of the entire legal team.

In the time I have, Chair, I just want to highlight where the principal changes are. These are outlined in the Report from page 2 onwards. Firstly, the Committee considered that it was important for the draft Measure to be clear about the cathedral's central role in the diocese and its role in mission. This is now where the Measure begins in clause 1.

Secondly, we looked at the proposals around the future of cathedral councils. The Committee amended the draft Measure to confer a power on chapters to set up an advisory council of stakeholders should they wish to do so. Such an advisory council would not have any statutory functions but would have those functions conferred on it by the chapter in its statutes, which could include many of the advisory functions currently undertaken by councils.

Thirdly, the place of administrators, receiver-generals, call them what you will, who are presently members of chapter. The Committee agreed with the principle that a paid employee should not be a member of the chapter so that there is a clear separation between the governance and management roles and functions in the cathedral. However, in recognition that in some cathedrals there is a desire that present post holders retain their position on chapter, transitional provisions have been made.

There was a degree of push back, not least from deans, on the notion of a vice chair of the chapter. The Committee decided that the term "vice chair" was unhelpful, let us say, and so recast it as "senior non-executive member". Although this role includes chairing

chapter meetings in the dean's temporary absence, the change of title clarifies that the role is quite distinct from that of the sub-dean, where such a position exists.

Quite a bit of work was done on the community role that non-parish church cathedrals have, not least in relation to the election of members to deanery synod, so we have amended the draft Measure to require all non-parish church cathedrals to maintain a roll which lists habitual worshippers. This list would be used to calculate the number of lay representatives on the deanery synod for that cathedral, but there is also provision to allow parish church cathedrals to have a community role as well as an electoral role if that would be useful.

One real area of concern has been around financial reporting, risk and audit, and we thought long and hard about these areas. Although it may be preferable to have a finance committee and a separate audit and risk committee, there is no legal imperative to do so. As some cathedrals may struggle to populate two committees with people of the right calibre and skills, the Committee amended the draft Measure to leave the decision as to how these functions are covered to individual cathedrals.

Another major area of change has been around the role of the bishop in relation to chapter. It is clear that as visitor they should not attend chapter meetings and, so, instead it is proposed that the chapter will be required to hold an annual special chapter meeting, which the bishop is required to attend. With regard to residentiary canons, most of the recommendations will be implemented through guidance. However, the Committee amended the draft Measure to provide clarity as to how residentiary canons will be held accountable to the chapter for their executive non-trustee functions.

The draft Measure confers an enabling power on the Church Commissioners to set the financial year end date for cathedrals. A number of people asked that this power be left out to allow for local flexibility. However, we considered that this enabling power should be retained as, although the Church Commissioners have no current plans to exercise this power, it was felt prudent to retain it so that it can be exercised should it be needed in the future.

One important area that we had to look at was removal of clergy from office. Clause 40 of the draft Measure was quite wide-ranging, including in its ambit non-cathedral clergy. Following discussions with the Charity Commission, this clause has been amended so that it only refers to cathedral clergy as the Committee considered that a separate Measure should provide for the removal and suspension of non-cathedral clergy. There is also clarification about how suspension and removal operate in relation to charity law.

Finally, the draft Measure has been considerably amended to provide for its staged implementation, as requested by the Charity Commission, and for the provisions of the draft Measure to come into force cathedral by cathedral. But there is one important date in that all chapters will have to have completed the process by 31 March 2023.

If I have tempted you with thoughts of a visit to Bhutan, I want to instead encourage you to visit your cathedrals, because we have a Year of Pilgrimage this year and we have a special passport for you to enable you to get stamps in your passport as you travel around all the cathedrals. You can buy one from your nearest cathedral bishops and then you can travel to somebody else's cathedral and see exactly what it is like, and the rest of us can do the same. Get your pilgrim passport. Ignore the advice of those travel companies. Do not go to Bhutan this year; instead, go and visit your local cathedrals. They are gems that we are very fortunate to have.

Chair, I look forward to hearing Synod's views but, as I said earlier, I have no hesitation as a dean in commending this revised draft Measure to the Church and move "That the Synod do take note of this Report".

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 57, it is not in order to debate a matter which is the subject of an amendment on the Order Paper.

*Mrs Margaret Sheather (Gloucester):* I speak as a member of the Chapter of Gloucester Cathedral. Since our debate on this Measure in July, the great sacred spaces of our cathedrals have been very much in the news, with the summer of golf and helter skelters, and with the continuing extraordinary impact of the Museum of the Moon exhibition as it continued its journey around the country. Chichester Cathedral even got a mention on "The News Quiz" last Friday – see me afterwards if you missed it. At Gloucester Cathedral the upward trend in Christmas attendance continued, as I imagine it did in many others, and all the while the daily cycle of worship, prayer and welcome has continued.

It feels very important, therefore, as the Dean of Southwark has already said, that the governance and working practices of these places should match what they achieve in this lively range of ways and be robust enough to enable their continuing challenges to be faced and negotiated successfully. In Gloucester we welcome this Measure and all that it seeks to put in place for cathedrals' current and future life. It is clear that thoughtful and careful work has gone in the Revision Group to bring the revised Measure back to us, and we want to thank them very much for that, and also to thank those who have done the similar, very careful work to develop the intended relationship with the Charity Commission. The result addresses skilfully many of the concerns that were raised in the earlier discussions, and it is clear that all the points that were put to the Revision and Steering Groups have been thoughtfully addressed.

As has already been said, there is a tremendous variation in the life and work of cathedrals across the country and it is good to see those variable starting points now being reflected in the balance of the Measure and the items that are going to then be included in guidance. I hope that we are going to see the resources which have been put aside, and it is good to see in the Financial Statement that those have been identified,

really ready with practical support at the time when the cathedrals that need them need to start to make use of them. The availability of legal advice is particularly welcome. We also welcome the light touch of the Measure and the extensive use of the guidance to allow for the creative variation that exists.

We can offer some experience from Gloucester, I think, as some departures from key roles several years ago could have been a crisis for us. But thanks to joint work with the diocese, the chapter was able to identify the serious changes that were necessary to put the operation on a firm and sustainable footing.

The work to deliver those changes is now well advanced, including new lay appointments to chapter, to strengthen the expertise and oversight, in the way the Measure seeks to achieve. The process of change inevitably continues as new initiatives throw up new needs. There have been some tough times to be negotiated and finance is always a challenge, as in other places. But we can say to others who may be concerned about what the changes might demand of them or what the disturbance to their lives and operations might be, that facing the issues and making the most of the opportunities that they offer can be a really good and successful process.

In that process, relationships, both internal and external, will still be key both to achieving the transition, which is not a minor one, as well as to the effective functioning of the new structures in the future. It does not matter how good the governance structures are and how excellent the reporting is if people are not working hard on constructive relationships, and that continues to need to be the context for all of these changes.

The saying goes that you should “never waste a good crisis”, and that proved true for us in Gloucester, and I am sure it can prove true as we work from the crisis that prompted the original Working Group Report to develop into this Measure and to see it implemented. I think it will be clearly a catalyst for important development that I hope I now will receive wide support.

*Revd Canon Deborah Flach (Europe):* In the Diocese in Europe we warmly welcome the draft Cathedrals Measure and, although we are not perhaps as attractive as Bhutan, I can offer you, oh Dean of Southwark, an invitation to meet our newly appointed Dean in Gibraltar – not bad – or a visit to one of our two Pro-Cathedrals, either in Brussels or in Malta. Do consider this on your very smart blue passport. I commend this Measure for your approval.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so I call upon the Dean of Southwark to reply to the debate.

*Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark):* I am very grateful to Margaret and Debbie for their contributions. I am looking forward to taking up the opportunity to go to Gibraltar. I have been there, I have been to that cathedral, and I will go again. Malta, yes, lovely

place, I have been to that Pro-Cathedral, so I am happy to go again if you are paying. We are very grateful to those who have designed the blue passport and the Archbishop did notice that little fact when I handed it over to him. I hope you will use it.

Margaret, thank you so much for mentioning some of the resources and support that will be available to cathedrals in order to do this very important piece of work in actually transferring what is in the Measure into the life of cathedrals. There is going to be support, guidance and templates for us to work through. There will be background advice as well in order that we can do that well and do it speedily. There will be various tranches of cathedrals going through final registration with the Charity Commission to enable them to deal with all that work. Thank you for highlighting the importance of that, but also, I think, the importance of relationships within cathedrals. That is really what is at the foundation of everything. You cannot legislate for relationships. Those things have to be built together as we do the tasks that we are given to do in our wonderful cathedrals.

I began by saying how important our cathedrals are, not just in the life of the Church but in the life of the nation. All who are involved in the governance of our cathedrals, staff and volunteers, need to be thanked for the amazing job that they do. This new Measure will help us to be even more fit for purpose, so I commend it to you again for the next stage of the revision process and thank again the members of the Revision Committee with whom I have served, and the legal team, for the amazing work that they have done.

*The Chair:* We now put Item 501 “That the Synod do take note of this Report” to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We now come to the Revision Stage for the draft Measure. Amendments and other motions appear on the Order Paper for today. Where no notice has been given of any amendments to particular clauses, and no members have indicated they wish to speak against those clauses, I give my permission under Standing Order 58 to the clauses being taken en bloc.

As this is the Revision Stage we will also have to use the 40-member procedure under Standing Order 59. Where an amendment is moved by someone other than a member of the Steering Committee, and is not simply consequential on an amendment that has already been passed, the mover has no more than five minutes to speak to it. I will then call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for no more than five minutes in reply. If the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken.

## **ITEM 510**

*The Chair:* We begin with clause 1, which is Item 510, and I ask Adrian Greenwood to move his amendment. You may speak for no more than five minutes.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I am an honorary lay Canon of Southwark Cathedral and was from 2012 to 2016 the Bishop of Southwark's lay appointee on the Chapter of Southwark Cathedral. I am the current lay Chair of Southwark Diocesan Synod and I am also a member of Archbishops' Council, which commissioned the original Report.

This is a very simple one-word amendment – simple but I hope significant – and I hope that Synod will support it. The opportunity to legislate for the governance of cathedrals only comes around once in a generation, so we need to get it as right and as fit for purpose as possible. Those of you who have read the Report of the Revision Committee, GS 2136Y, will know that I expressed concern that the Cathedrals Measure failed adequately to address the relationship between the cathedral and the diocese, so I am very grateful indeed that the Revision Committee has introduced new clause 1(b), as emphasised by the Dean, so that now the clause reads, “A person on whom a function is conferred by or under this Measure must, in exercising that function, have due regard to: (b) the importance of each cathedral's role in providing a focus for the life and work of the Church of England in the diocese”.

Thank you very much, a very clear commitment in the opening clause that underpins the whole Measure. So why am I, like Oliver Twist, coming back for more? I hope you would all agree that the promotion of reconciliation and unity in Christ is central to the good news of the Kingdom of God and to the church of which Jesus Christ is the head.

John 17:20-21 reads in the NIV, “20 My prayer is not for them alone. I pray also for those who will believe in me through their message” – – that is us – “21 that all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us so that the world may believe that you have sent me”. That is not only a prayer for unity but unity with a purpose: that is that the world may believe.

Jesus said something very similar after washing his disciples' feet in John 13: “A new command I give you: ‘Love one another. As I have loved you, so must you love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples’”.

St Paul combined the themes of unity and love in his letter to the Philippians, Chapter 2: “Therefore if any of you have any encouragement from being united with Christ, if any comfort from his love, if any common sharing in his spirit, if any tenderness and compassion, then make my joy complete by being like-minded, having the same love, being one in spirit and one in mind”.

Building on these foundations, Anglican ecclesiology sees the bishops as the focus of unity and mission in their dioceses and, of course, the cathedral is where the seat of the diocesan bishop is located. It is noteworthy to me and no doubt deliberate by the Revision

Committee that new clause 1(b) uses the word “focus”. At the start of this new decade so much of our national and global society has experienced division or divisions which extend unfortunately into our beloved Church. Who will lead us forward in reconciliation and unity? Fortunately, our wonderful Archbishop Justin is setting a great example.

Synod, we have a special opportunity here to support him through the Cathedrals Measure to enable and encourage our bishops and cathedrals to be that focus for unity in Christ, for our dioceses, for unity in the Church of England, for unity between cathedral, bishop and diocese in the mission of God. Please support this amendment so that sub-clause (b) would read “the importance of each cathedral’s role in providing a focus for the life, work and unity of the Church of England in the diocese”. I beg to move.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to speak for no more than five minutes in reply.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I am Chair of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has sympathy with Mr Greenwood’s amendment, but we do not believe that it adds anything to the legislation. Indeed, it may actually confuse it and make it less clear. Law should be clear and this amendment can be open to different interpretations as to what unity means and, indeed, does that include reconciliation? The Steering Committee considers that opening up the potential for disagreement in the context of what unity means in this context could have the opposite effect to that which Adrian intends.

In addition, there is a real concern that imposing such a duty could be used to undermine the independence of the cathedral and its chapter. As such, the Steering Committee resists this amendment.

*The Chair:* So the Steering Committee does not support the amendment. It will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or indicate in some other way their wish for the debate on this amendment to continue. Are there 40 members? There are not 40 members standing in their places. So the amendment lapses and we need to put 511 to the vote. Let us have a member of the Steering Committee come and move Item 511.

## **ITEM 511**

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move “That clause 1 stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* Is there any debate on 511?

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* Having listened to Robert Hammond just there, talking about clarity and trying to put two and two together, I note that in the IICSA Report that we will

be seeing later this week, there has been criticism over the clarity that the words “due regard” give. I just wonder whether or not there is something that can be done. I will not oppose this particular motion at the moment, but I think we ought to consider whether or not due regard is the right sort of thing to have in our legislation going forward.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so could a member of the Steering Committee reply to the debate on 511?

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I understand there is some work being done, including with IICSA, on understanding exactly what “due regard” means, and due regard is the legal phrase that is normally used in this context, so we would propose staying with that.

*The Chair:* Thank you, so let us put 511 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 512**

*The Chair:* So, we now move on to Item 512, so could I ask a member of the Steering Committee to move “That Clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move “That clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, in which case we put 512 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 513**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 513, which involves the assertion of a new clause, 5A. Can I invite Carl Hughes to move his amendment, Item 513. You may speak for up to five minutes.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* Thank you, Chairman. I had not quite realised that I was going to be part of such a Southwark tag team on the Cathedrals Measure this morning. Over the past four years I have been blessed with the opportunity to immerse myself in the details of how our great cathedrals are run, managed and governed: firstly, when I was asked to undertake an initial review of the financial condition of Peterborough Cathedral in 2016, thereafter leading a small team which worked with Bishop Donald on his formal visitation of the cathedral; secondly, through serving on the Cathedrals Working Group; and thirdly, most recently, by serving on the Cathedrals Measure Revision Committee.

The draft Measure that is before us today has been significantly enhanced and refined during the revision process, with input from members of Synod, cathedral communities and the Charity Commission. This Measure will assist in aligning cathedrals with current best practice in terms of charitable management and governance. However, there is one area of the Measure which has given me cause for concern and hence my decision to propose this amendment concerning cathedrals' community roles.

I would just like to say in passing that I am enormously grateful for the considerable assistance from Eva and the Legal Office in helping me to draft this amendment.

In the latter stages of the Revision Committee's deliberations, the Dean of St Paul's made a very helpful intervention, drawing the Committee's attention to his concern that the provisions of the original Measure, when combined with the Church Representation Rules, enable those who are not habitual worshippers to be represented in the governance structures of the Church of England, for example, on elections to deanery synods. This matter was addressed by the Revision Committee through the revisions to paragraph 3 in Schedule 1.

For parish church cathedrals, the electors for deanery synod representatives are those whose names are on the electoral roll of the parish. However, for non-parish church cathedrals, the electors for deanery synod representatives are persons aged over 16 whom the dean has declared to be habitual worshippers. This reflects the historical practice of Royal Peculiars and is clearly at variance with parish church cathedrals and all other Church of England parishes.

It is not apparent to me why the qualifications to be on the roll for non-parish church cathedrals should be different from those parish church cathedrals and all other parishes, i.e., the roll should comprise those who are baptised, aged 16 or over, members of the Church of England or a church in communion with it, and have habitually attended public worship at the cathedral during the preceding six months.

The new clause 5A, set out in my amendment, thus aligns the rolls of non-parish church cathedrals with parish church cathedrals and parishes more generally, while still enabling all cathedrals to maintain a wider community role for, amongst other things, the election of non-executive chapter members. This latter option also aligns cathedrals with parish churches where the electorate for churchwardens is broader than simply the electoral roll of the parish. In addition, I believe that the new clause 5A is much clearer than paragraph 3, sub-paragraphs 2 – 4 in Schedule 1, as currently drafted.

Synod, I very much hope that you will agree that it would be appropriate for the rolls of non-parish church cathedrals to be prepared on the same basis as is used across the rest of the church, other than by the Royal Peculiars, particularly as the people on these

rolls are the electorate for non-parish church cathedral deanery synod representatives. Accordingly, I beg to move this amendment.

*The Chair:* Could we have a member of the Steering Committee to reply?

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* The Steering Committee accepts this amendment from Carl Hughes and the necessary consequential amendments. This is because instead of aligning the non-parish church cathedrals with the Royal Peculiars in relation to their deanery synod representation, being habitual worshippers, it would align them with the parishes, including parish church cathedrals, by reflecting the provisions of the Church Representation Rules for being on a parish electoral roll. This amendment is accepted as the electorate who elect a small number of the non-executive chapter members in those cathedrals which want to have such elected members will still be on those wider cathedral community rolls.

This reflects the position for PCCs, where those in the parish who are not on the PCC's electoral roll are able to vote in the election of churchwardens who are also members of the PCC. But, to be absolutely clear, whether or not Synod decides to carry this amendment, paragraph 2(7) of Schedule 1 states that only a person who is a member of the Church of England, a church in communion with it, or one subscribing to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is eligible to be a non-executive chapter member.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee accept the amendment. The matter is open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Ven. Luke Miller (London):* I very much welcome this, but there is one small detail that I think that we should look at. And it is about starting things. If you look at 2(c), then in order to be on the roll, you have, as we well understand, to have been habitually worshipping for six months, and the problem comes at the beginning of the existence of a new cathedral. Now, we might not be expecting to open new cathedrals – maybe we will – but we have actually come across this in precisely the point when we open new parishes. When a BMO church has turned itself into a parish, we ran into precisely this problem, and for six months we could not populate the PCC. At some point, it would be very useful if the lawyers could look into how, for the first six months of the existence of a new institution, it would be possible for there to be some way of defining roll membership in order that you can then populate the governance body.

*The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines):* I am a bit embarrassed to ask this, but is there a definition anywhere of “a member of the Church of England”? I remember a bishop saying to me about 20 years ago that if you think you are a member of the Church of England, you probably are. But does it mean those who are baptised, those who are baptised and confirmed? Does it mean those who are on the electoral roll? Who does it

mean? Now, I might be missing something and there is a perfectly good definition in the Church Representation Rules, but I do not know it.

Just as an aside, I would beg your patience because I have three cathedrals, and so every provision we make, I do in triplicate.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so therefore we put Item 513 to the vote that the clause be generally approved.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 514**

*The Chair:* I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 514 “That the clause be inserted in the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move that the clause be inserted the Measure.

*The Chair:* Let us move to the vote on 514.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 515**

*The Chair:* Now we move to Item 515 “That clauses 6 to 9 stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move that clauses 6 to 9 stand as part of the Measure.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so we put that to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 516**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 516, which is Dr Michael Todd’s amendment to clause 10, and so I invite him to move his amendment. You may speak for no more than five minutes.

*Dr Michael Todd (Truro):* Thank you, Chair. I wish to move an amendment to section 10 which will add to the opening statement 1, that “the chapter must direct and oversee the administration of the affairs of the cathedral and its finances”.

There is no truth in the rumour that I am moving this amendment simply to prove that there are cathedrals other than Southwark, or indeed that the Diocese of Cornwall competes with Bhutan as a place to take your new blue passport, but instead I have tabled this amendment very much at the inspiration and instigation of Truro Chapter. I should mention that whilst I am the lay Chair of the diocesan synod, I have no role in Truro Cathedral.

Although finances are mentioned a number of times in the draft Measure, and in particular at 10(1)(c) and 10(1)(d), neither of these impose a general requirement such as a regular receipt of management accounts or cash flow projections. A chapter could fulfil its specified duties just with an annual budget and signed-off accounts. In case you think that this is an unreal fear, it is only a small number of years since our diocesan finances were reported only annually to the Bishop's Council and to the Board of Finance. The introduction of monthly reporting, which I sought when for a time when I became Chair of the Board of Finance, was thought by some to be an impossible ask. We are all aware that cathedrals are becoming ever more complex operations, and in today's climate such regular scrutiny is considered a minimum fulfilment of trustee responsibilities.

I ask you not to be unduly pedantic in saying either that the amendment is too brief nor is it really necessary, but I ask you instead to respond positively to Truro Chapter's desire to reinforce the formal financial responsibilities. The chapter is not only to be responsible for what happens in the cathedral, but how it is to be resourced, and keeping the two in balance. I happily move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* A member of the Steering Committee to reply.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* Clause 10(1) of the draft Measure sets out the particular duties that the term "affairs" relates to, which includes preparing the annual budget for the chapter and the annual accounts for audit and subsequent approval, and terms of reference for any finance committee will be in the guidance as well. The Steering Committee feel that this fully covers financial matters and, in the spirit of wanting to keep the legislation as clear and simple as possible, would resist this amendment as not being necessary.

*The Chair:* Synod, you have heard that the Steering Committee do not support the amendment, and so it will lapse unless there are 40 members who stand or indicate in some other way that they wish the item to continue to be debated. Are there 40 members? There are not, so that lapses.

## **ITEM 517**

*The Chair:* I ask a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 517 "That clause 10 [as unamended] stand part of the Measure".

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move that clause 10 as unamended stands part of the measure.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The matter is open for debate. I see no one standing, so we put Item 517 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 518**

*The Chair:* Could we move on to Item 518 and a member of the Steering Committee to move this item.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move “That clauses 11 to 40 stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* This matter is open for debate. I see no one standing, so we put Item 518 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 519**

*The Chair:* We now come to an amendment to be proposed by the Steering Committee to clause 41, and so I ask a member of the Steering Committee to move the first amendment to clause 41, which is Item 519.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* The Charity Commission has been clear in its expectation that should it need to exercise its statutory powers to remove or suspend any dean or residentiary canon as a charity trustee, the draft Measure should provide for them to be removed from their ecclesiastical office in the cathedral too. Clause 41 sets out how a dean or residentiary canon would be removed or suspended from ecclesiastical office by the bishop in such a situation. It has been drawn to the attention of the Steering Committee that there are a very small number of residentiary canons who still hold the freehold office. This means that there are likely to still be some freehold officeholders in cathedrals when the charity provisions of the draft Measure start to come into force for the first cathedrals in 18 months to two years’ time.

Therefore, Clause 41 needs to be widened so that the power to remove and suspend a dean or residentiary canon on common tenure applies in the same way to a dean or residentiary canon who holds a freehold office. This is a Charity Commission expectation. To be absolutely clear, the proposed power will only relate to a dean or residentiary canon continuing to hold freehold office. The Steering Committee is therefore proposing three

amendments to clause 41 to enable the suspension or removal by a bishop of any deans or residentiary canons who hold the freehold office.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we therefore move to a vote on Item 519.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 520**

*The Chair:* We now come to an amendment to be proposed by the Steering Committee to clause 41, which is Item 520, so I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move this second amendment.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move the second amendment as part of the block of amendments that I just moved and spoke to.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we put Item 520 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 521**

*The Chair:* We now come to an amendment to be proposed by the Steering Committee to clause 41 under Item 521, so would they please move this third amendment.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move the third amendment.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore we put Item 521 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 522**

*The Chair:* I now call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 522 “That clause 41 stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move that clause 41 as amended stands part of the Measure.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, therefore we put Item 522 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 523**

*The Chair:* I now call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 523 “That clauses 42 to 52 stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move that clauses 42 to 52 stand part of the Measure.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so therefore we put this item to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 524**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 524, an amendment proposed by the Steering Committee to paragraph 1 of Schedule 1. Please can they move this item?

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move this amendment. The Revision Committee considered what should be the factor which determines whether a residentiary canon is an executive or a non-executive chapter member. The decision reached was that it should depend on a residentiary canon’s role in the cathedral rather than on whether they are remunerated for undertaking it. This means that a residentiary canon who has operational responsibility for the management functions in the cathedral is an executive chapter member, whether they are a self-supporting minister, a House for Duty minister or if their stipend is paid in whole or in part by a third party, for example the diocese or another charity.

Therefore, the definition of an executive chapter member in paragraph 1(2)(b) of Schedule 1 of the draft Measure was amended to refer to a residentiary canon who carries out cathedral duties. The term “cathedral duties” is defined in clause 44 as meaning duties whether in the chapter or in a diocese which should, in the opinion of the chapter after consultation with the bishop, be performed in or from the cathedral. As this definition is also in the 1999 Measure, it is felt to be a well understood concept for chapters to apply.

It was therefore anticipated that in the few cases where there may be uncertainty as to whether a person carried out cathedral duties for these purposes, the bishop – as visitor – would exercise their visitor’s power in clause 9(2) to determine the matter. However, the Cathedral Duties Test, as currently set out in the draft Measure, does not enable chapters to determine where a residentiary canon has only occasional cathedral duties of a minor nature that such cathedral duties are below a materiality’s threshold.

As such, it has been drawn to the Steering Committee's attention that some residentiary canons may be considered to be an executive chapter member even though they only carry out very occasional cathedral duties of a minor nature. Therefore, the Steering Committee proposes that a further clause is added, which (a) enables the chapter to determine whether the cathedral duties of any residential canon are of such minor nature that they should be disregarded for these purposes, and (b) provides that if there is a dispute on the issue, the bishop – as visitor – has the power to determine the question. Guidance will need to be produced on what may be considered to be the duties of a minor nature for these purposes.

*The Chair:* Item 524 is open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore we can move to a vote on Item 524.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 525**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Hughes's amendment at Item 525. This is a consequential amendment to Items 513 and 514 which we carried earlier on in the debate, so the 40-member rule does not apply. I invite Mr Hughes to move his amendment to paragraph 3 of Schedule 1.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* I move the amendment at Item 525.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Item 525 is open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore let us put Item 525 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 526**

*The Chair:* Now we come to the Dean of St Paul's amendment to paragraph 5 of Schedule 1. This is Item 526. I invite the Dean of St Paul's to move his amendment. You can speak for no more than five minutes.

*Very Revd David Ison (Dean of St Paul's):* The deans, as the Dean of Southwark said, are very supportive of the Measure and its careful balancing of powers and accountability in setting out the roles of chapter, the bishop and the regulators, being the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commission. And a key part of the recommendations was that chapter would appoint all but one of its own non-executive members, but the bishops should appoint one non-executive member after consulting the chapter. The post initially called Vice Chair, but now with the longer descriptor of the senior non-executive member. I hope people enjoy being called SNEMs in future.

This is a full member of chapter who could, in a worst-case scenario, convene the non-executive members of chapter to hold chapter's executive members to account. It is, however, for chapter members to hold the executives of chapter to account, and the senior non-executive member does that as a chapter member not as the bishop's appointee.

It is also important that the senior non-executive member should not be too closely associated with a bishop, not only because the bishop needs to preserve his or her role as an independent visitor should a situation require it, but also because the senior non-executive member as a charity trustee needs to be accountable to chapter and not to the bishop. It is important that the SNEM is not perceived as having a potential conflict of interest or loyalty in exercising that role.

At their recent meeting, the deans identified a possible upset of this careful balance that could occur if a member of the bishop's staff were to be appointed by the bishop as the senior non-executive member. It is possible for one or two ordained non-executive members to be appointed to the chapter, and having a suffragan bishop, an archdeacon or a diocesan secretary appointed as the senior non-executive member would potentially undermine the role of the dean in chapter, and certainly make the dean's relationship with the bishop's senior staff more difficult.

Accordingly, this amendment is brought forward following advice from the Legal Office on the wording to disallow the appointment of bishops' senior staff to this role. It refers to the specific roles because there is no single definition in law of what constitutes the membership of a bishop's senior staff. The intention of the amendment is positive rather than negative in aiming to preserve the clarity in the proposed Measure regarding the respective roles of bishop, chapter and its non-executive members, and I commend it to you on behalf of the Deans. I beg to move.

*The Chair:* A member of the Steering Committee to speak in reply, please.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* The Steering Committee is grateful to the Dean of St Paul's for this amendment. The Steering Committee sees merit in the senior non-executive member of chapter not being one of the senior clergy in the diocese, or the diocesan secretary, so we are happy to accept Dean Ison's amendment.

*The Chair:* So the Steering Committee accept that amendment. The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we can put Item 526 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 527**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 527, an amendment proposed by the Steering Committee to paragraph 5 of Schedule 1. A member to move, please.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* Now, Synod, please bear with me on this one. Deep breath. Paragraph 5(2)(b) of Schedule 1 prevents the senior non-executive member from having any other role or function in a cathedral. The question was raised as to whether this would prevent a senior non-executive member from chairing chapter committees, which was not the intention of this clause.

Paragraph 3(4) of Schedule 1 of the First Consideration version of the draft Measure sought to make clear the separation between the governance and management roles in cathedrals. Paragraph 5(2)(b) sought to make this clear in relation to the role of the senior non-executive member by clarifying that they could have any other role or function in relation to the cathedral. However, it was not the intention to limit the role or function of the senior non-executive member in their capacity as a charity trustee.

The Charity Commission raised concerns to the Revision Committee that paragraph 3(4) of the First Consideration version of the draft Measure could be understood as purporting to restrict the role and/or discretion of non-executive chapter members as charity trustees in a way which does not accord with the Charities Act 2011. This is because the executive powers exercised by the executives and employees of a charity are delegated to them by the trustees and therefore the non-executive chapter members cannot be restricted in law from exercising such powers. Whilst the Charity Commission was supportive of what paragraph 3(4) sought to achieve, being the separation between governance and management functions in the cathedral, the Charity Commission considered that this should be achieved in guidance rather than in the Measure. Therefore, the Revision Committee agreed to leave out paragraph 3(4).

As it now appears that paragraph 5(2)(b) could be understood in a way that could restrict the senior non-executive member from exercising their trustee powers, which would raise the same concerns that the Charity Commission raised in relation to the original paragraph 3(4) before it was removed, the Steering Committee proposes that current paragraph 5(2)(b) of Schedule 1 is also left out of the Measure. The Steering Committee notes that as paragraph 4(3) of Schedule 1 prevents the senior non-executive member from receiving any remuneration from the cathedral, removing paragraph 5(2)(b) would not result in a senior non-executive member being able to undertake any paid executive role in the cathedral.

As new paragraph 5(3) of Schedule 1 was introduced to clarify paragraph 5(2)(b), the proposed amendment is to remove both paragraph 5(2)(b) and paragraph 5(3), as without paragraph 5(2)(b), paragraph 3 serves absolutely no purpose. I hope that is clear.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* Point of order.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Could we restrict voting on that to those who understood that speech.

*The Chair:* I am afraid, Archbishop, that is not a point of order. However, the matter is now open for debate. No one dares, do they? I see no one standing, so we put Item 527 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 528**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 528 and I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move it.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move “That Schedule 1 [as amended] stands part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we now move to a vote on Item 528.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 529**

*The Chair:* Now we move to Item 529 “That Schedules 2 to 4 stand part of the Measure”. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee. Mr Hammond, how lovely to see you.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* It is great to be back. I move “That Schedules 2 to 4 stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* Item 529 is open for debate. I see no one standing, so we move to a vote on Item 529.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 530**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Hughes’ amendment on Item 530, which is another consequential amendment to having carried Items 513 and 514. Mr Hughes, please move your amendment.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* I move the amendment at Item 530.

*The Chair:* Item 530 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so will therefore put Item 530 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 531**

*The Chair:* Now we move to Item 531 “That Schedule 5 stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* I move “That Schedule 5 stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so let us put Item 531 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 532**

*The Chair:* Now we come to Item 532 “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”. Oh, Mr Hammond.

*Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford):* Just before I do move this, may I thank Synod for your attention to what is some quite complex legislation this morning. On behalf of the Steering Committee, can I thank the legal team, particularly Eva Abeles, for her massive amount of work on this. Can I thank my vice chair Eve Poole and the whole Steering Committee for the massive amount of work that we have done, and the Revision Committee as well on this piece of legislation. Bearing that in mind, I move “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”.

*The Chair:* This item is open for debate. I would particularly welcome anyone who wants to speak to answer the Bishop of Leeds’s question about the definition of a member of the Church of England. Whether or not he is going to answer that question, Dr Harrison.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* I think that is beyond my understanding at the moment. Others will no doubt comment on who a member of the Church of England might or might not be.

Some of us will remember 1999 in this Chamber when we had a pretty tortuous debate or serious debates on the then Cathedrals Measure. One particular memory for me early on in that debate was where the Dean of Durham spoke on one side of the debate to be followed by the Bishop of Durham on the other side of the debate. Indeed, it was that sort of conversation or discussion which was very difficult. As we have discovered

through this process, it was a part-done piece of work. Sometimes we can only do so much, it seems, at one time before having to come back a bit later and perhaps get it right.

Those of us who remember the earlier debates in this particular set of sessions on this particular Measure will remember a certain caution and realistic scepticism within the Chamber from deans, members of cathedral chapters, residentiary canons, members of cathedral councils and so on. I think it is quite remarkable and wonderful how together the cathedral communities, their leaders, the leaders of dioceses, particularly the members of Synod who have been involved in this legislation, have worked so well together.

I certainly want to pay tribute, as many have, to the legal team and to the Revision and Steering Committees, to those who have given so much time and energy. I know Robert particularly, with a very difficult and complex day job, has done a remarkable piece of work as we heard just now. His humour, his grace, his ability to move things forward in a coherent way, even though perhaps some of it was a bit beyond us, is a wonderful example of Christian service. As others have done, it is great to pay tribute to that but also to see how we have moved in 20 years to a much better place. The fact there was so little, if you like, difficult debate today reflects the quality and effectiveness of this piece of legislation. I want to thank them again, particularly from those of us in the House of Laity for whom cathedrals are such an important part of our lives. Thank you.

*His Honour Judge Peter Collier (ex officio):* My understanding in answer to the Chair's question is that there is either in statute law or in any definitive case law no definition of a member of the Church of England.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I did actually ask for this matter to be clarified when the Measure which introduced the new Church Representation Rules was going through, and I was given the answer that we have just been given that there is not a definition. It is a matter of custom and practice.

When I was very young and attended my local parish church in the Diocese of Rochester, there used to be in the porch a little descriptor of the duties of a member of the Church of England, which included attending services, Bible study, prayer, fellowship, giving and what have you. So even if we cannot agree on the definition of who is a member of the Church of England, perhaps we could strive to work out what is expected of such membership.

*The Chair:* Strictly speaking, we are only debating now "That the Long Title stand part of the Measure", so keep it brief.

*The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines):* You did ask the question of definition. This is a serious point. We should not be putting in legislation terms that are not capable of legal definition. For future reference, I would refer to this.

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, I sense you might be getting very excited about something which you are not actually supposed to be debating. Mrs Durlacher and David Lamming, are you wishing to speak on Item 532 “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Only prompted by your question which has been the subject of the debate for the last two minutes.

*The Chair:* Well, forget it. I am sorry. Synod, I am going to test your mind on closure on this item.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* So now we put Item 532 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* That completes the Revision Stage for the draft Cathedrals Measure which now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of the final drafting. Thank you very much, members of Synod. Please stay in the Chamber for the next item which is term limits on deanery synods.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Derby (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 11.48 am.

## **ITEM 6 DEANERY SYNOD TERM LIMITS (GS 2154)**

*The Chair:* Synod, good morning. I did not expect to be able to say good morning as we came to this item, but, due to the extremely efficient chairing of our previous item, we come to Item 6 now, Deanery Synod Term Limits, for which you will need GS 2154. I call on Clive Scowen to move on behalf of the Business Committee. He has up to ten minutes.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* It is always so good to see a full chamber for these items. This is the first of no fewer than six items on this week’s Agenda which are what you might call the last fruit of the work of this quinquennium’s Elections Review Group, which has been my privilege to chair. Before I say anything else, I would like to thank the other members of the group, several of whom are [sitting] behind me, and all the staff who have worked so hard for us, and thank them particularly for their input and advice.

As members will recall, this time last year, during the debate on Final Approval of the draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure, the Chair of the Business Committee

announced that she had invited the Elections Review Group to undertake a consultation on Rule M8(5) of the new Church Representation Rules which has now from 1 January introduced a two-term limit for lay members of deanery synods. The group accepted this reference with great joy and decided that it would consult widely on seven options.

Those were, firstly, that the term limit as provided for in Rule M8 be retained; secondly, to reverse the default position so that there would be no term limit unless the APCM resolved to impose it; thirdly, increasing the number of consecutive terms which could be served and what that number should be; fourthly, giving the APCM power to specify what the term limit should be in that particular parish; fifthly, giving deanery synods power to impose a deanery-wide term limit; sixthly, giving diocesan synods power to impose a diocesan-wide term limit; and seventhly, reverting to the previous position where there was no power to impose a term limit.

In May, the consultation was disseminated to the members of the General Synod, diocesan secretaries, diocesan and deanery lay chairs, rural deans, PCC secretaries and the National Deaneries Network. We were overwhelmed by the response. We heard from 391 PCC secretaries, 37 PCC members, 137 lay chairs of deanery synods, 128 members of deanery synods, 46 area and rural deans, 71 members of General Synod, 48 churchwardens, 20 members of the National Deaneries Network, five diocesan secretaries, 17 other clergy, one bishop, six archdeacons and ten lay chairs of diocesan synod. 928 responses in all, including 11 anonymous ones. Maybe a lot more bishops, who knows?

We believe this to be the largest response ever received to a national consultation undertaken by the Church. Respondents were given the opportunity to give both quantitative and qualitative responses; the former involving ranking the seven options in order of preference which were then analysed using the STV software.

Option one, the term limit imposed by the new Rule M8, was not without support. 207 respondents gave it their first preference. Qualitative responses supporting it contended that new limits on terms of office can enable new members to join, the power of the APCM to disapply would enable the deanery synod to manage its local needs, and the introduction of term limits could lead to more diversity of members, including younger members particularly, as there would be an expectation that there would only be a commitment of three years. Several respondents noted that this would bring deanery synod lay members in line with the requirements for churchwardens, albeit noting that there are different responsibilities for those roles.

The most popular option, though, with 286 first preferences was the previous position where there was no power to impose term limits at all. The most common comment made by respondents was that limited terms of office for deanery synod lay members could lead to some deanery synods not being able to replace retiring members. This was related to the second most common comment, which stated that the efficacy of deanery synods

could be undermined by losing experienced members. Several respondents noted that as deanery synods only met three times a year, it can be challenging for new members to be able to deliver on their role.

Others said that there was a perceived lack of equity with other bodies, such as diocesan synods or General Synod, where there was no limit on terms of office. It was also noted that since the limit was only applicable to the laity, it could undermine the role of the laity in relation to the clergy. Some raised the question whether this could undermine the work being delivered under the *Setting God's People Free* programme. It was noted by several respondents that the decision regarding terms of office held by members should be made at the local level and that a national approach might not reflect the local situation, particularly in rural parishes.

218 gave first preference to reversing the default so that there would be no term limit unless the APCM voted to impose one, and a further 122 favoured leaving it to the APCM to decide how long any limit should be in that parish's case. So while neither the current Rule M8 nor the previous position was supported by a majority, there was a majority for there being some power to impose a term limit at local level.

When STV was applied to the results, the winner was not removing all provision for term limits but option two, reversing the default. The personal views on this matter of the members of the Elections Review Group were quite diverse, but all of us agreed that we should do our best to honour what had been said to us in such an impressive set of responses. We felt that option two should be expanded to incorporate option four, thus giving the APCM power, if it decided to impose a term limit, to specify how many consecutive terms a parochial representative could serve.

That is the proposal for which we seek approval in principle today. Unlike the position in Rule M8, the APCM could, if it wished, take into account service prior to the rule coming into effect. So, whereas no one will be affected by Rule M8 until 2026, our proposal would enable APCMs, should they so wish, to agree a limit which would disqualify a member from serving a further term from 2023.

If you approve this recommendation today, the Business Committee will bring a Church Representation Rules amendment resolution to the July group of sessions to give effect to that change. Today a simple majority will suffice, but in July a two-thirds majority will be required in each House. For that reason, I would not be unhappy if we were to have a vote by Houses today since, if there were no simple majority in each House today, there would be little point in taking up time in July to debate a resolution which was doomed to failure.

My hope, though, is that Synod will overwhelmingly approve in all three Houses this expression of the clear will of the majority of those nearly 1,000 people who responded to the consultation. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Item 6 is now open for debate. There will be a five-minute speech limit in the first instance. I call Caroline Herbert followed by Jane Steen.

*Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich):* I do not think I need five minutes. I just want to welcome the recommendation and I would urge Synod to vote in favour. Some people may find this hard to believe, but there are churches that even now cannot fill all their deanery synod places. Obviously, the imposition of a term limit would not make that any easier. In fact, it would mean the faithful few who are committed to serving on a deanery synod would then be prohibited. I am really pleased at the possibility that term limits will be done away with.

I think this will particularly impact on smaller churches, perhaps those in rural areas, where there are a few people faithfully serving and committed to the local church and the deanery, and they will be able to continue in that. For those churches where there is a queue of people champing at the bit to get on to their local deanery synod, the proposal for the APCM to be able to set a term limit in specific cases will enable that without disenfranchising the other, perhaps more churches where the deanery synod is not such in demand. Let us not forget it is not just about what happens at those three deanery synod meetings but that deanery synod members are the electors for diocesan and General Synod posts, so term limits would again disenfranchise those in many of our churches. In conclusion, please vote in favour of this motion.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* Members of Synod will not be at all surprised to hear me speak against this proposed change. We have heard that there are problems with limited terms. People will not have enough time to gain the necessary expertise. If two terms are not enough to learn the ropes of a deanery synod, they are not enough. That would be so whether an ACPM “must” limit terms or whether it “may” limit them. But I remind Synod the rules as written only require one term of absence. Nobody is being asked to leave the country. Those standing down will be available to mentor new members if that is needed, and perhaps that would be all to the good. The provisions, as we have heard, do not affect deanery synod lay members for many years.

Will new people come forward? All the Church growth research suggests that having opportunities for new people to take on roles helps them to do so. There is plenty of time for parishes to look at their deaneries for education, for preparation. If there really is no one else, PCCs can set aside the current rule, and if members cannot be found then maybe locally or more widely a long hard look is needed at the way our deaneries operate. We have had what is, by any account, a remarkable consultation on this, and our thanks are very much due to those who organised it. It was a consultation, rightly, about the option for limiting terms on deanery synods or not, but the underlying issue here is not only about terms served; it is about the chance to change the culture of the Church. We follow a Lord who changes lives, whose church once was said to have turned the world upside down. Might we just give it a go with deaneries? This will not undermine *Setting*

*God's People Free*; it just might set a lot of them quite a good deal freer than they feel at the moment.

And, yes, some will say this only affects the laity and some will say – and many of us often have said – what about the clergy? Alas, no one suggested that when we wrote the rules so let us have the laity pioneer it and if you want to come back to the clergy it is always an option.

Members of Synod, we have debated this long and hard. We searched our hearts and we came to a mind on this. As we believe that God has confidence in his Church, so I ask you to have confidence in your earlier decision, resist this attempt to amend the rules and help us to bring new life and new energy into our deaneries.

*The Chair*: After Simon Friend, I call John Mason. After Simon speaks the speech limit will move to three minutes.

*Mr Simon Friend (Exeter)*: I would urge Synod to vote against this motion. I went to my second deanery ever and was then elected lay Chair of the deanery. There were tears – my tears for realising what had happened after I was elected and tears of the then lay Chair who had been in post for many, many years. Let us say it was awkward.

We really need to bring in a new culture and a fresh approach to deaneries. There are many, many people who serve faithfully for years but feel they have to stay on and not allow space for new people to come in and grow. I think it is fair to say that when I became lay Chair we were able to reinvent the deanery and re-imagine it and take it to a new space, but it was difficult, and it was painful, and it was hard because the people in place felt they needed to stay there. I take the wonderful saying, “Unless a seed falls into the ground and dies, we cannot bear new fruit”. Sometimes we need to allow space. Sometimes we need to allow things to die in order that new fruit can come. I would urge you to vote against this motion.

*Canon Dr John Mason (Chester)*: I wish to encourage you very strongly to support this idea. It seems to me – it is very obvious, as others have mentioned – that there is a variance in other synodical bodies where there are no term limits and yet there is one being imposed specifically for deanery synods. I know that churchwardens are given term limits, but they are very different. They are executive roles and they are in positions where prolonged time in that role can have a bearing on a parish in a way which probably has an over-influence. I think the main reason why people – and we have already heard – wish to have some sort of term limit is to drive the turnover of the membership of deanery synods. My observation is simply if you wish to change culture, if you wish to change behaviours, imposing rules is rarely, if ever, a good way to do it.

If what you want is to make deanery synods more lively and get more people involved, what you need to do is make deanery synods themselves more attractive, give them more

powers, raise their profile, make it clear that what they do is of value, otherwise I think simply to impose a rule which is somewhat arbitrary is just not going to do the job. And also, from a very practical point of view, at a parish level – in small parishes and rural parishes – to be honest, these sorts of minutiae and rules are not things which are observed that strongly anyway. People will miss it. What we need to do is make deanery synods more attractive.

I was reflecting on this a little and we heard from the Archbishop earlier today in his sermon about the idea that rules and traditions and things can get in the way of human things. I think that is what is happening here. Let us just forget the idea of getting term rules and let the natural order of things take over when deanery synods become more attractive.

*Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester):* It was Karl Barth who said that faith in God has nothing to do with an ideology which glorifies the status quo. I declare an interest as a member of the Simplification Group that brought forward the change which you are now trying to change. And you are trying to change it before you have even tried it; before you have given it the opportunity to even see whether it works. You can today signify that the Church of England so loves the status quo that you would prefer to preserve the status quo before you try something different. Would you like to do that? Would you like to be culturally noted as so resistant to change that when you voted in favour of change you prefer to change it back to the status quo before you have given the change an opportunity?

I am not going to embarrass you and ask you to stand if you would like to be regarded as a revolutionary, but would you like to be regarded as someone who is prepared to signal that as a church we would like to change and move on? You have heard what could happen in a deanery synod if you adhere to and give these rules an opportunity of working. It may not be revolutionary but it is the way to bring new life.

It is said that there will be difficulties recruiting. If there are difficulties recruiting, with all due respect, the answer is not to preserve the status quo and allow the people who are in place to be Ms Haversham-like, covered with cobwebs as the years go by. The answer is to look at why there are not people willing to stand and to make more attractive the deanery synods which in a moment of humour we might say are not exciting. If they are not exciting let us do something about it. We will do nothing about it if we preserve the status quo. Let us be mildly revolutionary and, at least for a period, give the new rules the opportunity that they richly deserve. You voted in favour of then. Have the courage of your convictions for at least a period to see whether or not they work. I invite you to resist this proposal.

*Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury):* I see Mr Greenwood is standing, so I will leave it to him, if he is called, to remind you of the background to this matter. I think we have to think long and hard before we choose not to support a return to the existing position.

Synod, I would remind you that deanery synod members are of course the electorate for this General Synod. This would bring about a fundamental change in the franchise and the polity of the lay people in the Church. And it would be wrong, I think, to do that without at least an opportunity to debate the substance of the matter as suggested by bringing forward a rule change for debate in July 2020.

*Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield):* With my vicar's head on, just thinking through the options, whichever way we go here, PCCs are going to have the option to either opt in or out of whichever way we go. I am thinking in terms of potential conflict. If the default is everybody has to have a break, at least in terms of office, that then makes for potentially far better relationships than a PCC at an APCM choosing to say, "We have decided to opt for change" – potentially the subtext is "because we really don't want you to keep standing". If the default option is we clear the decks or we are going to need people who are standing to have a break in terms of office, it removes that element of conflict, or potential conflict. Synod, if we keep on doing what we have been doing we will always get what we have got.

*Dr Nick Land (York):* In asking Synod to support this motion, I find myself in unfamiliar territory. Like many of you, I will have taken over as chair of committees or boards of directors or trustees and looked around the table and wondered how many of them were appointed before the Reformation, or at least before decimalisation, and I would reach for that familiar tool of governance review and the introduction of term limits. But in doing this one always needs to be aware of unintended consequences, and I think in this case, in making it a term limit of only two terms, we introduce two problems. The first one, of course, is that term limits do not apply to all members of this particular group and therefore it does change the power dynamic significantly. I know there are clergy who dream about term limits for deanery synods, but in many parts of the country our deanery synods are changing. They are not always now the risible things of the past. Certainly in York we have put a huge amount of work into making them the thing that drives mission in our local areas. We have not a lay chair but a lay dean in partnership with the area dean, and we have a deanery leadership team of clergy and lay people alike, working together to build partnership in mission across the deanery. I would be being disingenuous if I said it was working perfectly everywhere, but there are many deaneries where deaneries have become real drivers of change.

Of course, a two-term limit cuts straight through this because really only the most self-confident, opinionated extrovert lay person is likely to step up to be lay dean after serving just one term. As a self-confident, opinionated lay person I am aware that other leadership styles are available. If we have a term limit of just two terms we cut through that leadership team. It means that the area dean will have a different set of people to work every single term and that undermines that partnership. Personally, I could have voted very cheerfully for term limits of four terms or even three terms, but two terms prevents that development of effective partnership and leadership across our deaneries between area deans and lay leaders within the deanery.

I would ask that we support this which simply asks for us to have a debate as to what might be a more appropriate way forward.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* I very much support what is before us today and I hope that Synod will, too. There are two particular aspects of this that I want to emphasise. The first is that it has already been noted that this would put deanery synods out of sync with other synods where term limits do not apply. But, of course, we, General Synod members, and also the diocesan synod members are ex officio members of deanery synods. So if we have term limits, and particularly if we have compulsory term limits, it means that there will be a small group of lay deanery synod members who will not be affected by those term limits while everybody else is. So who is going to end up as the lay chairman, the secretary, the treasurer? It is going to be us because we will be the only people who have the experience to be the natural fit for those roles in the majority of cases. It is not just a question of disparity but also disparity within the organisation itself which is a problem.

I am a lay Chair of the Oxford Deanery. Despite that, and despite the fact that my vicar has just become the area dean, my central Oxford church currently has no elected lay members of deanery synod. There is me but I am ex officio. That is because nobody wants to do it. I am hoping that will change at the ACPM, but being a member of deanery synod is not like being a churchwarden. When the churchwarden comes to the end of the term you have to have another churchwarden. You do not have to have deanery synod members. I am afraid that term limits, particularly in situations where there are not obviously people who can be persuaded to take on that role, will simply result in vacancies. I hope that Synod will support this.

*Mr Michael Stallybrass (York):* I very strongly urge all members of Synod to support this reconsideration of the term limit being imposed. We have heard a couple of people saying that we need to re-imagine deanery synods. We need to breathe new life into them. All I will say to them is: come to York and see what we have done. We have had a radical re-imagining of what deanery synods do and what they are. And the fact that we no longer have lay chairs but lay deans is just one of the outcomes of that radical change. It really has breathed new life into a large proportion – I will not say all but it is a large proportion – of the deaneries within York Diocese.

Having worked towards this re-imagining of deaneries, I am really concerned that putting a two-term, i.e. six-year, limit on elected deanery synod members will actually cut across the new life which we in our diocese are seeing in our deanery synods. Change does not require a term limit. Change in the life of deanery synods requires something much more radical, and we have experienced that and are already benefiting from it.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Sometimes short debates are good debates. Would you accept a motion for closure after the next speaker?

*The Chair:* I would be happy to put that to the Synod.

*Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle):* I speak as a rural dean of Appleby, which is, I understand, the largest and also most sparsely populated deanery in the Church of England. This is a very tricky question, is it not? It is quite a subtle one on the face of it as to whether we start with the presumption of term limits or start with the presumption of no term limits. Either way, we get a choice.

I want to speak up for the people of my deanery and other deaneries I suspect like them who are deeply underconfident, who are shy, who are instinctively highly reluctant to put themselves forward to serve in any capacity. I find it hard to explain to people not used to these situations how difficult it is to persuade good people to come and serve, let alone to stand for offices like lay chair or secretary or treasurer, and then to think of coming into a place like this where they might serve on General Synod. I rather think we would be better for hearing more from their voices. I know that I have learned an awful lot from them in the years that I have served as rural dean.

Of course, we could simply amend things locally so they did not have to step down after two terms, but I can see their faces as I try to explain to them after years of encouraging them to stand that they then have to step down. I also know that they would feel instinctively as failures, because the Church of England was wanting to move on and be radical and here we were sitting as a little backwater with our small number of people failing again and having to put in the motion that allowed us to opt out. They feel failures far too often, and in Appleby at the moment, as they sit under water, you can imagine how much they feel this.

My plea is that we consider the voices in these marginalised communities, people who feel deeply underconfident. It is not just in Appleby; I have also seen it in some of the inner-city parishes where I have served in the past. They need the encouragement and they need to know that they are valued. And yes, if you want to be radical – and I have revolutionary credentials – by all means opt into the limit, but for the sake of the weaker brothers and sisters let us say we will not impose these as a general rule right across the Church.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Point of order. Would you accept a motion for closure on this item?

*The Chair:* I give permission for that closure to be moved so I now put that motion to Synod.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* That is carried so we now ask Clive Scowen to respond. You have up to ten minutes. Make it five.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Chair, I will do my best. Thank you for a good debate. Despite what was said by one member, I think this is the first time we have had a proper focused debate on this subject in this Synod. I know there was a debate during the Revision Stage of the Measure, but that was very brief and people had not given it the thought they have now. Neither did we have the benefit of the research that the consultation has delivered. We now can speak in the light of what nearly 1,000 people said.

I am grateful for the support from many members for what is being proposed. I think what we are bringing forward today is very much in the spirit of simplification, which was invoked as a reason for not doing it, because simplification is really about allowing the maximum flexibility that is reasonably possible. That is the spirit that underlies the Model Rules in Part 9 of the Church Representation Rules, that local parishes can do things as much as possible to suit their own needs. And what we are proposing I think does that far better than what is currently in Rule M8.

There were several pleas from those who do not want to support this proposal on the basis that we need new life in our deanery synods – we need to re-imagine them. Absolutely. I do not know about you but for years my deanery synod was in urgent need of that. It is still not a finished work, although we have made quite a lot of progress. I think giving deanery synods power, as somebody said, with regard to local plans and pastoral reorganisation, the deanery plan, has begun to give deanery synods a greater sense of purpose than they used to have.

I am extremely grateful to Nick Land and Michael Stallybrass for their testimony to what has happened in York and the way that they have been able to create this partnership. I think they are right to fear that mandatory two-term limits would cut across what they have begun to achieve together.

I am grateful, too, to Stewart Fyfe for reminding us that not everybody who serves on deanery synod is like us. A lot of our deanery synod members are underconfident, as he said. Not everyone is going to be like Simon Friend, who has been able to walk into his first deanery synod meeting and be elected chair. People will need at least one term to get used to being there and then with a two term-limit they would only be able to serve one term as chair.

I am aware that I am not responding to every point that was made in the debate and that would be difficult to do so. I think, though, that we have to recognise that at deanery level the presence of all the licensed clergy is really important to the functioning of the synod and imposing term limits on them would make no sense at all. But if you have limits for the laity and not for the clergy, you get this imbalance.

I think the only other thing that I need to do is to record my thanks particularly to Jenny Jacobs, whose job it was to wade through 928 responses, record what people said in their qualitative response and analyse the figures. It was the most enormous Herculean task and, strange as it may seem, it was not the only job she had. I think we really ought to record our thanks to her.

Finally, Chair, I hope you will all support this resolution overwhelmingly, and I particularly plead to any clergy or bishops who are thinking, “This is a lay matter, I am not going to vote”, please, we need you to support the laity in achieving what they want to achieve. And so please do not feel disqualified in any way from voting on this proposal. Thank you.

*Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* Point of order.

*Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford):* Purely on the principle that this item cannot pass each House by a simple majority today, it is unlikely to pass each House by two-thirds in July, I would like to propose a vote by Houses on this item of business.

*The Chair:* I am content to accept that proposal. I need to see 25 members standing. I do see 25 members standing. You can sit down again. Therefore, I am content, because you want it to happen, to accept that proposal and I order a count by Houses.

Synod, the motion before us is that this Synod requests the Business Committee to introduce a draft Church Representation Rules (amendment resolution) at the July 2020 group of sessions to give effect to the recommendations at paragraph 22 of GS 2154. This is a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 6. In the House of Bishops, those in favour 14, against 6, with one recorded abstention. In the House of Clergy, those in favour 66, against 31, with three recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, those in favour 128, against 14, with two recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair:* That is the end of Item 6 and business for this morning. We can go to lunch a little early. We reconvene at 2.30 this afternoon.

THE CHAIR *Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

## **ITEM 7**

### **LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH AND PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP**

*The Chair:* Thank you. Now we come, as Order Paper III tells us, to Item 7 on the agenda, Living in Love and Faith and the Pastoral Advisory Group. This is a presentation under Standing Order 107, and there will, towards the end of the session, be the opportunity for questions. Let me just briefly explain how we will be structuring this session. The Bishop of Newcastle will introduce the item, and then there will be a short video. After that, the Bishop of Coventry will give a presentation for approximately 20 minutes. We will then move our attention to the group here on the floor in front of me, and the LLF Group will have a conversation amongst themselves in the kind of goldfish bowl mode for a maximum of 15 minutes. And it is then that we will move to the questions session for the rest of this timed period on the agenda. But we are going to do the questions in a slightly different way from usual, and so I will explain how we are going to do that when we actually get there.

I begin by inviting the Bishop of Newcastle to introduce the item and then introduce the video. Thank you.

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman):* I am extraordinarily proud of the members of the Pastoral Advisory Group. We were called together, most of us not knowing one another, or certainly none of us knowing everybody in that group. In that group, we held the whole range of theological convictions on issues of human sexuality. We also came from a range of different life experiences. And we were determined not to water down or in any way become a homogenous group, but were determined to work with deep respect for one another.

Out of that lived experience, which at times was full of joy and at times was very painful, the practical outcome came our Pastoral Principles for Living Well Together. What I feel more strongly about than anything is that if those Pastoral Principles remain just a pack of cards that stay on people's shelves or worse, in piles not used somewhere in bookshops, then just the fact they exist is not enough. We need to live them. We need to use them.

As we prepare for the launch of the Living in Love and Faith project, I hope that the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group and, in particular, the Pastoral Principles will help us lay down some important groundwork. This will help us as we prepare to receive the work of the Living in Love and Faith project.

You are going now to see a very short video, which is on the resource page for the Pastoral Advisory Group, which just gives a little intro to our work and which we hope will be one of the resources for people on the ground to use, so you will get a preview of it here. We hope that in coming weeks there may be more resources coming on stream. But, no more from me, see the video, and then we will move on to the Bishop of Coventry. Thank you.

(Video played)

*The Chair:* Thank you. I now call upon the Bishop of Coventry to give a presentation. He has a maximum of 20 minutes. Thank you.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Thank you very much, Chair, and good afternoon, Synod. Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to share with you the work of the Living in Love and Faith project. In many ways, this, General Synod, is a milestone, for by the time we meet in July, God willing, with your prayers, the resources will have been published and the project will have entered a whole new stage. More about that in a moment, but for now I thought it would appropriate for us just to recap something of the journey so far.

Back in February 2017, in this room, 2020 seemed a long way off. From the ashes of the take note debate and its demise, the Episcopal Teaching Document began to take shape in the summer of 2017. The first meetings of the ten lead bishops took place soon after, and by October, we had been joined by 30 others as members of the four Thematic Working Groups. And the Co-ordinating Group gathered and we were also joined by Dr Eeva John, who, with your permission, Chair, I am hoping will be able to contribute to this presentation. So work really began in earnest at that point.

During 2018, the Co-ordinating Group met six times, and the Thematic Working Groups, between them, 20 times. In 2019, all the Thematic Working Groups and the Co-ordinating Group met in various permutations eight times. In addition, LLF had primetime engagement with every session of General Synod in July 2018, February and July 2019. Thank you very much for that.

Bishops also gave substantial time in their meetings to seminars and small group work at the House of Bishops in May and December 2019, and at the College in September 2018 and 2019. Engagement with the Anglican Communion has included meeting with new bishops and clergy in Canterbury, participating in the Anglican Consultative Council, as well as meeting primates when they were here, including your Grace Archbishop Tito, and then other individual bishops who were visiting the UK.

Consultation with other churches has also taken place in several ways. Looking beyond the institutional structures of the Church, the group has been represented at the meetings of numerous networks and campaign groups. Recorded conversations with 54 individuals and 12 groups from diverse churches around the country have been held. We have received correspondence from 120 individuals who have shared their stories and views with us. Eeva, perhaps you would pick up the story?

*Dr Eeva John:* Producing the LLF resources has been a process of gathering around us an ever-growing cloud of witnesses. At times our accompanying cloud has cast a shadow over our work, as we have listened to stories of pain and fear, or as we have heard of a refusal to listen, to learn or to participate. At other times, we have been encouraged and

spurred on, as people have begun to see their story in the LLF story, or their insights honoured as the materials take shape.

But at all times we have sensed a great weight of accountability to this cloud of witnesses. Their contributions, their criticisms, their insights, their perspectives, even when pulling in opposite directions, have shown us again and again how much we need each other in order to see the fuller picture, to truly begin to understand each other and to learn to communicate with one another without causing offence or riding roughshod over stories of vulnerability or pain or fear.

It has not been plain sailing. We have learned through our failures, sometimes with eruptions of anger, sometimes with tears of frustration and confusion, and sometimes with moments of epiphany, of tiny glimpses of what may be happening behind the scenes, in the heavenly realms we might say. But, as the writer to the Hebrews says, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, we run with perseverance the race that is set before us.

Now, in a race, when the runners are within sight of the finish line, two things happen. First, the runners find from within themselves every ounce of strength for the final sprint to reach the goal and, second, the cheers of the onlookers intensify as the competitors strain towards the finishing line.

This captures something of how it is beginning to feel within the LLF project. Much of the race is behind us, but we have not yet reached the finish line. The book is in its penultimate and sixth draft, having been commented on by dozens and dozens of people from both inside and outside the project team. The in-depth papers are being organised and edited as part of an online library. Ten films have been produced and a number more are in the pipeline. The first podcast is on its way, and a series is planned. A comms strategy is in place to prepare the way for the launch in early July. The work is intensifying as we approach the finishing line.

At the same time, as with a running race, there seems to be an ever-louder chorus of voices as the summer of 2020 approaches, some shouting one thing, some another. Some in the Church, some outside it. There are voices of disappointment and frustration as it becomes clear that these are teaching and learning resources, not a set of recommendations or even a report from the Church. There are voices claiming that the resources are favouring one perspective over another, and interestingly, these are coming from both sides. So, what will happen after July 2020?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* The LLF teaching and learning resources are effectively a call to action – an invitation – for the Church. From summer 2020 onwards, for at least a year, every diocese, deanery and parish will be encouraged to engage with the resources. It is a call to learning together, using the resources to engage more deeply with the Bible, and with the Church's theological

tradition, with the context we find ourselves in, in relation to what it means to be human, to be sexual, to be loved by God and to be made in the image of God.

It is a call to relationship: relationships of openness, honesty, mutual vulnerability. It is a call to engage with difference, to step out of the comfort zones of our like-minded church communities to meet with those who understand things differently from us. It is a call to confession and repentance, as we discover and come to terms with our prejudices, blind spots, fears, hypocrisies, and to allow the Holy Spirit to guide our learning together.

It is a call to the leaders of the Church – bishops, clergy, lay – to accompany the people of God as we learn together in love and faith. It is a call to the bishops to listen to the people of God and to the Holy Spirit as, together, they begin to discern a way forward for the Church. It is a call to embark on a new way of doing things in the Church, a new culture, a new hope.

So the launch of LLF in early July 2020 will mark the beginning of a period of whole-church learning, leading to discernment about a way forward. It is not a process without an end. The implementation of this phase of the project will need leadership that will enable the Living in Love and Faith resources to bear the fruit of discernment and decision-making of which they are a means.

*Dr Eeva John:* Let me finish with a slightly more personal note. As we have been meeting together over the last two-and-a-half, three years, trying to hear the still small voice of God in amidst the chorus of voices on our approach to the finishing line, we have begun to wonder: why is God so slow to act? Or, why are we so slow to hear, to see? If there is a solution out there, why has it not been revealed to us? We hear from some the answer is obvious; God's mission demands that we change. And then from others the answer is obvious; God's mission demands that we stand firm.

Could it be that we are not yet ready for the answer, whatever it is? Could it be that there is a perspective that we have not yet seen, that enables us to understand, to see our differences and the way forward in a new light?

Much of our discussion has been around lifelong, committed, faithful relationships, as we have been thinking about marriage, civil partnerships and same-sex relationships. Maybe the call is to discover afresh what such relationships might look like, not so much between two people but within and across our church communities, our church families. Maybe God's mission requires us to practise what we preach, to discover what it would look like for us to truly love one another deeply and so to be known as followers of Christ. Maybe our call is for a new commitment to one another.

I mentioned that within the storms of our work there have been moments of epiphany. One of them was encapsulated in the words of one of our members after a particularly challenging period when our relationships were stretched to breaking point. Looking

around at all of us, he said, “It has become unthinkable to me for us to part company”. I do not know, but I do know that when the LLF resources are launched, the Church will embark on something new. It will invite the whole people of God, all around the country, to use the resources to learn together, to reach out beyond their echo chambers, to have informed conversations about what it means to be human, what it means to love, to be sexual, to be faithful, to be embodied members of the body of Christ.

Conversations shaped by Scripture, nourished by the Church’s tradition, conducted with godly reason that’s attentive to God’s world, enriched by stories of lived experience. Conversations that complexify rather than simplify matters that, in the words of Psalm 139, “are too wonderful for me”, and bring us to a place of awe at the beauty of God’s purposes. Conversations that take us closer to Christ, and so to one another, that lead us to Jesus’s will for the Church, the Church that he loves, and his hope for the world that he came to save.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth):* As we move through these conversations and the deeper learning that they enable, to discernment and decision making, it will be over to us all. When the resources are launched, may I ask what will you do to encourage your churches, deaneries and dioceses to engage with them? How will you embody openness, compassion, vulnerability and eagerness to learn among followers of Christ with very different perspectives? How will you be a catalyst for a change of culture in the Church? How will you help us together to learn the mind of Christ?

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. We now move to the next stage of this session, when the LLF Group here on the floor of the hall will have a conversation amongst themselves for a maximum of 15 minutes. And then we will move to the question session, which, as I said earlier, I will explain the procedure for when we get there.

*Dr Eeva John:* Friends, we have been together for at least two-and-a-half years, nearly three. It has been quite a journey together. I wanted to invite you to reflect on what is one of the toughest moments that you can remember in our time together, something that sticks out in your memory as a hard moment, a tough moment.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* The toughest moment for the group was undoubtedly, in my mind, the meeting of the whole group working on LLF at the Royal Foundation of St Katharine where there was the most spectacular fall out in the final meeting, and the really tough bit was some people in the room not feeling as though they were heard by the rest of us. That was one of those really difficult moments because it was not just their problem. It was our problem, and it was difficult to sort out in the moment what to do, and how to take that on into the next meetings.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I think the irony of my hardest moments, just carrying on from that Nick, is that they would definitely be those times coming away from meetings that we had and feeling like the particular view that I have of the way that God has spoken and asked us to live is one that seemed to be beyond the pale and, at best, to be tolerated, at worst, to be despised. The irony is that everyone in the group would share that experience.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* It has been really tough all the way through. It is hard to pick out one moment which has been particularly tough. There have been good bits, but the whole thing has been really challenging, I think, for all of us. For me, it has been really hard being a bridge between the LGBTI community within the Church and the process, the feeling that I have to be both an ambassador for the process but also make sure that the voices and the expectations of everyone are heard. The very specific hardest moment, and I am going to name it right now, was the publication of the Pastoral Guidance, because it just felt like what on earth have I been doing for the last two-and-a-half years? Am I being made a fool of? I was very grateful for the response of people after that because it helped it to get better.

*The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Dr Jo Bailey Wells):* Even as a member of the House of Bishops, I would say exactly the same thing as you, Giles.

*Dr Elaine Storkey:* I think I would echo what Nicholas said. It was someone standing up, and this person did stand up, and said that this person had not been listened to. Do you know, I had been sitting there and my ears were dropping off with listening. I could not listen any harder than I had been doing, and I looked around the room and I felt we were all listening like mad. And then I also realised there is a huge difference between listening and agreeing, or listening and being of one mind with this person, or listening and taking on the perspective this person so much wanted us to share. I think it was that sense of enormous compassion for this person, because this was a genuine cry from the heart: "I am not being understood, I am not being listened to, I am not being encountered", and in that moment I could see that it is possible to be of one heart with another person without being of one mind. From then onwards I wanted to actually explore that far more.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Eeva, I have a few of these. I think that was maybe one of my worst moments, and other external things that had just, sort of, thrown us. I remember your email to me, Giles, and that cut to the heart. Your faithfulness to this project has been extraordinary, and your bridge work. That meeting that we had, that was a bad moment.

I do not know whether anyone else was in the group that I was meant to be looking after, but for me there was an even worse moment which preceded that, when I thought this is going to be quite straightforward, what we are trying to do here is just tell the Christian

story of salvation. And, well, we ran into such difficulty there and I came away thinking, my goodness, these differences in the Church go deeper, much deeper than I thought.

That whole process of people not being heard in what they were saying even about the story of salvation, and the way we were saying things that were misleading other people by the way we were saying it, and working through that has probably been the greatest joy, in a sense, to see that we are all within this story of salvation. We need to take care over how we frame even these most fundamental dimensions of the faith.

*Dr Eeva John:* This kind of moves us on to thinking about what are the things that perhaps you have been surprised to learn in the process, whether it is something personal or in relation to the things we have been studying together.

*Dr Elaine Storkey:* I think I was surprised to learn how quickly we were able to become vulnerable to each other. I still remember that lovely meal. I had not anticipated this because I had walked out at the end of the last meeting feeling somewhat grumpy because I had said, "We're not sharing anything. We're not getting to any depth. We're just sticking bits of papers on walls and this is very, very frustrating", and then I cleared off to another meeting feeling quite cheesed off. In the meantime, you had decided to have this heart-sharing situation where you came and told your own stories, and we told our own stories. I was not quite prepared for this. I turned up and people were so vulnerable with each other as a mark of incredible trust and honesty and openness, and we were sharing the love of Christ at a depth that I have rarely experienced, even in churches.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* It also feels slightly as though we are scraping the surface and there is more. We have been very caught up in the process and it has been very good to be able to share deeply, but it feels as though there is a long way further to go. The thing I have really learned is how these things affect all of our identities. I have said this in the group. I have a much greater respect now than I had before for those who take a conservative view who have left the room feeling vulnerable in the way that I too have left the room feeling vulnerable, for different reasons, but the process has led us towards similar places.

I am much surer now that we need to find a way of working forward, but I am also as convinced as I ever was that we cannot continue as we were or as we are. The challenge has not got any less but the love has got greater.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I think it has become increasingly clear how much fear there is amongst us as a community about speaking about these things, wherever we are coming from. If we struggle to speak about these things – as you say there is so much

deeper we could have gone – how much more the rest of the Church. I guess my experience has been that we need to lean into that rather than lean away from it; that speaking about these things more is helpful rather than a hindrance, moving from a spirit of fear, as Paul says, to one of love and self-control.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* That is really helpful. I do come at this with views. Quite often, people think they know my views and can label me. One of the things that I have really enjoyed in the group is talking to people who are different. It is probably not that they have modified my views and changed my views to the extent that I have stood in a different position, but I have really understood where they are coming from and have deepened my appreciation in that sense. It is not “me right and you wrong”, but something about where together we are seeing this. We are standing in different places and we see things differently.

I have come to appreciate the way in which a community works at this and not just us as individuals. That has been a really powerful thing in the group. Some of the experiences that we have shared, although from different perspectives, have felt very similar experiences. That sense of leaning into it and how two or three people gathered together can do this in a way that tries to make sense of Christian faith and Christian life has been a really powerful experience. Eeva, you have been terribly important in facilitating that. It does feel like it is a new way of working for us.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* I do not know whether I have been surprised about it. I have certainly been deeply moved about the power of a grace-filled conversation and the little exchanges between you two. I am glad other people could listen in to a little bit of that. You have both been extraordinarily full of grace as you have sought to communicate truth.

I suppose I have been surprised and become much more hopeful, I think, about what real attention to each other can do together within the story of salvation around the Scriptures. That deep attention is a very beautiful thing. I have loved that. It has been a great privilege. The grace that everyone has shown – was a little example of it. –

*The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Dr Jo Bailey Wells):* There was one particular day when I thought we had the structure of our book sussed and I was deeply invested in it. By lunchtime it was all up in the air and I thought, “Oh, why did I bother with all that work I did before?” We spent the afternoon, I think, arguing about it and by the evening – we have had some fantastic times of prayer and worship together – we then had a Bible study together. I remember coming to God’s word from our different places, having in a sense let go of control and therefore being perhaps more open, more desperate, more thirsty to hear God’s word, and hearing God’s word through one another and, therefore, finding a richness in God’s word that I did not know before, and that was thrilling.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Thank you for that. It feels to me as though we have been doing theology, and it has been very kind of the Church of England to pay for us to go away and do theology together, so thank you everybody. We have been interweaving our stories, our personal experiences, but also with a very strong theological base absolutely grounded in Scripture. I hope that when the resources come out, people will understand that it is completely grounded in Scripture. It is where we go from Scripture which leads us into different places.

I suppose the advantage is that we had the time and the energy and the facilities to be able to engage that profoundly, and I hope that we can find some way of replicating that for everyone else.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I guess one of the things that has come out for me is the depth of difference in the way that we can approach Scripture: unified to some extent, clear, God's breathed-out voice at one end, and at the other the end, disparate human voices that we need to critique and are not clear, and everything in between. One of the things that has been enlightening is recognising how much of our different understandings go back to these deep differences in the way that we understand and interpret Scripture, what we even think the Bible is. It has been helpful to just be reminded of that.

*Dr Elaine Storkey:* I would concur with that. I remember one occasion where we had experienced a lot of pain – people had brought their pain to the meeting – and the pain was multiple from different positions. Then we read the word of God together and we prayed, and what really hit me is that the Church is not very good at lamenting. In that passage from the Scriptures, I heard God's lament for the culture, the lament for brokenness, for apostasy, for idolatry and all those things which we as a group were sharing. That was a very powerful sense for me too.

*Dr Eeva John:* Giles, you used the word "bridge" at one point, being a bridge. I guess there is a sense in which many of you in the Co-ordinating Group feel yourselves to be a bridge between a community that is behind you and a crowd of witnesses around you. Is that something that you have been conscious of as you have been working together?

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* For me, that is much more complex for being a Diocesan Bishop at the same time. Part of the bridge is to the Diocese of Salisbury and trying to relate to the whole Church. Of course, because I come at this with views. Some of the people who thought that I was there to argue their case have been pretty brutal in terms of feeling as though I have not fought hard enough for them. I do not think that is the way it works. I really think this has got to be above parties in some way and that the bridges have got to be bigger bridges that actually make us think harder about what the Church is. And that might, in the stage beyond where we are, cause us to think about how we are going to accommodate one another within this big tent, this big household of God, this many-roomed mansion.

*The Chair.* I wonder if I might ask the group if you feel that is an appropriate point time-wise and sentiment-wise to move on to the question session. May I explain how that is going to work? You will see there is an empty chair there. The purpose of the chair is to offer a very warm welcome, if they feel able, to those who wish to ask questions to join the group in order to ask their question, to sit with the group while the question is being answered by whomever in the group who needs to be the person to provide the answer, or maybe a couple of people providing an answer.

There will then be an opportunity for a brief – but only a brief – supplementary question, and then the person asking the question will give way to the person next asking a question. That is the idea of how we invite you to proceed in asking the questions, although, of course, the mikes are switched on in the podiums at the sides if you feel more comfortable that way, but there is the invitation to join the group to ask the question. The initial question in each case will be timed to be two minutes. We have a lot of voices who will wish to be heard, no doubt, and a limited amount of time in which to hear them. Can I ask people to be sensitive in your listening and brief in your questions.

We move on to the question time. And if you wish to ask a question please stand in the usual way and I will identify one person and the next again in the normal way, but you are welcome to come and use the chair to come and ask the question if you wish to do so. The questions are now possible.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* Hello. Thank you very much for sharing and for the very moving reflections on how this has affected you personally. I have been struck by the commitment to listening and the commitment to one another. What seems to have been slightly more muted to me in the discussion we have heard so far is the commitment to re-engage with the teaching of Jesus. I know that is a slightly awkward question to ask but I think we need to be honest and say, both within the Anglican tradition and within this room, there is a pulling away from whether Jesus really is a good pastor and whether His teaching is what we need to hear; that teaching which I believe is also echoed in the teaching of Paul. Will the LLF process give us a renewed commitment to the apostolic inheritance of the teaching of the New Testament? A nice easy question to start with – uncontroversial.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* There has been absolutely that commitment. I have been really moved by that. There is a commitment to each other, to attend to each other, a commitment from each person to attend to Jesus. That has been very real and very moving to see. And attend to the Jesus of the Scriptures. And to attend to the inheritance of faith. That has been common ground. That is what I have found.

Then it gets really interesting because there are different ways of understanding the teaching of Jesus and that inheritance. That is where this attention to each other is deeply important and, I think, does produce results. What I have been hoping for is a sort of

resonance, as it were, between people so that they can not necessarily agree but at least speak truly of what they believe as they speak of Jesus and the Scriptures and the faith that we have received, and then hear the other person do the same and begin to at least understand each other and begin – this is the big test – to see whether it is possible to come to a deeper understanding together of Jesus. It has not been a case of everyone signing on a line this is exactly what you believe, but there has been that common commitment. Sorry, we promised ourselves short answers.

*Dr Eeva John* Does anybody want to add to that?

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam)*: I was very struck by Bishop Christopher in the introduction ending on seeking the mind of Christ. Ian, I think it is relatively easy to say, “The Scriptures say this, St Paul says that”, but what is the mind of Christ? A friend of mine, when he was ordained as a Methodist, told me a few weeks ago that the President of the Methodist Conference put in his copy of the Scriptures a little card which said, “Study this world. Sense its need. Speak to its condition”, and that is a much more complex task than saying, “Jesus says this, Paul says that, therefore this is what we do now”. It is a real theological task of using the Scriptures to live the Christian life in the present context.

*Dr Elaine Storkey*: I know your own desire to lift Jesus higher and share that completely. I really can say that it has been a mind in the group as well. What we have done over and over again, even in the writing, the drafting and so on, has been concerned about the Gospels, what is Jesus teaching us, what is Jesus today in the way that we walk his way. I want to assure you on that. Do not be too worried for us.

*Dr Eeva John*: One more comment.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)*: I am very nervous about how people will receive the book when it comes out, but I hope they will understand how grounded it really is in the Scriptures. I am grateful to Jason for what he has said because it is true. I remember the day that we spent reflecting on the Emmaus story and how our hearts begin to burn within us as the Scriptures were opened to us. That was terribly exciting and a really good day because there was a real sense that we were engaging in a very gritty way with the Scriptures and with Jesus. Take heart. Do not be afraid.

*Dr Eeva John*: Thank you very much, Ian.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)*: The reason I have asked for a change in chair is that Giles and I sat just a few feet away from each other back in February 2017 together whilst we listened to the result, the whole debate which ended with the promise of radical Christian inclusion. And we really did not know, do you remember, how that vote would go, and we still do not know how this report will go.

I am very pleased, Bishop Christopher, that you acknowledged the pain on both sides and that it had been a difficult space. The truth is it has not been a safe space for many involved with LLF and many have had to leave. We have had 50 years of discussion. I run a blog where one of my bloggers has just told of the whole story about the last 50 years of discussions where each time we have a report we are told, "This will be the way forward for the Church of England to start discussing", and we have just been told that word-for-word by you yet again. Yet again, it is the LGBT community who are the pawn, who are putting themselves in a place of unsafety while their lives are unpicked, while their hopes are dashed, while they are not allowed to be married, while they are in places where they are told, as we have just heard by the person sitting in that chair, that they do not hold the Bible, that they do not listen to Jesus.

How can you, please, guarantee that we will be safe in these discussions that you want to continue? How can you guarantee that young people, who constantly put themselves in the place of trying to share their hopes and dreams, will not end up with the mental health issues that we all know that many of them are suffering from? And how will you ensure that we are not going to just keep kicking this can down the road for more discussions, please?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Thank you, Jayne. On the last point, there is a pretty strong commitment from the College of Bishops and the House of Bishops that that which LLF begins is in one sense not to go on forever and to map out a very clear process by which this discernment and whatever decision-making it leads to happens in a relatively limited time. That is the intention.

Safe space. In many ways that is going to be down to us all. When this process is out there, in one sense it will be beyond my control certainly. It will be a huge responsibility for all the bishops, I think, to ensure that these conversations that we want to happen – we will all say, I am sure – are safe.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I think I just want to say sorry, sorry that you are speaking on behalf of people who are feeling really hurt, let down, vulnerable, scared. All of us, I think, would agree that we are all made in the image of God and to that degree loved by God. The message of all of this Synod would be that each and every individual deserves respect, love, care, concern by virtue of being made in His image. All we can do is preach the truth of the Christian anthropology to the world such that we treat people with the respect that they should be treated. Many people are hurting, as you know, and many people from many perspectives, for example same-sex attracted living celibate lives feeling "Is our situation valid?" are questioning that and so on. From all of us there is a commitment to say being made in the image of God means that we deserve love, care and respect, and let us all strive to do that as best we can.

*The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Jo Bailey Wells):* Jayne, I want to say I understand the longing for some guarantees, but I also want to say I do not think there are any guarantees

in this process. That is what has been so hard in participating in it because it has been letting go of ends in order to encounter one another deeply in the present. I do not know where it will go. I pray the Holy Spirit will act among us. But I do know that when we pre-judge, when we cease to listen, we lose the ability to travel together and the commitment is to travel together, including with those who are hurting the most who need the most care along the way.

*Dr Elaine Storkey:* Could I also put a caveat here too? Jayne raised the question of safety and I think safety is a very, very important issue. If our LGBT brothers and sisters do not feel safe in the Church then that is an issue for all of us. I have to say many people do not feel safe, not in the Church but as Christians in the culture. The LGBT people have the culture behind them whereas many who are of a different view in the Church do not have the culture behind them and it can be a very lonely place.

I spent ten years researching and working very hard on violence against women. I was invited to a national conference – a huge conference of thousands of people. When they discovered I was a member of a church that had not affirmed gay marriage or same-sex marriage, they immediately no-platformed me and I was told I was not welcome. This went on for some weeks where they even said, “If you come you’ll be booed off the stage. We don’t really want people who believe what you believe leading big plenary sessions”. I said, “Okay, I get your point. I understand. I’ll pray for you but I’m coming anyway and I’ll sit at the back and enjoy the conference”.

It is a very long story, but in the end they changed their minds. They said, “Okay, you can come and address us”. I went and I was not booed off the platform. In the context of that, many Christians came up to me. They came and said, “We’re so glad you’re here. We’ve been working with this huge group of women and we haven’t been welcomed, we know, but you’ve given us hope in the fact that they’re opening their doors”. Did I feel safe there? Yes, I did feel safe because I knew that I had the protection of God and I knew that that is where I should be. I really want you to feel safe and I want everyone to feel safe in the Church, because we should have open doors where we can embrace one another and not create these hostile zones which are fearful for people to walk in because that is what they do outside the Church and we cannot go in that direction.

*Dr Eeva John:* Just one last word to Giles, I think.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* What we have never had yet is something which we can all refer to together in the Church of England which has the voices of lesbian and gay people, trans people, people who have been hurt. We have never had something which we have accepted ourselves. You and I have had many conversations about this. The reason I am so committed to this is because I think it will enable us to have better conversations if everyone is able to come to it – everyone, right the way across the spectrum – with a vulnerability, which will hurt for all of us but somehow we have to all own that. It is going to be hard for us all.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* I was told by Bishop Christopher that I could ask a supplementary if I may. I will keep it short. When I sat down in this chair I doubled the number of LGBT people in a conversation which is predominantly from heterosexuals. Forgive me, I do not know all your genders. When I talk about safety, Elaine, I talk about safety because people are looking at committing suicide, not just that they are not liked. It is not the same. That is one of the reasons why I am so worried that we continue talking about having discussions between different sides, because on one side the cost of those discussions is much higher. That is why I think we have to pay extra special care to what we are asking the LGBTI community when we keep telling them that we need discussions. I am looking for that radical sense of inclusion when that report comes out.

*Dr Eeva John:* Thank you so much, Jayne, for joining us.

*Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford):* I just want to ask whether you think it is going to be possible to find a piece of carpet on this matter on which we can all stand. If it is not possible to find a piece of carpet on this matter on which we can all stand, does there not come a point when we have to try and work out how we allow individuals from different churches within the Church of England to follow their own consciences and have a mutual flourishing? As the Bishop of Salisbury said, there are many rooms.

I think it is clear to all of us in this room, if we are truthful, that I am never going to persuade a number of people in this room that this is not a first order issue, and there are people in this room who are never going to convince me that one's sexuality is not a matter of choice, it is how you happen to be. I happen to be heterosexual. That is not a choice on my part, that is just how I am, and if it is not a choice I cannot see that it can be sinful. There needs to be an acknowledgment that we may never be able to persuade each other to a common view on this and have to find a way forward which acknowledges that.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* I think that is incredibly helpfully put. I think the last moment at which we thought there was a square inch on the carpet on which we could all stand – and I would have to say it would be quite tough for you and me to stand on the same square inch together – was the House of Bishops' Report that Synod chose not to take note of. I think this process is different. I think there is a recognition of the sort of difference that you have very eloquently described, and what we have to work out is how do we do that together in a way that accepts there is difference and thinks that that difference might be part of our God-given diversity and which allows us to remain together as a Church with sufficient grace and space that does not compromise our conscience. That is really difficult. I think that is the space we are in.

The resources that are being produced for LLF are meant to help the conversation, which I think there still more to do. I have to say I think that conversation has moved on lightyears in the last few years. I know it is difficult, I know it is painful and I know some people carry more of the costs than others, but I think we have moved on lightyears. The

task following LLF, as Christopher explained in the introduction, is to work out how we can use this material to help us think better about what sort of policy implications are involved in this for us as a Church.

*The Chair:* Does anybody else want to add anything?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* As in your political career, Tony, one of the pressures that I have felt all along in this is a lot of people are saying, have said and have expressed a real frustration that we are just not finding where the deal is to be done and on the basis of that deal work out how we carve up the Church, as it were. What this is trying to say is even now let us just give ourselves a little bit more time, not to go on forever, but to make the best use of this investment in learning and the opportunity to learn to see whether things might just look different through it. That is what I think has been our task, in a sense: to hold back the deal and to say God has more than that for us.

*The Chair:* I may bring us to a close after the next two speakers because I am conscious that later on in the afternoon we have timed business at 5.30 and before that a considerable amount of legislative business to get through. This is not a debate in any kind of way so I do not need a motion for closure. We will just deal with the clock. I think that is how it is going to have to be.

*Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford):* Thank you all for your commitment to what has obviously been a difficult process and, hopefully, a good process at times for you as well. I think I need to be honest and say I am dreading the report arriving on my doorstep. It is not something I am looking forward to whatsoever. I feel I need to stay committed to the process. I feel that quite deeply but fear it is going to be one of the hardest things I have ever had to do.

The two conversations I have had about sex and sexuality recently have been, frankly, really upsetting. The first was around the response to the Bishops' Statement, as I think it is now called rather than Pastoral Guidelines, where universally in my parishes there was the feeling that you have seriously undermined the mission of the Church. It is not about trust; it is about mission as well. I think in my parishes the willingness to engage in this is going to be somewhere near nil.

The other uncomfortable conversation I had was with my daughter just before Christmas who had gone to stay with her same-sex partner. My daughter is in a wheelchair and is disabled and I got a stream of messages, "Daddy, can you tell me where I can go to a midnight mass where myself and Chloe will feel safe?" That is a disgusting question for anybody to have to ask. I approached an archdeacon who sent me a list of churches not to go to as the first thing. And eventually they arrived at a church, where the priest was absolutely fantastic, and it had a happy ending and all was reasonably well, which was for her and her partner, who is not a Christian, a lovely and affirming experience.

My question to you is how do I engage my family in this given that they have their own identity and they do not want it to be picked apart? That has happened to them in churches and it ended up with cuts on her arm. Let us not minimise this, as Jayne and others have discussed. How do I actually engage a load of parishes – three, well, two and a tiny hamlet – which the Church might want to get involved in these discussions but which have moved to a different place ahead of where you are at the moment? How do I play a constructive leadership role in making sure that these conversations actually happen?

If I am really honest, at one level I am hating this process. I am not ambivalent about it. I loathe it – – at one level – – viscerally. That is okay, if I have to loathe it, I have to loathe it, but how do I stay in that in a positive way and exercise some genuine Christian leadership, despite the fact that every inclination says, “I do not want to do this”, but feeling as somebody who lives under obedience that I must do this?

*The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Dr Jo Bailey Wells):* Andrew, may I jump in? There was one particular meeting when we were sharing our own stories where we all admitted that none of us wanted to be here doing this, but we were all here under obedience, whether obedience to a bishop or obedience to a sense of call from God. If we are called to be the Church and to encounter Jesus Christ in one another, we are called to listen to one another's stories and look for Jesus in each other's faces. I take it that is what your daughter was doing in looking to go to church. I hope that is what your church members will do when these resources come out. It is fascinating to me that you began today not with a question but with telling a story.

*Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford):* Was that wrong?

*The Bishop of Dorking (Rt Revd Jo Bailey Wells):* No, I am just pointing out we need to tell our story in order to hope that others will listen to our question. I think that is the nature of a conversation on identity, sex and marriage. It is really hard to tell our story because we are all vulnerable in that area, all of us I think, but unless we listen to people with very different answers, we have not begun.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Just to follow that up on a practical point. Thank you, Andrew, for being prepared to stay with this process at great cost. We are trying to say that this is not a report; it is a suite of resources. A way in with your parishioners may well be through the films and podcasts that we are producing. That will give you another set of media, as it were.

*The Chair:* Bearing in mind that we have a time constraint and I have called one other speaker, I wonder if we could possibly move on to hear that additional voice and draw the session to a close. I am sorry to be working with my eye on the clock, but it is inevitable I am afraid.

*Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council):* I feel like I am ticking off people's Synod bingo by saying I really was not planning to speak. My question is quite simple and draws upon some of the things that Jayne was talking about earlier. It feels to me like this is one of the most considerable pieces of work to come out of Synod in this quinquennium, and it is my perception that, potentially, young people are being affected potentially the most by this. What efforts have been made to include young people and engage with young people in this process? As a potential supplementary question, can young people be engaged in it for the remainder of the process if they are not already?

*Dr Eeva John:* We have certainly interviewed or listened to the stories of a number of young people and visited a secondary school as part of that, but I would say we have not done enough and we need to do more. We also need to think really hard about how the resources can be made such that they are accessible and attractive to young people. Talking to youth workers, for example, they have given me some ideas of what young people might engage with. That is really important because I would say we still have work to do on that.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* One of the constant things we have been talking about is how differently young people see all these things. For people under 30 and people under 40, so many of these questions are not an issue at all. I am going to make a really general point now. We have tried to move on from sets of assumptions about what this sort of person does, thinks, believes into something about who we as human beings are before God. I think we are hoping that message is the one which is received first. Regardless of your age or who you are or what you are or where you come from, we are trying to ask who we are before God, and we are hoping that can be something which resonates with everybody right the way through all the generations. As a result of that question you end up with how do we live alongside one another before God? Sorry, that was a very pompous answer, but I am hoping that we can engage with everyone on those sorts of questions. It is about identity really.

*The Chair:* I am afraid the clock has run out on us because we have a little bit of furniture removal to do before we can resume the regular group of sessions. May I thank very warmly all the people who have asked questions, the group sitting in front of you and all the work that has gone on behind the scenes as well, and will continue to go on behind the scenes I know. Thank you all. I said at the beginning that sensitive listening was really important, and I do not know whether it is because I am in an elevated position and I can see everybody, but I feel that there has been hard listening going on, so thank you all very much for that. Please now remain in the Chamber whilst we reset for the rest of the rest of the business this afternoon. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 3.44 pm.

## **SPECIAL AGENDA I LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS**

## **DRAFT CHANNEL ISLANDS MEASURE (GS 2152)**

*The Chair:* That is not the only excitement of the afternoon because we are going back to the Channel Islands. I would like to point out to everybody I have only ever been to Jersey, so after the invitation from the Diocese of Europe this morning to go on a nice holiday in Europe visiting their cathedral, I am looking forward to an invitation to visit the Channel Islands.

Synod, we come now to the Revision Stage for the draft Channel Islands Measure. In addition to Order Paper III, on which the motions appear, members will need the draft Measure GS 2152. As there are no amendments and no member has indicated a wish to speak against any clauses standing in part, I give my permission under Standing Order 55C to the clauses being taken en bloc.

### **ITEM 585**

*The Chair:* I now call the Chair of the Steering Committee, the Bishop to the Forces, Bishop Tim Thornton, to move Item 585 “That clauses 1 to 5 stand part of the Measure”. Bishop, you have five minutes to speak.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* I do so move en bloc, as we say in the Channel Islands.

*The Chair:* We have not even got the stopwatch going. This item is now open for debate.

*Mr David Robilliard (Channel Islands):* Chair, you will be very welcome to visit us. My friends in Jersey will not mind if I say that in “Bergerac” times Guernsey used to be known as the “thinking man’s Jersey”.

Yesterday Lord Chartres referred to himself as being in the springtime of his senility. I stand here today in the late autumn of my membership of this Synod having been elected last century. Some of you who have been here as long as I have will remember the Bridge Report which in my early days on Synod found me explaining the peculiarities of the Channel Islands and the relationship with Winchester, so nothing really changes.

I would like to thank members of Synod for their overwhelming support yesterday at the First Consideration stage of the Channel Islands Measure. I will not repeat the things said yesterday, but I want to emphasise the urgency in giving Final Approval at this group of sessions. It might be thought that deferring consideration until July only adds four months to the timetable, but that is not so. Given parliamentary constraints, not only here in Westminster but also in the States of Guernsey, States of Jersey, States of Alderney and the Chief Pleas of Sark, deferring the final stages to July puts the whole process back by at least 12 months. Deferring consideration would achieve nothing other than to paralyse the whole process. All other legislation, such as the Women Bishops Measure,

will also be delayed as they cannot move forward until the Orders in Council made pursuant to the Channel Islands Measure have entered into force. The ministry and mission of the Church in the Islands would continue to be compromised.

I conclude by placing on record the thanks of both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in the Bailiwick of Guernsey: to his Grace, the Archbishop, for setting up the Commission; to the Commission itself for the thorough and painstaking conduct of its business; and to its Secretary Jonathan Neil-Smith for his part in the Commission's deliberations. Finally, I wish to thank Bishop Timothy Dakin for the gracious manner in which he has accepted the recommendations of the Commission.

*Mr Ed Shaw (Bristol):* I have been an unhappy exile from the place of my birth, the beautiful island of Jersey, ever since the age of eight when I was exiled, perhaps unintentionally, by the Church of England itself. My father moved us from the Channel Islands to the UK mainland or to the United Kingdom (Jersey not being part of it) to train for ordination in the Church of England.

So I have enjoyed both the benefits of being born and being proud to be born in the independent island of Jersey. I love the fact that we own you. I love the fact that my birth certificate is a translation from the original in French. I love everything that comes from having been born and bred in Jersey. However, I have also experienced the benefits of the interdependence the Islands have had with the Church of England over the years, because my father was trained for ordination in the Church of England, sponsored by the Diocese of Winchester.

What I love about the Measure in front of us today is that it would seem to wonderfully preserve both the independence of the Channel Islands and to wonderfully continue their interdependence with the Church of England as well. I want us to vote for it so that we both preserve the independence of the Islands and their inter-dependence historically over many centuries with the Church of England.

*Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester):* This is a plea for you to really enthusiastically support the idea that we might have one of the most sustainable episcopal visits on offer here with the opportunity for a bishop by boat. You can only get to the Island of Sark by boat. You will have the opportunity to see a bishop on a bike. You can only get around the island of Sark by bike or walking. You might even have the opportunity of seeing a bishop bathing on one of the most beautiful beaches in the world, La Grande Greve, on the island of Sark. Think of it, Bishop Nick, no, not in the nick, but Bishop Nick bathing.

The serious point is that the island of Sark as a part of the Channel Islands has suffered greatly over recent years, for a variety of reasons that it would be inappropriate to discuss, but it needs encouragement. Dean Barker has done much to encourage spiritual life on the island. We have a lively ecumenical partnership with the Methodists, but it would be hugely encouraging for the Islands to know that somebody was going to take care of

them, and even more encouraging if he could be persuaded to undertake an episcopal visit. There is a lively Christian community there that will take a very positive message away from this Measure. I invite you enthusiastically to support it, not just because we might have a sustainable episcopal visit or the prospect of a bishop bathing but because the body of Christ will be much encouraged by it.

*Mr David Kemp (Canterbury):* I speak as the Chair of the Canterbury Diocesan and Cathedral Safeguarding Advisory Panel, named by the Church of England's snappy title department.

I want to commend the Measure and the transfer to Salisbury. Safeguarding was one of the contributing factors to the breakdown in relationship between the Channel Islands and Winchester. In 2015 the Canterbury Safeguarding Team had no knowledge of the Channel Islands and found it was necessary to win trust, to listen hard and not to assume that we knew how the Channel Islands worked. We have discovered they are different in unexpected and surprising ways. It took time and patience but, with a willingness to make it work and a determination to respond to issues promptly and carefully, the relationship has grown and flourished. If, as I hope we all believe, safeguarding is now central to the mission of the Church, I say with some trepidation and humility that I do not believe safeguarding could flourish if, as some suggest, the relationship between Winchester and the Channel Islands was forced to continue in the hope of long-term reconciliation.

The Islands because of their history and the constraints of their geography present particular safeguarding challenges, in addition to those experienced by other parts of the Church of England. They require more resource than one might expect and we trust that Salisbury is prepared for this. The Canterbury Safeguarding Team will miss the Channel Islands as well as the friends and colleagues we have got to know over the last five years. Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney and Sark, go well. And, Salisbury, please take care of them.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, therefore, I invite Bishop Tim to respond to the debate and you have five minutes, should you need it.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* Just to say thank you for your speeches. It was very helpful indeed. You have spoken far more eloquently than I could ever do, so I would just want to echo the essence of what I was hearing. David Robilliard, thank you very much. I heard the word "urgency" and I am sure that Synod members heard that word and all that you said around it.

Ed, thank you very much for using one of my favourite words, "interdependence", and again I hope that Synod members heard the strength and importance of that word left to us in this debate and for this Measure.

David Kemp, thank you very much indeed for all that you have said, and, in particular, bringing to us the word "safeguarding", which is so crucial and that word "different" as we

think about the Channel Islands. I fear we probably have to leave in our minds the Martin Kingston's idea of bishops bathing as perhaps a picture that we can think about as you get ready to vote.

I am very grateful to you and I hope that we now feel able to support "That clauses 1 to 5 do stand part of the Measure".

*The Chair:* Thank you. I therefore put to Synod Item 585 "That clauses 1 to 5 stand part of the Measure".

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 586**

*The Chair:* I now call on the Chair of the Steering Committee to move Item 586 "That the Long Title stand part of the Measure". You have up to five minutes for this as well.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* Slightly in trepidation in view of what happened this morning, I do so move.

*The Chair:* Thank you, this item – and we are intrigued to know what you are going to say – is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so there is no need to respond. Therefore, I put Item 586 to Synod "That the Long Title stand part of the Measure".

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* That completes the Revision Stage for the draft Channel Islands Measure, which now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting.

We now move on to the next item of business, Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 3.58 pm.

## **CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 2020 (GS 2155)**

*The Chair:* We come to Item 506A, for which members will need GS 2155 and the explanatory notes that accompany it. First, a member of the Business Committee will move Item 506A, the preliminary motion that the resolution be considered. This will provide an opportunity to make general remarks about the resolution or to raise specific points which do not relate to the amendments on the order paper. If the preliminary motion is carried, we will then move to the amendments. Members who wish to comment

on an amendment should not do so on the preliminary motion, but should reserve their comments for debate on the amendment.

## **ITEM 506A**

*The Chair:* I now call on Mr Clive Scowen to move Item 506A, that the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020, be considered. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* This is the second item of business emanating from the work of the Elections Review Group, and I see has commanded even less interest than this morning's piece. I hope the numbers in the Chamber might grow as we carry on. This resolution seeks to amend the Church Representation Rules in three respects.

Firstly, part three of the resolution seeks to correct a handful of drafting errors in the Church Representation Rules which were discovered after the Church Representation and Ministers Measure had completed its course through Synod. In particular, paragraph 11 makes express provision for the register of electors not to include co-opted members of deanery synods since they are not entitled to vote. Strangely enough, they were supposed to be on the list before.

Secondly, in paragraph 14, in anticipation of amendments made to the draft Cathedrals Measure by the Revision Committee, it amends the definition of community roll to ensure that only those whom the dean of the cathedral concerned declares to be habitual worshippers are entitled to be represented on deanery synod. This provision is now of no practical relevance. We are partway through the process of diocesan synods making schemes for the representation of non-parish church cathedrals on deanery synods. Some dioceses have made their schemes, others have not, and it would be inappropriate to change the rules in the middle of the process.

So, Sue Booy will shortly, on behalf of the Business Committee, move amendment 533, postponing the coming into force of Rule 14 until July, so that it will not apply to this year's elections by cathedrals to deanery synods. It will not in practice, therefore, have any relevance until the preparation for the 2023 deanery synod elections, by which time it will have been superseded by the community roll provisions in the Cathedrals Measure, which Synod voted to amend this morning, so that they no longer correspond to paragraph 14 anyway. It is here, but just forget about it.

The most important aspect of these rules is part two, which introduces a comprehensive and detailed set of rules which apply where an appeal is brought in connection with an election conducted under the Church Representation Rules at parochial, deanery and diocesan level. In fact, all church elections except for elections to the General Synod, which are dealt with under the three sets of election rules for the three Houses, which we will have the delight of considering later.

The new Election Appeals Rules in part two clarify rights of appeal relating to the eligibility of a voter and the validity of a nomination. See paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraphs 5 to 7 introduce two new procedures, under paragraph 6, a fast-track procedure for cases which raise a point of law, for example on the issue of whether a vote should have been allowed, and paragraph 7 sets out a more lengthy procedure for cases which involve disputes of fact, for example whether the conduct of an election affected the result.

The new rules also make detailed specific provision about the findings which are possible on each type of appeal instead of the current general provision which does not fit in every case.

The summary procedure will be for appeals relating to the validity of a nomination or for appeals against the result of an election on the grounds of whether a candidate was duly elected or qualified to stand or whether a vote should or should not have been allowed.

There is not a freestanding appeal against the allowance or disallowance of a vote. That matter instead just provides grounds for an appeal against the result of an election. There is to be a two-day period for bringing the appeal and the appeal is to be determined within seven days, or five working days in other words. And the appeal will be determined by a judge who will either be the Dean of the Arches, or someone he appoints, or a diocesan chancellor.

The full procedure will be for enrolment appeals, for appeals relating to the eligibility of a voter and for appeals against the result of an election on the grounds of whether there was a misrepresentation of a material fact or how the election was conducted or whether there is an error on the register of electors. On a full appeal, there will be a 14-day period for bringing the appeal. For both types of procedure, the notice of appeal is generally to be given to the presiding officer for the election. I should also have said that on the full appeal, it will be determined by a panel of three persons.

Paragraph 10 amends the Churchwardens Measure to ensure that the appeal provisions in it are consistent with those in the Church Representation Rules. Members who have looked at their Order Paper will have noticed that in addition to the amendment 533, which I have already referred to, there are 16 amendments in the name of Mr Lamming. These originate in concerns raised by him, particularly that no provision had been made as to who were to be considered parties to an appeal, and for those parties to make representations.

We are grateful to him for identifying that omission. There are other amendments which we do not consider strictly necessary, but which nonetheless add some helpful clarity. Furthermore, the raising of these issues precipitated further reflection by the legal team and caused them to propose additional text to deal with related points. All of those

matters are now included in Mr Lamming's amendments. You will be pleased to know that I intend to accept them all.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that they form a coherent whole, and I wish to accept them all, Standing Orders require that we vote on all 16 of them separately, so please bear with us as we go through this process, which we will try to handle as quickly and as painlessly as possible. As I mentioned this morning, resolutions to amend the Church Representation Rules require a two-thirds majority in each House when we get to the final resolution at the end of this process this afternoon.

So, even if you are now, or become totally perplexed or bored, or both, I hope you will trust that the collective minds of the Elections Review Group, the legal team – and Mr Lamming have done our level best to get these right – and that you will affirmatively vote for them. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* Point of order, Mr Cawdell.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Given that we do need a two-thirds majority in each House, I think it might be wise to check at the moment that we are quorate in the House of Clergy. I think they are all in the tea room.

*The Chair:* I am satisfied we are quorate for the House of Clergy. Thank you. This is now open to debate and I call on Bishop Pete.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* I am completely overtaken with admiration for Mr Scowen and Mr Lamming and their colleagues in the way they have done this. I just want to bang the simplification drum. I suspect there is quite a few people outside the Chamber who are, even now, watching a can of Dulux as it solidifies, but that is not the point. We do have to get this stuff done and it is really important. But I do worry about presentation.

Imagine that you are a PCC secretary or an archdeacon trying to access the Church Representation Rules as they will stand after we have passed all this stuff, and I hope we do. Presentationally, they are dense. The whole point of revising the Church Representation Rules was actually to make them simpler and easier to access. And what we are doing now is building in a whole pile of stuff which is really necessary but probably ought not to be standing in the way of those who are trying to find quick answers to questions about quorums for PCCs and that kind of thing.

Therefore, can I ask is it possible for us to look at whether we can reorder or simply put in different sections when these things are published online or in a book such that this dense stuff does not stand as something that is the immediate thing you hit when you

start looking at what is in the rules? The rules need to be usable, not merely for those who have to run appeals, but for those who have to use them on a week-by-week basis. Most weeks we will get a phone call to the bishop's or the archdeacon's office asking for clarification because people already find the Church Representation Rules difficult to navigate their way through. So, can we look? If we cannot reorder the rules or renumber them, can we at least look at how we set them out when they are published, please?

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. Clive, please would you respond?

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* It is always fun responding to Bishop Pete, particularly from up here. Yes, there can be a degree of density in the Church Representation Rules, and I do understand the plea he makes. And I think it is really important that those bits of the rules which are regularly going to be used at parochial level should be clearly and separately available. The good news is that they are. Part 9 of the new rules which came into force on 1 January, the rules preceded by the letter M are the rules that relate to parish governance. You can go to those and read those without having to wade through the minutiae of election appeals or anything else.

Bishop Pete makes a really important point, but I think it is already attended to so far as we can. Now, if it can be made even more easily navigable on the website, I am sure those who have the responsibility of presenting it will have heard the plea and will act on it. It seems that, apart from that, there are no substantive concerns here, so it encourages me to think that you will vote for the final resolution when we get there.

*The Chair:* I put Item 506A "That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 be considered" to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 533**

*The Chair:* I now call on a member of the Business Committee to move their amendment, Item 533. The member may speak for up to five minutes.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* As Clive has said, paragraph 14 relates to cathedral community rolls. I do not need to repeat his explanation at this point, but to reinforce that we are taking out paragraph 14 to delay its coming into force until July so we do not put ourselves in a situation of changing rules mid-process. After you have voted in favour, I quote Clive when I say you can just forget about it. I beg to move amendment 533 standing in my name.

*The Chair:* That item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we put Item 533 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 534**

*The Chair:* We now come to the amendments at Items 534 to 549. The 40-member procedure applies to amendments other than those moved on behalf of the Business Committee or those that are consequential on amendments already agreed by the Synod. I call on Mr David Lamming to move his amendment, Item 534. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Thank you Chair, members of Synod. Might I preface what I am going to say about this item, 534, by just explaining that these amendments really all arose out of a debate unfinished in York, when we were going to be amending the Standing Orders in relation to appeals. And what emerged from the Standing Orders at the time when there was a CNC appeal was that they were very sparse and really not fit for purpose.

As you will have read in the paper, I think it is the 56<sup>th</sup> report of the Standing Orders Committee, you will see that the consequence of not being able to finish the business at York because we ran out of time is that the Standing Orders Committee have been able to look afresh at all the rules relating to appeals and at the same time the appeals rules relating to Synod elections, and we have got three sets of appeals rules there. Likewise, the Business Committee have been able to look again at the appeals rules as they appear in the Church Representation Rules, and that is what is before us at the moment.

It is a lot of words, but, as Clive Scowen has already explained, once one understands what the purport of the amendment is, then everything else is really consequential and so I think what I am going to say over the next couple of minutes, in relation to subsequent amendments I will simply be able to say "I move Item so-and-so". Hopefully, we will not take anywhere near the hour-and-a-half which potentially we have got available until the next item of timed business.

I want, secondly, to express my thanks to the Legal Office and in particular to Chris Packer, who has done a lot of work over the weekend in putting the flesh on the bones of these amendments. Without his work we would not have the text which you have got before you this afternoon.

What do these amendments do? They cure the omission in the text that you have got in GS 2155 for a respondent to an appeal to be able to make representations. So someone, for example, whose entry on the electoral roll of a parish is challenged by someone else in the parish has the right then to respond and say why [this person] should be on the roll. For example, to prove that they have in fact been baptised when it is suggested that they have not. Likewise, in relation to the election appeals, if someone challenges the election of a person, let us say to the diocesan synod, quite plainly as a matter of natural justice

that person should have the right to be able to say, “Yes, I was rightly elected. I was properly nominated”. The other thing these rules do is to give the person who made the decision, be it the electoral roll officer in respect of someone’s name being added to the roll or the presiding officer for an election, to give an explanation as to why he or she made the decision that they did.

Members of Synod, I am not sure that I need really to say very much more than that. What, of course, these rules also do provide and the detail of them is for time limits for making submissions, for some of the appeals to be dealt with summarily rather than have to go to a full hearing, and also for notification of decisions made pursuant to appeals to be in writing. Members of Synod, I think that is probably all I need to say at this stage and I move the amendment standing in my name at Item 534.

*The Chair:* Mr Scowen may reply in under five minutes, please.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Chair, I think I should manage that. As I indicated in my earlier speech, I am happy on behalf of the Business Committee to accept this and all the other amendments. I do not know whether I really need to say that 16 times, or can we just take it as read? Anyhow, I certainly want to say that about this one.

*The Chair:* Item 534 is now open for debate.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* I would like to pick up Mr Lamming’s amendment if I may. I am not in a position now to propose an amendment to this amendment, but were I to be in that position, I might very well propose the words “or omitted” after the word “misrepresented”. I have talked to Geoffrey Tattersall about this and he has advised me that this is the point where I could best intervene.

Some of you may know that I have had a very great interest in elections for some time, and in the disclosure by candidates of any interests or trusteeships. The response from the legal department has been that absent a new Measure or legislation to make such a demand now would be ultra vires. I would like to flag up this afternoon, though, that there are two internal General Synod elections which may require us to make disclosure of interests. These are the elections for General Synod members to become Church Commissioners and the elections to the Archbishops’ Council. And this is because these two bodies are charitable bodies.

As far as I can see this may well put an obligation on potential trustees and it appears now to be a legal requirement rather than guidance to declare immediately you are aware of any possibility of your personal or wider interests which could influence your decision-making. I can give the link to the gov.uk website where this will be found. There is no longer a Charity Commission website, as I found out. This is a short and very clear requirement.

If I may, I might enquire whether the necessary legislation for this requirement in these two elections might be made by way of a provision in one of the Miscellaneous Provisions Measures, which come our way from time-to-time. It occurs to me that should such a provision be passed, albeit for the purposes of these two particular election processes only, General Synod might see fit to frame and use the power or obligation for other elections also. On the basis of this legislation, I would hope that failure to disclose would become appealable in all Synod elections covered by the new provision.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so I put Item 534 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 535**

*The Chair:* The amendments at Items 535 to 543 are consequential on Item 534. I therefore call Mr Lamming to move each of them formally, that is, without a speech, on the basis that being consequential on an amendment the Synod has already agreed, they do not need to be debated. I call Mr Lamming formally to move Item 535.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Items 535 to 543 inclusive.

*The Chair:* Sorry, Mr Lamming, you need to move them one at a time.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I am trying to speed it along. I formally move Item 535.

*The Chair:* Item 535 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so Item 535 is now to be voted on.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 536**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 536. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I move Item 536.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, I put Item 536 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 537**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 537. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 537.

*The Chair:* That item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. Item 537 is now put to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

### **ITEM 538**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 538. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 538.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we go to vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

### **ITEM 539**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 539. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 539.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we go to vote on it.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

### **ITEM 540**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 540. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 540.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. We move to vote on 540.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

### **ITEM 541**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 541. Mr Lamming?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 541.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. We move to vote on 541.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 542**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 542. Mr Lamming.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 542.

*The Chair:* The item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. We move to vote on Item 542.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 543**

*The Chair:* We now move on to Item 543. Mr Lamming.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 543.

*The Chair:* The item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so Item 543 is now put to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 544**

*The Chair:* I now call on Mr Lamming to move Item 544. He may speak for up to five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I shall not need anywhere near five minutes. I will just preface what I am about to say by having noted the time and my archdeaconry mission and pastoral subcommittee are meeting this afternoon and they will just be starting their business now. I am not quite sure what they are going to say when I report back to members what I have been engaged with by being absent from that meeting. In relation to Item 544, all that does is to provide specifically that a notification in the proposed rule has got to be in writing.

It affirms something which perhaps should have been obvious as being necessary, but that is one of the things one does when you are drafting rules to take account of contingencies and being in writing would not necessarily have to be by snail mail or letter because we have already got a provision in Rule 76 of the Church Representation Rules to enable most communications to be by email. I formally move Item 544.

*The Chair:* Mr Scowen, would you like to reply?

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* This is an example of one of those amendments which, as I said, we felt was not, strictly speaking, necessary. As Mr Lamming says, it is fairly obvious. Nonetheless, it does put beyond doubt what was always intended, that the notification should be in writing, so once again I gladly accept this amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Item 544 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we will put Item 544 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 545**

*The Chair:* The amendments at Items 545 to 547 are consequential on Item 534. I call Mr Lamming formally to move Item 545.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Madam Chair, I do move Item 545 but I would like just to point out the particular provision that it contains because this deals with appeals which may be out of time where the notice of appeal has been filed late. You will see that what it does is to enable the panel that is considering that out-of-time appeal to consider it if, having regard to all the circumstances, it is satisfied that there is a good reason to allow the appeal to proceed.

You will see in paragraph (1A) that the panel has to consider, among other things, “The purported notice of appeal and any accompanying written submissions (whether on the question of why notice of appeal was not given within the required time or on any other point)”. So a notice of appeal might be a day late and meritorious and, therefore, ought to be considered even though it is out of time. That is what this rule is providing for. I so move.

*The Chair:* Item 545 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we will move to a vote on Item 545.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 546**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 546. Mr Lamming.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Item 546 is consequential and I formally move it.

*The Chair:* Item 546 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 547**

*The Chair:* Item 547, Mr Lamming.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 547, which is also consequential.

*The Chair:* I now open the debate on Item 547. I see no one standing, so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 548**

*The Chair:* The amendments at Items 548 and 549 are consequential on Item 544. I call Mr Lamming formally to move Item 548.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Item 548.

*The Chair:* That item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so Item 548 is put to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 549**

*The Chair:* Mr Lamming, 549, please.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I have come to the end and, just before moving it formally, can I thank everyone for their support and tolerance, as it were, when going through all these what might be regarded as somewhat tedious points. As Clive said when he introduced this item earlier this afternoon, they are important and, hopefully,

will not need to be used very often but they need to be there if and when there is an appeal.

I am aware, actually, of only two enrolment appeals, one in 1936 in my diocese and one more recently in Carlisle that was conducted by a member of this Synod. That perhaps demonstrates that what we have got here, as it were, are the fall-back provisions, that we have got something to use if and when an appeal arises and we do not have to scabble around on an ad hoc basis to see how the appeal is to be conducted. Having said that, I formally move Item 549.

*The Chair:* The item is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we move to a vote on Item 549.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 506B**

*The Chair:* I now call on Mr Scowen to move Item 506B “That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 be approved”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Well done, Synod, for your patient endurance. That is something we are called to. And well done for resisting the allure of the Bishop of Willesden’s pot of Dulux. I do not have a great deal to say more than I have already said on the first motion but, having passed these amendments, the proposal before you in the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution is even more fit for purpose than it was before.

The very fact that we have Rules does not mean we have to use them, so please do not go out and start precipitating enrolment appeals or such things just because you can. Restraint is another great virtue.

I will take the opportunity, however, if I may, to respond to what April Alexander said earlier on one of the amendments. Actually, what she said was more germane to Rules 58 and 59A which the main resolution seeks to insert. Charity Commission guidance is guidance; it is not a legal requirement. The legal requirements that apply to our elections are contained in our legislation. In any event, interests of that sort are really matters that one discloses at a meeting when they arise. It is different from what you would disclose in an election.

However, she does raise an important point of principle, of policy, and if that is something that she or other members feel they want to pursue, then I think a PMM is the right way to do that and then Synod can consider the principle of the extent of the disclosure requirements that we should have. But as she observed, today is not the day for doing

that. Chair, I simply move 506B “That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 be approved”.

*The Chair:* Item 506B is now open for debate. I see no one standing. Section 7 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969 requires a majority in each House of not less than two-thirds of those present and voting for the resolution to be passed. The question is “That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 be approved”. In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

*The Chair:* The vote on Item 506B: In the House of Bishops, 21 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 91 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 128 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair:* This was carried by a two-thirds majority in all three Houses. The Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 has been carried in all three Houses and will be laid before Parliament. That ends this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 4.51 pm.

## **ITEM 8 SPECIAL AGENDA III PRIVATE MEMBERS’ MOTIONS WINDRUSH COMMITMENT AND LEGACY (GS 2156A and GS 2156B)**

*The Chair:* Brothers and sisters, we now move to Item 8 on Special Agenda III. This Private Member’s Motion raises the really significant issues relating to the Windrush generation and, even more deeply, our broader concerns of conscious or unconscious racism, so this is a debate of some significance.

You will need for the debate GS 2156A and GS 2156B and, also, as we move to consider the amendments to the motion, you will need the Eleventh Notice Paper which is a financial statement on the cost of the second and third amendments. If you have not got that, I think they are being distributed in Synod and I will remind you again when we come to the amendments. I am now going to invite Andrew to speak to this item and to move it. Andrew, you have up to ten minutes.

*Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark):* Friends, I have been on a journey. I became a member of this Synod in a by-election in 2018 and it has been a steep learning curve. 2018 saw the 70th anniversary of the arrival of the Empire Windrush carrying British Commonwealth citizens from the West Indies, invited by the UK Government to come and help to rebuild this nation after the War. It saw the 50th anniversary of the

martyrdom of the civil rights giant, the Revd Dr Martin Luther King Jr. But, of course, this topic is as relevant now as it was then, as it has been for many generations.

My journey has been from submitting what now feels like a pretty polite Private Member's Motion marking an anniversary to feeling myself what Dr King described as "the fierce urgency of now". I want to begin by saying that on one level I personally have nothing to do with the Windrush generation, nor am I an expert in this area. I am raising this because it is a matter of simple Christian solidarity with a group of people who have fallen victim to the injustice and discrimination at the hands of our Government and our Church.

This is an issue of justice and Christian solidarity. St Paul tells us, "Rejoice with those who rejoice; weep with those who weep". It does not matter if their skin is the same colour as yours or not, for we are all one in Christ. Perhaps my own Jamaican British heritage, and having ministered in black majority congregations in South London for all my ordained ministry, may have helped me to see this as something which the Church should be passionately engaged with, but it is not something that affects me personally. What is Christian solidarity really worth if we only ever show solidarity to people like us? We need to learn to stand up for people who are different from us, people who are more vulnerable than we are.

In fact, I want to suggest, friends, that if you are white perhaps you could stand up for the place of black, Asian, minority, ethnic people in Church and society. If you are a man, perhaps you could stand up for the place of women. If you are able-bodied, what about those who are differently able? If you are straight, what about those who are LGBTIQ? Because from my own limited experience, and from the experience of others, I can tell you this: it is exhausting and it can feel humiliating to have to justify your own seat at the table. Are not those who are given a place of strength by this world called to use that to honour those who the world discriminates against? That involves using our prophetic imaginations to look, to see, to speak and, indeed, to act.

In bringing this motion to Synod, what I thought might be a recognition of two important anniversaries has become for me a passion to see urgent change in the Church and to hear a much stronger voice from the Church as a whole in speaking truth and justice to our nation.

When I began this journey, I did not imagine that I would be reading in Amelia Gentleman's excellent book, *The Windrush Betrayal*, about the death in 1991 of Joy Gardner who fell into a coma after UK immigration officers raided her home in the presence of her five-year-old son, restrained her with handcuffs and leather belts and gagged her with 3.96 metres of tape, wrapped seven times around her head, as they attempted to forcibly deport her to Jamaica; or about the death in 2010 of Jimmy Mubenga, who died while being restrained by G4S guards during a flight deporting him from the UK to Angola. Jimmy was held down for half an hour, crying out that he could not breathe until he breathed his last.

It is shocking, but many of us do not see it because, for the vast majority of us sitting in this Chamber today, it is not a problem. You, I presume, for the most part, like me, do not have to live with the worry that our homes may be raided by UK Border Agency guards who will knock down our door at 6.00 am and arrest us heavy-handedly in front of our partner, our young children, our elderly parents – the lived reality of people in my parish – and, yet, we are called to weep with those who weep.

Brothers and sisters, these issues, I believe, affect the soul of our Church and the soul of our nation. Dr King said that our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. He said that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Just this morning, an unknown number of people were deported from the UK to Kingston, Jamaica.

The Government was urged by the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants and others to wait for the Lessons Learned Report into the Windrush scandal to be published before carrying out further deportations. And yet, people who have lived in the UK for decades since childhood, parents of British children who have already served sentences for the crimes they committed, are now being sent to a country where they have nothing simply because of their race.

Miranda Grell, a barrister and campaigner for BAME Lawyers for Justice wrote in *The Independent* newspaper this morning, “White men from Australia or New Zealand are not having their homes raided in the middle of the night by immigration officers, being thrown into detention and deported in chains and shackles while all the world looks on”.

Ben Lindsay, in his excellent book *We Need To Talk About Race*, says that the white church does not tend to preach so much on issues of justice and yet he points out that these issues often disproportionately affect black people and minorities.

Friends, we must look, we must see, we must speak and we must act. In my briefing paper is the story of Doreen Browne, whose mother, father and siblings in 1961 were literally barred from entering the church where I am now the Rector, St Peter’s Church in Walworth, by the priest of the time, due to the plain fact of the colour of their black skin. They eventually found a home in a nearby parish church, but we know that many cradle Anglicans from the Caribbean did not and simply left the Church of England. That is a scandal of our own. Doreen’s family suffered a horrible humiliating racism which still affects Doreen’s relationship with the Church even today, from a priest who should have been welcoming her into God’s Church, a church for all people, and yet in the name of the Church he failed.

I believe it would be the right thing, a helpful and possibly a healing thing for the Church to apologise for this racism. I completely understand those who ask what the point of an apology is, though. Last night at Downing Street and then at Parliament Square there was a protest against the charter flight which eventually took place this very morning for

deportation. One sign directed at the Government read, "Apology not accepted; we want justice". Any apology that we the Church can give must lead to urgent change in our Church, and concrete change at that.

This is not just about the Church's past. Just a couple of years ago a committed black woman told me about her and her mother's experience in their parish church in London. She said, "They are always happy to ask us to cook for church events, but they never ask us to be on the PCC or to be a churchwarden or to think about being ordained". It is shocking. When we consistently see that black and minority ethnic people are underrepresented in lay and ordained leadership roles, we must name this as institutional racism.

I also want to highlight the fact that some of the Windrush generation found a warm welcome in their parish church. Doreen's family quickly found a spiritual home in the nearby church of St Paul's Lorrimore Square. They often visited St Mary's Newington where their cousins already attended. Both places, like many other parishes churches, actively made black people welcome in church. Indeed, in later years at St Peter's Walworth in later years, Doreen's family did indeed find a home. Doreen, who I am honoured to say is here today, has for many years been part of extending that welcome to whoever comes through those doors today. Doreen herself has served as a deputy warden at St Peter's and has been licensed as a Southwark pastoral auxiliary for many years.

Doreen, I salute you and give thanks for your faith and ministry today. As Rector of St Peter's Walworth, I for one am deeply, deeply sorry for the racism your family experienced at the hands of one of my predecessors. Friends, we need to get our house in order urgently.

*The Chair:* Item 8 is now open for debate. I call the Archbishop of Canterbury. I am using my discretion under Standing Order 22(3) to set a speech limit of seven minutes. After the Archbishop has spoken the speech limit will revert to five minutes.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* I have a speech prepared, but it is less eloquent than Andrew's and, with apologies to my colleagues who have worked so hard on it, I am going to ditch it.

I am almost beyond words. Personally, I am sorry and ashamed. I am ashamed of our history and I am ashamed of our failure. I am ashamed of our lack of witness to Christ. I am ashamed of my lack of urgent voice to the Church, to use Andrew's phrase. It is shaming as well as shocking. It is shocking but it is profoundly shaming.

Most of us in here, almost all of us, the vast majority of us, well over 85% – – and remember 15% is roughly the BAME in this country so if we were representative it would be 15% – over 90%, are white. I have white advantage, educational advantage, straight

advantage, male advantage, all the things that enable us to go through life without the kinds of experiences that Andrew spoke of and his wonderful paper speaks of and Doreen knows so well. I am not ashamed of those advantages. I am ashamed of not knowing I had them. I think that is where we probably need to start.

I will just take one phrase from the speech which is that we had a “hostile environment”. What an extraordinary phrase, a terrible phrase, but we have to transform it into a hospitable welcome. I can see that hostile environment coming back when other groups appear who we do not quite like, or we do not know how to deal with or do not appeal to the voters sufficiently and the Church does not speak up for justice.

I have often wondered how the German Church in the 1930s managed to ignore what happened to the Jews. I think they just did not really notice. They just took it that this was normal and perhaps that is what we have done in the way we have behaved since Windrush with so many of our fellow British citizens, who we treated as something less, something less important.

There is no doubt when we look at our own Church that we are still deeply institutionally racist. Let us just be clear about that. It was said to the College of Bishops a couple of years ago and it is true. I get loads of lists to approve. I get short lists and long lists and lists of panels for interviews. We have just about got past the point in the last two or three years where they are not all male, but they very, very seldom have minority ethnic people on them, neither the applications for lay nor for senior clergy posts. I have been trying to play nice and I send them back with a polite note saying, “I’m not absolutely sure this is quite what we want”. We cannot go on playing nice really, can we, I do not think? I will bring this back to Synod in due course, but I think we need some basic rules. An appointment panel does not work if it has no minority ethnic representation or other discriminated-against minorities. It just does not work. It does not work on the CNC. It does not work at any level at all in our Church. It does not work when long lists are simply one colour. It does not work.

Injustice. We did not do justice in the past. We do not do justice now. And, unless we are radical and decisive in this area in the future, we will still be having this conversation in 20 years time, and still doing injustice, the few of us that remain, deservedly. We have damaged the Church. We have damaged the image of God. Most of all we have damaged those we have victimised, unconsciously very often.

In this incoherent speech, I want to emphasise my agreement with everything that Andrew said and end where I began. I am personally sorry to those who are here who have been affected, those around the country, those where I could have done better, to CMEAC and others, Turning up the Volume, and I am ashamed. I will, I hope with all of you, seek to do better.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Point of order. In view of those two speeches, Madam Chair, could I ask you to allow us a moment of silence and perhaps to lead us in prayer in response to those speeches?

*The Chair:* I am informed that it is not a point of order but I think it a good suggestion. Let us take a moment of silence, and then I will lead us in prayer.

*The Chair* led the Synod in an act of worship.

*The Chair:* We now resume the debate. I call Rosemarie Mallett to be followed by Jason Roach. The speech limit has now reverted to five minutes.

*Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark):* Unlike Andrew, I am part of that Windrush generation myself, migrating here, like them, as a child to join my family, arriving with my famous blue passport. Alongside every member of my family, I have faced and continue to face overt racism, unconscious bias and sometimes simple racial arrogance. I am not the only one in this Chamber for whom this is their reality and, quite honestly, people of colour are sick and tired of being sick and tired about this situation. But still, like air I rise, to keep saying to this Chamber that we must rethink not just how we talk about race but what we are doing to make the lives of all people who call our church home a place of welcome, hospitality and belonging, and the place in which they see themselves as integral members at every level.

Despite the flurry of senior appointments over the past few years from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, I know far too many people, lay and ordained and those discerning a vocation, currently experiencing racial bias in their encounters in this Church. It is hard to think that this is happening when for over 30 years the Church of England has had a Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns, staffed and led by amazing lay and ordained people of colour who have had to tirelessly work against the grain to make the national Church take the issue of BAME engagement, involvement and leadership at all levels of the Church seriously. Despite their activities, many BAME people are still feeling battered and bruised by a system that has often displayed good intentions but lacked intentionality over the years.

Last year in October I spoke at an event at St Paul's Cathedral entitled "We need to talk about race: black experience in white majority churches". The event was attended by almost 2,000 people, all eager to hear what the Church is saying on this key issue.

There are just a couple of points that I raised there that I think are pertinent to the demands from this motion. I left the Church at 18, and I am a cradle Anglican, due to institutional racism, and I suppose I came back into it for social justice reasons to make a difference. Institutional racism still remains, so let me say that I am not personally looking for an apology if the apology does not come with a plan of action to change the

situation. My beloved and well-loved stepfather always said to me, “Sorry didn’t stop the lorry”.

Instead, the Church must admit negligence in not fully responding to major critical issues such as the Windrush scandal affecting a large part of the BAME community that make up a good number of members of the Church of England. As well as acknowledging institutional racism, which is still prevalent in our structures, we must be given, all of us – not just the black members or the black members of our churches – a plan of action that indicates a systemic and systematic approach to ensure that issues of diversity and inclusion are embedded in the national Church’s leadership and management processes as well as making it clear how this will be evidenced. This is much more than a one-off unconscious bias training course which can be taken and forgotten if it is not a part of a systemic approach to challenging and reducing bias that the leadership of the institution is leading on.

On that point, we need clear leadership and spiritual governance at the management level from the Archbishops and the Secretary General that they will be ones steering this root and branch approach. The Turn Up The Volume committee has some done good work, but much more is needed than simply turning up the volume if the institution continues to refuse to listen.

The Windrush scandal is beyond a boat, beyond a point in time and beyond a particular group of people. The scandal is that of racism, and that needs to be tackled head on.

Yesterday Archbishop Justin said to be a church that expresses love institutionally, we have to consider the wellbeing of all. If this is the case, we need to move beyond intentionality and put in the hard work necessary to really finish the business that has been long started in this Church.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* Thank you, Andrew, for bringing this motion and, Archbishop, for your words. Some months ago I was walking with a lifelong member of the Church of England. They were alerted to the fact that a baby had been born, Baby Archie, the Royal baby. They breathed a huge sigh of relief as they saw a picture pop up. I asked what they were so relieved about and they said, “I am so glad that the baby has light skin”. The interesting thing about this is they said this to me. They did not realise this in any way was an issue. Unconscious bias is alive and well within the Church of England, as we have already heard mention of.

I want to speak, following on from what we have heard from Rosemarie, in favour of the amendments due to be brought by the Revd Brunel James, because we need to count this, because so often we do not realise we are even doing it. You count what you care about. When last week I opened my payslip from the Church Commissioners, I knew precisely the figure I was expecting to see along the line that said “net pay”. In the recent election, the Government knew very clearly how many people had voted in each

constituency across this land. As a doctor, it is important to me to know how many people we were able to treat before and how many we are able to treat well now, because we count what we care about.

Eight years ago, apparently we asked that details be supplied of the numbers of people of colour who were on boards and councils and committees, and yet, to date that information is not available. We have no idea how deep and serious these issues are. Let us ascertain how things were and how they are now so that we might dream about what they might become, because Jesus gave the Apostle John a vision of the great number that no one could count from every tribe, and every tongue, and every nation, and every language, standing before the Lamb who was slain. And surely that is the vision of our Church.

*The Chair:* I am going to call Annika Mathews. And after Annika has spoken, I am going to ask the Bishop of Leicester to speak to and move his amendment.

*Miss Annika Matthews (Church of England Youth Council):* What I often (although not always I want to add) have encountered on moving to a new church – and I have moved quite a lot over the last few years – is a question that goes like this: “Where are you from?” Reply: “Surrey”. Question and answer repeated in exactly the same way. Other person: “No, where are you really from?” “Surrey”. Person seems unsatisfied. Playing along a bit, as I have realised why they are asking this question. I say, “You mean why do I have this skin colour? My mum is from Sri Lanka”. The other person looks a bit aghast. Less frequently encountered: “Were you a Muslim before you became Christian?” Thankfully only once: “Oh, you’re a bit of a mongrel then”, in relation to a comment that I am of mixed race background.

I am aware most questions are asked out of interest and they are not intended with malice. However, it does not always come across as welcoming. It draws attention to the visible differences present between people in a church.

I count myself as quite privileged because my experiences are very small and I can brush them off and I am fine with it. I have got used to that. But from the stories we have seen in the papers and we see in the media and have heard from others today, the hatred, the violence, the terrible things which have happened to them, little words which I guess most people of BAME heritage encounter in conversation can have the potential to lead to more hatred and violence and brutal attacks. I also count myself as fortunate as I grew up in this country and I am what is classed as a second-generation immigrant. My mother and others in her situation have had to deal also with new cultures, being away from family and new languages. It is a lot to deal with on moving to a new country.

Last year I attended a celebration of vocation and diversity run by Sheffield Diocese. It featured unconscious bias training. I would really recommend the importance of this for everyone in the Church because it is not only about race; it is about gender, disability and

social background, too. Many, myself included, sometimes unintentionally have this bias without realising.

It was only in more recent years that the appalling treatment of the Windrush generation came to my attention, perhaps also because of the increase of media focus during the 70th anniversary year last year. I never learned about it at school. Obviously, I was not one of the generation that came over, being quite a bit younger. I only learned about the American civil rights movement.

I am glad that Synod is now discussing this. The Church has an important role in ensuring that past wrongs are acknowledged and apologised for, and that all God's children are welcome in this Church.

In relation to cases such as the deportation of those back to Jamaica this morning, it must use its voice and speak. Christians are called to stand up and fight for justice and equality. They also have the potential to pastorally assist others who are going through trouble and difficulties in their lives. Speak truth to power. All should be affirmed in their gifts, calling and humanity by others.

I benefitted hugely from my time in churches in Moss Side and Whalley Range in Manchester, where those from many different cultural backgrounds worshipped together and supported one another. The stories and cultures of parishioners are celebrated and included in worship, prayers and church activities. For example, a photo collection on the history of the local Caribbean carnival was put together.

I appreciate the increase of BAME representation in all levels of the Church, but more is needed now. Many dioceses do great work in this. Manchester is one example, and I am sure many others too, but all churches and dioceses need to take note. There is a great lack of support in some places and no visible representation in church structures, just as in churches themselves, is a barrier to many from even exploring vocation or entering into a church.

I would urge Synod to support this motion, but, even more, go back to your churches, congregations and dioceses and take steps to really ensure that all have a voice and a place in the Church; that all feel welcomed and loved and accepted, as they should; that no one's stories, even if they are very difficult to handle and cause a lot of pain, are forgotten; and that we all may pray for an end to discrimination and hate of all kinds.

## **ITEM 27**

*The Chair:* I now invite the Bishop of Leicester to speak to and move his amendment. Bishop Martyn, you have up to five minutes. I am rather hoping with all the amendments that people will be as concise as possible because I want to have a goodly amount of time to return to the main debate after we have dealt with these amendments.

*The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Martyn Snow):* My amendment is for the insertion of three words – and I apologise for three simple words – but I believe they matter. Let me explain.

I was born in South East Asia. I have lived in a number of different parts of the world. I have visited countries in many different parts of the world. I have worshipped in grand cathedrals, under mango trees, as well as in tin shacks. I count it a great privilege to have travelled widely. I can say with real confidence that every church I have entered, without exception, has greeted me with kindness, with generosity, with warmth. As often as not, I have been given a seat of honour, I have been asked to bring greetings or to preach – and all this long before I was ordained. All this as well because I am white, Western and male.

And yet my experience of living in different countries also means that I know something of what it feels like to enter a new culture and be all at sea. I have been through the classic transition curve where the initial fascination with the new culture fades and is replaced by bewilderment, unable to speak the language fluently, unable to read the subtle signs of social etiquette, not knowing how to complete even the most basic of everyday tasks. I remember well how uncomfortable that made me feel and how long a process it was to learn the cultural norms. Yet I experienced this bewilderment in a context where most people were willing to forgive me or to give me the benefit of the doubt. So I cannot even begin to know what it was like for those who arrived on the Windrush, all at sea culturally, turning to the one place they thought they would be welcomed and offered hospitality, only to find they were shunned.

So to those who say, “How can we apologise for the actions of previous generations?” I say, “This is not just about previous generations. The impact continues today”. I have heard it first hand from African-Caribbean people in Leicester. Indeed, the contrast still exists today between my experience and that of many others. So I do want to apologise personally as well as on behalf of the institution.

To those who say that the Church of England seems to be apologising for everything at the moment, I say, “Yes, we are starting to learn a new language, and we’re taking our first steps into a new culture, one defined by humility”. There are, as one writer has put it, several languages of apology. It is not just expressing regret – this is about a lot more than that – but accepting responsibility. As I say, this amendment is not simply about previous generations, though we must acknowledge what an appalling stain this is on our Church’s history, but it is about accepting our part in all of this.

Recently, a group of BAME Christians got together for a retreat at Launde Abbey. And there, on the beautiful hills of Leicestershire, they sat down and wept and lamented, not for the experiences of their parents and grandparents but, rather, their own stories of experiencing racism and unconscious bias in our Church today.

Another language of apology then is about genuine repentance – not just asking for forgiveness but also putting in place the concrete and practical actions to change things. In Leicester, in 2017 we received SDF money which allowed us to employ a BAME Mission and Ministry Enabler, Lusa Nsenga-Ngoy, who is here today. His first task was to research our current position. In a city where more than 50% of the population is BAME, we realised to our horror that we had just two BAME stipendiary clergy and only a handful of BAME lay ministers in the whole city. Today, I am pleased to report that my DDO has told me that, of those currently exploring their vocation in Leicester, 40% are BAME. I hope this is evidence that we are starting to do something to make this apology real and meaningful.

Synod, I am only asking for the insertion of three words, but I believe they are hugely powerful words. I ask you to support this amendment and to commit yourself to taking action to show that this is more than just words.

*The Chair:* Andrew, I now invite you to respond to the Bishop of Leicester. You have up to five minutes.

*Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark):* Today, as Rector of St Peter's Walworth, I have made my apology to Doreen, which I extend to her sister Muriel, to their mother and their father and to the whole family. We have heard very powerful words of apology and of action from Archbishop Justin. I completely understand the reticence of people here who might say that we have had apologies before, who say that an apology can be empty.

Bishop Martyn talked about the need for genuine repentance, genuine turning away from sinful behaviour and turning towards God. I hope that you will agree that the words we have heard today, firstly, have not been empty and, secondly, that they have come with the promise of action. A member of this Synod said to me earlier today that the best form of apology is changed behaviour. I welcome this amendment and I hope you will support it.

*The Chair:* Item 27, the Bishop of Leicester's amendment, is now open for debate. The speech limit for this is three minutes. I need to give some warning that I am not minded to take a huge number of speeches. You are wonderful. I now, as no one is standing, put Item 27 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 28**

*The Chair:* We now move to Items 28 and 29. I call Revd Brunel James to speak. Brunel, I would like you to speak to both your amendments, please, but not to move them just

yet. After you have spoken I will ask you to move the first amendment. But if you could speak to both your amendments. You have up to five minutes for that.

*Revd Brunel James (Leeds):* I needed somewhere quiet to write this speech, so I went to room 6 here in Church House and I sat there for an hour at lunchtime. Room 6 is where an exhibition has been set up to celebrate and honour the Afro-Caribbean community and their contribution to British life. I spent a very pleasant hour there in perfect silence because the hour passed without a single member of Synod popping in to have a look at the photos and read the stories of the Windrush generation. I do take that as a significant sign of where we are still at as a Church.

I have some personal experience of the scandal of our Church's collective failure to give a decent welcome to Anglicans coming to our parish churches from the Caribbean in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. I worked in the Small Heath area of Birmingham a generation later, in the mid-1990s, and the situation there was that two out of three parish churches were having to close due to lack of support. At the same time there were several successful, new black-led independent churches in the area. The chain of causality was plain to see and well understood in the area: white churches had been slow to embrace black members and paid the price in decline; other churches were being founded and enriched by the energy and spirituality of Afro-Caribbean believers, not ours.

I have recently been attending seminars hosted by Dr Anthony Reddie, Director of the Oxford Centre for Religion and Culture, at Regent's Park College. He defines our problem theologically as a failure of catholicity, a failure to see beyond difference and towards an underlying unity. Why have we fallen into this failure of catholicity? Well, Dr Reddie provides the answer, which I think of as being of the utmost importance. There are obviously many painful forms of "othering" which go against the catholic spirit and which we touched on earlier this afternoon. However, the Afro-Caribbean community in our country are affected by a racism that goes back to historical notions of biological racial inferiority which were argued in scientific terms and were used to justify the exploitation of dark-skinned people within the British Empire. It is painful to face this historic reality, but face it we must.

As the Church of England, we always prefer to glide forwards, away from our past mistakes, never really admitting what we have done wrong. This is not the Biblical way, which is the way of repentance, that of taking responsibility, turning around and finding a new direction.

As an assistant DDO I am involved in supporting the vocational journey of the next generation of clergy. It is very striking that even now, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, 70 years after Afro-Caribbean Anglicans began arriving in England in considerable numbers, the number coming through into ordained ministry is still much lower than we would wish to see. Because of the failure to embrace and celebrate the Caribbean community, the Church of England as a whole has missed out on a massive scale. It is time to count the

cost. We like to think that we are a growth-oriented Church, but if we are truly to grow to our full potential we need to understand in terms of hard numbers the way in which our previous failings have made growth impossible in certain parts of the country or have even led to church closures. If we wish to sustain the historic parish system and genuinely be present in every place, in every community, we must ensure that the mistakes of the past can never happen again.

In terms of the two amendments I am bringing forward, Item 28 is something of a backward-looking proposal, something we can manage with our internal resources at a national and diocesan level. Item 29 is meant to look forward and, I believe, needs some external facilitation. If we are serious about the danger of unconscious bias, we cannot presume to examine our own prejudices all by ourselves. That is self-evidently illogical and, I would argue, also displays an unrepentant spirit. We need help to see what we have not been seeing up until now.

I just want to conclude with one recent example of unconscious bias that Dr Anthony Reddie has pointed out in his Oxford seminars. Recently, the Church of England has been championing the cause of anti-Semitism, and I am truly delighted that we have had a significant impact in this area. However, Dr Reddie points out that many in the Afro-Caribbean community have taken offence that we seem to have done much less, with much less effect, to show solidarity with victims of the Windrush scandal. So let us take appropriate action now, in a proportionate way, and make a small investment that can pay great dividends in our future ministry to and with our diverse national population.

*The Chair:* Could I now ask you to formally move your first amendment, Item 28?

*Revd Brunel James (Leeds):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Andrew, I now invite you to respond to Item 28. You have up to three minutes.

*Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark):* I am grateful to Brunel for his thought and passion on this issue. I am also grateful to him for pointing out the Windrush photo exhibition by Jim Grover, which is indeed in meeting room 6. I am not going to ask for a show of hands as to how many people have been there, but I hope that by the end of Synod everyone who would like to will take the opportunity to go and see that because this, like what Brunel is asking us to do, is about hearing the stories. It is about learning from those stories and making sure that people know we have really listened carefully in order to make a difference going forward.

As I have said, I am not an expert on the history of race in the Church of England, but I am told by my more expert colleagues on the platform that it was nearly 40 years ago that this Synod was asked for a commission on race but voted against that in favour of a

committee. I do not know what images come to mind when you think of committees. The work of CMEAC has been excellent in highlighting these issues, but it has not had the power of a commission. Canon Hendricks at the time apparently said that Synod could not accept its black and brown members holding it to account. This is about making sure that we allow ourselves to be held to account, about making sure that the mistakes of the past do not happen again. This is about being serious about this issue and resourcing it seriously because I doubt that any of us want to be here in 20 years time making similar apologies. I welcome this amendment and fully support it.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Andrew. Item 28 is now open for debate. The speech limit will be three minutes. Again, I am minded to not allow more than around three speeches. Before we have this debate, however, I am asked to call your attention to the Eleventh Notice Paper, which is a financial statement relating to both Item 28 and Item 29. Item 28 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* Andrew, that was such a wonderful speech at the beginning. I always worry when the wonderful Dr Elizabeth Henry is sitting there, what she will think of me. We have had some good conversations together. She is our National Adviser on BAME issues, and she keeps me under some degree of control when I go off the rails with both my conscious and unconscious bias.

There is a risk, as I begin to read the Eleventh Notice Paper, of a sense that maybe our first response from the Archbishops' Council, let us say, is a bit negative. I do not think it is negative. I want to support this. I think what it is saying is that this question that is being asked in Item 28 is actually testing but that does not mean we should not do it. It will stretch the theoretical and practical ability of folk to do the research and to make it work, but it should be done, and I certainly am very supportive of that. If I am allowed to, I might even be willing to say I support Item 29 as well, but I know I am not talking to that.

What struck me as well as I was looking into this debate was the very point that you have made in Item 28: what are we missing; what have we missed; what have we lost; what have we not had. That wealth of experience, wisdom, evangelistic zeal, capability, worship style, would have come if only we had encouraged it in those folk who came and were not welcomed and went elsewhere, who have been missing in the TEI staff members at the moment. Those, fortunately, now coming forward at the moment for ordination are not enough. We need more. But what about those who should have been ordained and ministering and in this Chamber debating and commenting and inspiring us? So I worry about letter (b) in the main motion before us. Yes, (b) is absolutely right, but (b) little whatever also says to lament for those who are not able to inspire us and move us forward.

So I do welcome the amendment at Item 28. I think we can find the money. I do not see why we should not. It seems an excellent way of spending more of our money in an appropriate way. Maybe others will have a different view from the Council, but I hope not. As I say, Item 29, again, I would encourage.

*Revd Simon Fisher (Liverpool):* I warmly welcome this amendment. I am glad that Jamie thinks that we can find the money.

Andrew spoke very movingly about the valuing of difference and seeing beyond difference, and I thought Rosemarie's speech was even more important with her own blue passport and her own cradle Anglicanism. There is a danger that we collude with the racism that this main motion rightly calls out by thinking this is about other people. It is not about other people. It is about us. One of the scandals of Windrush was that people were being sent back who did not think they needed the papers because they were British citizens, and that was the scandal of that particular moment it seemed to me, and that pointed to our common citizenship in a heavenly way; it pointed to our common Anglicanism. This is not "other people". These are our people and, as the amendment rightly says, people whose input and whose presence we may well have lost. I think we do need to look at this. I warmly welcome the amendment.

*The Chair:* I am minded to hear one more speech before testing the mind of Synod for closure on Item 28. Can I just ask whether any of the three gentlemen standing wish to speak against the amendment?

*A Speaker:* No, heavily for it.

*The Chair:* In that case I call the gentleman there, please.

*Mr David Ashton (Leeds):* I am a Yorkshireman. One of the things that Yorkshiremen do quite often is think of the cost. As we say in the North, "Where's the brass coming from?" But on this occasion I think the Church should forget Notice Paper XI and put its vote into what we have heard from Andrew today. I would back both of Brunel's amendments. Let us get to the bottom. Let us find the truth.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 28 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 28.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I now put Item 28 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 29**

*The Chair:* the motion is now as amended by Item 27 and Item 28. I now invite Brunel to formally move his amendment in Item 29, please.

*Revd Brunel James (Leeds):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* I now invite Andrew to respond if he so wishes. Andrew, you have up to three minutes.

*Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark):* I fully support the amendment. Thank you, Brunel.

*The Chair:* Item 29 is now open for debate. The speech limit is three minutes. Again, I draw your attention to the financial statement. I see no one standing, so I now put Item 29 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We can now resume the debate on the main motion as amended by Items 27, 28 and 29. I call Rogers Govender, followed by the Bishop of Rochester.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Very Revd Rogers Govender (Dean of Manchester):* I sometimes wonder whether we really understand the level of racism in our churches and even in our cathedrals. I could tell you numerous accounts, personal stories of racism that I have experienced as well as having to deal with as a parish priest and as Dean of a cathedral.

Not more than five years ago I had to reprimand two senior members of my chapter who were involved in a very overt act of racism when it came to our AGM. They had fiddled the figures in favour of a white candidate for churchwarden as opposed to a black candidate. Of course, I became terribly unpopular as a result, which did not bother me terribly much, but action had to be taken. The term that was used constantly during that period in my cathedral was, "We do not want them". It is the "othering" kind of issue. "We do not want them", referring to brown and black people, "in my cathedral congregation". It is a serious issue. It is something that we, as BAME people, experience on a regular basis.

Just a few years ago I was considering putting my name forward for an episcopal post, and so I decided to seek the guidance and wisdom of a then recently retired episcopal colleague. This was one of the responses this colleague gave to me: "Rogers, I don't think you'll be appointed to the post. There's not a lot of BAME people in that diocese". I was trying to think, "Well, when was it that I was ordained to minister just to BAME people?" That was a very liberal episcopal colleague friend of mine. I said to myself, "If

that's the kind of attitude amongst some of my liberal colleagues, God help the Church of England".

Do we now realise why we are very often in the state that we are? The whole story of the Windrush generation and the exclusion experienced by Caribbean folk during that period is still very much alive today. Friends, we have got to believe it. More importantly, we have got to take some serious action, – and we have got to take it now.

Very recently, all of us, including myself, were most supportive – and I still am very supportive – of women bishops in our Church. How is it that we have not been able to appoint BAME bishops to our Church in the same way over these many years, including the 34 years of the existence of the campaigning by CMEAC, which I chair at the moment? At CMEAC we are really struggling to get the Church to listen but, more importantly, to get our Church to act.

I want to appeal and say that prayer is very necessary, repentance is very necessary, – and I am very grateful to Archbishop Justin for saying sorry on behalf of the Church. – That has to be accompanied by some serious action as if BAME people do not see changed behaviour in the way we appoint laity, clergy, in every sphere of the life of our Church, we are going to say it was an empty, empty offer of being sorry or being apologetic, and our prayer itself will stand empty. Let us make a change for the growth of our Church, for the mission of our Church, and let us ensure that our Church represents the diversity that we see in our towns and our cities and, indeed, in this country at large.

*The Chair.* The Bishop of Rochester followed by Mark Murthen and, after Mark Murthen has spoken, I will be reducing the speech limit to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff):* When I think of the Windrush generation, I begin to see faces. For example, Mr Anderson, who soon after I went to be incumbent of the parish where he worshipped in the mid-1980s became our churchwarden. He was from Jamaica. Or Herbert and Marie, who were of the same generation, who had come from Barbados; others in our congregations from St Kitts, from Nevis, from Montserrat and elsewhere.

I am pleased to have the opportunity through this motion to express my gratitude to them and to those who they stand for in my memory because it was those people who began to teach me, to help me to learn as I listened to their experiences, both positive and, more especially, negative. Some of what they taught me has stayed with me, not least about the experiences which they had when they first came and sought to be part of churches in this country. But, interestingly, at that time in the 1980s and early 90s, I had to go mainly outside the Church to learn about these matters in a more intentional and structured way.

Therefore, I also want to express my gratitude to those such as Rosemarie who was a senior director in the housing association where I was a trustee, who helped me through my work with that body to look into these matters in a more thoughtful way and to think through them in a more strategic and structured way. Interestingly, her son is a priest not far from where we stand today. Gratitude to those people but, yes, also the lament and now, after the amendment, the apology which is in this motion, because much of what I learnt from those people and continue to reflect upon was painful and indicated the failures of our Church.

Of course, the further sadness and scandal as this debate has revealed is that, over 30 years later, many of these issues are still with us and are very much live. I have been honoured in these last few years to chair the Turning Up The Volume Steering Group, which has already been referred to, which has been seeking to address a small part of this agenda but an important one in relation to senior leadership roles. We have made some very modest progress, but I am acutely aware of how much there is still to be done in that regard.

Therefore, in relation to section (d) of the motion which talks about “great effort and urgency”, I think if I had got my brain around myself before the debate and put in an amendment it would have been to change “great” to “significantly greater” because we have an awful long way to go. Others have talked about the racism which is still part of the life of our Church, and I endorse that and have become more aware of it through this work.

Yes, we have been able to put in place one or two things which have led to some change, but it is minuscule in the grand scheme of things. Rosemarie, who has been part of that group, has already mentioned and articulated better than I can the challenge to our National Church Institutions and leadership. I want to just focus a challenge to myself and to others as members of this Synod in terms of what we do when we go back to our dioceses.

Bishop Martyn, in introducing his amendment, referred to the particular initiative taken in the Diocese of Leicester and the effect that that has had. That indicates that, actually, concerted attention and hard work and decisions which are thought through and which are intentional can make a difference. Others of us would echo that in relation to initiatives we have been able to take in other places.

Yes, I am encouraged when, as this last Sunday, I meet a black churchwarden in a parish where there has not been one before and when I see those coming forward for licensed lay and ordained ministries where there is some modest increase in my diocese. But when I look at who is employed in the parishes and in my diocesan office, when I look at who serves on our boards and committees, I realise how much more we have to do.

The challenge to myself and to fellow members of this Synod is to take this back to our dioceses and ask what we are doing intentionally in those places. Perhaps one place we could start, of course, is the forthcoming elections to the successor body to this General Synod.

*Revd Mark Murthen (London):* Thank you, Andrew, for your paper. Thank you also to the Secretary General for the Background Note. As we started this debate, I was reminded of Proverbs 27:5-6. Some of us will have heard these verses yesterday, “Better is open rebuke than hidden love. Wounds from a sincere friend can be trusted but an enemy multiplies kisses”. Certainly, many things that we have heard have been painful but it is better to be open about it. Better is open rebuke.

I just want to draw attention to the question of lay leadership from the BAME community in our churches. I am glad it has already come up in our debate so far. I feel this is an area where we are really lacking, desperately lacking. It is really great to hear of work to encourage BAME vocations to ordained ministry but, as we know, as we continually affirm, it is not just about the ordained. You do not need me as a person of colour to tell you this. Just think of your own towns, your own cities, of the diversity there. Then think about your own PCCs, your own deanery synods. We do need more BAME representatives on our PCCs, for wardens, for lay chairs of deanery synod and so on.

I am not sure if I know where we are starting from. We see the paper mentions data on BAME ordinands, but I am not sure if we have that data on churchwardens or on deanery and diocesan synod reps. It is easy for us also to think that we are waiting for the reports to give us answers from the top down, but we also need work being done from the ground up.

I have been involved in unconscious bias training in the London Diocese in the Edmonton area, my diocese, working with PCCs as they consider filling vacancies. But in my experience, as I have undergone that training, as I have helped to train PCC members, they start making all sorts of other valid applications to that training. For example, thinking, “Well, who do we ask to greet people on the front door? Who do we ask to fill key roles? Who do we encourage to stand for PCC?”

I had a brief word with Dr Elizabeth Henry from CMEAC earlier, and she said that work is being done to encourage lay leadership in our churches but, for whatever reason, it does not feel like that is filtering through to us on the ground. As Jason said earlier, in Revelation 7, it talks of every tribe, nation and tongue worshipping together. Our voices will be heard on that glorious day but they need to be heard right now. I wholly support this motion.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin):* I was not expecting to speak but I thought that I would in the end. The sending home of prisoners is a clear statement that you do not belong. Our silence in that is a symptom of what we also believe: people who have lived here and made their lives here. I want to say that when we think about the celebrations that we are going to do later on this year of those who travelled on the Mayflower to America, what do we call them? We call them pioneers. We call them pilgrims. What do we call people now who are fleeing for their lives and seeking to be integrated in a safe country? We do not call them pioneers and pilgrims. We refer to them as asylum seekers and we refer to them as refugees.

I share that with you to say that, in the same way, we do not look at the people in our congregations as ordinary people with gifts to give and contribute to the life of the Church, and that is where we need to change it. We need to change the language that we are using and we need to search ourselves and ask what do we see. Do we just simply see a black face? Archbishop, it never occurred to me, sir, Mr Archbishop.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Sorry, I was looking at you on the television.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin):* Oh, I am sorry. It never occurred to me that when Canterbury said “yes” to me that they were just ticking a box, and I do not believe you did. But it was interesting that that has been said, “Oh, she ticks the box”. I know that for none of my fellow white, female clergy sitting in this room it would have been said that they were ticking the box.

I just want to say to us as a Church that if we are going to go forward, then we are going to be a better Church when we embrace the gifts and the abilities that we all bring to the table. And to say to you, and to say to the Church generally, that if it is excellence and vision that you are looking for, then minority ethnic people will always be at the table.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Mr Michael Stallybrass (York):* In this morning’s sermon, we heard about the evils associated with when we lose sight of the human being. I think it was Terry Pratchett who wrote that sin is treating people as things. I feel ashamed today that we have a government which is propagating what they describe as a “hostile environment”, where in that environment people have been lost sight of. How can we, as a Church, remain silent?

Last Sunday was being celebrated in the Catholic Church in this country as Racial Justice Sunday. I would like just to bring to your attention two things which were said: “You are not on the margins of the Church. You are at the centre. You are the heart of the Church”. That was Pope Paul VI talking to Roma Travellers. Pope Francis, very recently, said, “The time has come to put an end to age-old prejudices, preconceptions and mutual

distrust that are so often the base of discrimination, racism and xenophobia. No one must feel isolated and no one is authorised to trample on the dignity and rights of others". I think those words are a call to every single one of us in what we do as we go back home from this Synod.

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Lynn and, then, if anyone is standing, I will be testing the mind of Synod for closure.

*The Bishop of Lynn (Rt Revd Jonathan Meyrick):* Thank you, Madam, very much, especially for giving me a second chance to expand on my vigorous support for this motion. 23 years after the Windrush generation arrived here, I went back out there and I had three years in Barbados teaching in the Theological College at Codrington. There were some 30 ordinands there, all of them fantastic priests in the making. Nearly a third of that number are now in higher dignitary posts, mostly in the Caribbean itself but in one or two cases elsewhere as well. Fantastic people.

The welcome that I received was just staggering. For the whole of the three years that I was there, I felt a key part of the life of the Church in that island and in that province. I felt warmly welcomed and greeted and taken for what I was. That makes it doubly shaming that over here we failed to do that.

It also leads me to say that there are other paragraphs in this motion that I want to affirm as well, particularly (b) and (c), because the amount that is given here by our fellow brothers and sisters, despite the absence of proper welcome that we gave them, is just staggering and I do, indeed, thank God for it.

*The Chair:* There is somebody standing, in which case I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether this item has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 8.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* That motion is clearly carried and so I now invite Andrew to respond to this debate. Andrew, you have up to five minutes.

*Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark):* I am grateful to the Bishop of Lynn in his last words for highlighting one thing which, sadly but probably rightly, has been missing in our conversation today, which is to celebrate and to give thanks for everything that the Windrush generation and their children have brought to our Church and, indeed, our nation. Please do go and see the Windrush exhibition for a real dose of life and joy. That is the scene in so many of our parishes.

One of the ironies of my bringing this motion to Synod is that if you come to our church, to St Peter's Walworth, you will see such a vibrant community, a congregation where

people of every tribe and nation and language are taking part at all levels. We want to celebrate that and give thanks for that. If I knew how to, I would say perhaps we could have finished this session going out to Lord Kitchener's, "London is the place for me". If you do not know that song, YouTube it later, pour yourself a rum and coke and celebrate and give thanks.

Archbishop, I want to thank you for your profound listening. I want to thank you for tearing up the speech, although I am sure it was a very good one and said lots of good things. I thank you for the apology that you have offered to individuals and to those who have worked hard to make this a church for all. It is my sense, Father, that you do not see this apology as an end but as a beginning to a new, urgent chapter in which we all work together for real, strategic steps towards becoming a church for all, a place where everyone knows that they truly, deeply belong.

It is important that you told us how shocking and shaming the racism people have experienced in the Church is. It is important that you have spoken about a hospitable welcome rather than a hostile environment. It is important to hear you say that we are still deeply institutionally racist. This is us. This is you and me, friends, that we are talking about. It is important that you spoke about the advantages that so many of us have here.

I want to encourage us all to look at ourselves, to look at our own advantages and our own privilege because those are things with which we can make a positive difference. This can become something which brings about joy and change once we acknowledge our advantage. It has been very good to hear about the practical steps that you are taking in your role of leadership which are very concrete steps. As you have said, we do not want to be having this conversation in 20 years time.

Rosemarie Mallet spoke about "being sick and tired of being sick and tired". In some ways, what more can we say? That says so much. This must not just be about talk because there is still racial bias and this needs to be about change. This also needs to raise the question, as Rosemarie said, about the evidence for change. This needs to be about clear leadership. This must be about the institution listening as the volume is being turned up.

That evening in St Paul's Cathedral where you spoke so powerfully, Rosemarie, seemed to me to have an amazing energy about it, partly just seeing so many black people in St Paul's Cathedral but also to sense a new sense of belonging as stories were heard and teaching was given.

Jason reminded us of the everyday casual racism that still exists in our society and which needs to be reflected upon and called out. He talked very powerfully about the importance of measurements. We count what we care about. Could we ask archdeacons in their Articles of Enquiry to count some of the things that we are talking about, and that is for ordained and for lay.

Annika also mentioned the casual racism that she has experienced. I just wonder if we can think for ourselves and imagine how it feels to be othered in that way. Friends, I want us, in supporting this motion, to build a Church of England which is not going to other people but is going to be a place where all are welcome because we are all strangers and aliens here on Earth together.

*The Chair.* This has been an extraordinarily powerful and significant debate. I apologise to those I was unable to call and your voices were not heard.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* Point of order. Due to the extremely important nature of this debate, would you be willing to accept a count of the whole House.

*The Chair:* I would, if we see 25 members standing. Excuse me, the gentleman that raised the point of order, you said “the whole House”, did you mean the whole Synod?

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* Yes. I do apologise, Madam.

*The Chair.* I now order a counted vote of the whole Synod.

*The motion was put and carried, 295 voting in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions.*

*The Chair.* This now concludes this item of business. I believe we will be passing to the next item of business, 19, but somebody will confirm that. Thank you very much, everybody.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 6.29 pm.

## **ITEM 19**

### **56<sup>th</sup> REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (GS 2157)**

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, we now come to business relating to the amendment of our Standing Orders. Members will need the First Notice Paper, this afternoon’s Order Paper and also the Report of the Standing Orders Committee, GS 2157. No notice has been given of amendments to Items 18, 20 to 23, 25 and 26 on the First Notice Paper and there has been no request to debate these items. They were therefore deemed to have been approved by the Synod yesterday at 5.30 pm.

The only items on the First Notice Paper we are concerned with are Items 19 and 24. A number of amendments are proposed. Some of those amendments raise substantive issues. Others are consequential amendments that will need to be made in the event that the substantive amendments are carried. While it may be necessary for the mover of

substantive amendments to speak to explain their effect, consequential amendments can, I hope, be moved formally.

Having taken advice from the Registrar, I have also determined in exercise of my authority as Chair under Standing Order 15(2) that consequential amendments may be moved en bloc provided they are not opposed and no member indicates a wish to speak or vote on a particular amendment.

I now call on the Chair of the Standing Orders Committee, Mr Geoffrey Tattersall, to move Item 19.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* Here we go again. Members of Synod will have seen from the First Notice Paper that the 56th Report of the Standing Orders Committee deals with proposed amendments to Standing Orders 123, 132, which we are not concerned with, and 135, which sets out a comprehensive set of provisions relating to election appeals. And there are consequential amendments to Standing Order 154, which we are not concerned with. I am sorry for the length of the First Notice Paper, but it is necessary for it to be so long to deal with all the relevant matters. Having said that, I am confident that all of you have carefully read Notice Paper I and digested it.

[start here, 4.09.47]

Where we are at the moment is Standing Order 123 currently addresses the situation where there is a vacancy in see and provides that a suffragan bishop who is temporarily exercising the functions of the diocesan may attend this Synod and speak but not vote in place of the diocesan. The Standing Orders Committee was asked to consider widening the scope of Standing Order 123 so that it would cover other situations where the diocesan issues an instrument delegating the functions of the diocesan to another bishop. We believed there was much merit in this so that where the diocesan was unable to carry out his duties, whether from disability, illness or absence from the diocese, the diocese should continue to have an episcopal voice on this Synod. Items 18 to 20 – we are concerned only with Item 19 – give effect to those proposals.

It would be helpful at this stage if I refer to the amendments proposed by Mr Lamming. Mr Lamming has engaged, quite properly and quite sensibly, with the Church House lawyers and myself, as late, I might say, as 12.40 this morning when I was asleep. He sought to explore ways in which these provisions might be further improved and when they come to be proposed by him, I will, with my personal thanks to him, accept all of them, you will be glad to know. That is all I want to say on Item 19, so I beg to move Item 19 standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Geoffrey. I am now going to invite David Lamming to move his amendment at Item 30. He has up to five minutes to do so.

## **ITEM 30**

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I hope it will not take as long as five minutes. The amendment at Item 30 stands apart from the other amendments which I shall be moving shortly. Those other ones replicate the amendments we agreed a little earlier this afternoon in relation to the Church Representation Rules.

What prompted the amendment at Item 30 that I am now proposing arises from the current suspension of the Bishop of Lincoln. He has been in suspension for reasons that members of Synod may or may not have read about since May last year. The Bishop of Grimsby, David Court, has been designated as Acting Bishop. A couple of weeks ago he and the other suffragan bishop in that diocese, the Bishop of Grantham, issued an *ad clerum* letter in which they stated that they had had no involvement in the controversial statement issued by the House of Bishops in relation to civil partnerships. That set me looking at the relevant legislation, particularly in light of this proposed amendment to Standing Orders at Item 19, to see whether it was sufficient to ensure that the Acting Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Grimsby, would have a voice in this Chamber.

Because of doubts as to whether that could be the case, just in light of the amendment which you have at Item 19, I have proposed, and it has been accepted as you know by Geoffrey Tattersall, the additional words at Item 30. If I can just explain how this arises because there is a reference there, as you see, to section 37(3) of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003.

Section 37 of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 is the provision by which an archbishop can suspend a diocesan bishop, which is of course what has happened in respect of the Bishop of Lincoln. And subsection 3 says this: “Where a notice of suspension is served under (1) above the Archbishop may, after consultation with the two most senior diocesan bishops of his province” – and in this case that is the Bishops of Birmingham and Worcester – “make such arrangements as he thinks fit for the ministrations of the diocese or province concerned while the suspension remains in force”.

The effect of the amendment that I am proposing at Item 30 by inserting the words “or pursuant to arrangements made under section 37(3) of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003” would enable, if agreed, the current Bishop of Grimsby to attend and speak at General Synod.

It is one of those occasions where it has not happened before. It is rather like the Appeals Rules. For the first time ever we have had the suspension of a diocesan bishop, 17 years after the CDM. I think that is all I need to say by way of explanation for that particular amendment, and I would ask you, members of Synod, to approve it.

*The Chair:* Geoffrey Tattersall to reply if he wishes. Again, he has up to five minutes.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I have already indicated to the Synod I accept this amendment.

*The Chair:* Item 30 is open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln):* We have already had set before Synod the situation we find ourselves in in Lincoln Diocese and on behalf of the Diocese we are grateful for the prayers of so many who are sustaining us as we work through the current situation. We are concerned though that the Church does learn from our experience. I pray that nothing similar ever arises in another diocese, but of course it is always possible that it might. We are grateful for David Lamming's amendment such that should history repeat itself, an acting diocesan bishop may have both seat and voice here in General Synod, and some small good may arise from the situation we find ourselves in in Lincoln Diocese. I commend this amendment to Synod.

*The Chair:* Before the next speaker, just a reminder that we need to express ourselves very carefully this evening as the matter which is being touched upon in this part of the debate is still a question of police investigation.

*Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn):* I support this amendment and, indeed, all the other amendments that David Lamming has put forward. I just want to point out that the Synod app is out of date with the Standing Orders and when I went through them – I did go through them all earlier – it was very difficult to make sense of some of them because the app is showing the amendments as they were in May last year. In fact, there was a further amendment in July of last year. Could the app be kept up-to-date, please?

*Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford):* I would like to point out that our diocesan bishop is currently on sabbatical, and consequently we do not have episcopal representation as the Diocese of Oxford at present. So I do not think this is necessarily such a rare event, and it is good to remedy it.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* I am seeking clarification from Geoffrey Tattersall, please, in my ignorance. In the First Notice Paper, the paragraph reads, "The bishop may attend and speak but not vote". Could I ask why not, please?

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so we now move to put the amendment to Item 30 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We return to debate on Item 19 as now amended by Item 30. I see no one standing. Geoffrey, do you wish to reply on the main item?

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I do not wish to reply to the debate. I want to say to Philip Geldard that only members of the General Synod are allowed to vote. If we wanted to change that we would have to change the Constitution, which I fear is a bigger job than he envisages.

*The Chair:* We move to a vote then on Item 19 as amended.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 31**

*The Chair:* I now call David Lamming to move Item 31 standing in his name. Again, he has up to five minutes if necessary.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Item 31 is rather putting the cart before the horse because what it does is to amend the definition in Standing Order 131 to say that for 135 substitute 135M. We have not got to 135M unless we pass all the other amendments. I am wondering whether it makes sense to do that, it is rather illogical, or whether that should not be a following amendment. I will take the Chair's guidance on that before proceeding.

*The Chair:* I think we are going to continue as set out.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* In which case, I anticipate, members of Synod, that you will approve everything that follows because you have read it and you are happy with it. In which case I do not think I need to say more in relation to Item 131 than, as I say, it anticipates acceptance of amendments which are in equivalent form to all those amendments you agreed two or three hours ago in relation to the Church Representation Rules. They provide for respondents to appeals to have the right to make representations, et cetera. I invite you to approve them.

*The Chair:* Geoffrey Tattersall, you have up to five minutes to respond.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I accept this amendment.

*The Chair:* Item 31 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so we move to vote on Item 31.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 20A**

*The Chair:* I call on Geoffrey Tattersall now to move Item 20A.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* This item relates to Standing Order 135 and is more significant. The proposals relating to the changes to Standing Order 135 were prompted by the decision of an appeal tribunal which I chaired, given on 6 April 2018, where we observed that there was apparently a lacuna in our Standing Orders.

*The Chair:* I think you need to move it formally.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I have to move this formally. I am sorry, I am getting lost. I so move.

*The Chair:* This is Item 20A. Do I see any debate? I see no one standing, so we put Item 20A to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I think we may be now catching up with ourselves. I invite Geoffrey Tattersall to move Item 24.

## **ITEM 24**

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I am certainly catching up with myself, too much in advance, but there it is, the time is getting late, and it has obviously been a very late night already. The amendments to Standing Order 135 were prompted by a decision of a tribunal in April 2018 where we realised that there were no real rules about election appeals. For example, there was no provision which said whether or not the hearing should be in public or in private. That is obviously not very satisfactory and you might as well jump one way or the other and provide a default position to change things round.

Synod will remember that we were going to come to this Synod last July with proposals, but there was insufficient time to debate them. This was fortuitous because something which Mr Lamming had raised gave rise to a number of thoughts, and all these items, Items 24 to 26, of which the vast majority is Item 24, result from those labours.

Synod will understand that in five minutes I cannot possibly explain what is written down in about 16 pages of script, but you will see that they are necessarily complex. The provisions relate to what an appeal may relate to. – See Standing Orders 135, 135A and 135B. They provide two new procedures: a summary election appeal which is intended to be a fast-track procedure, by which we mean that things can be dealt with quickly with a two-day period within which to bring an appeal, a determination within seven days, and a determination on the basis of written representations to a single judge, the Dean of the Arches, or someone appointed by him. It also provides for full election appeals, which are a more detailed procedure which will deal with disputes of fact, with a 14-day period in which to bring an appeal and the determination by a panel of three people appointed

by the appropriate House, who must have between them suitable legal or other experience.

It also includes a sort of triage system whereby there is to be a preliminary assessment as to whether or not there are grounds for appeal. That is something which happens in the ordinary legal world. The hearing is also to be in public unless the appeal panel, having regard to all the circumstances, is satisfied that it would be in the interests of justice for the hearing to be in private. There is then a provision for appeals to be made out of time. That is Standing Order 135K, which requires the appellant to show good reason why the appeal was not pursued within the 14 days.

Again, Mr Lamming has proposed a series of amendments. It is fair to say that some come directly from him and others have been prompted by Legislative Counsel. However, all the amendments which he is proposing have been drafted by Legislative Counsel. The amendments look far more formidable than they really are because there is quite a lot of necessary repetition in them and when they come to be proposed I will again, with my thanks to Mr Lamming, accept all of them.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Geoffrey. Members of Synod, confident that we ought to be able to move on with despatch but also very mindful of the need, if we possibly can, to complete this business this evening, I am going to seek your consent to extend this sitting for not more than 15 minutes. Does that have your consent? Please show clearly.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I now invite David Lamming again to move the amendment standing in his name at Item 32, with up to five minutes if necessary.

## **ITEM 32**

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I think just two sentences. One to respond to an observation which Geoffrey made a few moments ago about being sent an email at 1.20 in the morning. Members of Synod, these amendments, happily, were resolved over the weekend. All I did at 1.20 in the morning, having looked at the paperwork, was to observe that one of the amendments was not on the Notice Paper. I copied Geoffrey in on an email to Jenny Jacobs and Sue Booy to make sure we have everything on paper today. I did not expect Geoffrey to be looking at an email at 1.20 in the morning. That is the beauty of emails: you can send someone a message and they decide when to look at it.

The other point is just to reiterate what I said in the debate earlier this afternoon, how much we are grateful to Chris Packer, Legislative Counsel, for all the work he has done, in particular over the weekend on the amendments which are now before you.

Having said that, I move Item 32 which stands in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Geoffrey, I believe you have indicated that you do not wish to reply on this occasion, in which case Item 32 is open for debate. I see no one standing. We therefore move to a vote on Item 32.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 33 TO 35**

*The Chair:* Items 33 to 35 are consequential on Item 32, which we have just passed. Therefore, I ask David Lamming formally to move en bloc Items 33 to 35.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Those Items are open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore we move to a vote on Items 33 to 35 taken together.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 36**

*The Chair:* I call on Mr Lamming to move Item 36, again with up to five minutes if necessary.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* This amendment is similar to ones we passed earlier in relation to the form of notification of decisions. It requires notifications to be in writing. That might have been assumed to be the normal means of communication, and what we are doing is putting in an amendment to make that absolutely clear. I formally move Item 36.

*The Chair:* I understand Mr Tattersall continues his Trappist vow. We therefore move to any debate on Item 36. I see no one standing. I put Item 36 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 37 TO 41**

*The Chair:* Items 37 to 41 are consequential on Item 32, which we have passed, and therefore I call on Mr Lamming formally to move, again en bloc, Items 37 to 41.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Items 37 to 41 inclusive.

*The Chair:* Items 37 to 41 are open for debate. I see no one standing. We move to a vote on Items 37 to 41.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 42**

*The Chair:* Item 42 is consequential on Item 36 and I call on Mr Lamming formally to move Item 42.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 42 is open for debate. We move to a vote on Item 42.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 43 TO 45**

*The Chair:* Items 43 to 45 are again consequential on Item 32. I invite David Lamming formally to move en bloc Items 43 to 45.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move Items 43 to 45 inclusive.

*The Chair:* Items 43 to 45 are open for debate. We move to a vote on Items 43 to 45.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 46**

*The Chair:* Item 46 is likewise consequential on Item 36 and I call on Mr Lamming formally to move Item 46.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 46 is open for debate. We move to a vote on Item 46.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 47**

*The Chair:* I now invite Mr Lamming to move Item 47, and on this occasion you may have up to five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I will not detain you, members of Synod, for anywhere near that time. I will simply say for the final time this afternoon I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 47 is open for debate. I see no one standing. We therefore move to a vote on Item 47.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We now resume the debate on Item 24 as amended by the many amendments that we have passed, which I will not list in full. Is there any debate on the amended main item, Item 24? I see no one standing. We did not need those 15 minutes, did we? Mr Tattersall does not need and has decided not to reply, so I put to you Item 24 as amended.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Thank you, Synod, very much indeed. That completes that item of business. Very well done. You can all congratulate yourselves. Please remain in your places for evening worship, which will be led in a moment by Canon Allison. And just to remind you before we move to worship that Dean's Yard will be closed tomorrow and you will need to come into the building through the main entrance on Great Smith Street tomorrow morning. Thank you, Synod.

*Revd Canon James Allison (Leeds)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

## **Full Synod: Third Day Wednesday 12 February 2020**

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves Smith (London)* took the Chair at 10.05 am.

### **ITEM 9 SAFEGUARDING: RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN IICSA MAY 2019 INVESTIGATION REPORT (GS 2158)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 9. For this Item members will need GS 2158, the Sixth Notice Paper and the Twelfth Notice Paper, which contain financial statements relevant to the main motion and the amendment. This is a debate on the Archbishops' Council's response to the recommendations contained in the May 2019 investigation report of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. Members will realise that the motion has a very clear focus and, of course, speeches should be addressed to that clear focus. However, there is an amendment in the name of the Bishop of Huddersfield at Item 48 and I propose to take that early in the course of our business this morning to allow the slightly wider debate that will be possible.

Members, I know, will be very aware that there are survivors of abuse in this chamber, in the gallery and indeed following our proceedings from beyond these walls, and I know that we would all wish to be mindful of that when speaking with care and sensitivity. Could I now invite the Synod to spend a moment of silence as we prepare for this debate?

*The Chair* led the Synod in an act of worship.

*The Chair:* I now invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to speak to the motion at Item 9. Bishop, you have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* Good morning, Synod. When I took on the role of Lead Safeguarding Bishop some four years ago it would be fair to say that I did not really know all that I was getting into. As I have often said, I am not a safeguarding professional. As I get ready to pass the lead safeguarding responsibility to Jonathan Gibbs, Bishop of Huddersfield, I reflect on these years as an experience and a privilege I will never forget. The IICSA hearings, the conversations with victims and survivors and the learning lessons reviews, all this together has had a deep and profound impact upon me. At times I have been left angry and bitterly ashamed at how the Church I love has behaved, but I have also seen light being shone into dark places.

The past four years has been an important period for the Church in its safeguarding work. Significant progress has been made. The Church has improved governance, invested significantly in posts, training and audits. It has developed a suite of guidance, procedure and policy and, in doing so, has taken necessary steps towards a safer system that seeks to prevent abuse. We can and should celebrate some of our safeguarding achievements. Circa 250,000 people have now completed safeguarding training. We have an independent National Safeguarding Panel acting as our critical friend and supporting national safeguarding governance. Safeguarding is now firmly embedded into our recruitment processes for clergy and church offices.

These developments, whilst incredibly welcome, have come about too slowly, and we know that, and we have much further to travel on our safeguarding journey. As the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding, I have seen first-hand there remains a very real danger that when safeguarding is discussed in the Church that we still experience it as something other or as somebody else's responsibility.

I said at the start that I am not a safeguarding professional but as a bishop I know that safeguarding must be at the very heart of all of our work in the Church; embedded in our theology, in our mission, in our practices and in our policies. We must remember that safeguarding affects us all. Every member of this Synod and every member of the Church has safeguarding responsibilities. It is not a responsibility we can pass to anybody else.

I shall be pleased to welcome the amendment being brought by the Bishop of Huddersfield and I am grateful to him for this. The amendment calls for a more survivor-

centred approach and a commitment to exploring options for redress. I endorse the spirit of this amendment and I hope that Synod will accept it. We must all work together to make the Church a safer place for everyone, and one that responds with care, compassion and professionalism to victims and survivors.

As we come to this debate, I ask you to remember, as the Chair has already done, that victims and survivors of abuse are amongst us today. I hope that in our debate we will hear a very wide range of voices and consider the calls for change that I hope will come whilst respecting the very real sensitivities that are involved.

To begin, I would like to give you a brief background into the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA). The Inquiry was established in March 2015 by the Government to consider the growing evidence of institutional failures to protect children from child sexual abuse, and to make recommendations to ensure the best possible protection for children in the future. Some estimates suggest that one child in every 20 in the United Kingdom has been sexually abused.

The inquiry also incorporates the Truth Project, which offers victims and survivors of abuse the opportunity to share their experiences in writing, on the telephone or in person. To date, over 4,000 people have come forward to speak to and with the Truth Project. In May 2019 the Truth Project published a thematic report into child sexual abuse in religious institutions. It provides powerful qualitative and quantitative evidence that sexual abuse in a religious setting is a terrible abuse and breach of trust, a breach of faith and an abuse of power. In their findings they note that individual perpetrators were afforded trust and high standing, where their actions were never questioned and their ability to abuse was never contemplated.

The investigations into the sexual abuse of children in the Church of England came following an invitation from the Archbishop of Canterbury. To date there have been three public hearings. In March 2018 there was a three-week hearing into the Diocese of Chichester, which considered the multiple allegations of sexual abuse which had occurred there and the resulting investigations. In July 2018 there was a one-week inquiry into the case study of Peter Ball, the former Bishop of Lewes and subsequent Bishop of Gloucester. In July 2019 there was a further two-week hearing on safeguarding in the Church more widely. This considered whether themes identified in the first hearings were national issues and four dioceses were chosen as sample dioceses for a deep-dive analysis.

Throughout these hearings the powerful testimonies of victims and survivors of sexual abuse in the Church have provided the strongest evidence that our safeguarding journey is far from done. Listening to their accounts has been deeply moving and often harrowing. I commend their bravery and I thank them for coming forward. These are voices that we need to hear and to heed.

The inquiry has also heard from staff throughout the Church, from parish safeguarding officers, to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and in all our engagement with IICSA we have sought to be open and transparent and welcomed opportunities to explore our safeguarding practice and have been seeking ways to move it forward.

In May 2019 the inquiry published its interim report into the Anglican Church, focusing on the first two case study hearings, Chichester and Peter Ball. We anticipate that the inquiry will publish a further report on safeguarding in the Church later this year and we recognise and acknowledge there will be more recommendations and further matters to consider. The National Safeguarding Team has put strenuous efforts into identifying the key themes that have emerged from the IICSA hearings, including our response to victims and survivors, issues with the Clergy Discipline Measure and oversight and governance of safeguarding. Synod will be pleased to hear that we are already working to address these and other issues and to build them into our safeguarding practice.

Today, though, this Synod is asked to consider the first report that we received from the Inquiry which gave five key early recommendations. These are outlined in GS 2158. I would emphasise that all five of these recommendations have been welcomed and accepted by the Church in their entirety. I hope that Synod will see from the paper that we have already taken significant steps in our efforts to implement these five recommendations. I look forward to hearing this debate and I encourage Synod to give unequivocal support to the motion and, I hope, the amended motion that has come before us this morning.

*The Chair:* Before we begin our debate may I just mention that members of the National Safeguarding Team are available during the course of this debate and immediately afterwards if anybody wishes to speak to them. Item 9 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* I want to start by reaffirming what Peter said and agreeing with every word he said, including I hope very much that we affirm as close to unanimously as possible the motion with its amendments.

I want to reaffirm my apology and to join in with his to the survivors and victims who are here today, and to echo his words, to quote his words; they are voices we need to hear and to heed. I want to reaffirm that I know that around this chamber in the House of Bishops, in the House of Laity, in the House of Clergy, there are victims and survivors at different stages, more than we think, as well as those in the gallery who have had the courage and the resilience to come forward and to demonstrate how badly we have done in the past and what we need to do.

We are deeply committed to listening to and implementing the recommendations of IICSA and to pursuing more urgently the desire for a safe Church. As Peter said, the journey is far from done. In this debate let us hold to the fact that we have not gone nearly as far as we should, we have not satisfied the conditions to be a safe Church and there is much more to be done. Peter mentioned, and I echo, CDM responses to victims and survivors and the independence of safeguarding as areas that we need to continue to deal with.

Having said that, there is nothing that we can be complacent about it, far from it, quite the reverse. I want to pay tribute to Peter for the work that he has done. It has been onerous, utterly consuming, personally costly. As it did with Paul before him, it has been at high personal cost – emotionally, spiritually, mentally, even physically. I quote from something that was sent completely unsolicited from a survivor of clergy sexual abuse. The survivor says, “Below is what I would like the Archbishop to read as a thank you to Bishop Peter. Please pass this on to him”, which I am now doing. It is to be anonymous.

“Thank you on behalf of a survivor of clergy sexual abuse for all you have done within the Church. For myself you have been a true shepherd, making yourself available and giving of your time, looking out for me and exposing yourself to harrowing situations to bring me and others healing, counteracting past abuse by clergy. Thank you for creating a safe place of care and for bringing light into darkness. God bless you.”

I want us to reflect on that, not because we can say, “Oh, haven’t we done well”. No, we have not. Not nearly well enough. Far from it. I say that to victims and survivors – far from it. Our new Episcopal Lead on Safeguarding has a huge mountain to climb and we must climb it with him. We must climb it most of all with them. I say it because I hope this Synod will rise to its feet and acknowledge the enormous sacrifice that is made by those who take the lead on this. With these words I end. Peter, thank you.

*The Chair:* We continue with the debate at Item 9.

*Ms Kashmir Garton (Worcester):* I declare an interest in this motion as I am a senior manager within the National Probation Service and have a vested interest in safeguarding. I fully endorse the responses to the five safeguarding recommendations made by the IICSA inquiry. The responses introduce changes which will be far-reaching and will provide a robust framework for safeguarding within the Church.

The legal designation of religious communities and the inclusion of clergy and lay officers in the legal definition of positions of trust will place such changes on a statutory footing and, as such, provide the Church with powers to enforce such changes where necessary.

I particularly welcome the approach of learning lessons case reviews for sharing learning. This will mirror the learning from serious case reviews within Children’s Services, the serious further offence reviews within the Probation Service, the Prison and Probation Ombudsman reviews into death and learning from domestic homicide reviews. By

undertaking these reviews independently of the home parish or diocese the Church can learn from actual events to strengthen its procedures and practice and help reduce the risk of such learning being repeated. By promoting a culture of openness, honesty and evidence-based learning, churches can be empowered to learn from each other and provide strong leadership in good safeguarding practice.

I urge Synod to endorse the responses. Safeguarding is at the heart of our mission. Survivors need to see concrete actions to rebuild their trust in our Church. I am hopeful that the responses and strategy being put in place by the National Safeguarding Team where survivors are at the centre will help the Church to redress past actions and, more importantly, use past learning to improve the leadership and management of future safeguarding.

*The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North):* The recommendations that flow from the IICSA report are quite specific and quite detailed and they are well addressed in GS 1258, but I would really urge people to read the whole Report. It is one that raises vastly wider issues. It is essential reading and I was really blown away by the impact reading it had on colleagues and me at Blackburn Diocese. Why? I think it is because the IICSA report enables us to see the Church through the eyes of survivors. Those who watched the Peter Ball documentary on BBC2 a few weeks ago will find it did exactly the same. We had a really powerful Bible study this morning where Isabelle Hamley called so strongly for us to see the Church through the eyes of the powerless. And that is what this Report enables us to do, I think. We need to pay vast tribute to the survivors for their courage. They are, in my view, prophets, calling us to greater Gospel faithfulness.

As I read the IICSA report I found myself more and more reflecting on power, its use and abuse, and indeed on the power I hold myself as a bishop. As bishops, as priests, as lay leaders we tend not to think of ourselves as powerful. We are instead often aware of the limits of our power. We are too aware of what we cannot do because of complex legal structures and inherited traditions of the Church of England, or we affect a kind of faux humility, which was very much the tactic of Peter Ball. And that is the danger: hidden power, opaque structures of power. Ill-defined patterns of accountability are very easy to abuse or to take advantage of.

These are important recommendations in front of us, and I am sure we will embrace them wholeheartedly, but this is only the beginning of a response to one of the most forensic external analyses the Church of England has ever undergone.

I think there are two things we need to continue to consider in order to make power more transparent and strengthen accountability. The first is clergy terms and conditions of service. Freehold is demonstrably a safeguarding disaster. I am not sure that common tenure is much better. We must ask ourselves very honestly if better defined, more transparent professional relationships would make for greater accountability in a safer Church. The safety of children and vulnerable adults must trump even cherished

traditions.

The second is a joined-up and externally accountable safeguarding service. I worry deeply that the current arrangements lack the strength or coherence that we need to hold church leaders to account. In fact, in my view, they are dangerously fragmented. Every diocese and most cathedrals have their own teams with different employers. Then we have a national team and we have professional advisers whose relationships to DSAs and cathedral advisers are undefined. Often different safeguarding teams will give contradictory advice or will interpret guidelines in different ways. There are huge complexities when, as often happens, a safeguarding case impacts on numerous dioceses, and, of course, in a deeply financially unequal Church there may always be the temptation for poorer dioceses to cut. There is simply too much fragmentation and fragmentation creates gaps that manipulative people can crawl into. I would suggest it is time that we TUPE-ed safeguarding staff across to a single, independently scrutinised National Safeguarding Service so they are not employed by those whom they are meant to be holding to account, with all the clashes of loyalty that that may encourage.

I am extremely grateful to the Bishop of Bath & Wells, to the National Safeguarding Team and all the others who have put so much work into GS 2158. I look forward to that same willingness to listen and to reform being brought to bear as we continue to engage with IICSA.

## **ITEM 48**

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Huddersfield to speak to and move his amendment at Item 48.

*The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs):* Thank you, Chair. I would like to begin with some words of thanks. First, echoing the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Peter for all that he has done as lead Bishop for Safeguarding over the last four years and, specifically today, for his introduction to this debate. We are, as we have shown, profoundly grateful for his personal commitment to leadership in this vital work and for bringing us to this point today.

Secondly, to those members of Synod who proposed amendments to the main motion last week and for the way in which these helped focus everyone's minds on where we must go from here. Without going into all the details, we have had some very constructive conversations over the last week or so and these led to the revised amendment which you have before you today. The words are not the same but the underlying intention is. I am very grateful for the support of those members in bringing today's amendment.

Thirdly, and most importantly, to the members of the survivor community who have spoken out so courageously and done all they can to hold us to account. We owe them a huge and continuing debt in so many ways.

So, to the content of my amendment, which is proposed on behalf of the NSSG, following our meeting last week and which is intended to supplement as well as to endorse the terms of the original motion, all of which is important and needs to be said. Clause (b) of the amendment welcomes the fact that the NSSG “remains committed to ensuring that words of apology are followed by concrete actions”.

Synod, we all know that the season of apology and lament is by no means over, but now is also the time for action and for change. Clause (c) begins to outline what that will look like, including, crucially, our developing a more survivor-centred approach to safeguarding. That means hearing what survivors are saying and trying to see things through their eyes. It means recognising that the world looks and feels different to those of us who have suffered trauma and abuse, and it means working together with survivors to reshape how we go about the shared life of the Church. And that is vital because, frankly, too many of us too often still just do not get it.

Clause (c) also speaks of arrangements for redress for survivors. This is a small phrase but with big implications. It will mean money, serious money, and we will need to work out how we are going to fund that. But it must also mean changes in the way we handle claims and complaints so that how we do things is shaped by the righteousness and compassion of God’s Kingdom and not by the short-term and short-sighted financial and reputational interests of the Church.

Finally, clause (d) looks to the future, and to the final IICSA report. That report will not make comfortable reading, and nor should it. And we must be ready to respond promptly and fully to the report as clause (d) requires. But we need to more than that, and we should be looking right now to go beyond whatever IICSA says and to commit ourselves to making the Church of England into what it should be, namely a beacon of excellence in safeguarding, recognised as a community that excels in promoting the safety and wellbeing of every single human being and one that acts as a voice for the voiceless and a refuge for the vulnerable.

Synod, now is the time for action and for change, and I commend this amendment to you as an expression of our shared commitment. I move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Bath & Wells, as the mover of the main motion, to comment on the amendment.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* I thank Jonathan for his very powerful and very clear speech. I endorse everything he says and I hope that Synod will vote very clearly and firmly to accept the amendment.

*The Chair:* The Bishop has accepted the amendment, so debate continues on Item 48. Canon Rosie Harper followed by the Bishop of London. The time limit remains five minutes.

*Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford):* In this short speech I hope I will be able to say some of the things about why these amendments are really seriously needed, because my question at the moment to the Archbishops and to the Bishops is very simple: what has really changed? A couple of years ago I asked a question in this House wanting to know in what ways the Bishops could be held accountable for implementing their promises. I am afraid I received a very patronising answer along the lines of “Trust me, I am a bishop”.

Of course, at a deep level, nothing did change. I can see that there is a lot more process, as we have just heard this morning, and as a parish priest I am certainly doing a lot more courses and a shedload more paperwork, and that is good and it has raised the general level of awareness considerably. But what has not changed yet is how survivors feel about the Church response. They are still waiting for a genuine Christian and human interaction. They know full well, because the institution is so leaky, that they are still spoken about as difficult, or persistent and vexatious, or tricky, or damaged.

And they wait. They wait for apologies, they wait for fair and just restitution and they wait for proper pastoral care. And in the case, for example, of Iwerne survivors, they even wait for an honest and truthful investigation into the whole barbaric abuse to actually be undertaken. Some survivors have lost income and life savings in their process of fighting injustice and dishonesty, and they are still waiting for their lives to be rebuilt. Last week, a Iwerne survivor made a heartfelt plea. It has been seven years, they wrote – seven years.

There needs to be a culture change and it needs to start at the top, because big public apologies come easy, even tearful ones, which, incidentally, make the apology about the person apologising, not the survivor. Genuine personal apologies seem to be more difficult, even when the people concerned are in the same room as one another. Will the House of Bishops please work out how to make the Archbishops’ promise to put the survivors at the heart of what we do a reality? A reality to which they will be held accountable in a measurable way, with consequences for ongoing failure, a tangible reality that survivors can see and know. But, as the full IICSA report will doubtless demonstrate, we are still on the nursery slopes.

*The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally):* Safeguarding from abuse and responding well I believe is grounded in the fundamental themes of Christian theology, thereby it should be woven into the Church. Churches should be places where all are welcomed into, they should be open and secure communities that make Christ’s reconciling peace known. And I do personally lament that in the past we have failed to do this. I do think that over the last few years there have been changes – better resourcing, new policies, better procedures, training has improved, there have been

audits of all diocese in the Church of England undertaken by the Social Care Institute for Excellence – and I do see some change in culture.

But I also continue to hear the voices of survivors and victims of abuse who say we have not moved quickly enough. And I am sorry if I have been part of their frustration. But as I think IICSA reflected on, on the day on which I attended, no one person can do this alone. The House of Bishops cannot do this alone. We are all, every one of us, involved in culture change.

Culture change is about the way we do things around here. Culture change does not happen and the way we do things around here does not change unless it is owned by each one of us who is part of the culture. Anything less would turn what are behaviours of the heart into something that is a bureaucratic checklist. Culture change, I have observed, is more successful if it is clearly led by its leaders. When behaviours are reinforced by training, communication and audit, but, maybe most importantly, change is only successful if we understand what good looks like, and we can only understand what good looks like if we work with survivors and victims of clerical abuse.

Actually, if we are to properly involve survivors and victims of clerical abuse, we do need to properly resource this. Not just in terms of money, but also in terms of skills. Therefore, I would encourage each one of us to think very carefully when we come to vote on this motion and the amendment, and particularly (c), because by voting for it, which I will, it says that we will properly refund the involvement of survivors and victims, and I do not just mean redress. If we are to work together, to work with them so they enable us to know what good looks like, we have to properly resource and fund this.

I also want to add my support to the Bishop of Burnley. If we are to properly understand our power, our lines of accountability and responsibilities, I do believe that we need to review common tenure and freehold, because until we do that we will struggle to hold to account and understand our responsibilities.

Maybe a final comment about our struggle with amendments here at Synods. The voices of survivors and victims may never be in order, and maybe I am thankful for that, but we do have to hear the voices of victims and survivors, so it is us, Synod, and the Church of England, that need to change, and not their ability to navigate synodical processes and the Church of England. Together we are involved in transformation – together we are involved in transformation – which I do believe has begun, but I know that we are not there and I long to see, and my prayer continues to be, that we will see changes of the heart and of the way we do things around here. I will vote for both this motion and the amendments, and I will commit myself to continue to persevere.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* My friends, I ask you to support the amendment and the motion and I would like to explain the importance of what lies behind the mere text. The words may still look a bit bland, but let me unpack why they matter, to explore the spirit

of the amendment and show you some of the hope that lies latent within it, and especially within that little word redress.

It is common knowledge here that Peter, David and I would have liked stronger words, but all three of us have experience in mediating acrimonious disputes, and if that collective experience has taught us anything, it is that usually it is more important that there is agreement than that any part of the agreement should be insisted upon. For us, delivering bishops, church authorities, Synod and, most importantly of all, survivors of our sin to a place where we have an outline for moving forward together is already a real achievement by Bishop Jonathan, one to be thankful for and one to be grasped.

In a very real sense, when you record your vote today, as I think we all should do as it is on record, we will be pressing the reset button. Last week, Bishop Jonathan acted decisively, encouraging his colleagues to accept that the initial motion was nowhere good enough, it was not a proper response to the Peter Ball story. Anger and frustration is widespread, not only amongst survivors, but also in the Church itself, the decent people in the pews have heard and they want action.

So we began to insist that Synod needed to say more than the bare minimum of acceptance of the IICSA criticism and recommendations. Nothing says that better than that little word redress. It does not sound much but it means a lot. For victims, it means hope. It means binding up the wounds of those victims beyond what the lawyers advised. It implies actively nurturing our victims back to as much wholeness as possible in a host of ways even if they never can forgive us. Christ requires nothing less. Ask the Good Samaritan for details. Do not ask the Levite and do not ask the reputational management consultant.

Promising this is one thing. Getting the survivors to believe that they might just dare to begin to consider the possibility of fundamental change in this place is quite another. Bishop Jonathan has won their provisional trust. They are thinking about giving us, once again, the precious gift of their hope. Do not let any of us professing Christians here dare to think about letting them down again.

Bishop Jonathan told us yesterday at the safeguarding fringe that he has talked to his colleagues and he assures us that they know that restorative justice will be costly and, to their great credit, he tells us they accept it is the right thing to do, because our God is a God of justice and mercy and if there are two qualities that are needed now, it is surely justice and mercy. All this is within that little idea, those few words in that amendment.

Do you remember Father Raniero Cantalamessa's sermon at the beginning of this Synod? He told us to rebuild my house. I have written overnight to some of you about it. That commission is not just about restoring the structures but it is also about restoring the penitent – us. Putting our money where our mouths are is part of that too. Our God is one whose actions speak louder than words.

In his Presidential Address, Archbishop Justin spoke well of love in action. That is precisely what I have been talking about here. Owning our failures is love in action. Giving proper apologies, however delayed, is love in action. No more delay is love in action. Costly reparation is costly love in action.

And whilst we are doing this, if you hear the faint sound of a lion roaring, do not be alarmed, it is not the devil, like a lion abroad seeking whom he may devour, it is the sound of Aslan on the march, and we all know what that means. My friends, the ice is cracking, come with us on this journey of penitence and hope.

*Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro):* I had thought that many would stand. I thought my voice would not be needed. And I wonder if we all feel too small, too powerless, because I know I do. I have been on a journey myself in the depths of the safeguarding world, and I want to start by apologising to all the survivors and all of the victims, not just of abuse that we see in the IICSA report, but of episcopal and arch-episcopal bullying, because some of us have remained silent for too long.

Four things, perhaps, that I have learned over the last couple of years. Firstly, listen. Listen to the smallest comments and let people speak. I had a phone call from a clergyman who is now a long way from this country, after the announcement of Jonathan Fletcher's abuse, and he said to me, "Well we know that he could be a bully, but. We know that he could be a bully, but", and I said, "Listen to that. What shepherd is a bully?" What have we let ourselves be part of?

Secondly, speak up. Even when some suggest that to speak might be to be unhelpful, even when you do not know what to say, speak up. Thirdly, put the survivors first. Tribes go out the window, listen to what they have to say, allow them to shape our response. Fourthly, conceal nothing. We all want to cover up our sin, but it will all be known one day. It will all be revealed and we will all stand in judgment. But, wonderfully, now is the time for redemption, now is the time of mercy, conceal nothing and bring it to the Lord and to the world.

Finally, take responsibility. Bishop North talked about hidden power and ill-defined patterns of accountability. We have seen victim-blaming, so please make change happen. If there is one thing I have learned, it is that the Gospel does not need defending, it does not need our support. God is big enough and He calls us to be faithful, to love mercy and to act justly.

This will be my last speech to Synod, and safeguarding, as far as the Church of England goes, will no longer be my responsibility. I may be leaving the Church of England but I will not be leaving survivors. This is for all of us, for all our responsibility, so please listen, speak up, put the survivors first, conceal nothing, and take responsibility.

*Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester):* My declaration of interest is Bishop's Lead for Safeguarding in Rochester and, as a member of clergy in the Church of England, a constant feeling of being conflicted. I wanted to just speak, briefly, about that word redress. I think it does give us a glimmer of hope, most importantly, of course, it gives a glimmer of hope to survivors.

I am a Charlton Athletic fan. We have a saying – I am sure many of you do – that it is not the despair that kills you, it is the hope. We particularly remember that when we have thrown away a two-nil lead. That is important to remember. Survivors have suffered in terms of mental health and physical health, they have lost families and relationships and homes and jobs and secure retirements.

If we are serious about redress, if we are serious about offering hope, then we must not fail to deliver on that. Failure to deliver on hope kills, quite literally. I have been doing some hand-wringing recently – we are often accused of that in the Church – and I realised last week, in conversation with a survivor, that I had been up to it too. I had been bemoaning, privately and among friends, the derisory payments that have been made to survivors of church context abuse. And I have been waiting, waiting for the national Church to take action about that, but I had forgotten that I am well placed within my diocese to ask some very difficult questions, as are many others of you in this room.

So I spoke at Bishops' Council and raised this, because surely within our dioceses we have the capacity to go further than a full and final settlement. Surely we have the capacity to do justly, to act mercifully and even to be generous. Surely we have the capacity to question our insurers about their practices and, indeed, our lawyers. It occurred to me that actually we can change insurers if we do not think their methods are ethical. I change my electricity supplier.

I am hoping that when I go back to my diocese, some of my colleagues, and I am sure they will, will be asking me some very difficult questions in diocesan synod. I urge you, Synod members, do not just wait for the national Church. Survivors are watching and wanting to help us, but we must not hold out hope and disappoint them, we must go back to our dioceses and do something.

*The Chair:* After Mr Adams, I shall test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on Item 48. The speech limit remains five minutes.

*Canon Peter Adams (St Albans):* Synod, I welcome the motion and especially the amendments. I believe it sets a platform from which our new Lead Bishop for Safeguarding can take us forward. Thank you, Bishop. I know the words “apology”, “concrete action”, “survivor-centred response” and “redress” are music to our survivors' ears.

Synod, the IICSA inquiry has been deeply painful for the Church. It is vital we embrace the whole process and deeply and widely as we can. We need to take on board these five recommendations and we need to go so much further, now. Central to so much of IICSA's hearings has been the Church's handling of disclosures of abuse. How has it happened that as a Church we have allowed ourselves to become mired in the mess of failure to respond appropriately?

My desire today is not to apportion blame. The whole Church, as we have heard from Susie Leafe, has been silent for too long on this and we have left it to our bishops. I think it is too much for them to bear. General Synod now needs to add its weight to this issue as clearly as possible. I sat with a survivor last week. Robert was sexually and physically abused between the ages of nine and 13 while at a cathedral choir school in the early 1960s.

He has not been part of MACSAS or the other survivors' networks. In his words, "The cathedral was heaven to me from the first time I went for voice trials. The choirmaster led me into the nave, he asked me sing a high note and, to my amazement, the echoes danced around the expanse of this vast building. I felt as an eight-year-old, I had heard the voice of an angel and that somehow that would please God my Father. But then that cathedral became the place I was abused multiple times. When I left aged 13 it was like I said goodbye to my Father in Heaven. On the brink of a suicide at 18, I came to a personal faith. Over the years I have occasionally visited but found it very difficult to go to an Anglican church. I broke down on going into a cathedral, I had such a surge of emotions. Three years ago I told my story to the IICSA Truth Project, then two years ago I met with the dean in the cathedral where I had been abused. Last year, in my mid-60s I was able to go and sing evensong there".

Robert's is, to be frank, one of the good stories. I wish there were many more. Today, Robert works in prisons with men who have been abused. He has a deep and profound understanding of trauma, and post-traumatic stress disorder, experienced by victims of abuse. We spoke of the lifelong impact of that trauma and PTSD, and the way that trauma impacts people differently. Talk to any of the dear men and women who have been gracious enough to spend time with us and you will see that. Some have found coping mechanisms that allow them to live relatively normal lives on the surface, though depression and dark times come on unexpectedly, and too often, but others find it hard to keep down a job decades after their abuse.

Almost all tell how, on disclosing, life gets harder, and even more so when they are not believed or obstructed again and again. For some, their anger can lead easily to being dismissed as not serious about resolution, but none choose the way they present. It is a consequence of their abuse, of their trauma. Some have retained faith, like Robert, but express it in another church. Some, amazingly, have found a home amongst us. Many struggle with faith. Most struggle financially.

We need to learn from our survivors and from experts in trauma and PTSD on how we can make it easier for those who have been so deeply wounded and still need appropriate redress. Survivors of child sexual abuse in our midst will carry the impact of that trauma throughout their lives. Nothing we do will change that, but today we can lay a foundation for a response that will make that journey easier.

*The Chair:* Under Standing Order 31, I put a motion for closure to the Synod on Item 48.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We move to a vote on Item 48.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We now return to Item 9 as amended by Item 48. The Bishop of Gloucester will have five minutes. The speech limit thereafter will be three minutes.

*The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek):* Mine is a title I find quite awkward to hold in this debate. As has already been said, safeguarding is integral to our mission and ministry. It is not an add-on issue, just as other things we have talked about in Living in Love and Faith yesterday and in the Windrush legacy are not add-on issues. Our failure in each of these areas is our failure to be the Church, Christ's body here on earth, our failure to live the good news of the Kingdom of God. Creation is groaning, longing for the freedom of the children of God.

Two years ago, in February 2018, I took part in a presentation here at General Synod, again on safeguarding, and we had the Gibb Report in front of us, that report published in 2017. Following the publication of that Report, and again after the IICSA inquiry into Peter Ball, I publicly expressed my views not only regarding the horrific abuse of one of my predecessors but also regarding the appalling failure of bishops and an Archbishop at the time, who failed to care for those who came forward, who failed to put survivors at the centre. I repeated that again recently following the documentary on Peter Ball. I once again want to publicly pay particular tribute to the tenacity and courage of Neil Todd, who sadly is not with us today.

I was glad that so many people expressed deep shock following the BBC documentary, and yet in so many of the comments I received or read after people had watched the documentary or seen my response it was as if some people were absorbing it for the first time. That in itself has perturbed me. There were hardly any new facts in that powerful BBC documentary. Almost all of what we saw had been in the Gibb Report, had been in the public domain after the IICSA inquiry, and that says something to me about our learning. We need to show that we are learning from the past.

I am in favour of reviews. It is very important that we give due attention to what has gone wrong in the past. Indeed, we agreed to do that yesterday in our debate around the Windrush legacy. But if we are going to learn from reviews and inquiries, then lament and regret and apology are not enough, as the amendment today has said. These reviews and inquiries must be read and absorbed by all of us, not simply filed away. They must ask searching questions which change us as individuals and worshipping communities and as a national Church – all of us. One of the things that concerns me around case reviews is that I wonder how well we test what we have learned. How does it go deep within us as we live the body of Christ together, all of us?

I have wholeheartedly endorsed the recommendations today, and I am grateful for them, because they challenge us more fully regarding our learning and our accountability to each other. The past, the present and future need to be held together in much greater tension. We do need to get process and structures and policies right. We do need to put money into all that is needed. We need to find ways of testing together how what we have learned from reviews, and indeed all that training, is changing us in the present, which is not simply about process but is about something much deeper.

When it comes to money, there have been discussions in this chamber regarding how we use money that we are fortunate to have from the past and how we spend it now in the present, very aware that we are spending the money of the Church of the future. There have been lots of discussions around that, particularly in relation to strategic development. However, when it comes to safeguarding it is surely right that we have appallingly failed people in the past, so money needs to be spent in the present to ensure that how we live now in the present and the future continues to look very different when it comes to flourishing of all people made in the image of God.

So my question is: how do we truly learn and ensure reviews are not simply part of process but that they change us in the present and for the future?

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* I stand here as someone who was subjected to sexual abuse as a schoolchild. The schools are much better than the Church at getting on with it. The head teacher involved spent time in jail because people told the authorities. Since then, as chairman of governors in schools, we have had members of staff who have been accused. They have been suspended immediately. They have been investigated, there was no substance in the claim, and they came back. I have also, as leader of a committee in a community centre, had someone who was apprehended by the boys in blue. He never crossed the premises again. He was also a school governor elsewhere, and he never crossed those premises. Do something straightaway. Do not hang about. That has been half the Church's problem. I know it is difficult with members of the clergy, with all the problems of freehold, et cetera, that have been brought to our attention by the Bishops of Burnley and London but, whatever else, get on with it now. Do not drag your feet.

*Mrs Emily Bagg (Portsmouth):* Chair, I had not intended to speak, but as one of those one in 20 that Bishop Peter spoke of earlier abused by my church I wanted to stand to support this motion, albeit slightly cautiously. I am not a victim. I am a survivor. Words are not enough. We can talk and we can promise, and we can promise and we can talk, but concrete actions are all that really matter to people like me – concrete, real, immediate action. Synod, please support this motion, but, absolutely vitally, be prepared to put your money where your mouths are to totally, utterly and radically take real, concrete action.

*Mr Simon Friend (Exeter):* I want to acknowledge the presence of survivors here, both in the chamber and in the gallery, and I want to say to those in the gallery that I saw your poster and I think it is vitally important that you keep asking awkward questions. I think it is vitally important that we in the chamber feel uncomfortable and continue to feel uncomfortable until you feel comfortable and your questions are answered.

I also want to reflect on the word “lament” that has been used, not just today but yesterday. I wonder what it means for us as a body to truly lament. After reading the IICSA report and watching the documentaries, I, like many, was deeply sorrowful at what people have been through at the hands of us here, representing this institution, and the words “sackcloth” and “ashes”, I do not believe we have begun to understand what that would look like for us now and in this age.

This is a very cerebral chamber. We talk, we think, we write. But somehow we need to embody “lament” and somehow we need to find a way of embodying the sorrow that we all feel. The words that come from the Archbishop, Bishop Peter and those in senior leadership are very, very welcome, but actually those of us who are on the ground also need to enter into this lament. I would encourage us that we need to find a way to embody that as an institution.

*Miss Debbie Buggs (London):* Simon Friend has just alluded to the poster. For the record, for those outside of the chamber and for those reading a record of the proceedings, I would like to just say that it said that £23.5 million has been allocated to the Lambeth Palace Library – the new building – and nothing has been allocated for redress.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* First of all, may I endorse thanks to Bishop Peter for all the work that he has done, including behind the scenes, over the last four years. Synod has already expressed its gratitude. I want personally to add mine to that. I also want to welcome Bishop Jonathan because Jonathan is committed to carrying the work forward.

That leads me to what I want to say first of all about the amendment that we have now added to the motion. Yesterday afternoon we spent quite a lot of time talking about rules. I make no apology for that. But today is not about rules. It is about justice and doing justice. The amendment which Peter Adams and I sought to have added to the motion

last week – and you will have read the report in the *Church Times* about it and its rejection last Friday – has led, happily, to what is now before us as a result of Bishop Jonathan’s lead at the NSSG and the feeling amongst the members of the NSSG that the rather, for want of a better word, bland motion that we originally had on the Order Paper unamended needed to be expanded, needed to acknowledge the fact that we need to be survivor-centred in our approach to safeguarding and these issues.

You may remember that last summer in York Martin Sewell and I sought to have added to the agenda a motion welcoming the Blackburn *ad clerum* letter, but that required the consent of the two Archbishops pursuant to Standing Orders, and Archbishop Justin, understandably, felt, first of all, that it was premature until people had had an opportunity to read the IICSA report. Secondly, because the IICSA hearing was going on concurrently with the York Synod, there were not the right people at York at the time. Now, happily, we have that opportunity. What I would like to do is just share with you some of the words of that Blackburn *ad clerum* letter to which, of course, Bishop Philip North was one of the signatories. What they said in part was this:

“The Church should be the conscience of the nation and yet as the IICSA report shows, again and again we have placed the reputation of the institution above the needs of the vulnerable.

“In addition, when the contemporary church fails to respond properly to allegations from the past, this becomes a form of re-abuse, adding a fresh layer of hurt and harm to those whose lives are already damaged. Trite, formulaic (responses) will not do. There has been grave sin within the Church, and unless corporately we name, confess and deal with that sin, our mission to the nation is fatally undermined”.

Members of Synod, time has run out. May I just conclude with a quote from Professor Munro: “A concern with doing things right (against) a concern (with) doing the right (things)”. Today we must do the right things.

*Ven. Luke Miller (London)*: Faced with the realisation of evil and the need for us all to deeply and properly repent and take new and concrete action so that such things can never happen again, we are left with a need to work out how then to act.

I am a parish priest as well as being an archdeacon and stand, therefore, at both ends of the communication process, something which has been difficult, and I apologise when sometimes my communication has not been as good as it might have been. Clarity is needed, as the culture changes, about what it means that we should be doing, as Canon Harper points out, amidst the plethora of training and the paperwork with which we are now faced.

Recommendation 4 points to the need for all those in regulated activity to have a DBS check, but in the variety of activity in our churches, not only for clergy, for whom things are pretty clear, but also for our lay volunteers, there is a real difficulty of definition and a need for real clarity of advice. Despite the best efforts of our diocesan safeguarding teams – and thanks to them – it still feels on the ground amongst so many parish clergy to be unclear, to be confusing, to be uncertain about what should be done. One church I know sought to appoint an organist who would from time to time, but not very often, go to the Sunday School. They required a DBS check. But then they got a solicitor's letter from a former offenders' group saying that they had broken the law and threatening to take the parish priest to court.

Parish clergy can feel caught, trying to do the right thing but trapped in what feels like a maze. We want, we need, we must put survivors first and prevent further abuse. Those of us at the centre bear a strong responsibility to continue to work hard to try to get this right so that people do not feel that they are hung out to dry or left in an impossible position. Where I have got that wrong I apologise. I apologise mainly to those who may be at threat or who have been harmed or abused, but I also apologise to those who are trying to get this right but finding it difficult.

Synod, we need to help one another to get this right. For the sake of our clergy – but, more than that, for the sake of those who have or might be abused – we need to work together in order that real clarity can be given about precisely what are we to do.

*The Chair:* After the Archdeacon of Lincoln I shall test the mind of the Synod on a motion for closure.

*Revd Canon Gavin Kirk (Lincoln):* I declare an interest as a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group. I welcome this Report and each one of its recommendations, but I want to suggest two further ones in order that we may put, as we have been encouraged to do, our money where our mouth is. As an archdeacon, you might anticipate they will be structural. In no sense do I want to divert Synod's attention from survivors and victims.

The first thing I think we need to do is to underscore and to strengthen the independence of Diocesan Safeguarding Advisers. Some of them have experienced being disregarded, marginalised, their work interfered with or compromised, their advice disregarded. I wonder whether the term "adviser" is the most appropriate one for their role. We do not have advisers in finance, do we, or advisers in education, advisers for ordinands? Perhaps we should have Directors of Safeguarding, with all that that new title would mean. When an adviser gives advice and people fail to follow it, please could we have a one-stop route for blowing the whistle there and then? If the archdeacon or the bishop or whoever is correct in disregarding the advice, that will come out in due course, but let us no longer have professionals and not listen to their advice.

The second is about formation. We are still some way short, as colleagues have said, of the whole Church realising that safeguarding is an every-member responsibility. I believe we need a significant investment in the formation of clergy and lay ministers in order fully to embed the culture of safeguarding to which we all aspire. At theological college or training institutions you have exams or essays in Biblical studies and missiology, philosophy, ethics and all the rest, but none in safeguarding. It is possible to fail systematic theology, but no one yet fails safeguarding. Surely we need that same rigour in respect of those we are going to place in positions of authority.

Please, Synod, endorse this Report resoundingly, but let us not leave it there.

*The Chair:* Before I put the motion for closure I would be glad to hear from Canon Spence.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* As your Finance Chairman I have listened to points being made about money needing to be spent and about allocations being made for libraries or other things. Let us be very clear, this is not about affordability. It is about justice. Justice cannot have a different value depending on the finances of this or that diocese. Whatever we are told is required by those responsible that is required for redress, then those funds will be found.

*The Chair:* Under Standing Order 31 I put the motion for closure on Item 9 to the Synod.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to respond to the debate. Bishop, we would be grateful if you could do that within five minutes.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* Thank you to Synod, all those who have spoken, all those who have listened and all those who have engaged in various ways today. Can I just make one or two closing comments and particularly words of thanks?

Archbishop, thank you for your gracious words to me. More important to me was the very clear commitment that you made as you lead us here in Synod. I am very grateful to Martin Sewell, to David Lamming, to Peter Evans and to Jonathan Gibbs for bringing the amendment to us, which has allowed us to speak freely on much wider and more significant matters.

I am grateful to Kashmir Garton calling us to increase professionalism, saying very prophetically that survivors need to see concrete actions to rebuild trust in the Church, and a call for redress that others echoed subsequently.

Philip North, a forensic analysis of the Church: a lack of strength and coherence, a worry about fragmentation, structures inadequate, and he set out the reasons for that. Jonathan

Gibbs, I know deep in your heart is a survivor-centred approach to safeguarding. We thank you for that. We thank you for the work that you have been doing and the work that you will do. You have called us to be, as a Church, a voice for the voiceless and an agent for change.

Rosie Harper posed that hard question, “What has changed?”, and reminded us that culture change is needed and the tangible reality of actions. The Bishop of London reminded us that we have not moved quickly enough and reminded us that significant resources are needed.

Martin Sewell, you have given us something to think about when you talk about pressing the reset button. As you spoke about the meaning of redress, you reminded us that there are those who might just begin to dare to think about hope. And you spoke about a God of justice and hope. You spoke about the love of Christ in action. You said that the ice is cracking and that Aslan was on the march. May that be true and may we in Synod do what we can to further that.

Susie Leafe spoke very personally. She gave us much to think about and amongst the four things she said she asked us to listen and to let people speak and said that we, too, need to take responsibility for speaking up. Julie Conalty talked about Charlton Athletic and the failure to deliver hope is what kills. You asked some very difficult questions of us, and you have said you will continue to ask difficult questions. We seek to follow your example.

Peter Adams, you gave us the very harrowing story of Robert, but you gave us some prophetic words, some words of hope and you spoke about laying a foundation, and we thank you for that. Rachel Treweek, you spoke about our failure to be and our failure to live out the good news. You said that lament and apology and regret were not enough. You talked about the need to make sure that in the Church we are concerned for all the flourishing of God’s people.

John Freeman, your speeches will always attract applause. You told us not to drag our feet. We underline that. Emily Bagg, speaking courageously to us this morning, called from your own experience for concrete, real and immediate action. Simon Friend reminded us, as others have done, of the importance of keeping asking awkward questions. You spoke about embodying lament and sorrow going beyond the outer action to the heart.

Debbie Buggs, you read from the poster that was unveiled and you spoke about the cost. David Lamming, among many of the wonderful things you said, you said this was not about rules, which Synod is good at, but it is about justice. Luke Miller, you called for greater clarity. Gavin Kirk, you spoke about the need to strengthen the diocesan resources and embedding a culture of safeguarding right across the Church of England.

You called us to go further. And John Spence, you ended by giving us some reassurances about finance that are most welcome today.

Perhaps I can try to sum up our debate with three observations. The first has been the importance of a victim-centred response. Some of us were in the chamber earlier this morning when we were being led through a Bible study on 1 Peter 3 and we were asked what was the verse that stood out for us. For me it was this verse: "Do not repay evil for evil or abuse for abuse. On the contrary, repay evil with blessing ..." In the motion before us we are seeking to repay with blessing.

The second thing, and I know the Business Committee will already be aware of this, is that IICSA and the IICSA recommendations are important for our own life. We need to make adequate space to hear, to listen and to debate the words they will bring to us. Then concrete actions are needed to follow our votes and our statements, and that needs significant resources.

With those thoughts I commend this motion, amended as it is, to Synod and trust that we will once again give it our unequivocal support.

*The Chair:* Before we move to vote, I invite Synod to wait upon God for a space in silence.

*The Chair* led the Synod in an act of worship.

*The Chair:* We now move to vote on Item 9.

*Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham):* Point of order. In view of the importance of this issue to those outside the House, would you order a counted vote of the whole Synod?

*The Chair:* It is within my discretion to order a counted vote of the whole Synod under Standing Order 37, and I so do.

*The motion with put and carried, 361 voting in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions.*

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 11.42 am.

## **ITEM 10**

### **CLIMATE EMERGENCY AND CARBON REDUCTION TARGET (GS 2159)**

*The Chair:* Brothers and sisters, we now come to Item 10 on our agenda, our debate on Climate Emergency and Carbon Reduction Target. You will need paper GS 2159 for this debate, and I can see, as I speak, that the Thirteenth Notice Paper on the financial statement is being distributed in the Chamber. As you can see from your Order Paper, there are five amendments to consider today and there has been considerable interest in this item, which of course is a very good thing. I want to hear as many people as possible today. To give you an idea of how the debate is going to go, I am going to have a few speeches on the main motion first and then we will move fairly early on to the amendments. Apart from the Bishop of Salisbury, when he comes to introduce this debate, there will be a speech limit of three minutes from the outset.

I now call on the Bishop of Salisbury to speak to and move his motion. Bishop, you have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* There is a climate emergency. It is a crisis for God's creation and a fundamental injustice. It has raised big questions from young people about whether people of my generation really care about intergenerational fairness. It raises big questions about climate justice as well as about our creativity and spirituality in relation to God and the Earth.

This graphic was produced by Professor Ed Hawkins, a meteorologist from Reading University. It shows the annual average temperatures for the earth from 1850 to 2018. One stripe represents one year. The blue colours are cold years, the red stripes are hot years. Coming to the present, the stripes get redder and darker, showing that the planet is warming up by about 1 to 1.1 degrees across the period. But it is accelerating. There is now no serious doubt that climate change is happening and that people are causing climate change.

The 2015 UN Paris Agreement aimed to limit global warming caused by people to 1.5 degrees above pre-industrial levels and not more than 2 degrees. BCurrently we are heading for more than 3 degrees.

The impact is seen in melting ice in the Arctic. Sea levels have risen by 25 cms. The bush fires in Australia have caught our attention. Even in the UK we are experiencing more extreme weather events. We met in the aftermath of storm Ciara and depart into storm Dennis.

Fossil fuels, carbon and what are now known to be greenhouse gases have brought enormous good. They are now doing great damage. In this changing context, we are having to rethink the theology of creation and our spirituality about how to live in God's gift of creation. The poorest are the most immediately affected, which is why the development agencies have climate justice as their top priority.

Incremental change is not going to be enough. This year we have some big opportunities to make a step change in thought and action, particularly because the UK is hosting the UN climate change summit in Glasgow in November. Whoever is presiding over it, that conference is particularly significant five years after Paris. As with Paris, national and international networks are preparing the churches and faith communities to support and to challenge our governments and politicians in effecting a change like the Industrial Revolution but this time led by a crisis in which for the first time we are giving up resources that are still readily available in the ground but which are damaging the climate. We need creative, new world thinking, not old world thoughtlessness.

The Church of England has just launched #LiveLent Care for God's Creation. The booklets for adults and kids were on your seats, and so far over 50,000 have been sold. They go alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury's Lent Book by Ruth Valerio, *Saying Yes to Life* (SPCK £9.99) N.B. fringe event 7.15pm this evening in Room 3. In the foreword, Archbishop Justin quotes one of the Communion's Primates: "For you Europeans, climate change is a problem for the future. For us, it is a problem of everyday survival". That is why we need to ensure that our actions and our plans are in alignment with the resolutions from the Anglican Consultative Council. We know that the environment will be a pillar of the Lambeth Conference. A lot of work is going into that.

Later, the Season of Creation runs from the World Day of Prayer on 1 September to St Francis Day on 4 October. A coalition of Christian environment and development charities, mission organisations and denominations are calling on churches to hold a Climate Sunday, preferably on 6 September, to ask congregations to make a short and simple commitment to greater action to address climate change in their own place of worship and community, and to raise their voice to urge faster action by governments. I really hope we will support that call and be part of it.

Anglicans in the 1980s developed the Five Marks of Mission, the fifth of which is, "To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation, and to sustain and renew the life of the earth".

A crisis is both a judgment and an opportunity. In recognising there is now a climate emergency, we need to pick up the pace by setting a target date for net zero by 2045.

Some of what has already been done is deeply impressive. The National Investing Bodies are not included in the scope of this motion, but their work on investments is world class. We are widely seen to be leading the field of responsible investment. This is a work in progress with separate regular reports to Synod.

There are many good environmental initiatives. *Living Churchyards* and *Caring for God's Acre* are great ways of treasuring biodiversity that speak of the resurrection in churchyards. In schools, children and young people have become our teachers. But we do not know how many are Eco Schools there are or how they are reducing their carbon footprint. Eco Church and Eco Diocese has engaged over 1,500 churches across the

country, many of them Anglican. Wherever that is happening churches are engaging a wider community in education, evangelism and mission. But it is not quite 50% of dioceses and it is less than 10% of our 16,000 churches that have engaged with Eco Church.

Synod, if we are serious about holding others to account, we have got to get our own house in order. If we were a company in which we invested, those making the investment would have serious questions about whether and how the Church of England is aligning itself with the Paris Agreement, let alone hoping to move faster.

The deadline of 2045 to achieve net zero is five years ahead of our previous target and the Paris Agreement. Some think it is not ambitious enough, and we can and must move faster. I am happy to have that debate. What would be great is if those who think they can demonstrate they can move faster will lead the way. Taking the whole Church estate of 16,000 churches and approximately 29,000 other buildings is going to be very challenging indeed. The technology is changing, and it may become possible to move faster, so we are proposing progress reports to Synod every three years starting in 2022.

That which cannot be measured cannot be managed. We have set carbon reduction targets before, and we have had a very limited ability to measure our carbon footprint. We now have for churches a simple Energy Footprint Tool as part of the annual parish returns. It is a start, and similar will be needed for our other buildings. The aim is not to use our buildings less, but to heat them differently and use them better.

This motion calls on all parts of the Church of England to work to achieve reductions in carbon emissions to reach net zero by 2045. If we are to do this we will need to frontload the change, as illustrated on page 6 of the briefing paper. As we heard in Questions on Monday, we are very dependent on the work of Diocesan Environmental Officers. Of the 35, only four are paid just to be just a DEO; 15 do their work as part of another role; 16 are unpaid.

DEOs do a lot, but they cannot do it all. We are asking every diocesan synod to address progress toward net zero emissions every three years. In our context, it is an evangelical and missionary imperative. If we do not do the Fifth Mark of Mission, frankly, the other four are meaningless.

Synod, this motion is serious. It has been prepared by your Environmental Working Group. It will help us pick up the purpose and pace of what we are about in caring for God's creation. I commend it for your debate, and for support and action. I move the motion.

*The Chair:* Item 10 is now open for debate. I remind you that I am imposing a speech limit of three minutes from the outset. May I warmly encourage members to be as concise

as possible so we hear as great a variety of voices as possible. I call the Bishop of Norwich for a maiden speech followed by Bill Seddon.

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham Usher):* As an ecologist, it feels right that the first time that I speak at General Synod is about environmental matters. I believe that seeking to heal our broken planet and tread more gently on it goes to the very core of Christian discipleship. This debate is not a luxury in the ministry of the Church; it is an imperative for the mission of the Church. One of my distinguished predecessors at Norwich was the polar explorer and glaciologist Bishop Launcelot Fleming, who steered the Antarctic Treaty Act through Parliament 60 years ago this year. Air bubbles trapped in polar ice sheets give us insights into the past. These tiny time capsules let us measure the composition of atmospheric gases from three quarters of a million years ago until the present day. The evidence is startling. In 1850, the level of CO<sub>2</sub> was 280 parts per million, as it had been for the previous 10,000 years. Civilisation developed in this steady climate. Yet since 1850, that has risen to 400 parts per million. The last time that the world experienced this level of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere was 5 million years ago when temperatures were four degrees warmer than today and sea levels 20 metres higher. This is the future that awaits us. We also face a crisis of biodiversity. We only need to think of how often we clean our car windscreens compared to 25 years ago to realise the catastrophic loss of insect life.

But I do worry about a narrative of gloom. In some places, it is leading to inertia. “What can I do?” we ask, and worryingly, many young people are being consumed by ecological anxiety. Can we also say alongside the lament and the protest something from deep within our Scriptures about a hope-filled ecology of wonder and gratitude? Might we wonder at the beauty of God’s creation and be motivated to protect it? Might we respond well by being overcome with gratitude to God for the rich diversity of creation, and so treasure it? This is why I am giving every confirmation candidate a hazel tree to plant, so that they, like Mother Julian, will one day hold in the palm of their hand a hazelnut, and wonder, and give thanks.

And we must learn from our sisters and brothers in Christ around the Anglican Communion. The Anglicans of South Africa, for example, go out at the end of the season of creation with words of hope and rejoicing at all around them.

Synod, I urge you to support this motion so that in 16,000 local places, we may rekindle a care of creation at the heart of our discipleship.

*Mr Bill Seddon (St Albans):* I would like to urge Synod to vote for the motion as it is. It calls on us to prioritise the Fifth Mark of Mission, which I will repeat again is “to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth”, and to recognise that, unless we do this, our pursuit of the other four marks, as the Bishop of Salisbury has already reminded us, will lack credibility.

In this context, I believe that the suggested new target of net zero carbon emissions by 2045 is an appropriate mix of the prophetic and the achievable. I was pleased to note that GS 2159 put the emphasis on how we, as individuals, should be seeking to make environmental stewardship part of our personal witness. In the past, we may have fought shy of making what could be costly changes to our individual lifestyles, relying instead on calls on the National Investing Bodies to take the strain by, for example, disinvestment from fossil fuel companies.

As one of the Synod elected members of the Pensions Board, I have been privileged to see the huge efforts taken by the Board to make the transition to a low-carbon economy an integral part of its investment philosophy. I have also witnessed the immense strides taken by all three NIBs over many years when working with them through my previous role in investment with the Methodist Church. Please do not be distracted by the exclusion of the NIBs from the new target. They are among the leading investors on climate change issues, as seen by the remarkable Transition Pathway Initiative and the Climate Action 100+ work, to name but two of the many examples that could be given.

I would conclude with a plea for symbolic action that parishes and their congregations be encouraged to take. All will know that Methodists do not go in for alcohol and that is because it is not allowed on their premises, at a cost to anybody who goes to an event there. Could thought be given to some action that becomes synonymous with the Church of England's commitment to minimise climate change? Perhaps all parishes could be encouraged to become Eco Churches, not just the 10% as at the moment, so that we can seek improvements year by year and at the same time perhaps suggest to our congregations to use carbon footprint apps to achieve reductions in our own household emissions. If people are to believe what we say on climate change, they need to see evidence that it makes a difference to how we act, not only as an institution but also as individuals.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* Well, I think some of you probably know what I am going to say. If the entire objectives of the Paris Climate Agreement were achieved, there would be a reduction in global temperatures of 0.3 degrees by the end of the century, that is by 2100. Climate emissions from Western countries are dwarfed by those from India, China and from Third World countries developing rapidly, in parallel with massive reductions in global poverty, which surely, we must all celebrate, but which go hand-in-hand with generating a lot of CO<sub>2</sub> as those countries industrialise.

These kinds of measures are like taking water out of the ocean with a pipette, and at the same time they cost money. They cost money which parishes need for mission. Now, it would be worth it if it was going to avert a catastrophe. The IPCC estimates that if things carry on as they are, if nothing changes, the impact by 2070 will be the equivalent to a loss in average global income of up to 2%. That is about the same as the impact of a global recession. That is in a world where everybody will be very much better off than they are today.

It does not really sound like an emergency, but it is still a problem. It is a problem that needs to be solved. But there is only one realistic way to fix it, and that is not by asking everybody to use less and more expensive energy. That is not going to work. The only realistic way to fix this problem is through scientific innovation that lowers the price of clean energy below that of fossil fuels, and I have confidence that scientific ingenuity will enable that to happen, and I think we should all be encouraging that to happen. But, please, do not think that aiming for zero emissions in our churches is going to make any difference at all, because I am afraid it will not.

*The Chair:* Chris Newlands, followed by the Second Church Estates Commissioner for a maiden speech, and then after that I am going to call upon Andrew Nunn to speak to his amendments.

*Revd Canon Christopher Newlands (Blackburn):* To be able to speak on this most vital of subjects and to be heard by many beyond the walls of this Chamber is a tremendous privilege and responsibility for all of us. There is, we all know, a huge groundswell of support for our commitment to addressing the climate emergency, but in the detail of the discussion, we have to balance the urgency of the issues before us with the achievability of the change that we all know is needed. And we need to bring everyone with us, across all parts of the Church. This includes church buildings, of course, and especially the largest of our buildings, our cathedrals and major churches, but also schools, clergy housing and the NCIs.

Net zero emissions by 2045 at the latest is an ambitious but achievable target. However, what is really needed is that we all begin now to work as hard as we can to reduce our emissions year-on-year, and be clear that the target date is less important than the direction of travel that we all work towards to achieve net zero. The way we run our buildings is of course missional, in that it reflects our commitment to the Fifth Mark of Mission, to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and to sustain and renew the life of the earth, as Bishop Nicholas has reminded us in his presentation to this debate.

As a member of the Church Buildings Council, I am delighted that our body has recently discussed and agreed heating principles which will help guide churches towards more efficient lighting and heating. This is why it will be so important to include DACs and advisers in the shared task of reducing our emissions in our 16,000 churches, 4,700 schools, as well as clergy houses and diocesan offices, away from gas and oil to electric heating provided by green electricity, and focusing more on heating people than heating spaces.

There is already far too much hot air of the wrong kind in our buildings. Let us have instead people who are on fire with the passion for preaching a Gospel which proclaims God's love for all his creation in all its glorious abundance.

*The Chair:* The Second Church Estates Commissioner and then I will be inviting Andrew Nunn to speak to his amendments.

*Andres Selous (ex officio):* Andrew Selous. Thank you, Chair, for calling me to make my maiden speech to Synod. It is a very great privilege to be able to do so as the new Second Church Estates Commissioner, and I would like to pay tribute to my predecessor and good friend Caroline Spelman for everything she did in this role. I am particularly pleased to be able to speak in this important debate, having been a green Conservative since before David Cameron made it fashionable. Overall progress on emissions reductions does not always stand out from tallies of individual voting records, and with December's general election fresh in my mind, I know how important this issue is to people up and down the country and to very many Christians in particular.

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the Earth", reads the opening verse of the Bible. We have a special duty to care for the creation of our creator, and I recognise that people are dying today because of the impact of changing climate on agriculture and the movement of people, and the conflict that is often caused as a result. Those who led the world into the Industrial Revolution have a duty now to lead it towards a greener future and provide practical support to developing countries towards this goal.

And the power of the Church, leading by example, should not be underestimated. Getting our own house in order gives us an increased moral authority to approach the Houses of Parliament on this issue, and I look forward to the churches providing Parliament and Government with the evidence, every three years, that this is happening. I want the Church to speak loudly and clearly across the country, and the Anglican Communion to do the same across the world in the run-up to the Convention on Biological Diversity in China in October and to COP26 in Glasgow in November.

Now, I am delighted that the Church Commissioners joined the Net-Zero Asset [Owner] Alliance last month, making a commitment to transition our investments to net-zero emissions by 2050, and hopefully sooner. The FTSE Transition Pathway Initiative climate index developed by the Church is a global first. There is, of course, more for the Commissioners to do as there is with our physical estate where we clearly still have work to do, with 93% of our churches not yet registered as Eco Churches.

Now, I recognise the challenges for many churches in reducing their emissions. This work will not be easy, but I am encouraged by the many examples of good practice already happening. Well done to Exeter for providing a discount on electric vehicles for clergy, staff and Readers. It is good to see Leicester putting a solar farm on glebe parsonages and many other similar examples. Yes, I absolutely recognise the central role of Government in helping us to achieve these objectives, and I will play my part in helping the Government to get it to the right place in these issues.

Even though the UK has cut carbon emissions faster than any similar developed country, the Government recognises there is more to do and will lead the fight against climate change by delivering on our net zero target by 2050. At COP26, we will ask our global partners to match our ambition, The sale of new conventional and diesel cars will end in 2035. We will have 40 gigawatts of offshore by 2030.

*The Chair:* I now invite Andrew to speak to amendments 49 and 53 and then to move Item 49. You have up to three minutes, Andrew.

## **ITEM 49**

*Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark):* Thank you for this motion and this debate. When I looked at it, though, I thought cathedrals should be there named, particularly after the Cathedrals Measure that we were looking at yesterday, and the responsibility that we have within the diocese to be a focus for mission and for the life of the diocese. So I think it is good that we set the challenge for cathedrals there explicitly rather than implicitly, as it would have been before, and to lay upon cathedral chapters the responsibility of reporting back.

This will be a challenge for us, as this is a challenge for every church. These are big buildings, complex buildings, historic buildings. They are set, often, not all, but most, set within lovely closes. There is a lot to do. There is a lot to address. Every morning, as you probably know, I open my curtains, look out my window, across the river at the gorgeousness of St Paul's Cathedral and thank God I am not the Dean. I am just looking forward to the Chapter of St Paul's beginning to embrace the possibility of solar panels on that dome. And we ourselves at Southwark, with a great south-facing roof, but so obvious by the railway line that at the moment FACs and CFCE might have problems with us putting solar panels all the way along that.

We need to ask these questions and address these issues. And I think that the amendments that I have put forward of actually making explicit the role of cathedrals in this and the role of the cathedral chapter will really hold us to that task. I therefore move amendment 49 in my name.

*The Chair:* I now invite the Bishop of Salisbury to respond. Bishop, you have up to three minutes, but if it can be less that would be marvellous.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* I was wondering about how to handle all the amendments What I do not want to do is to get down in the weeds and prevent the main conversation taking place. I want to keep fairly high level. The motion does call for all parts of the Church of England, and does not name cathedrals, Andrew is right. So I am very happy to accept this amendment because it will allow us to deal with it quickly.

I just want to say that I think the amendments are a really helpful way of framing the debate, of getting into the discussion, but let us try to keep the conversation focused on the target and the main purpose of what we are trying to achieve. So I am going to accept these amendments and I hope we can move on relatively quickly.

*The Chair:* The debate is now open on Item 49. You have heard the encouragement of the Bishop of Salisbury to keep to the main theme.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Revd Bill Braviner (Durham):* Synod, the issue before us is mission, it is the Fifth Mark of Mission, but it is all the Marks of Mission. And if we think we are not talking about mission, then we are making the wrong call and we are missing out on God's leading. We need to be able to say that the Church is leading the way on this issue and it would be wonderful when we can say that, fully and across the board. People need time to effect change, of course they do. There are capital projects that need to be done. There is deep cultural change that needs to happen in the way we live together. But, Synod, we do not have much time to play with, and this issue grows more urgent every day.

The timetable to 2045 is achievable with effort and encouragement and support across all of our buildings, churches, schools, vicarages, offices, et cetera. Those who can go faster should go faster, and there may be those who can be pushed to achieve 2030 and that must be encouraged for those for whom it is possible. But the variety of our buildings has to be taken into account. The context has to be taken into account, what is possible in other places needs to be taken into account.

*The Chair:* Mr Braviner, are you speaking to Item 49, which is the amendment on cathedrals?

*Revd Bill Braviner (Durham):* To the amendment, yes. What I want to say is that the whole Church needs to do this. Cathedrals have to be included as well as everybody else, yes.

*The Chair:* Thank you.

*Revd Bill Braviner (Durham):* The main point I wanted to make about that was that we need to be enabled to encourage all parts of our Church, cathedral schools, everybody else. We need some resource to be put into this, and it is great if we spend lots and lots of money on building and resourcing churches, and growing big churches in other places. But if they are all under water then it is not going to be very helpful. I want to ask, across the Church can we put resource into this and put our money where our mouth is and develop exemplar cathedrals, buildings, schools, vicarages in the regions that people can look to for inspiration and for guidance?

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so I now put Item 49 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried by a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 50**

*The Chair:* I now invite Canon John Spence to speak to and to move Item 50 and to draw your attention to the fact that for Item 50, there is a financial statement on your Thirteenth Notice Paper. Thank you, Canon Spence.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I am a man with a confession to make. When I first read this motion, my sentiments were negative, almost hostile. How can we do this, I said, when we are already coping with parishes under severe financial pressure, where dioceses are reducing their numbers of stipendiary priests, when our carbon footprint is being reduced not for good reasons but because churches are closing and activities are ceasing? But then two things happened.

Firstly, I read the associated papers and came to understand that even with all the excellent work going on now, we will not achieve the existing target of 2050, let alone a more adventurous one. And, secondly, I realised that I had been thinking about this as a zero-sum game, where actually it cannot be either/or, it has to be both/and. What is the point of proclaiming the glorious Gospel of the risen Christ if we are not at the same time in the vanguard of expressing the joys and hope of His creation and preserving it?

What is the point of reaching out to younger people, if we are not equally embracing the issue which is closest to their hearts? What is the point of our National Investing Bodies having ground-breaking world-class activities if we are not putting our own house in order? And what, I may say, is the point of the government listing thousands of our buildings for conservation status without them then helping us conserve them in environmentally friendly ways?

So the purpose of this amendment is two-fold, and I hope it will be acceptable to the Bishop. Firstly, to stress the urgency and universality of responsibility. This is not an issue to be delegated to the Church at the centre, it is dependent on our individual and collective behaviours at home, in church and in our community. But, secondly, to recognise that we do need to underpin it with some central resource or some resource available to the Church, giving the necessary capacity, competence and expertise so that we can move from “that” or “this” to “both” and “and”.

If this motion is passed, and hopefully this amendment, I commit to Synod that I will work with and the Bishop and the Environmental Working Group to take to the next meetings of the Strategy Investment Board and the Triennial Funding Working Group, papers which seek to discuss how we can create that capacity, that competence and that expertise. I

do not know what it looks like yet. It may involve bringing in outside people. It may involve better funding for Environment Officers at diocesan level. It may involve various things.

I am clear it has to do several things. First, to establish on an evidence-based basis what we are doing, what the gaps are, what needs to be done. Secondly, to provide a source of information, guidance and advice at parish and other community church body level. Thirdly, to identify those limited numbers of interventions which might best be done across the Church to achieve the greatest efficiency, the greatest effectiveness. Fourthly, to assess how a proper programme of activity can be created which truly will enable these targets to be achieved, and might enable them to be accelerated.

But, let us be clear, a plan of programme which achieves 80% carbon footprint reduction in the first decade and then takes a bit of time to do the other 20% is far better than one where it is 20% first and 80% at the end. And, fifthly, to engage with the National Investing Bodies, other parts of the Church and beyond, to ensure that we have the right amount of finance to create a prioritised programme of action, to have that in place, to monitor it and to ensure it is delivered.

On the basis of my commitments to Synod, I hope you will support this amendment. It is the time to move from ambition to action, from aspiration to achievement. I move the amendment that stands in my name.

*The Chair:* I call on Bishop Nick to respond. You have up to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* John, it is always very moving to hear an Emmaus road experience, and I am glad that you have engaged with this in a way that has clearly moved you and has engaged you in some different ways. I am not having difficulty accepting this amendment; it seems to me it is really helpful. One of the things that has bothered me a lot in the time I have been the Lead Bishop is the way in which the pressure of the crisis that we face makes it quite easy for tactics to divide people about the goals that we are trying to achieve. It is really important that we work together, all parts of the Church working together.

The Environmental Working Group has been focused particularly since we were set up on developing activity possibilities for the local church. I had assumed that what we need out of this motion is 16,000 action plans in order to address the issues of climate change. John, I think you are absolutely right. We also need a national plan to provide the framework for that and I am very grateful for the amendment and think it will give us considerable capacity to move in the direction of travel with which we are all agreed.

*The Chair:* Item 50 is now open to debate. I call the Bishop of Manchester and Pete Spiers.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I am Chair, for the time being, of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and Deputy Chair of the Church Commissioners. I want to support Canon Spence's amendment. So me Synod members have already very kindly commented on the Thought for the Day I did on Radio 4 earlier this morning, talking about this debate. The key point I was trying to make was that it is all very good to do progress reports, looking back at what we have done in the past, but actually we need interim targets taking us forward each year or each three years into the future, and that is what Canon Spence's amendment, I believe, gives us.

Through the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and now through the engagement work of the National Investing Bodies, including the Commissioners and the Pensions Board, we are able to produce the Transition Pathway Initiative, where we are part of a massive coalition, many thousands of times larger than ourselves, where we are really seeing what companies are up to, how they are making promises for the future to get themselves in alignment with the Paris Agreement, step-by-step, not just some long-term aspiration that by 2050 we will reach some particular final destination point.

We are also challenging those companies when we do not think they have got the right governance or management structures in place, and I think, again, that what Canon Spence is offering us in this amendment will help us to make sure we have got the right structures to govern and to manage our work year-by-year, not just to 2045 or whatever year we end up with, but year-by-year. Not just aspirations, not just progress reports on the past, but what we are going to do next year this year. I support this amendment and urge Synod to do the same.

*The Chair:* I call Pete Spiers then, after Pete has spoken, I am going to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure on this amendment debate.

*Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* I support this amendment and I have a suggestion as well, for Canon Spence, because in this debate there will be a lot of talk, perhaps, about the resources and where were we going to get the money for it. Well, I know where we could get the money from – the £1.4 billion of money in historic endowments in the dioceses. Prudence is from a diocese that she knows very well, and they have £200 million, as of 2017 certainly, and it is not evenly spread. The top five dioceses have about a third of those resources.

I wonder whether a tiny contribution from some of those dioceses towards the resourcing of this debate and this action could go a long way. After all, we are all in this together. One of my jobs as an Archdeacon is to go to PCCs who are unable to afford the parish share, and they will tell me, "But, Archdeacon, we have not got any money". And what they mean is that they have not got any money in their current account but often have it in unrestricted reserves. And so I point this out. And I also say, "What is that money

there for?" They say, "Oh, that is for the rainy day", and I say to them, "Today is the rainy day".

So please support this amendment and do not be put off by the resources that no doubt the central Church will feel under pressure to contribute to. You can go back to your dioceses and suggest to your DBF trustees that perhaps they might be able to release a little bit of those, especially those dioceses that have more than others.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing, so I am now going to call for a vote on Item 50.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 51**

*The Chair:* I now call both Martin Gainsborough and Sue Booy to speak to but not move their amendments, 51 and 52, at this point. I want to hear Sue Booy speak to her amendment, but do note that if Item 51 is passed, Item 52 will lapse. Martin Gainsborough, you have up to three minutes.

*Revd Canon Professor Martin Gainsborough (Bristol):* Thank you to everyone who has spoken so far. I want to push us a little bit harder, whilst not underestimating the challenges that we face. I want to persuade you that 2030 net zero, the target Bristol Diocese has committed itself to, not 2045, is the right target for all of us. And by right, I mean right scientifically, theologically and ethically, and that it is achievable if we are determined enough.

So why 2030? First, scientifically the seriousness of the situation we are facing as a planet cannot be overstated. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says we have less than 11 years, not 25 years, to drastically reduce our emissions or we will not avoid catastrophic climate change. Next, we should commit to 2030 because it is the right thing to do ethically. We all know that climate change disproportionately affects the poorest in low-lying islands like Fiji, in Bangladesh, in South Africa. To not move quickly is to condemn our brothers and sisters to an uncertain future. I, for one, cannot look them in the eye and say "I did not care enough to change rapidly how I live".

And there are unassailable theological reasons why we must commit to net zero by 2030. The Christian faith is about sacrificial life. Faith is risky. A 2030 target says we believe in a God that goes before us, bringing new life and transformation. I have had the privilege, over the last few years, of leading Bristol Diocese's work on the climate crisis. In November, we passed our new environment and climate justice policy and committed to net zero by 2030, joining 60 councils in the UK who have also committed to 2030.

Of course, we are not oblivious to the challenges, but we can see the path to net zero in the next decade. Focusing on our diocesan offices and clergy houses, working with

churches and schools, we are decarbonising energy production using proven methods, reducing energy efficiency and looking at our indirect emissions as well. There are challenges, but let us not exaggerate them.

Before I finish, I would like also to speak from the heart. Synod, I am flabbergasted that anyone can think that a 2045 target is acceptable. It is not acceptable. As the world overheats and ecosystems are destroyed, are we really saying that we are unwilling to set an ambitious target for fear of failing. We must aim high and step up. Synod, at a time when our public standing is not at its highest, let us really lead for once, and let us commit, all of us, to moving heaven and earth to make this happen. There is nothing more important than this.

## **ITEM 52**

*The Chair:* Thank you Martin. I now invite Sue Booyes to speak to Item 52. You have up to three minutes.

*Revd Canon Sue Booyes (Oxford):* Friends, I wonder how you manage your deadlines. Sometimes I set a deadline a long time ahead so that I am certain I can manage it, and others I set close to my nose and I know when I do that that I am taking a risk. I welcome the good sense of this motion, the passion that I feel in this Chamber and I share Dr Gainsborough's sense of urgency.

In Oxford Diocese, we are from the bottom up deeply concerned about the climate emergency, with three deanery synod motions coming to diocesan synod in a couple of weeks time. We believe our new diocesan Environmental Task Group can help lead the way in responding to paragraph (c) of this excellent motion. The group draws members from within diocese, business and academy to look at the whole picture, integrating theology and communications, policy and advocacy, individual church and community engagement. We are taking seriously planning for net zero and integrating the Fifth Mark of Mission across all aspects of our planning. Our Task Group is working on a ten-year strategy with two-year action plans, a long view marked out by flexibility and the freedom to work with changing deadlines. Two things are being underlined for us in beginning this work: first, that it is a big challenge; and, second, that in this constantly changing landscape, a long-term fixed plan risks locking us in.

We all want to achieve carbon neutral quickly and realistically. This amendment offers the Synod an opportunity assessment of this changing situation every three years alongside the proposed progress reports, offering freedom and flexibility to move in a timely way, as I understand, within the cost of the amendment already accepted. My amendment comes firmly alongside the principles of the main motion and offers additional provision, allowing us to maintain a sense of urgency and manage our deadlines well.

*The Chair:* Martin, I now invite you to formally move Item 51.

*Revd Canon Professor Martin Gainsborough (Bristol):* I beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Bishop Nick, you are invited now to respond. You have up to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* As the Bishop of Manchester said on Thought for the Day this morning, actually this is the heart of the debate, is it not: how fast can we move in what is now an agreed direction of travel. I think we do need to spend some time on this.

I am going to resist both amendments, but I want to start by saying I am really grateful to the Dioceses of Bristol and Oxford. They are field leaders among us. They put me under a bit of pressure, to be honest, as the Lead Bishop on this in the Environmental Working Group. I think that is really helpful, and I very much admire the work that is going on, so thank you, Martin and Sue, for the amendments.

I want us to keep it simple. I think that is one of the reasons why I am resisting the amendments. Of course, there is a great temptation to say we have got to do it now. That is part of the pressure of Greta Thunberg or the Extinction Rebellion people and Climate Justice people outside: get it done now, it is so urgent. But if you have got a church boiler, a heating system, that is working okay, you know that you are going to have to review it by 2045, but if you put a deadline on everybody at 2030, parishes will be committed to additional financial expense when it is not yet necessary to review the heating system. I think that will cause some resentment in local churches. It will also increase carbon footprint for getting rid of stuff before it is out of its natural life.

By having the 2045 date, we know that everybody is going to have to review their heating and lighting. The technology is changing fast and we will be able to make best use of best practice as we go along. We have built into the motion a three-year review, coming back first in 2022. I do not think the Oxford motion will add very much more to that, but let us see what you think because this is the heart of it and is about how fast can we travel.

I have got every sympathy with what Chris Newlands said about the importance of us travelling together as a Church of England with the complexity of the estates that are our responsibility. It is not a simple problem and we are going to have to travel with others together as we do this as a Church.

*The Chair:* Bishop Nick is resisting this amendment and so before we move to any debate I would need to see 25 members standing. There are 25 members standing and so Item 51 is now open for debate. I remind you to look at the financial statement about this on the Thirteenth Notice Paper.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes):* I want to support this amendment. I encourage the Synod to do so, too. I know it is very easy to pluck net zero dates from the air, but I do regret the timidity of the framers of the motion in reaching for the blurred phrase, “By 2045 at the latest”. In classical Anglican fashion, I seek a middle way, but in this case it is a middle way between the 2025 demand of Extinction Rebellion – with whose protests, incidentally, and those of Christian Climate Action I am proud to have identified myself – and the aim of the present motion. Therefore, we arrive at 2030.

Readers of the background paper GS 2159 will have noticed the difference in tone between the words with which Bishop Nick began, “There is a crisis” and his phrases “faster action”, “picking up the pace” and then the diplomacy, for example, in paragraph 19, which talks about “a balance between achievability and prophetic emphasis”. I must say it is hard to see prophetic emphasis in a date which even many of the plutocrats of Davos seem to think is not too difficult to set. Prophecy is gift of the Church rarely implemented in Synods, but I hope that today we can connect with our prophetic inheritance to the modest extent of setting ourselves a target which is, indeed, more difficult but is not impossible.

I respect the work of the EWG and the technical skill of its advisers, but here in this Synod we are concerned with leadership. Like the paper, I honour the aims of Dioceses Oxford, Bristol, Birmingham, and the paper clearly sees their aim as achievable. Instead of holding them up as models, I shall be glad in Liverpool, whose City Council has set the 2030 target, to join them. And I cannot see why this Synod cannot invite the whole Church to do the same.

In Liverpool Diocese, we have moved in less than a year from a single Eco Church to a bronze award as an Eco Diocese. We are in line for silver and eventually for gold a good deal before 2030. My own home, which contains a chapel, is, after eight months, a silver Eco Church and will be gold before this Synod meets again. I am saying these things simply to indicate that if we can do it, anyone can do it. And surely, by mutual encouragement and discipline we can do it together. In short, I strongly support Professor Gainsborough’s amendment and I exhort the Synod to do the same.

*Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark):* I am against this amendment. I think that the whole idea of spending the historic reserves of the Church’s finances on eco-friendly actions is incorrect. If we have finances that are available, the top priority of the Church is to preach the Gospel to the lost. That is the business of the Church, saving those who will be sent into hell if they do not hear the Gospel and receive the Gospel. Talk of improving heating resources is totally secondary. Please, Church, can we get our priorities right.

*Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham):* I am a member of the Environmental Working Group. At the Christian Aid fringe meeting last evening, we prayed that, “God

may bless us with wonder at creation's glory, fury at creation's spoiling and courage at this critical hour". Absolutely, but I would add, "Inspiration to act wisely".

Historic England has learned much about maladaptation. We want to avoid negative unintended consequences of our actions in ancient and newer buildings. The best action is not always clear, at least at present. We will have to learn as we go along, together under God, our creator, redeemer and sustainer of all that is. I would love to be listening to the livestream from Synod in ten years time with the folk of the worshipping communities where I am then parish priest, and hear that we, the Church of England, in all our many parts have been so transformed that our carbon footprint is zero. But I just cannot see the path to get us there yet.

The motion with this amendment would be more than a challenge. It is in danger of being overwhelming, even paralysing. What will we do in the church on the estate where I am vicar now if the gas boiler in the hall breaks down next winter? Working on how we might use the garden for the basis of a ground source heat pump or some newer technology will take us some time, and the mechanisms to support us are not quite there yet. But if we installed a new gas boiler because the hall needs to be open for the community, we would be ripping it out before the end of its useful life to reach a 2030 target, and that is a waste.

What I would love and what I can imagine and plan for is to be listening to a report back to Synod in two or three years time and hear that progress in cutting carbon emissions is falling in line with the curve on page 6 of GS 2159. Plans are starting to emerge all across the Church that mean an 11% year-on-year reduction can continue. That would mean a 70% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030. Let us not underestimate how much change that requires. It is ambitious. For everyone, an 11% reduction is a significant change.

Over a millennia ago, St Benedict in his Rule called disciples of Christ to live a life that was radical and one of balance. The wisdom of the Rule is clear that living well with creation is absolutely core to being a disciple of Christ. This motion and what is spelled out in more detail in GS 2159 is a call that is balanced and, yet, a call to radical action. I would urge you to stick with 2045 and regular reviews.

Our actions as a whole Church over the next five years could enable a new Synod to bring forward the date when we aim to reach net zero. Pray God that they do. This planet and her people, created by God, redeemed by Christ, is our common home. Our sisters and brothers across the world need us to live differently now.

*The Chair.* Friends, it is really important that this debate comes to a vote on the main motion, otherwise we lose it and that will be a disaster. I am going to test your mind whether you would agree and give consent to extending this sitting by not more than 15 minutes. There is a further amendment to be heard. I propose an extension of sitting of not more than 15 minutes, if we need it. Does the Synod give its general consent?

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair.* Thank you very much. I am afraid I will be going to be even more brutal with the speech limits and I will endeavour to have us finished as soon as possible.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I, unlike Brian Wilson, am not confident about exactly who is going to hell and who is not, but I am certainly not prepared to be part of a country whose actions may contribute to the people of Australia living in further hell than they already have in the past year.

Synod, I was not going to support Martin Gainsborough's amendment, and then I thought, "Well, hang on a minute, what is the danger of setting a target for 2030?" If people do not make it, we have not lost anything, have we? Other people will have been given some energy to get on with things. Let us not be afraid of setting those deadlines.

In St Mary's, Battersea at the moment we are currently doing our mission action plan for the next five years. For the first time ever, we have got an item on climate change and how we as a parish respond to climate change. I think there are many parishes that are still way behind the curve on this. Adding some energy to it by setting a nearer target will not harm our efforts, but they will engage us far more accurately, so let us support Martin.

*The Chair.* I am now going to test the mind of the Synod on a motion for closure on this amendment debate.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair.* We now vote on Item 51. I think we are going to need a definite count. It is looking very much 50/50 to me. I order a counted vote of the whole Synod.

*The motion was put and carried, 144 in favour, 129 against, with ten abstentions.*

*The Chair.* Friends, Item 52 now lapses as not being relevant at this point.

## **ITEM 53**

*The Chair.* I call Andrew Nunn. Andrew, could you please move Item 53 formally – you introduced it earlier – and then I will call on the Bishop of Salisbury to reply.

*Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark):* I do so move.

*The Chair.* Bishop Nick, I call on you to respond.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* I do so accept.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Item 53 is now open for debate.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order. Madam, can I tempt you to use your powers to support a motion for closure?

*The Chair:* I will if I see anybody standing. I see no one standing and so I now put Item 53 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 54**

*The Chair:* I now call on John Appleby to speak to and to move his amendment. John, I apologise but the speech limit is now two minutes.

*Dr John Appleby (Newcastle):* I welcome the motion. I welcome the passions that have been put in and the excellent paper supporting. Before this last but one amendment was passed, I was applauding the 70% reduction by 2030 that was implicit in that paper which I felt was the kind of target everybody could commit to and would not overwhelm people but, there we are, we have got the amendment as it is.

This morning, the Bishop of Manchester on Radio 4 said, "What do we want but not yet". I think that is the big danger. Obviously, this motion and the amendment are trying to get people to commit but people are going to vary in their responses. The Archbishop of Canterbury in a different debate pointed out that things become normalised and we stop noticing.

Although this is primarily about carbon reduction, it addresses all the issues of waste and pollution and biodiversity and all the things that we have come to sort of normalise. An article this morning in the *Guardian* said (on a very mundane subject) in the UK we now throw away 7 million mattresses a year and that is a huge waste, but we have got used to comfort and convenience.

The issue of individual contributions, Prudence Dailey seemed to suggest that they do not matter, but in 1 Kings 19, Elijah was told by God that his individual contribution did matter and he was not alone. We need to also recognise our contributions are part of proving to Government that it matters to us. We all need to set ourselves milestones. Even with the amended date, every parish and body needs to set its own milestones that it can achieve and not even wait a few more years. Let us do that.

Lastly, I would point out that, as drafting by Church House staff not by me, the blank brackets at the beginning of my amendment which should contain a (d) are of the sort of tokenistic effort to save ink. That is not good enough. I move the amendment in my name.

*The Chair:* John, would you please formally move your amendment.

*Dr John Appleby (Newcastle):* I beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, John. Bishop Nick, I call on you to respond, please. You have up to two minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* John is a member of the Mission and Public Affairs Council. I understand there was a discussion there. It has been discussed by the Environmental Working Group. It adds nothing to the process of what we are about, I think, given that we have got a request to all parts of the Church of England to address the issues, and everybody is going to have to work out their own milestones.

I have to say, Synod, in relation to the amendment that has been passed and the bringing forward to the date of 2030, the test of prophesy is whether prophesy can be made true. You have put an enormous burden on yourselves and the wider Church in setting the targets that you have, but I will resist this amendment because I do not think it adds anything to that. I think that is a much more substantial part of this debate.

*The Chair:* Bishop Nick has resisted this amendment and so it will fall unless I see 25 members standing. There are not and so the amendment falls. We now resume the debate on the main motion as amended.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield):* I have got teenagers and they are very aware of the enormity of this. We know that climate anxiety is a real thing. We have been told that our small actions are like taking water from the sea with a pipette. Well, I am delighted that we have better news than that and alternative images of that with which to travel with our teenagers. Synod, we have the most hopeful image there is of small action and massive impact. We have yeast in the dough and so let us move forward, each and every one of us: tiny, insignificant, brave, risky action with that kind of hope.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Point of order. A motion for closure on this item.

*The Chair:* Thank you, but I am now wonderfully able to introduce a motion for closure myself at the time I deem fit.

[start here 2.54.27]

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* I was not intending to speak in this debate and I fully supported the original motion. I am standing simply to apologise to Bishop Nick and also to those members of the Diocese of Southwark to whom I had committed that I would vote for this motion. However, I find myself in the position now that, as amended, I am afraid I, for one, cannot now support this motion. I fear that we have set a target which is totally unrealistic, is unsupported by any plans and, unfortunately, on those grounds, for me, I can no longer add my name to the yeases.

*Mrs Margaret Swinson (Liverpool):* As Vice Chair of the Anglican Consultative Council, I think it is really appropriate to bring our debate to a close by coming back to the resolutions that the ACC passed. They are the foundation of the motion today. They remind us that the Church of England, much though we like to think of ourselves as very important, is part, and a small part, of a global Communion; a global Communion where this is an absolute emergency which makes the 2030 target very appropriate.

It recognises also the importance of mission, the Fifth Mark of Mission and, as was referred to earlier, the other Marks of Mission; for when climate emergency strikes our fellow Anglicans and other communities around the world, we do exercise mission in delivering response to human need. It also reminds us that we should be, as we were encouraged this morning, looking at the world from the point of view of the vulnerable, from the point of view of indigenous peoples, from the point of view of peoples for whom this emergency means they are planning to relocate their homes not in 20 years time but immediately.

I hope as we vote for this – and I hope we will vote for this – we remember that we are a part of that global Communion. It is not things that are happening to them. These things are happening to us. Let us bear that in mind as we support this motion.

*The Chair:* I am going to call Sophie Mitchell as I would like to hear the voice from a younger generation as we come towards the end of this debate. After Sophie has spoken, I will be testing the mind for closure.

*Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council):* 2019 was the year of climate action and climate emergency declarations. It was the year that Greta Thunberg stood before the UN Climate Action Summit and said, “For more than 30 years, the science has been crystal clear; how dare you continue to look away and come here saying that you are doing enough when the politics and solutions needed are nowhere in sight”?

It was also the year that thousands of ordinary people, many of which were young people, took to the streets and participated in climate actions like the one stood outside Church House today. Over the last year, we have begun to wake up to the increasing threat of the climate emergency but at great cost to our planet. We have all seen the news stories of floods in Indonesia and bushfires in Australia. Synod, we know what we need to do. We must act big and act fast.

During the environment debate in February 2019, I used my maiden speech to say that what is required is not more documentation but clear plans, clear actions and clear deadlines. I was pleased at the time that Synod was recognising the increasing threat of the climate crisis, but felt cautious that it would not lead to any real change. I now must thank you and thank the Synod Environmental Group for this motion. This motion is strong because it sets clear targets and it creates enough accountability for our targets. It is exactly what I asked for last year in the debate.

I would like to draw your attention to the final paragraph of GS 2159 which states that "... many of us will not be around to hear the Synod report that we have hit our zero emissions target". Though I did enjoy the humour in this statement, I would like to remind you of its serious connotations. I plan on being here but I know that many of you will not be. In my February speech, I urged you to think about your children and grandchildren, for they will be left to face the consequences of your decisions on climate change. Please vote in favour of this motion, but also be prepared to act big and act fast.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I now invite the Bishop of Salisbury to respond to this debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* That has been a very engaging, interesting and distinctly challenging debate. There is some real clarity, I think, in what Synod has been talking about. Certainly, some of the speeches have emphasised the importance of spirituality, about the theology of creation and about what we believe and think affecting what we do. I thought that there were some powerful comments about the connection between Church and State.

I was very grateful for those making maiden speeches, the Bishop of Norwich and Chris Newlands. The Second Church Estates Commissioner said, did he not, that the Church has got to exercise leadership and we have all got to put our own house in order before we are credible in doing that. I think that is where my caution came in.

In the introduction to the debate, I pointed out that fewer than 10% of Church of England churches have engaged with Eco Church. I am pleased that the Bishop of Liverpool is so confident that he will take his churches from one in the diocese to an Eco Diocese with a gold award. – Paul, not just before 2030, it has got to be faster than that. We are proposing to be at absolute zero now by 2030. You are talking about doing this in a matter of years. That is what we have got to do.

We have got to introduce a staged process to achieve this with realistic marking points which are no longer that 70% reduction by 2030, as in the paper supporting the original motion, but are now saying, "This is a game changer, folks". I do not know how we are going to do it, but we have said we will do it, and those who have set that target have said, "Well, it is a target, so let us see what happens if we do it". That is what we have agreed. We will come back in 2022, as indicated, with three-year reviews and we will try to achieve the maximum that is possible. I have to say I think it is a very tall order that you have set yourselves.

There was a question about buildings, which was actually raised by Andrew Nunn in relation to cathedrals. There is that question about how do we handle having heritage buildings, of which we have so many, and the environmental best practice that we know is coming upon us. There is a real difficulty, which Catherine Grylls spoke about, in relation to the dangers of maladaptation of buildings. You have to do what is best now and it takes some time to work out. It is not as simple as one thing trumping another. It is about how we hold those two aspects of heritage buildings and environmental best practice together. We are learning to do it.

There are some brilliant examples of best practice, for example, Gloucester Cathedral's solar panels, Manchester Cathedral's ground source heating and so on. St George's, Wash Common in Newbury is carbon neutral. How do the rest of us learn to do it? Some things are simple and can be done with existing technology. That is why we were setting the 70% reduction by 2030.

Some things are going to be much more challenging and will, actually interestingly enough, as Prudence Dailey pointed out, depend on science helping to provide new technology. It is changing fast. Christians Figueres, who chaired the climate change talks in Paris, said that ten years ago we would not have believed we could have made such progress.

Well, Synod, I hope that that will be true when we meet, or our successors meet, in 2030, but I have to say you are going to have to work really hard at this, convincing all the parts of the Church of England to act on this motion and to engage in a way that, so far, we have not yet seen. Synod, I commend the motion to you and propose it in its amended form.

*The Chair:* Friends, I now put the main motion, as amended, to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, members of Synod, for a good debate and thank you for your forbearance. We now move to a lunch break.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Derby (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

*The Chair:* Synod, before we start this afternoon, I invite the Chair of the Business Committee to make an announcement

*Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Synod, I want to share in anticipation a problem – no, a hiccup that we are experiencing. As you know, the Election Rules were deemed to have been appropriately and properly asked to be debated, and we are hoping that we are going to be able to do that in the context of tomorrow morning's business. However, we are not yet absolutely clear how that is going to work out. I am not on this occasion, Chair, going to ask if you will move that, but I want to give the Synod notice both that that is likely and also that the likelihood is we will achieve this by delaying Prorogation by about half an hour. I thought it was helpful to tell you that at this stage and come back to you when the picture is clearer. Thank you very much indeed.

## **ITEM 11**

### **SPECIAL AGENDA III**

#### **PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION**

#### **END TO PAUPERS' FUNERALS (GS 2160A and GS 2160B)**

*The Chair:* Now we move to Item 11, Special Agenda III, the Private Member's Motion: End to Paupers' Funerals, for which you will need GS 2160A and GS 2160B. I draw your attention to the notes concerning this item on the Sixth Notice Paper. I invite Sam Margrave to speak and move this motion in his name. He has up to seven minutes to speak and he will conclude with a video clip.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* In 2018 I watched an ITV news report by Chris Choi which we will play at the end of this speech. This tells the story of Jack, who lost his dad and his mum. We need to answer the call of families like Jack and his mum. In fact, my own dad died in 2016. He worked all his life, but he was terminally ill at 58 and at the time was on benefits, and if my dad had been in a care home any longer his estate would have been spent, and so my brother, sister and I would have had to fall back on a pauper's funeral. This really could happen to any of us.

I want to thank the extensive media coverage this motion has gained which has provided significant awareness and recognition. The nation is following the Synod response. The Church of England reaches into every community and can make a profound difference if we choose to. We have a moral and theological imperative to do all we can to change policy and transform the experience of the poor. There has been a 70% increase in the number of paupers' funerals between 2015 and 2018, with this figure expected to grow. While local authorities try to meet the growing need, the State, society and the Church are failing to respond appropriately to a broken system.

Councils all have different practices so the experience of paupers' funerals can mean no one being allowed to be present at a service or a service at a time that makes attendance

impossible, ministers not being allowed to take funerals, churches prohibited, ashes often not returned, and pastoral care is rarely provided to support the bereaved. There is no headstone allowed in many councils, thus enforcing a policy of unmarked graves; indeed, communal shared graves are even used. Paupers' funerals are a major public policy issue. This motion is a real test for the Church, to show our bias to the poor and to offer moral leadership to a society on an issue of national importance.

Proverbs 31.8–9 calls for us to speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute, "Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor". And those who die in destitution should have rights too and should be treated with dignity. Their deaths have shown that they were among the most poor and needy of society and although in their lives they probably would often have been denied their rights, they should not be denied them in death.

I have asked for an independent task force because this is a complex issue and we need to create a space where the stories of those who have had paupers' funerals can be told, and members of this Synod can have a voice, with experts and stakeholders coming together, to recognise, reflect and respond to this issue. We need a group that can co-ordinate and develop joined-up thinking to offer meaningful change to existing discourse on paupers' funerals. It should be an independent group and bring together local government, council leaders, Government and others. Task groups and task forces are new and the Church is beginning to grapple with them, so I understand the resistance from some, but this is a real opportunity to invest resources and time that we have into paupers' funerals so that, as they are today, we can bring them to an end. I believe the best way to achieve that is through an independent group.

Funerals play a central role in our society and national life. Whether for the departed or those who mourn, funerals offer comfort, care and an opportunity to say goodbye. Matthew 5.4 says, "Blessed are those who mourn for they shall be comforted". With no one else offering open arms, it falls on us, the Church, to provide that comfort to those in need of the love of Christ.

The next step in this process is for us as individuals to use our influence in our communities to speak to councillors in our own areas as I have done, and you will find that they will listen and we can ask them to change their own policy. Collectively, though, the Church must also undertake work to play its part in tackling this great social ill of our age at a national level.

We should also share good practice across the Church with stories of how we responded well so that we can learn from one another. It is through both the personal and institutional response that together we can make a real difference, and that includes both acts of love and kindness as well as keeping the poor in our prayers always.

*(Video played)*

*The Chair:* We now have some time to debate the motion as it stands. Would those who wish to speak please indicate. I call Andrew Dotchin and then Jacqueline Doyle-Brett for her maiden speech.

*Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I would like to declare an interest in that I represent General Synod on the Churches' Funerals Group as well as on the Council of British Funeral Services.

In the historic fight against sin, the world, the flesh and the devil, we have gathered some of the most egregious of them together and named them as the Seven Deadly Sins. This is not to say there is a hierarchy of sin. As has been said in many a sermon, despite inflation, the wages of sin remain the same. All sin is in some sense deadly, but these seven seem to hurt more than ever. They describe the things at the heart of our waywardness.

The mother Church has provided an antidote for them by calling us to practise the Seven Corporal Works of Mercy. Six of them we should be familiar with as they describe the difference between sheep and goats in Matthew 25: care for the hungry and thirsty, the naked and the stranger, the sick and the imprisoned. But the seventh comes from a different stable altogether. Of all the other good works the Church could call us to do, why do you think the seventh Work of Corporal Mercy is to bury the dead? Do we do it to honour the incarnation; to remind us that our bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit; to let us know that we are all destined for something other than this flesh; maybe even to compel theologians to occasionally plumb the depths of the Book of Tobit? Whatever the reason, Church and society recognise the importance of the sanctity of flesh and the need to care for the dead, and when we do not do this we slip into the realm of sin.

Sadly, some local authorities, in carrying out what they presume to be a routine task, are guilty of sin when they commodify the bodies of the poor and the indigent and see them as a nuisance instead of a treasure. It is sinful to not allow families space to grieve and reflect and pray just because they are poor. It is sinful to treat human cremated remains as a waste product and disposable without ceremony just because the bereaved are poor. It is sinful to take the great care and dignity and dedication of funeral directors, cemetery staff and the operators of crematoria and compel them to hurry up, arrive early or stay late, because the poor are an inconvenience and do not provide enough profit. It is sinful to not only treat the poor with disrespect in their grief but also to punish them for their poverty.

Thankfully, these are not universal practices and there are many who carry out funerals with deep respect regardless of the circumstances of the deceased and their family. However, my personal experience and that of others is there remain too many instances of those who, while accepting money from the public purse, treat the poor with little dignity and scant respect.

I have wept and prayed with a family shut outside a crematorium after they had been refused entry through its doors. I have seen ashes disposed of as if they were garbage with the words, "Oh, they're only cremains". A disgusting phrase. I have stood gobsmacked alongside caring funeral directors after an apple-munching jobsworth sniffed at a coffin of a friend of mine and proclaimed, "It's only a committal, you will have to wait until I have finished my lunch".

Friends, in a country such as ours we should be ashamed, and we should call this out wherever we can. Synod, please pass this motion, whether it is amended or not. With it you give those of us who are working on behalf of the dead, in the corridors of power and in local cemeteries and crematoria, the authority to cry enough and instead proclaim some familiar words: "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, From henceforth blessed are the dead which die in the Lord. Even so said the Spirit for they rest from their labours".

*The Chair:* Jacqueline you have five minutes. After this speech I will be calling on the Revd Tiffer Robinson to speak to the motion standing in his name.

*Revd Jackie Doyle-Brett (York):* A while ago – quite a while ago – when I was studying for my history degree, my dissertation focused upon the welfare reforms of the 1830s, especially workhouse legislation and the phrases "deserving" and "undeserving poor". One word littered the primary sources and that was "pauper". I find it quite sad that the documentation from this Synod will also include such a word, especially when attached to funerals.

However, Mr Margrave's motion today highlights the real necessity for us not only to reflect upon this issue of funeral poverty but to do something about it as the body of Christ. Both GS 2160A and 2160B explain in detail the scriptural and theological imperatives, so I will not repeat them. This is an issue that sadly comes down to the lack of money and its impact.

Last year one of my Messy Church families found themselves in crisis. The eldest son aged 21 had committed suicide due to complex reasons that included drug debt. Mum, a single parent on benefit with three younger children at primary school, was crippled with grief. When I visited her, one of the first things she said was that the family and friends had "chipped in" to get the deposit for the funeral. In her grief she had the additional worry about paying for her son's funeral. I knew that the only burden I could lift at that point was to arrange to waive all fees associated with the church. The funeral director then significantly reduced their fees. This had an impact. It allowed this mother to grieve for her son without the additional financial burden and worry. When we met again it was to focus upon the life and death of her son and to write his eulogy. I did not know this family through traditional church but through Messy Church and because of that I was entrusted with a funeral. But how many in financial difficulty do I not know about?

This motion helps us to highlight and bring to the fore funeral poverty and what we, as a Church, can do about it. Mr Margrave's motion calls for a task force and the summary suggests using the resources we already have. I would support either. What is important is using whatever means we have towards ending funeral poverty and increasing church involvement. How many of us here today have stood in the crematorium vestry looking at the list, shaking our heads or tutting at the ever-decreasing Church of England presence?

I have learned many things in the past almost five years on Synod: for instance, how easy it is to debate one or two words, which can often be important. That is not my intention here, but using outdated antiquated language is not helpful when talking about human distress. I have also learned that things move slowly. Yes, the phrase "pauper's funeral" should not return to the Synod but, more importantly, we need to work together in whatever way gets the job accomplished, to create a system that allows our brothers and sisters to die and be buried with dignity, and a system that allows us as a Church to weep with those who weep and comfort those who grieve.

Going back to those 19th century phrases of "deserving" and "undeserving" poor, I would hope in the 21st century we believe that no one deserves to be poor or find themselves in funeral poverty or debt, or be denied a church funeral, with all that brings, including lack of ongoing pastoral care. No one should die or be buried alone. We, as a Synod, should support this motion and help make funeral poverty a thing of the past and not the future.

## **ITEM 55**

*The Chair:* I invite Tiffer Robinson to speak to both Items 55 and 56 and when he finishes to move the first of those items, Item 55. You have five minutes.

*Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I want to begin by thanking Sam for starting this Private Member's Motion on a topic which brings together two things we as a Church are about: caring for the poor and funeral ministry. These are friendly amendments which seek to direct the motion in front of us in the most helpful way. The Life Events team and the Advisory Group on which I sit have years of experience and expertise between them and I feel is the best place to move this piece of work forward.

I want to pay tribute to the ministry of Sandra Millar, who heads up the Life Events team. She is enthusiastic about these amendments and is in the gallery today. She is passionate about good funeral ministry and the Church's role in ministering to people at the hardest time in their life. What she does not know about funerals is not worth knowing.

Although a task force would have consulted the Life Events team as well as the Churches' Funerals Group, some of the issues around paupers' funerals and local authority funerals

are incredibly complex. They vary so much around the country it is not a national picture. The Life Events team can truly hit the ground running on this work.

My first amendment also asks that there are some resources directed towards this, so this does not just become another part of an already busy brief for the team but gets addressed specifically in a timely manner. As we can see, the issue of funeral poverty is on the increase and shows no sign of slowing, so time is of the essence.

## **ITEM 56**

*Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* My second amendment concerning reporting combines urgency with enough time to look at the next steps for this work. I do not want people to think that by giving this work to the Life Events team that lets everyone else off the hook. Our Bishops, in particular, will continue to use their voice in the House of Lords, I hope, to influence public policy, and this motion, amended or unamended, will add power to their elbow as we make it clear this is something the Church is really concerned about.

In some of my conversations about this motion amendment some have expressed fatalism about what more we as a church can do. Maybe they are right but are we Anglicans or are we Anglican'ts? We need to try. I believe the best way to do this is through the expertise and knowledge and passion of the Life Events team. I move my first amendment.

*The Chair:* I invite Sam to respond.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* I want to thank Tiffer for moving this amendment. While we are of one mind on many of the issues around this subject, we differ on sending this to this particular group. I disagree when he says this is not a national issue. It is a local and a national issue. If we think about prayers at councils for example, the Church works to call on the Government to provide guidance, and what I would like to see is an externally facing group that co-ordinates and brings together stakeholders, including the Life Events Advisory Group, the MPA and others, but, equally, to bring to the table those who are external, those who represent political bodies, policymakers, experts, members of this Synod, so that we can explore the complex issues and come up with something to respond. I would like us to raise awareness, to reflect and to respond. I believe that this is a public policy issue and to only send it to the Funerals Group would lose something in that, because the Funerals Group consists mainly of funeral directors and clergy and their issues focus on funeral arrangements and the theology of funeral ministry, which is very important work but I feel that we need an independent group.

If this amendment is passed my concern is that paupers' funerals will become an agenda item on another agenda or a footnote in another report. I know that this will cost money, but I would disagree with the figures that have been raised because we could have our

first meeting face-to-face and use Skype to have following meetings like the safeguarding groups do. There are other ways to save money if money is the issue.

I believe we should invest in this because the return on our investment will be huge and the poor need to have a group that will listen and that is independent and takes into account all of the issues, not puts it into one particular focus, because the whole issue may be lost. I respect the mind of Synod and I will let you decide. I am sure that whatever the outcome of our decision, we will make this a success and the Church, as always, will be at the forefront of fighting and speaking up for the poorest in society.

*The Chair:* As Sam does not accept this amendment, it will fall unless I see 25 members or more indicating that they would like to debate this amendment. Do I see 25 members standing or indicating? I do see 25 members. The debate on Item 55 is now open.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell):* St Budeaux is a quaint medieval church overlooking the Old Naval Dockyard in Plymouth. Its claim to fame is it is where Sir Francis Drake was baptized and later married. Today, the church is marooned in the middle of two grim post-war housing estates, but I am proud to say that it is a beacon of hope in that community because, with seed core funding from the diocese, it set up a debt relief and counselling centre which is making tangible differences to the local people. Talking to some of the centre's team, I asked them in their experience what were the main causes of people on the estate getting into debt and what surprised me was what came top of their list: funeral expenses.

Typically, funerals are big shows with lavish floral tributes and families have little idea of just how much a funeral costs these days. Ashamed to admit their inability to pay, they borrow money from loan sharks and before they know where they are, they find themselves caught in a spiral of debt. I am sure those of you who serve on similar estates will recognise the scenario. We hear a lot about food poverty but not about funeral poverty.

The insurance company *Sun Life Direct* says that funeral poverty has risen by 125% since 2010, a figure that it calculates by assessing the shortfall between the cost of funerals and people's ability to pay. Today, around one in seven people in the United Kingdom are unable to pay that bill and last year alone 93,000 people took out a loan to pay for the funeral.

But it is not just that steep rise in the number of so-called paupers' funerals that concerns me. When I was first ordained, the Church of England funeral was the default option of most English people, but today, although the Church of England remains the major provider, with its ministers presiding over just over a third of all funerals, it is no longer automatically the default choice of the population. There are others competing in the

market, including a new cadre of funeral celebrants who cater particularly for those of no faith or who no longer feel at home in church or who are ambivalent about organised religion.

And a further example of change, direct cremations are being marketed by some funeral directors ostensibly as a way of keeping down the cost of funerals, because they are cutting out the funeral, they collect the dead body from the home and hospital, and take it directly to the crematorium. And that is the trouble. It excludes death, avoids it, squanders it away. Goodness knows the psychological damage that is being done to the population.

Speaking as the Chair of the Liturgical Commission, we are at the service of the Church and already working hard with the Life Events team and Funerals Group. A lot of work has already been done. I do not believe that we need a new task force. What we do need is a concerted effort at local level, building relationships with local councils and funeral directors, who will always be the gatekeepers in the times of funeral ministry. I gladly support these amendments.

*Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* I am also speaking in support of Tiffen's amendment. Also, at the outset of my speech, I just want to say I think that the title of this motion is the end of paupers' funerals, not funeral poverty in general. Perhaps that is the second bullet point, but the focus seems to be the end of paupers' funerals or, as I think we should be calling them, public health funerals.

Of course, funeral poverty is a symptom of poverty as a whole, and that is the context in which these issues arise. It is mentioned in one of the background papers that two years ago the Diocese of Liverpool set up the Good Funeral Company, as we could see that fewer and fewer people were turning to the Church of England for their funerals and we wanted to see whether, by going into the market and building good relationships with undertakers, we could start doing funerals in that way. Not bypassing the local church, but if the local church for whatever reason did not feel able to do it or if people did not want someone from the local church they could come to the Good Funeral Company and have a funeral with us.

We appointed Juliet Stephenson as the first director and she has gone round and spent lots of time building relationships with funeral directors and they now turn to her in certain circumstances and ask if she or one of our celebrants can do a funeral. She has also said, "We will do public health funerals for you as well. You can ring me if you are not sure who else to contact in these situations and we will provide a celebrant to do the service. We will do it well and we will even remember them afterwards in the cathedral at a memorial service". That has also been useful.

The point of that is that this requires local action. In the Diocese of Liverpool we have six local authorities, so there are six public health departments that Juliet has to deal with. One of the answers to this issue is for every diocese to build good relationships with their

public health departments in the local authority, so that you can say to them, “If you ever need someone to be a celebrant at one of these funerals, we will do it, because we believe that everyone is made in the image of God and is unique and precious”. Juliet is a part of the Life Events Advisory Group so you will be able to call on her expertise, we do not need a task force, we have already got things in place, so let us vote for Tiffer’s amendment.

*The Chair:* I call on Jamie Harrison to speak and after that would like to test the mind of Synod about whether we go straight to a vote.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* Just to bring Synod’s attention to the Sixth Notice Paper regarding costs on this item. I think the costs are not something that cannot be looked into, I do not think the costs are the issue for the Council, the only issue would be, I think, in the paper from the Secretary General. Cost-effectiveness is one issue, not cost, and also whether expediency would be better served following the amendment rather than rejecting the amendment. I am just noting in passing that Item 57 does give the opportunity for us to vote on an amendment, which will call on Her Majesty’s Government and other bodies nationally to respond to this. I think from the cost point of view I would not suggest this would hold us back.

*The Chair:* So I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 55 has been sufficiently debated. Therefore, I put the motion for closure on Item 55.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We now move to a vote on Item 55.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I now ask Tiffer Robinson to move Item 56.

*Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Sam, I need you to respond.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* I accept the amendment.

*The Chair:* Sam Margrave accepts that amendment and therefore Item 56 is now open for debate. I do not see anybody standing and so we move to a vote on Item 56.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 57**

*The Chair:* I would now like to call, somewhat unusually, Sam Margrave, to move an amendment to the motion standing in his name. Sam, would you like to come and speak to this amendment? Item 57, you have maybe a couple of minutes to introduce this, please.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* This is very unusual and possibly the first time it has been done, but this is in response to a request from a number of people across the Church. In order to strengthen the public policy goal and in response to requests made to me, I put forward this motion that I hope will help the Church speaking to public discourse and to open dialogue with national and local leaders.

*The Chair:* Sam, do you accept your amendment?

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* I do.

*The Chair:* Therefore, the debate on Item 57 is now open.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* Sam, thank you very much for calling this to our attention in such a strong way. I am speaking now as a member of a district council myself, and I am ashamed to see Telford, although that is not my council, as one of those councils where graves cannot be marked.

I sat in a planning enquiry for two crematoria in January and I found out at the time that there is a 10% increase year-on-year in the demand for crematoriums, and I was very surprised to hear that. But not surprised, as I represent the most impoverished ward in South Staffordshire.

I just want to say to you two things about this really. First, in my own community I have already helped to crowdfund two funerals in the last year, because appeals have been made by people whose particular partners have died after a long period of illness where there was no basic good income coming into that family except benefits, and they have issued a personal appeal to help them meet the cost of a basic funeral.

*The Chair:* Mrs Allen, can I ask does this relate to the particular amendment that is under discussion at this moment?

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* It does, insofar as I am representing a council. I just want to say to Sam that I think all councils in this country need to pay careful attention to what you are moving through today. From my own point of view, I am hearing those stories. I have every intention of going back to be active about this myself, and I hope that other members who have connections in this body will use that with their public bodies to try to highlight this issue.

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* I fully support Mr Margrave's amendment to his own motion. I think it is helpfully strengthening and brings the attention of a national matter to national authorities. I am just slightly concerned about the wording of the final phrase in it, which reads "the return of the departed, where permitted, to family members", and I just wonder if that is quite the text that Sam intended. Did he mean "the return of the cremated remains of the departed, where permitted, to family members"?

*The Chair:* I call on David Ison to speak. You have up to three minutes.

*Very Revd David Ison (Dean of St Paul's):* It is just to make a comment on the wording and the lack of inclusion in the wording. This, presumably, is not simply for the benefit of the Church, but for all groups in the country. I know you cannot simply amend an amendment, but we should be putting something more like having simply a funeral service which can take place in a place of worship or at a crematorium. There are other religious groups who would also like the opportunity to be able to take advantage of this.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing, so we move to a vote on Item 57.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We now, therefore, return to the debate on the motion, as amended, Item 11, Special Agenda III, the Private Member's Motion to end paupers' funerals. Those who wish to speak, please indicate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Chris McQuillen-Wright (Truro):* I stand here as a simple parish priest with over 2,500 funerals behind me for those of strong faith, of no faith, of many faiths, for families who profess to be Wiccan, Buddhist, Jewish and Druid. Always paramount, though, the universality of the love of God to all people regardless of distinction. Therefore, the collusion we, as a Church, are blindly walking into of a two-tier system of bereavement based on financial welfare is a problem in the making. This Synod, we have lamented and recognised our shameful role in the past treatment of others with a conscious or unconscious bias. With regard to bereavement, we are doing the same again – colluding with the system that currently exists on financial affordability.

Since when has the Church not inclined its ear to the poor? Since when has the Church allowed others to judge solely based on wealth? Just at the moment when vulnerable people, who are probably some of the most vulnerable anyway because of their economic deprivation, are hit with bereavement, we collude to create and maintain a system based on affordability.

I have stood in a crematorium car park with a family living in funeral poverty, denied the choice of day, time, denied attendance into the chapel, they stood in the car park to watch their loved one unloaded and pushed into a building 50 metres away. I was not allowed in the chapel nor allowed to say any form of words, but, of course, turning my back away to the camera facing on the car park, I did. Since when is grief allowed to be treated as clandestine and loving care to be hidden? It has already been said that crowdfunding to pay for funerals is increasingly becoming commonplace. We see the best in our communities at such time, but that is not enough. We need to make a stand, and it will be a costly stand. For us to have an authentic voice, we need to wrestle once more with the issue of our fees as part of the discussion.

Are we defending the poor and the marginalised, the vulnerable and the grieving or are we determining the future apologies of our successors in this place for the sake of the financial solvency of an institution? I fully support this motion.

*The Chair:* After Catherine Farmbrough, I call the gentleman with the blue lanyard and then will be testing the mind of Synod as to whether we have sufficiently debated this item and are ready to move to a vote.

*Miss Catherine Farmbrough (Deaf Anglicans Together):* I wanted to talk to Synod today a little about the situation of deaf people, particularly thinking about the financial implications for some deaf people in the current funeral system. Of course, we would all agree deaf people need access, it is paramount that they are able to access all services in our mind, I am sure.

But just to provide two brief examples of where this is not currently happening. Recently, a deaf person had a pauper's funeral. There was no attempt made to engage members of the deaf community, and for many deaf people they consider the deaf community a second family to them, so it feels increasingly that sad that people did not have access to mourn. The deaf people who they were, indeed, very close to and they would consider their family, in fact did not even know they had departed until after the service had happened.

And, unfortunately, because of the family members not having that understanding of the deaf person in their family, they did not know to contact these people, so it was a very difficult and upsetting situation for all involved. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated event, we know these things happen more than we would like, unfortunately. The deaf community, unfortunately, in this instance found out too late and were unable to grieve.

If I just give an example of another funeral. Unfortunately, we see in various dioceses there are different policies, some dioceses do not have any policy around the provision of access for deaf people for funerals and, unfortunately, what this can mean, in one recent example, a deaf lady had to – out of her own pocket – pay £200 to an unscrupulous

agency who charged her this money just for half an hour of interpretation for the service, so she was able to attend her family funeral. We know this happens a lot.

I would love to very much support the establishment of this task group, but also ask that the task group really do think of the needs of deaf people within these issues so we can sort out these long-standing issues once and for all.

*Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury):* Thank you, Sam, first of all, for bringing this motion, this topic for us to reflect on and debate together as a Synod. It is, I believe, an important topic that goes right to the heart of us proclaiming the Gospel of Christ once more to our nation. Later this month I will be conducting a thanksgiving service for a lovely family following the experience of their not being able pay for their own funeral of both a father and also a husband. Yes, that service will take place at a crematorium at a time when the family will not know when it will happen. So what is the response of us a church? Well, we have organised a service of thanksgiving to invite the family to, along with their friends.

Synod, let us find a way to end funeral poverty. Dying is one of the only events in life that every single person will go through. It has huge, massive consequences both emotionally and financially, not just for the family, but also for the community watching on. Also, for us a Church as we seek to hold out the Gospel.

Today, let us speak out on this subject of public health funerals. These funeral arrangements cannot be made by a family of the deceased, for instance due to the inability of some families to pay the funeral costs. And this is going to be on the rise. Why? Well, because we know that our population across the country is rising and we see increasing extremes of wealth and poverty. There is another scandal in the background, and that is the cost of funerals in England, and that, indeed, itself, should also be investigated.

How should we respond? I believe that it is time for pastoral care that walks in the steps of Jesus Christ to once more be on the front foot. This is a time for mission, as we seek to hold out the Gospel to the lost and dying world, offering hope of resurrection. The resurrection of Jesus, for surely he was the one who came to speak to those who were poor in our world. This is a time to stand alongside those who are the poorest and the weakest in our society, for Jesus showed us that we are to be a people of compassion.

Therefore, I wish to commend the idea of a person-centred funeral. I hope that the future task force or group, or whoever investigates this, might find a way of levelling maybe a small additional charge to ordinary funeral costs so as to make a source of funds available to help the poorest and neediest and most disadvantaged.

Thirdly, I would like to encourage this group to look into our relationships with funeral directors across the country so as to improve our pastoral care for all who are mourning. I support the motion.

*The Chair:* There is nobody standing, so I invite Sam Margrave to respond to the debate. Sam, up to three minutes, please.

*Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry):* Can I begin by thanking the Business Committee for tabling this motion. Importantly, I want just very quickly to thank Synod staff, with special thanks to Jenny and Alvin, because without them I would not have been able to bring this here today and the important work that the staff do behind the scenes is very much appreciated. Also, I would like to thank everybody who signed the PMM.

The debate has been very important today and shared stories of your own personal experience of paupers' funerals, of taking paupers' funerals, and, also importantly, we have demonstrated that we have local councillors who are members of this Synod, that we can work with. I want to apologise, though. I have never liked the term "paupers' funeral". Unfortunately, I could not find a workaround. In relation to inclusion that was mentioned, I agree it would be better if we could support all faith communities and I hope that that has been taken on board, but because of wording in this place, I felt very constrained.

I want to particularly thank Tiffer for his motion, and I look forward to working with him and Sandra to build on the excellent work that they are already doing. I also want to thank the other speakers, particularly Catherine, with her story of her friends and your own experience, and it was very moving. I hope that in future we can begin to improve the situation, not only for you and your friends but for everybody in this country, and that the Church can be there, standing with those in need, as Jesus Christ stood with those in need, because that is truly what we are called to do. Blessed are the poor.

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* Point of order. Madam Chair, this is an important motion, and it is amended with Sam's amendment, asking the Government and others to do some significant work on it, so it would be good to have an accurate record of those voting. Would you order a count of the Synod?

*The Chair:* If I see 25 indicating that they would like that to happen, I would be content. Yes, I do see 25 so indicating. And so I order a counted vote of the whole Synod. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod.

*The motion was put and carried, 273 voting in favour, none against, with one recorded abstention.*

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 3.33 pm.

## **ITEM 12**

### **CHILDREN AND YOUTH MINISTRY (GS 2161)**

*The Chair.* Good afternoon, everyone. We come to debate Item 12 on the agenda: Children and Youth Ministry. For this item, members may like to have GS 2161 to hand.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that I have given my permission to Mark Sheard to move the motion in a form which is different from that on the agenda. The difference – wait for it – is that an additional paragraph has been incorporated: paragraph (b). The text of the motion, therefore, as it is to be moved is on Order Paper V at Item 12.

As you can imagine, this type of debate attracts a lot of people wishing to speak, and so there will be, if you are hoping to speak in the debate, a speech limit of three minutes from the outset. I call upon Mr Mark Sheard to speak to and move Item 12. You have up to ten minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* Good afternoon, Synod. The debate that we are going to go through this afternoon builds on last year's encouraging Youth Evangelism debate. You may remember the opening words of the paper that supported that debate stated: "Our engagement with young people within our Sunday worshipping communities is currently very limited. The majority of churches have no, or very few, people under 16". Synod requested further data on that, and that is why you have the Report that has been brilliantly prepared by Jimmy Dale from the Evangelism and Discipleship team and Ken Eames from Research & Stats, entitled "Children and Young People in the Church of England".

So what is today about? Today is about firstly reminding us of the urgency of this issue and, secondly, to encourage the whole Church to take responsibility for responding positively to the challenges raised by the figures.

I do not propose to mine the data contained in the Report, but I do want to emphasise two key startling statistics on which this motion rests. Firstly, in the last five years, overall attendance of under 16s has decreased by 20%. That compares to a 12% decline in adult Sunday attendance. Secondly, in the last five years, the number of churches and parishes with 25 or more under 16s has decreased by 28%. That means that we now have only 903, i.e. less than a thousand, parishes and churches with 25 or more under 16s. Let that sink in for a minute. I want to let it sink in because it means that, if these trends continue at the same speed, in less than ten years there will be no children or young people in our churches. Synod, we are facing an existential threat.

So what is our response to this? For many people, those figures will not come as a shock, but we are so good at finding ways of avoiding having to do anything about them. We tell ourselves that we are doing our part, or that as we have no young people we cannot

contribute, or we say, “That big church up the road has all the young people and we can’t compete with them,” or even worse, “We don’t need to”. Or we explain statistics away as exceptions, using facts like, “Ah, we had an interregnum” or “It was a building project”. Synod, these figures are not one-off parishes that can be turned around. What we are looking at is a trend that is now the rule.

Some people would say that these figures are wrong. They would point out that they are based on Sundays. That raises another question about what our understanding is of what it means to be part of a worshipping community. We hear stories of Messy Church services not being included but church leaders pleased to note that it is encouraging that one of the mums came on a Sunday morning. What is church? Or we delude ourselves and we include dance classes which happen in the church hall. We need to ask ourselves what it means to be part of a worshipping community and to move young people into paths of discipleship.

Or we say that we need more data and that the data we have is not adequate. Well, I think it is adequate to give us the trend, but I am really pleased to tell you that we are already scoping out further research on it to help understand not just the what but the why. What we can do is we can argue about detail, but we cannot dispute the trend that the number of young people in our churches is in long-term sustained decline.

We are facing an existential threat to the Church of England. It is not something we can push down the road. It needs to be addressed now in a way that sees tangible, substantive change. The future of the Church of England depends on what you decide today.

But that is not why it matters. The future of our children is why it matters. It matters because they matter to Jesus – Jesus who worked miraculously through the gifts of loaves and fishes given by an under 16, Jesus who healed Jairus’s 12-year-old daughter, Jesus who came to bring life in all its fullness. He did not put an age limit on that promise. He did not put an age limit on his command to love our neighbours. He did not put an age limit on the Great Commission. That is not how Jesus works and that is not how I see it.

Frankly, I am stood here because a little church in rural Essex cared enough to run a youth group for four or five teenagers who would come some weeks, and in that group they shared the love of Jesus. Small is beautiful. Small can be really beautiful.

Let me give you another statistic that comes out of the Report. Amongst churches reporting smaller numbers of under 16s, say less than ten, nearly 20% of them – that is 2,500 churches – reported their numbers growing since 1913. Then in big churches, of the 903 churches reporting 25 or more under 16s in 2018, 329 of them were not in that cohort five years ago. They have grown into that cohort. Growth is possible. Against a backdrop of widespread decline, growth is happening in many places. I would not be standing here if I did not believe that further growth is possible.

How? It begins with a response from every single one of us, every church leader and parishioner, wanting to see it change, wanting to share the love of Jesus with young people in this land and matching that desire with action.

This motion calls on us all to act urgently and to act recognising that our action will come at a cost, investing in family ministry, running events like Messy Church, building links with local schools, running parent and toddler groups, engaging in long-term relationships with Christian families, running midweek youth and children's groups. As a Church, we have to do all we can to encourage faith in families using the host of opportunities available to us. That is what is at the heart of the *Growing Faith* initiative. We cannot afford to squander these opportunities.

But they do come at a cost. We must invest in resource and finance. Within the 903 churches with the larger cohort of children, more than 50% of them have invested in youth and children's work. Of course, resources are tight, so our challenge is to make sure that we invest where we are most likely to see impact to avoid an unco-ordinated approach or an approach which seeks to resource everybody, which leads to short-term, shallow, low-impact investment, where any change, if it does come, is short-lived. I want us to focus on two elements of investment.

Firstly, and this one may sound counterintuitive, I want us to resource those churches who have numbers of under 16s. I want us to resource them to share their best practice, encouraging those of them who have been blessed to be open-handed and generous to help those who are apparently less well resourced. You can see examples of that happening in places like London, Sheffield and Oxford, where they run initiatives that have identified key churches whose youth, children and families ministry is growing, and they have looked at how not only can they share their models of good practice but how they can also help resource others who are less well resourced.

Secondly, we must embrace new ways of reaching young people. Generation Z are the first generation to be un-churched rather than de-churched. They have no frame of reference for what church looks like. We must be actively looking at the places where our children and young people are engaging and asking "What needs to happen for them to see an active extension of those places as an act of extension of church community, where they are offered space for worship, prayer, teaching, discipleship and the sacraments, ensuring that their engagement helps build life-long disciples?" In Carlisle you can see that happening, where, instead of resourcing every church, they have pioneered new Fresh Expression worshipping communities with a focus on reaching un-churched young people. Or some of you may know in Canterbury Diocese the new church plant, Zeal Youth Hub, in partnership with Holy Trinity, Sittingbourne.

Growth is possible. Growth is possible. We need to dream and enact big plans, like the York Province's Missional Youth Church Network, and we need to value the small and

encourage and resource that. But it is urgent. We need to do it now. The future of the young people of England depends on what we do today – not what some of us do but what all of us do.

Synod, if you pass this motion today – which I urge you with all my heart to do – then in two years' time the Evangelism and Discipleship team will return to Synod to report what we have all done together to address this issue and how God, who does immeasurably more than all we could ask for or imagine, is blessing our endeavours. I commend this motion to you.

*The Chair:* Item 12 is now open for debate. Please note that the speech limit is three minutes. I first call the Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham, Paul Williams, followed by Katrina Thomas for a maiden speech.

*The Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Williams):* As Lead Bishop for Youth Evangelism I am thankful for this motion. This Report presents us with a sobering challenge, but I would urge us, Synod, not to become too overwhelmed or absorbed by inward-facing missional angst on this. We need to pull together and to do so with prayerful and purposeful action. We have everything to play for. And we have the Holy Spirit. The statistics matter, yet they can create such a fog of despair that it obscures our vision of the great opportunity that is before us and the unrivalled resources we have available to us.

I want to highlight particularly the substantial benefits that arise from smaller and larger churches learning together in this ministry. We are best placed to fulfil this commission when we pull together. The harvest is plentiful, and we need every available worker, in every church, equipped and engaged. This was demonstrated recently for me in our diocese where a cohort of 28 churches, comprising four or five people from each, met every other month over a year as learning communities together. Four of the churches had 25 or over under 18s; two churches had none. Most were in between. Four came with the head teacher of their church school as part of their team. The objective they shared was a resolve to make some new bold step change in their ministry with children.

What became clear was that best practice and ground-level inspiration did not come only from the larger churches. Larger churches certainly bring creative gifts and resources, but they also can learn. Many of the smaller churches demonstrated what can happen when the whole congregation is engaged in welcoming and nurturing the faith of a young person.

In smaller churches, it is more often seen as the responsibility of the whole congregation, whether that is reflected in the kindness and care of a young person learning to ring, or in a choir or music group, as a server, or even being given the opportunity to lead and preach. In smaller churches the whole congregation really notices and values the young person rather than delegating the ministry to someone else. Some of our larger churches

in the learning communities were hugely challenged by this and realised that complacency in their context can turn children and youth ministry into a department of the Church which many have no interest or engagement with. As a former incumbent of a larger church, there is more of a challenge in this report for these churches than for smaller churches. For those to whom much is given, much will be expected.

So in supporting this motion, I commend the value of churches learning together, not with some who have all the answers and others who have all the struggle, but united in a holy and urgent endeavour, with every member of the body of Christ playing their part. I urge Synod to support this motion.

*Mrs Katrina Thomas (Southwell & Nottingham):* As someone who has worked with children, young people and their families for 15 years now, in a number of settings, I do support this motion and urge you to vote and support it yourselves. However, I would say that it does not go far or deep enough.

Over the time in which I have done the work that I do – my whole adult life in fact, since becoming a Christian at age 19 – I can say, hand on heart, that I have not in that time come across a single church that does not want to engage with children and young people. In fact, most are desperate to but do not know where to begin. They do not have the training, the experience and resources.

I am thankful to the Bishop for talking about the learning community that I myself was part of within the diocese. Larger resourcing churches do have a part to play in sharing good practice and physical resources. However, I do know that this is not just about those churches. It is about our new worshipping communities. It is about smaller churches in areas of rural or urban poverty or otherwise, and this is about our cathedrals. We are the Church of England. This needs to be, I have to say, about resourcing everyone – not directly, necessarily, but resourcing everyone – to reach every child in our nation, not just those who live perhaps near a larger church. We need to be investing in training and resources, in elevating the status of this specialised ministry to and with children, young people and their families.

If we were to suggest that those without sound training and discernment of their calling and suitability could be responsible for the spiritual wellbeing of large groups of adults, there would be an outcry. Yet each week many faithful servants do this working with children and young people. They want to see change. They want to see children in their churches. Many of these volunteers have minimal training, using resources that expect little of children and simply do not engage those children and young people in the world they inhabit. We need to hope for more – and expect more – for our children and young people because they live in a strange new world with many challenges. They have so many questions that perhaps they did not ask previously, questions about morality, faith and the nature of their own identity. Are we, the Church, equipped to answer these

questions? Are we trained to pastor and minister to and with these young seekers and disciples?

So I urge each person here present this afternoon not only to support this motion but to go away from this Synod thinking about what needs to happen and to change; our need for recognition for this vital area of ministry, this vital relational ministry. Do go and read the study commissioned by the Bishop of Leicester last year about the challenges facing children and youth workers.

I just want to sum up by saying that clearly from these statistics something is not working and there is a need for change. It is often said that the definition of “insanity” is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. Perhaps with this in mind it is time to change how we view, understand and resource this specialised ministry to and with children and young people, both now and in the future.

*Revd Canon Christopher Newlands (Blackburn):* I was not planning on speaking, but I do want to address something which is important to me. I rejoice with every initiative which works to bring young people to the faith and to come to know the Lord Jesus and to live according to His teaching. Not every way we do that is a fresh expression or is something new. Sometimes the old works.

In our experience in Lancaster Priory, we have a robed choir. We have 45 children between the ages of nine and 18 in our robed choir. We have 15 young adults between the ages of 18 and 23. We have 15 children between the ages of seven and nine in our children’s choir, which is the prep for the robed choir. That is 75 young people between the ages of seven and 23 who make music in our church. It is a wonderful thing.

One of the unique things about us, perhaps, is that we are explicitly an inclusive church. We have significant numbers of those older children and young adults who are LGBT, who feel safe in a church which welcomes and affirms them. Perhaps one of the things that we ought to be clear about in our mission and work with young people is how the inclusive agenda welcomes them, affirms them and helps them to be who they are fully and truly.

## **ITEM 58**

*The Chair:* We are going to work our way through the amendments. As you will see, there are five amendments on the Notice Paper. First of all, we will take the amendment standing at paragraph 58. I invite Thomas Seville to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to three minutes.

*Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities):* I must begin by commenting on the last speaker. I am very, very happy with the old and traditional ways, but it was delightful to hear the spin on them in Lancaster Priory.

I want to propose an expansion of the motion. I acknowledge that the new paragraph, paragraph (b), goes some way to answering the question which prompted my amendment. I do think it is important that the old, traditional ways, and some very new ones, which are being conducted with commitment, but often under-resourced across the land, many sustained by the grannies of England, do get recognised and included as equal partners with those churches which have been so blessed with numbers.

There are many places in England where you will never – never, ever – get large numbers of young people, and it is because either the population is ageing, or the cost of housing is too high for young people to live, or, indeed, because the population itself is too small. I think of some parishes I know in an eastern diocese where there are 20 graveyards, there are 12 parishes, and the population is 2,000 of all those 12 parishes. The one focus of community is a school, in a village where there are 650 people, and that is quite properly the focus of the one clergy person's ministry. There are always going to be small numbers of young people in those churches, but where, in a sense, church really gets off is in that school. That actually, I think, may be a way where many areas are going, where the one place of community in an area is actually the school, no longer the church or the social clubs.

I want to shift focus so as to include all those places in England which are engaging with young people and fostering the growth of young Christians but are not doing so with any realistic hope of huge numbers. They do need resourcing. They do need questions and advice. Sharing good practice will do it, but I think it is absolutely essential that we have them included in the main motion.

*The Chair:* I invite Mark Sheard to comment. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* I hope I made clear when I was speaking earlier that for very personal reasons I have a heart for the smaller rural community where the love of Jesus is shared. I also said that resources are tight and we must invest where we are likely to see most impact. I also said, and I was delighted to hear Bishop Paul reiterate this much more clearly than me, that the challenge is not for the centre always to invest in the small; the challenge is to the bigger churches that are blessed to cascade their blessing.

Although I have enormous sympathy for the sentiments behind the amendment, I want to resist it because I think it deflects and it will push us into a place where we say we are going to try to do everything and we will support every community from the centre with investment and we will end up doing so in a shallow and short-term way. I do not want to accept this amendment. I would like us certainly to continue to treasure and encourage our churches to treasure the small as well, but I would like us to focus on the main topic of the motion as I put it.

*The Chair:* In order for the amendment at Item 58 to be debated I need to see 25 members indicating that they wish to see the item debated. If I do not, then the amendment will lapse. Do I see 25 members wishing that there be a debate on Item 58? Yes, I do. Item 58 is now open for debate. Please remember to address your comments to the amendment and that the speech limit is three minutes.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Dr Rose Hudson-Wilkin):* I am excited by this particular amendment because of one word that is mentioned there, and that is the word “aspiration”. I was very fortunate growing up in Montego Bay to have a church with not a priest every week, so it meant that the wise old church lay Reader decided that he would get the young people involved and engaged in the service, and that was an amazing thing for him to do. He did not hog the show and say, “Right, this is my Sunday alone”. There were a few young people who were there and then that grew. I preached my first sermon at 14 years old.

I think what we need are churches with a real sense of aspiration, a real sense when our grandchildren come to visit and they say, “I don’t want to go to church”, we say, “We are going to church”. Frankly, if we are not excited about what we are proclaiming, and if our children and our grandchildren are not excited about it, how can we expect the children in the villages and the children from our schools to be excited? Let us have this aspiration and let us work together and pray and commit ourselves to being with our children and not seeing this as an added extra for some pioneer ministry or frontier ministry or some other name or label we want to give it. This is part of who we are.

*Revd Gary Waddington (Leeds):* I want to follow in agreement very much with what Bishop Rose has just said, because I want to support Fr Thomas’s amendment as well as all the amendments that appear on the Order Paper. I fear that the main motion has me conflicted. I am lucky enough to find myself Team Rector of a large parish church, which, much to my shock and horror, is in the 6.4% of parishes that have more than 25 children on its books. We just do what we do. We find that unsurprising. We include children who serve and read. Thirteen of them were confirmed during Advent.

I suppose in that sense it makes me uncomfortable because it makes me feel that somehow we are a success when what we need to do is to continue to try harder and learn from others. The fact that we do this with no youth worker and with minimal funding is great and, therefore, with a motion that says that a church like mine might attract more resources you would think I would be cock-a-hoop and the PCC would be doing cartwheels that they do not have to find more money.

But here is my trouble. Why is the money going to the 6.4 when I think it would do a lot more good with the 93.6? I fear, Synod, what we have done is be what we are very good at doing: being a bit white and a bit middle-class. We have produced something that sounds, at least to me, as though it is an urbane policy for the suburban parishes and does not reach out to the rural, the inner city, the UPA and the multicultural. Most of all,

even though I might sound a bit posh, and you might say I am hypocritical because I live in Harrogate – it is in the north of England, even if it feels like Chelsea – I am a proper Yorkshireman and the thing I learned from my parents, who never took me to church but allowed me to go when the local director of music asked me to join a choir, is that muck and brass are really important things to get to grips with. We learn a really important lesson from them because with muck, if you spread it thinly it does a lot of good; dollop it in a few piles, though, it stinks.

*The Chair:* After the next speaker is there anyone who wishes to speak against the amendment, please?

*Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford):* I would be delighted to support the recommendation with the amendment. I find it hard to warm to it without the amendment, for the purposes that have been very eloquently addressed in the last talk. Renewal and Reform talks about the re-evangelisation of the whole of England. By focusing purely on the big, successful et cetera already, and do not necessarily have the reach, however much we might like to think so, into rural areas, we risk an urban-to-suburban model of success and we risk the possibility of achieving several successful projects but not the aims of the movement as a whole, which I would 100% support.

Having done our mission return statistics recently, we are stubbornly under the 25. It is thoroughly frustrating. We could get there, but the way we will get there is not by having the support of the larger resource church because we are in a rural area. We need more support for ourselves directly, in the hope that we can then enable smaller churches around us to also grow their ministry and their mission amongst younger people, who are not just the future of the Church but the current of the Church. They are the Church alongside all of us.

I worry that the analysis is a little shallow, a little bit quick, a little bit easy. We need to get into the deep end. I also think we need to acknowledge that those churches that have lots of children tend to be in large areas of population. They tend to have outstanding musical traditions, both lively and contemporary, or cathedral style, or good parish choirs. We need to interrogate these figures a lot more closely and stop jumping to quick solutions that say it is churches like this and it is churches like that. We can all do it, but we need to think more holistically, more roundly and more deeply, and we do not need to go to monochrome solutions. We also need to accept, as Chris so eloquently said, that we need to support the existing and the traditional, because if you are unchurched everything is fresh.

*Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I am the Rector of four rural parishes with a total population of only 2,000 people, and we are blessed that, with quite a lot of striving and struggle, we have managed to increase our children from a very small number to a slightly less small number over the last seven years. I pay tribute to the hard work of our benefice children's worker, who has the misfortune to be married to me.

When I look back over the last seven and a half years and the children we have managed to encourage to come to church from our small area, where it is very difficult to get a critical mass, I think of two families in particular who came to us from large city centre churches. They have come from churches with large numbers of children, really good children's ministry, good discipleship for children, and I have to say those families have been invaluable in partnering with us for keeping the children's ministry going and alive in a very unusual and challenging context.

I want to resist this amendment and other amendments that seek to generalise this motion, because I think that those churches in city centres and urban areas, of whatever tradition, which are able to do this ministry well will need to be resourced to bless the rest of the church even in small contexts such as mine.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of Synod as to whether Item 58 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 58.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We move to vote on Item 58, the amendment standing in Fr Thomas Seville's name.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 59**

*The Chair:* Moving on now to the amendment standing at Item 59, I invite Gavin Oldham to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* My amendment removes the 16<sup>th</sup>-birthday restriction in paragraph (a) on encouraging initiatives, both because it makes sense – young teenagers grow into older teenagers – and for the specific reason I am going to talk to, which will not only benefit very large numbers of 16 and 17-year-olds in major deaneries but also bring them into contact with the church, many for the first time.

I declare an interest as the founder and Chair of the Share Foundation, a registered charity which runs investment schemes for young people in care on behalf of the Department for Education, and which has a large-scale recovery plan for the whole of the Child Trust Fund scheme, in which 2 million out of the 6 million accounts opened are lost to the young people concerned.

There are just 68 deaneries with a population of 14 million in total and with a 16/17-year-old population of 345,000, of whom we estimate that 115,000 have lost track of their Child

Trust Funds. The oldest recipient of Child Trust Funds should be getting access to their individual accounts from September 2020, but one-third of them are lost. Starting on 1 September this year lost accounts will enter into a protected status on the journey towards becoming dormant. Across the UK as a whole there are already 300,000 16 to 17-year-olds with lost accounts and a further 200,000 will add to these numbers every year until 2027. That is 2 million worth £3 billion focused on the most disadvantaged young people.

From their sixteenth birthday a young person is allowed to take control of their own Child Trust Fund account. Our campaign, therefore, focuses directly on the 16 and 17-year-old age group, hence my amendment. With the co-operation of HMRC we have built a simplified search facility for this age group, accessible on [findctf.sharefound.org](http://findctf.sharefound.org) to help young people to track down their lost accounts. There is no charge for the service which is funded voluntarily.

As described in GS 2161, the Church of England has a deep need to communicate better with teenagers, and deaneries provide organisational points across the whole of England. We are therefore asking the biggest deaneries to select their largest church and invite as many 16 to 17-year-olds as possible to come and hear about their Child Trust Funds. Naturally, there should be a broad welcome to the Christian faith and it will be the first time that many of these young people have ever set foot inside a church. If you are connected with any such deanery, come and talk to me about making such arrangements.

This initiative will not only offer real benefit to the young people themselves, identifying a reserve to help them start adult life, with access to life skills, but will also provide many with the opportunity to consider how a faith journey might help them through their active and visible involvement with the Church. Please therefore support my amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Gavin. I invite Mark Sheard to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* Thank you very much, Gavin. I do not think any other providers are available, so that was a very well worthwhile advert. Thank you very much indeed. The substantive point is about teenagers, of course, and, you are absolutely right, funnily enough, people are 16 one day and then have a birthday and become 17 the next day, or whatever, and, clearly, our heart has to be for all of those. The reason the data is focused on under 16s is all to do with admission to the electoral roll and so on.

With all of that, I just want to say I am more than happy to accept that amendment.

*The Chair:* Item 59 is now open for debate. Please remember to address your comments to the amendment.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford):* I think it is important that we remove this number. As has been said, somebody who is 16 today will be over 16 in a few years, if not a few weeks or a few days. Reading these papers, I became a bit concerned that we were treating young people as another category, something that needs a lot of focus but something rather separate. We need a picture not only of churches that have large numbers of under 16s, but we need to rethink how we do our statistics. Also, we need those who will enable young people to deepen in discipleship as they grow older through the difficult transition years of the late teens and twenties. There are a couple of references in the Report, one to deepening discipleship of Messy Church congregations in paragraph 11, and more directly the comments from Peter Langley of St Barnabas, North Finchley, on page 40. We need more focus on that. Removing the number 16 in the motion goes a step towards that.

*Mr James Cary (Bath & Wells):* I oppose the amendment on the grounds of the way it is explained and the reason for that is: what I have heard said, and I think it is very wise, what you win them with, you win them to. It is what you keep them with. Come to church; you might win some money. I am afraid I am very uncomfortable with that. No, No. Here is why: the Church presents Christ crucified. In 2019 the most useful thing I did, I think, was help with the Pathfinders in my own church, normally about ten young people aged 11 to 14 and together we open the Bible and read what it says. Why? Because Jesus Christ, as revealed in Scripture, is endlessly more fascinating and attractive than me, and I hate to say it, you. He has the words of eternal life.

So, in our churches let us not promote campaigns, movements, activities, competitions, games. Young people can get those anywhere else. We do not preach ourselves; we present Christ crucified. I hope the Report overall will encourage us and incentivise us to do that. I think we should reject this amendment and keep the main thing the main thing and plough ahead.

*The Chair:* Is anyone wishing to speak in favour of the amendment?

*Emily McDonald (Church of England Youth Council):* I would like to speak in favour of changing it to “children and young people” rather than “under 16”. I would like to declare an interest because I think I am the only person in the room who has the most recent memory of being under 16.

I think it is really important that we treat our young people not as statistics. I am very taken aback at this motion that, reading through it, we seem to have measured our success in evangelism and discipleship through cold statistics on a Sunday morning, which is not valuable to our young people and I do not think is valuing our young people. If we are truly invested in discipleship to and with young people we need to value them as the members of the church that they are, valuing the input they have, the value they have. The benefits and the inclusion is very important. So yes, I would urge people to change it to “young people” and not “under 16s”.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 59 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 59.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We move to vote on Item 59.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 60**

*The Chair:* We now move to the next amendment, this time standing at paragraph 60, and I call upon and invite Beverley Hollins to speak to and move the amendment standing in her name. You have up to three minutes.

*Revd Beverley Hollins (Peterborough):* As a child I was privileged to attend a Sunday school with over 100 other children in it. Definitely a “significant number” of children and, on the face of it, a successful project. But that project with so many children in it did not link the children into the church. By the time I was 14 years old I was the only one left, and that is because my mum made me go because I had to take my little sister. The reason I am still standing here is linked to that large Sunday school. I absolutely believe and support the investment in our large and successful and significant church projects with children.

However, it is not all about the large. The reason I am still standing here is because I joined a church choir and as part of that church choir was able to attend the Ordinary services, become integrated into the life of a church and discover that I was valued and wanted alongside the other adult members of the congregation. I see that happening amongst children in small churches all of the time.

In many rural villages, hard-working people invest as much time and energy into the work that they do with children and young people as their counterparts who work in large churches. They attract small numbers of children, but, statistically, those small numbers of children are a higher proportion of the catchment area than the large groups in the towns. We can play with statistics all we like. I follow a shepherd Lord who was prepared to go out to find one lost sheep. I think the “significant number” is one. That is what my Bible tells me.

What concerns me more than anything else is the potential that the message this Synod could send out, if the motion is agreed in its current form, is that we are telling small churches, whether rural or urban, that we do not fully value the work that they do. I know it is not our intention, I know it is not the underlying feeling that went into the work that made up this motion, but it is the message people will get. It will say we want to invest in

the big and not in the small. Synod, I ask you not to send out that message. Let us affirm the small as well as the large. Let us go with the shepherd and seek the one lost sheep and work together investing in both large and small across the Church of England.

*The Chair:* I invite Mark Sheard to comment, please. You have up to five minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* Thank you very much, Bev. We read the same Bible. We see the same shepherd. We are sheep called by name. We are all individuals in the sight of God, and I would absolutely hate any church, anywhere, any volunteer faithfully, faithfully preparing Sunday school or opening their home during the week to maybe the one or two to think that they are not valued. That is absolutely not the purpose of this motion at all. Indeed, going back to the previous one, I wanted to re-emphasise the fact that what we are doing is not just singling out churches that have large numbers of under 16s, and not even singling out those which have aspirations to have large numbers. We want to find a way of encouraging every single church to have that aspiration and the means to deliver that. The means to deliver that will be best achieved by empowering other churches nearby, the learning communities that we talked about and so on.

I find myself utterly conflicted by your amendment. I find myself feeling that I agree with it absolutely. I wish there were sufficient resources that we could adequately resource every single church to the utmost from the centre, but we cannot. Life is not like that. We need to liberate more local resources and encourage more collaboration and so on. You will not break my heart, Synod, if you pass this amendment, but I think I would prefer you to stick to the main business of it and follow the strategy that this motion does. Bev, very conflicted, I find myself resisting this amendment.

*The Chair:* In order for the amendment at Item 60 to be debated, I need to see 25 members indicating that they wish to see the item debated. If I do not the amendment will lapse. Do I see 25 members wishing there be a debate on Item 60? Yes, I do. Item 60 is now open for debate. Remember the speech limit is three minutes.

*Mr Ben Hodson-Franks (Birmingham):* Firstly, obviously, we need to take the opportunity to be thankful for God's blessing on us by the countless people for whom the focus of their ministry and mission is a personal calling to work with young people, often lay, often unpaid, often with no formal qualification, but always with a huge heart for the young people whom they serve and the God whom they serve.

Thank you also to those who have helped with the background paper, which was very useful. The evidence there suggests, and many of us will know from our own personal experience, that there are extensive untapped opportunities for the Church to engage with young people, both within and currently outside the Church. These opportunities are often, but not always, in our more deprived areas that do not have the local capacity for or cannot afford to pay a children's or youth worker. We need to encourage all dioceses to facilitate a platform for growth, providing the means to enable growth to happen within

the local context. It needs to be owned by the local worshipping communities. We have seen many changes in those local contexts, but overall now the Church is still disproportionately older than the population she serves.

However, some churches appear to be doing mission and ministry to young people very well and the statistics appear to show churches from the evangelical tradition are way ahead in the statistics. How then can we encourage and support our churches from the central and catholic traditions in developing their work with young people? We need to concentrate on discipleship. Churches of all traditions should have confidence in their tradition, and their people should all have the confidence to share their living faith. As the psalmist tells it, and do excuse my use of the message's idiomatic translation, "We're not keeping this to ourselves. We're passing it along to the next generation – God's fame and fortune, the marvellous things he has done". The paper refers to a primary use of and criteria for Strategic Development Funding being work to grow and develop work with young people.

At my diocese, we have been very encouraged by signs of work undertaken under Strategic Development Funding. In one instance, we have been deploying an albeit fixed-term resource to parishes. We have had that in the context of mission apprentices or children's and family workers, with an ultimate aim of creating, enabling and supporting local capacity for young people's work. We are now working more towards an intergenerational ministry, which I believe will help us engage more with people from the broader range of the local worshipping communities, and I hope that intergenerational ministry will not just become the latest buzz word, but will become something that is lived.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister):* I am very grateful for this amendment, as I was for Fr Thomas's a few minutes ago. During my time in parish ministry, I have been involved in churches with large numbers of children and young people, and we have, indeed, seen occasions when smaller churches nearby have been helped and supported through that to do children's and youth work. I am very glad that that happens when it does. But what the main motion not amended in this way looks like saying – I know it does not mean that – is that we think in an urban way, we think in a suburban way, and we think in a metropolitan way.

The reality of rural ministry is quite different. In my patch, I have rural Northants, I have Rutland, and I have rural areas of the City of Peterborough, which do not relate easily to the large churches, which do not have public transport that can reach the large areas, certainly on a Sunday, and which are very often a more central churchmanship than the places where there is "successful" youth work.

We, as a diocese, want to encourage and we do encourage, I hope, our smaller churches to do good children's and youth work. I commend that across the board. I am sure others want to do the same. Please, Synod, let us not give the impression that rural can work

by trickle down from urban and suburban. Let us encourage and endorse and affirm rural ministry for its own sake.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Colleagues, I find myself at Archbishops' Council observing from time to time that we keep asking people to do more and more things with less and less resource. When I read this motion, my heart sank because it is all "encourage, encourage, encourage, request". Quite frankly, much of the encouragement falls on deaf ears because it is either happening already or dioceses are hard-pressed to do what they are doing already.

It seems to me that we have got to start thinking very seriously about how much we ask dioceses to do and dioceses need to think very carefully about what their priorities are. We keep sending things down from here with things like this that are incredibly well-meaning and correct, but as the Bishop of Peterborough just said, we are already doing this, so what does sending some more words down that say "encourage" mean? We have got to allow our dioceses to get on with doing what they need to do.

Whilst I understand the necessity of small churches and small numbers, I do not really see that adding another thing to do to a motion adds any more to it. Let us, as James Cary said, "Keep the main thing the main thing". This is probably one of the four or five most important issues that we face in the Church of England in the next five years, but let us not just keep sending stuff down that dioceses scratch their heads about as yet something else they have been asked to do. Let them run the show and let us stop telling them to do unnecessary things.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 60 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 60.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We can now move swiftly to voting on Item 60. That is looking very close, so we will need to do a count of the whole Synod, please.

*The motion was put and carried, 141 in favour, 113 against, with nine recorded abstentions.*

## **ITEM 61**

*The Chair:* We move to the next amendment, Item 61. I call upon Martyn Taylor to speak to and move his amendment. You have three minutes, as you know.

*Revd Martyn Taylor (Lincoln):* I speak as a rural dean in a rural county where, if we were to do a risk register of the things that we face falling off the cliff with, it will be the future of children's and youth ministry. That is not just my own diocese. That will probably be

all of us. I am very grateful for this research that we have received. Basically, my request is that I would love more detail and breakdown of the information that we have received; as some people have already said in some of the statements that have been made, qualitative research across a variety of contexts to help us understand what is working well, when it is happening and what age groups are particularly represented as we break the demographics down.

We have already got a good starting point with the information that we have got, so could we just dig a bit deeper, a deep dive as they say in school speak. It is not about the large. It is not about the small. It is not about the town. It is not rural. What I want is what is working well in any context and what can we learn from it for the good of the whole Church. I move the amendment and “request the NCIs to commit funding for qualitative research on the data received to help understand best practice in a variety of contexts”.

*The Chair:* I invite Mark Sheard to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* Thank you very much, Martyn. As we have already indicated – Andrew Lightbown raised the same point – we have a good set of numbers in front of us, but there is so much more that we need to understand. Indeed, that work on scoping out is already underway. I think I would say there is one set of numbers we do not need and that is another count. I am going to accept the amendment and I hope Synod will do quickly as well.

*The Chair:* Item 61 is now open for debate. Please remember to address your comments to the amendment and the speech limit is still three minutes.

*The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Martyn Snow):* I simply want to thank Martyn for this amendment, which I think takes us helpfully back to what this Report is really all about. This is not intended as designing our own funeral. This is, rather, about realising that society has changed enormously, that the factors that once created an environment for the growth of faith among children and young people are no longer working in the way that they did before.

Therefore, we need to learn. That, for me, is the bottom line in all of this. We need to learn more about how to do this in our new environment. On the basis that what is being called for is primarily about staff time and an ability to dig deeper into learning the lessons from churches across a range of contexts, I want to support this amendment.

*Revd Canon Mike Booker (Ely):* I have been in the awkward situation of someone who has been involved and committed to Christian children’s and youth work virtually all my life, initially intending to vote against the whole motion. As we address each amendment, I find myself inching towards voting in favour. The reason why is because we have made significant progress with the amendments in recognising that the statistics we have had

have been a blunt instrument, and 0-16 church attendance is just not getting to grips with what is really happening. By broadening our categories, we have got further on that.

I think Martyn's amendment takes us a very significant step further and that is into culture. Within the Diocese of Ely, in nearly all of our churches, large numbers of children and young people are in and around the Cambridge area. You simply cannot take models from Cambridge and dump them in Wisbech or in rural Fenland and expect them to work, nor can you expect people to drive an hour and a half across flooded Fens to join in those large churches.

We need to see what is happening and what is working in different contexts, not just what is large but what is growing – I am grateful for that amendment, they are not the same – and we need to start thinking where culture actually is a key part in what is going to be effective in any particular setting. It is out there. It is happening. We have loads of data within the Changing Market Towns project in the Diocese of Ely. Other dioceses I know are working with detailed recording as part of the SDF funded projects. The stories are already being gathered. There is much more to be done.

I would urge Synod to enthusiastically support this amendment. I would want to say as well, to those who may have found their hearts sinking because the motion has now been changed so much, particularly perhaps in the Evangelism and Discipleship team, that actually we are now getting there. We are getting close to doing some very hard thinking, which is what we need to do. If we do that, there is hope. If we just go for a broad brush we will miss it, but I think this will help. Please vote in favour of Martyn's amendment.

*The Chair:* I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 61 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 61.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We move to vote then on Item 61.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 62**

*The Chair:* We come now to the last amendment, which is at Item 62 in the name of the Bishop of Durham. I invite Paul Butler to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* Last year, Synod approved *Growing Faith*. GS 2121 says this: "*Growing Faith* envisions children, young people and households coming to faith, growing in discipleship and contributing confidently to the Kingdom of God through the community of faith. It is about how, as members of the whole people of

God, children and young people are encouraged and how the whole Church is equipped to think intergenerationally. It brings together work in Education, Evangelism and Discipleship, Ministry, Renewal and Reform and *Setting God's People Free*".

I simply propose this amendment to ensure that this work is not lost in that joined-up stuff. To pick up Simon Butler's comment earlier, dioceses do get fed up with things being sent down. Simply by adding this phrase, we make it quite clear this is not extra to *Growing Faith*. It is part of *Growing Faith*. It is part of everyday faith, and it will help *Growing Faith* Champions like myself and the team that I work with in Durham, who love *Growing Faith* and think it is a wonderful initiative, to make sure that evangelism and discipleship remain at its heart.

*The Chair*: I invite Mark Sheard to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio)*: Paul, I agree with every word that you have just said. As the team have developed the papers and the agendas, Nigel Genders and the education team have been intimately involved and *Growing Faith* is absolute. What we are talking about is part of the *Growing Faith* initiative. I cannot see any reason, but Synod may surprise me as it has done regularly, why that amendment should not be accepted unanimously.

*The Chair*: Item 62 is now open for debate. Please remember to address your comments to the amendment.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Dr Benjamin Carter (Newcastle)*: I would like to support the Bishop of Durham's amendment and speak to the evangelistic value that we have found in working constructively with the *Growing Faith* agenda and developing our work with children and families in the rural contexts I work in. In the parishes I serve, which run along the finer sections of Hadrian's Wall, there we pitch God's Tent, a six metre bell tent which Bishop Paul himself has experience in helping put up, which we use to explore the rich stories of God's love for us in the glories of creation.

We have kindled fires to find the light that shines in the darkness and that darkness cannot overcome. We have been wise and certainly not foolish builders of dens. We have followed scavenger hunts to explore the way of the cross and the way of the resurrection, each time gathering children and their families in new and creative ways as we explore the stories of God's love revealed to us in Jesus Christ. Through this, we have found God's Tent eloquently and creatively meets the challenge of the *Growing Faith* agenda, which the Report highlights and the amendment encourages us to look towards.

Families tell us that God's Tent becomes an important space for them to be with one another and with God in the busyness of their modern lives, with conversations that begin

in God's Tent continuing on the journey home and then over the evening meal at that home. In our dispersed and sometimes remote communities, if families struggle to come to church, then by pitching God's Tent at a farm or familiar spot, church comes to them wherever they are. Equally, we have come to support our small schools.

Pitching God's Tent is a space for prayer and reflection for all, following themes which then play out in our formal pitching of God's Tent on the coming Sunday. God's Tent is, we believe, a sign of true hope and true growth in the rural landscapes of the Diocese of Newcastle. This year, in my parishes we will prepare for confirmation, parents and children of a second family drawn into the faith of the Church through God's Tent. This year, two more parishes in Newcastle Diocese, with the support of our diocesan board of education, have begun to regularly pitch God's Tent. Through this growing network, this month we will have engaged with 50 children or so and their families, building a network of new and vibrant Church communities in places and parishes which have in the past had little or no contact with children.

I very much welcome and support this amendment and its focus on the *Growing [Faith]* agenda. I hope that, as this work continues, we allow space to recognise all the contexts, both large and small, where this work is already happening because God's Tent might be small, but so are many of the communities we are called to served. But from these small beginnings, wonderful things are happening when we make space to grow faith in the places where God pitches his tent among us.

[2.24.00]

*Revd Martyn Gough (Armed Forces)*: It has been interesting to hear many people talk about the young people that you work with, but the constant word has been "parishes". I work with other military chaplains outside a parochial system, but we work with many, many young people. My parish, if you could say, is 30,000 in the Royal Navy, but last year we baptised 70 young men between the ages of 16 and 18 and, yet, nobody ever seems to pick up what we do in our mission and our evangelism.

Joining together in this growing in faith needs to take into account those other organisations, schools, chaplaincies and the military that engage day-by-day with the young men and the young women. We often ask them, "Why now? Why have you come to faith now? Was it because you grew up in an atheist or humanist household?" "No, I played football on a Sunday".

This is the first chance to have a conversation, an encounter with a chaplain who asks them the great questions of life, "What are you here for? What do you want out of life and where does God fit into it?" So if we are going to be joined up, remember there is much more than just the parochial and diocesan systems. There are many people who work outside with young people and see great results in the harvest.

*The Chair*: I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 62 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 62.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Now we can move to vote on Item 62.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We are now able to resume debate on Item 12, as amended by all those items, Children and Youth Ministry.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Miss Rosemary Walters (Canterbury): I just think that there is something missing from our discussions, and that is the importance of secondary school assemblies. We rightly commend Messy Church and junior school activities. I realise we do not have as many Church secondary schools, but if we really want to encounter many unchurched young people from rural areas who go to secondary school, then I think secondary assemblies ought to have a great deal more focus.

You are given a theme by the head of RE or the person co-ordinating, which relates to the school's values; and therefore, you start from where the school and the young people are trying to get to. These are unique opportunities to articulate how these values have lived in your life, to ask the young people how they apply to their lives and to say where does the Christian narrative, the life and ministry of Jesus, have something to say about this.

I would just like to make a plea for us to think much more deeply about the value of secondary school assemblies in reaching unchurched young people. I think these encounters where we can encourage critical thinking are truly a form of collective worship, and they might help many young people to actually say, "Okay, I have thought about these questions, perhaps I will go along and explore what the Christian community has to say".

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* I speak as the Church of England appointed representative on the National Council of the Church Lads and Church Girls Brigade. For those of you who have not heard of the Church Lads and Girls Brigade – I will call it "the Brigade", it is a bit of a mouthful – it is a national Church of England youth organisation. Up until a few moments ago, the President of the Brigade was present here in this hall. However, his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury has nipped out by the looks of it. I was going to say a thank you to him. I can do that later.

The Brigade operates in parishes, often very deprived, throughout England and Northern Ireland with some affiliated groups in Canada and even Bermuda. It is an organisation for children aged five and upwards and already has a realm of resources for working with children and young people. The Brigade brought me to Church, and so I apologise on the Brigade's behalf that you have to sit and listen to me today.

I came to Brigade as a 13-year-old boy and it proves that children can grow up to be full, active members of the Church of England if, as the Bishop of Leeds said yesterday, the Church of England can decide what that definition is. Members are involved in many activities which can be challenging whilst fun, including the Duke of Edinburgh scheme, outdoor activities, camping, building teamwork and camaraderie.

Very quickly, a couple of benefits on the CLCGB website for parishes states that the Brigade involves young people and their families in positive youth work and activities to engage them with the Church. I will stop there.

*Mrs Rebecca Chapman (Southwark):* My faith is the product of ministry to under 18s in a church in Bristol over the 1980s and 1990s. My parents divorced when I was five and my following home life was somewhat fraught. Church provided me not only with a grounding in the Bible that saw me go on to read theology at university, but adults who listened to me who cared, a place where I felt safe and a consistency. I feel really strongly this is something all of our churches can offer, whether or not they employ a youth worker.

But, as the Bishop of Leicester said earlier, Synod will be aware that things have changed. There is now fierce competition for family Sunday time. I am the mum of three boys under ten and there are a huge range of demands on our time at weekends: sports lessons, parties, homework, invitations for friends. Let us look at what we can offer that is not only about Sunday mornings and also ensure we include that as part of our evaluation.

For my family particularly, church has additional challenges. My middle son is autistic and Sunday services for us can feel like a nightmare. He cannot cope with a loud social environment and we get asked quite a lot what is wrong with him. Messy Church, for us monthly on a Saturday, offers a really different experience of church, as mentioned in the Report: craft, food – always a winner when you have got three boys – and running around is much less disruptive. This gives us a place to be part of church. In the UK, around one in every 100 children is autistic and 15% of under 18s have special educational needs. Let us please look at vital training on awareness and adjustment for clergy and our young people and children's workers.

Finally, whilst thanking the team for this Report, please could we hear from some young people themselves when we next look at a report on this ministry, either in person or with, obviously, the appropriate consents. Some sort of video presentation would be amazing. Given most young people's use of YouTube and Instagram, doubtless something thought-

provoking would result. As the Bishop of Gloucester mentioned earlier today, filmed material can have so much more impact than written reports.

Please, can we hear from someone under 20 or even under 18 whose experience of our Church has been positive, but I would also love to hear from someone young who has chosen to leave the Church, if they felt able to share that with us, so that we could all be further encouraged by what is being done, reflect on what we could have done differently and motivated to do more.

*Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester):* It is ideal that I follow on from Rebecca's account because I think figures are only part of the story and that is what is missing, the stories that she was talking about. The numbers show the presence or not of children but it does not show their engagement or even hint at their discipleship. We need to hear stories so we can learn from them and be challenged by them. Children invariably learn by watching, which is often very, very annoying. If only they would learn by what we say and not by what we do. That is why I think the everyday faith and discipleship is key and why it was really important for us to have that final part of the amendment relating it to *Growing Faith*.

Children watch and see how important faith is to us and the effect it has on our lives. We really need to take that part seriously as well because, if they are part of the Church, they are going to be watching our every movement and everything that we say. I have noticed with my own children at home – mine are older, mine are in their 20s – if I sigh at the wrong time they notice. Children notice everything we do. We need to think conscientiously about our discipleship and then the children can see it lived out in our lives and it makes far more sense. I will support the motion.

*Revd Barney De Berry (Canterbury):* I fully back this motion, but I am worried that with all the amendments something has been lost, and that is the urgency of this. At the lunchtime presentation of the statistics behind this Report, we saw that this is urgent and the time to act is now.

This last week I had the privilege of spending some time with the Sorted Community Youth Church in Bradford. This fantastic fresh expression of Church, which is resourced by the Church Army and operates under a BMO, is built on the faithfulness of those involved and an unashamed confidence in the Gospel of Jesus. The faithfulness is demonstrated from the 80-year-old prayer warriors, who back up that work, to the young people who lead this community, which is by young people for young people. They have that belief in the power of the Gospel to transform lives because it is seen in their own lives, these young leaders who are living testimonies to that power.

Are the numbers of that community large? I do not know where to put them. But are they significant? Yes. It is happening now, and they need backing now and supporting. So, yes, we might step back and we might assess some more, and we might work out how

these principles work out in different contexts. But we also need to back what is happening now because, as we heard earlier, these young lives are getting older and they might be getting lost to us as a Church as well.

Jesus in the Parable of the Talents demonstrates that things are not always resourced evenly, but actually he says there that we should back those places that are proving fruitful because, as we heard right at the beginning of this debate, the responsibility is not even either. Much is expected from those to whom much is given. This Report coming under the *Growing Faith* Report speaks into the sphere of the Church's work in that work. We should back it wholeheartedly, but we should back it now and do it now.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Barney for your maiden speech. Under Standing Order 31, I wish to move to a motion for closure on this debate.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* As it was carried, I ask Mark Sheard to respond to the debate, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio):* In up to three minutes I cannot possibly do justice to every contribution that has been made, but I do want to thank each and every one of you who has been able to make a contribution and, indeed, those who were standing at the end who were not able to do so. I find it hugely encouraging that there is so much energy behind this issue. What I hope you will do shortly is approve a motion that, with the various amendments that have gone through, is now far more comprehensive than I could possibly have imagined. However, I do not want us to lose sight of some of the main points here.

Barney, that final speech that you just made was right on the money. Resources will not always be distributed evenly but aspiration must be. I think somebody said at the beginning that every church should aspire to have vibrant youth and children's work. It would be awful if we went away believing anything other than that. Whether it is a large or a small church, an urban, suburban or a rural church, whatever tribe it wants to ascribe itself to, let us aspire to bring the good news of Jesus to the young people of this land.

I also saw the theme about learning coming through very strongly, learning from each other and learning within dioceses. Bishop Paul talked about the work that has been going on in Southwell and I know that is so close to his heart as he leads the EYTG. We also talked about more research and stories. Yes, that is desperately important and I hope that theme was clear as I talked about understanding the why as well as the what. The Big Church Survey will be a contributor to that and we must look forward to seeing what comes out of that, but we must back what is happening now. That was the phrase that was used at the end there.

This is not a task that we can kick down the road and wait for more learning. We must act now. We must act, reaching people in traditional ways where they work, in fresh ways with Messy Church, learning the lessons of Generation Z who have no framework of Church where everything is fresh, as somebody said. Then, other methods of reaching people. Martyn Gough, you kindly reminded us about chaplaincy and the work done in the Armed Forces. We heard about schools and *Growing Faith*. That is absolutely crucial.

Also, I just want to pay tribute to the work of the Brigades. We must never forget that our job is not just to reach but is to disciple. Brothers and sisters, the task before us is significant and massively urgent. It is something that the Lord has commanded us to do. If that is what He has done, we can be very confident that He will equip us to do it. I urge you to support this motion.

*The Chair*: Thank you, Mark. We move to vote on Item 12, as amended.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair*: Item 12, as amended, was carried. Thank you very much, everyone, for your heartfelt contributions. That concludes this item of business. Legislative business will now follow.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 5.11 pm.

## **ITEM 500**

### **SPECIAL AGENDA I**

### **DIOCESAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION MEASURE (GS 2131A)**

The Chair: We come to Item 500, the Report by the Revision Committee on the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure. Members will need the Report of the Revision Committee and the draft revised Measure. Please also note the financial comment on this item at paragraphs 24 to 26 of the Financial Memorandum on the Sixth Notice Paper. I call on the Chair of the Revision Committee, Mr Clive Scowen, to move the motion "That the Synod do take note of this Report". Mr Scowen may speak for not more than ten minutes.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London)*: Legislative business does not seem to get any more popular, does it? As members will recall, the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure received First Consideration at the July 2019 group of sessions. If enacted, it will replace the Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 1991 which provides the current legal framework within which the Church of England's dioceses engage and work with Church schools.

The Revision Committee was broadly willing to follow the approach of the Steering Committee in the spirit of simplification. So, like the Cathedrals Measure Revision Committee, we sought to strike a balance between the need to provide consistency and governance standards across all DBEs on the one hand, and, on the other, the ability for DBEs to make the local adaptations they need to flourish in their particular situations, having regard to regional differences and varied local circumstances.

The Committee favoured enabling clauses over excessively prescriptive requirements and sought to keep the legislation as light touch as possible using guidance rather than statutory prescription wherever that was appropriate. Members will be aware that a DBE exists pursuant to a scheme made by the diocesan synod. The new Measure will require every diocesan bishop to propose a new scheme to be made by the diocesan synod, giving every diocese the opportunity to reconsider whether their current scheme is still appropriate for their needs, and if not, to change it.

The draft Measure would also give express power to two or more dioceses to make schemes creating a single joint DBE for those dioceses, which, although it happens in practice, is not expressly provided for at present. The original draft Measure gave the Secretary of State power where the consent of the existing DBE could not be obtained to make the first scheme under the Measure.

The Committee considered it preferable for the Church to resolve any such deadlock between the bishop and the DBE and so amended the draft Measure to provide that the power to make a first scheme in a case of deadlock would be conferred on the archbishop of the relevant province, who will now be able to authorise the bishop to propose a scheme to the diocesan synod without the consent of the DBE if the archbishop is satisfied that the DBE is withholding its consent unreasonably. We trust this is a precaution rather than something that is likely to happen, but you never can be too careful.

The archbishop would actually be required to consult the Charity Commission on the proposed terms of any new scheme so that he can ascertain that the scheme's proposals comply with charity law. Whilst most DBEs are incorporated charities separate from the DBF, in some dioceses the charity remains unincorporated, and in others it operates as a committee of the DBF.

A consultation carried out in the summer and autumn of 2018 made it clear that a significant number of DBEs and DBFs wish to retain the freedom to adopt any of those structures and that, where unincorporated or committee DBEs were working well with other diocesan bodies to further mission, incorporation and restructuring should not be imposed on them. However, the Dean of the Arches and Auditor made a strong submission that an unincorporated structure was unsuitable for a DBE in today's world and that unacceptable conflicts of interest would arise where the DBE was a committee of the DBF.

The Committee shared those concerns, particularly with regard to unincorporated DBEs, but, mindful of the results of the consultation, decided that all three options should remain in the draft Measure *pro tem*. The Committee invited the Dean and Auditor to raise those issues again at the Revision stage if he saw fit. The draft Measure, as introduced, included new restrictions on the attendance and right to speak by governors or trustees at the relevant part of a DBE meeting that was considering the matter on which a school had sought advice or consent from the DBE or where the DBE was considering providing directions to the school.

The Committee considered those restrictions too restrictive and revised the draft Measure to permit the following people to attend such a DBE meeting: the headteacher, the chair of the governing body or board of directors or trustees, as the case may be, and one or two other people, or more if the DBE so permitted, who would be nominated by the governing body or board of directors or trustees. A headteacher or chair of governors, directors or trustees may nominate a person to attend the DBE meeting in her place where she is unable to do so. Attending representatives will be permitted to present or make a submission to the meeting and to respond to questions put by the DBE.

The draft Measure confers a new power on DBEs to require a school to provide specific information sought by the DBE. The Committee has inserted a mechanism for resolving a dispute as to whether such information sought under this new power had to be provided by the school. Now, in the case of dispute, the consistory court of the diocese will be able to determine whether the request for information is lawful.

The Measure includes an important clause conferring power on the Archbishops' Council to make updating amendments to the draft Measure by order to reflect changes to the law made by future Acts of Parliament, thus future-proofing the Measure. The Committee considered whether the clause was too widely drafted and inserted a requirement that the Secretary of State be consulted on any such statutory instrument made in exercise of that power before it could proceed to approval by General Synod.

The Committee noted that there may be some dioceses which would like to be able to make their new scheme under the draft Measure so that it comes into effect earlier than the target date of 1 January 2022. Therefore, the Committee agreed new commencement provisions which provide that the Archbishops' Council will certify when a diocesan synod has made a scheme under the new Measure, and the certificate will prescribe the date on which the scheme and Schedule 2 of the draft Measure will come into force in relation to that diocese.

Finally, the Committee amended the draft Measure to require the diocesan scheme to include an obligation that appropriate reporting arrangements to the DBE board be put in place for all committees and sub-committees to make provision for how a person appointed, elected or co-opted can be removed from office prior to the end of their term by the body which appointed or elected them if there was good cause for doing so and,

also, for term limits for elected, appointed and co-opted DBE members if the diocese considered that appropriate.

I have not covered everything. Further details of the proposals considered and the changes made by the Committee can, of course, be found in our Report. I commend that Report to the Synod and ask you to take note of it.

*The Chair:* The motion is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 57(6), it is not in order to debate a matter which is the subject of an amendment on the Order Paper.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Ven. Luke Miller (London):* I am hugely grateful for this Measure making its next steps. We have just heard of the importance of our engagement with young people, and the good working of those relationships with tens of thousands of them in our schools is very much part of that work within our Church. I am very grateful for the view that has been conveyed to me that the new legislation will allow, in the particular structural circumstances of the London DBF, the diocesan synod to make use, should it choose, of all aspects of this Measure.

Working with young people is enormously important to us. We must get this right and make sure that the structures are well done and that our schools can continue to work in collaboration with our churches to the best effect for the advancement of the Kingdom and for the knowledge and growth of young people in stature and in faith before God and all people.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. I call on Mr Scowen to reply.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I just want to thank Luke Miller for his endorsement of the work that we have done. I do hope that Synod will enable dioceses to adopt a structure that works for them, provided Synod is also satisfied that it is safe in terms of the legal protections for those who serve on it. That is all I wish to say. Thank you, Synod, and I hope you will now all vote to take note.

*The Chair:* We now move to vote on Item 500.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 550**

*The Chair:* We now come to the Revision stage for the draft Measure. Amendments and other motions appear on the Order Paper. Where no notice has been given of any amendments to particular clauses and no members have indicated that they wish to

speaking against those clauses, I give my permission under Standing Order 58(4) to the clauses being taken en bloc.

As this is the Revision stage, we will need to use the 40-member procedure under Standing Order 59. Where an amendment is moved by someone other than a member of the Steering Committee and is not simply consequential on an amendment that has already been passed, the mover has not more than five minutes to speak to it. I will then call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

If the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken. We begin with clauses 1 and 2 of the draft Measure. No notice has been given of any amendments to these clauses and no members have given notice of an intention to speak against them. I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 550 "That clauses 1 and 2 stand part of the Measure".

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* Just before I do so, Chair, the Steering Committee are very sad that it is me here and not the Bishop of Ely, not because they do not like me but because we wish that we had our Chair with us. We just want to use this occasion to send our best wishes to him. Having done that, I move "That clauses 1 and 2 stand part of the Measure".

*The Chair:* This item is now open to debate. I see no one standing. Item 550 is put to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 551**

*The Chair:* We now come to clause 3. I invite Mr Carl Hughes to move his first amendment to that clause, Item 551. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): Certain legislative matters only come before Synod for consideration once every ten or 20 years, and the legislation which we pass effectively establishes a pattern of governance, operation or behaviour for the ensuing couple of decades. The Cathedrals Measure, which we considered yesterday, is a perfect example of this. Through the Measure, Synod has established a new framework of charitable governance and management which is fit for purpose for today and for the next 20 years.

The DBE Measure similarly establishes the framework for the future governance and management of boards of education. Quite rightly, in clause 3(a) the Measure identifies constitutional best practice for DBE governance through a company limited by guarantee or the more recently introduced charitable incorporated organisation (CIO).

Clause 3(c) also permits DBEs to be part of a diocesan board of finance. However, the Measure as currently drafted perpetuates the option of a DBE being an unincorporated body. The Revision Committee's Report seems to imply that this option has only been retained due to a number of dioceses stating that they wish to continue with this option that they currently use based on their earlier consultation on the Measure.

My amendment simply removes the option for a DBE to be an unincorporated body. The reason why I have decided to propose this amendment is because the governance of a charity on this basis is simply not best practice today. We are producing legislation that should be fit for purpose for the 2020s and 2030s rather than for the past.

I fully support the submission made to the Revision Committee by the Dean of the Arches as set out in paragraph 19(a) of the Committee's Report. In my view, the unincorporated option is no longer fit for purpose as such bodies are most suited to membership organisations, usually small groups with no staff or premises. Also, unincorporated bodies are unable to enter into contracts, nor are they able to own property in their own right.

It is also important to understand that transferring from being an unincorporated body to a CIO is really not that difficult, and indeed, DBE members would notice little day-to-day practical change. One should be aware of resistance to change being presented as practical complexity.

Further, as regards joint DBEs across dioceses, shared governance would be determined by the composition of the members of board of directors or trustees of the new incorporated entity.

My contention is thus: that Synod as a legislative body and the Church more generally should be and should be seen to be promoting best practice in all that we do, especially when setting frameworks for many years ahead. I thus hope, Synod, that you will support this amendment to remove a governance option which is no longer fit for purpose for the 2020s. I thus beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I now call upon a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* Chair, as Mr Scowen has already reminded us, Synod members will recall from the Revision Committee's Report that the Committee considered a proposal from the Dean of the Arches, as we have heard, to remove both the option of an unincorporated board and that of a board as a committee of the DBF. The effect of that proposal would have been to require every board of education in the future to be constituted as a separate and incorporated charity.

The Revision Committee appreciated the thinking behind the Dean's proposal and noted the weight which any submission from the Dean of the Arches has. However, given the responses to the extensive consultation of DBEs, DBFs, education teams, diocesan secretaries and bishops, which informed the drafting of the Measure, and the clear preference in some dioceses for retaining an unincorporated option, as well as the principle of enabling maximum flexibility for dioceses under the new arrangements, the Revision Committee decided to keep all three options in the draft Measure for Synod to consider.

At the same time, the Committee indicated in its Report that if such a proposal were brought to the floor of the Synod, and 40 members wished it to be considered as an amendment, the Committee's view was that it would be appropriate for Synod to debate it.

In the end Synod has not been asked to consider such an amendment. Instead, Mr Hughes' amendment would remove the option of an unincorporated board and leave two choices of a separately incorporated board or the board as a committee of the DBF, although it should be noted that only the incorporated model would be possible for a joint board serving two or more dioceses. In any case, guidance will be provided for dioceses wishing to adopt an unincorporated model about the management of the risks involved in that option.

In light of the diocesan consultations and the aim of maximum flexibility for dioceses, the Steering Committee does not accept Mr Hughes's amendment, but the Committee would consider it appropriate for his proposal to be debated on the floor of Synod should 40 members wish to do so.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Given the important issues that are raised here, is it in order to ask for a quorum count at this point?

*The Chair:* Please would the Bishops stand so we can count you. We are quorate. Thank you. Now the Clergy please stand. We are quorate there. The Laity please stand. We are quorate. We will proceed.

The Steering Committee does not support the amendment. I need to see 40 members standing if we want to proceed with the debate. We do not see 40 members standing and the amendment therefore lapses.

## **ITEM 553**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 553. I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move "That clause 3 stand part of the Measure".

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I so move.

*The Chair:* That item now goes to debate. I see no one standing so we go to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 556**

*The Chair:* I call on a member the Steering Committee to move Item 556 “That clause 4 stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 556 is now open for debate. I see no one standing and so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 559**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 559. I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move this item “That clause 5 stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 559 is open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 560**

*The Chair:* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 560 “That clauses 6 to 12 stand part of the Measure”. No notice has been given of any amendments to these clauses and no members have given notice of an intention to speak against them.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I so move.

*The Chair:* Item 560 moves to debate. I see one person standing.

*Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester):* I just want to very briefly take this opportunity for us to thank our diocesan directors of education who work extremely hard on our behalf. That was all I really wanted to say. Sometimes legislation can seem a little dry but behind these words are people working very hard and doing a great job on the front line, and I want to record our thanks to them.

*The Chair:* We now move to a vote. I put Item 560 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 562**

*The Chair:* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 562 “That clause 13 stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I so move.

*The Chair:* Item 562 is open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 563**

*The Chair:* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 563 “That clauses 14 to 16 stand part of the Measure”. Again no notice has been given of any amendment to these clause and no members have given notice of any intention to speak against them.

*Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter):* I so move.

*The Chair:* Item 563 is open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 564**

*The Chair:* We now come to clause 17 and I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment to that clause, Item 564. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Members of Synod, if you would turn to the Measure GS 2131A you will see that the two sub-clauses I propose should be added follow the provision in clause 7 that says in 17(2), “the DBE for each diocese must, as soon as practicable after the end of each year, (a) make a report to the diocesan synod on the exercise of its functions in that year”, and the second sub-paragraph deals with joint DBEs. The question arises is in what format should that report be made in order (a) to ensure proper accountability by the DBE and (b) transparency and it being seen and received by all those who may have an interest in it. The problem is that diocesan synods generally meet perhaps three times a year. They are not necessarily well attended and if the report is only made to the meeting of the synod, it may not be seen or read by everybody.

At the Revision stage, there was an amendment proposed by Adrian Greenwood to require that the report be in writing. That did not find favour with the Revision Committee, and you will see in their Report at GS 2131Y, at page 12, paragraph 107, the Committee considered that imposing a requirement for a report to be in writing was too prescriptive and that the matter should be left to individual diocesan synods.

Members of Synod, these are important matters of accountability and transparency on the part of a very important body, be it an incorporated or unincorporated association or even the DBF or a committee of the DBF. My proposed amendment, as you will see, provides at sub-clause 3 that the report, first of all, must be in writing and posted on the diocesan website so that there is wide availability for that report, but, secondly, it provides for the option, in addition to the written report, for a presentation to be made to diocesan synod. Taking up the point that the Revision Committee was concerned about as to whether there was sufficient flexibility, if the DBE in a particular case says, "We want to do a PowerPoint presentation to the diocesan synod. We want to highlight particular points of the DBE's work over the previous year", that can be done.

Members of Synod, I think that is probably all I need to say about it. I would urge 40 members to stand, please, if we hear in a moment or two's time this is not supported by the Steering Committee, because I suggest to you all that it is a very important matter of, as I say, both accountability and transparency.

*The Chair:* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* The Steering Committee is grateful to Mr Lamming for the amount of time he has spent on reading and commenting on this Measure. However, we consider that his proposed amendments to clause 17 are unnecessary, and, indeed, could be unhelpful to our aim of making sure this Measure offers enabling and not prescriptive legislation, which can be shaped appropriately by each diocese within their scheme to suit their own needs.

We discussed this matter, as Mr Lamming has mentioned, at some length during the Revision stage. You can see, as he said, at paragraphs 100 to 108 of GS 2131Y, and it might help for those who read those things avidly to know that at that point what is now clause 17 was clause 16.

It is important to reassure members that this report and the amendment is not the annual report and statement of accounts. Such reports will of course be required of those boards of education which are incorporated or unincorporated registered charities and will be available on the Charity Commission website. In the case of DBEs that are constituted as sub-committees of the DBF, the DBF annual report will include relevant accounts and reports of the DBE. It is also worth saying that any oral presentations at diocesan synod,

at least in my experience, are captured in the minutes, which are of course circulated to all members, even those who do not attend.

The Steering Committee continues to see the additional reporting requirement set out in the Measure at clause 17 as something which should properly be shaped and decided by each diocese or jointly by dioceses where joint DBEs are established, to suit the particular need and practice of each diocesan synod. That is not to say they cannot be written; we are saying we would like the diocese to be able to decide.

This clause as presently drafted allows the flexibility needed at diocesan level whilst ensuring both through the broad-brush requirements of the Measure, and through the scheme, and the additional advice to be offered in guidance, that such reports are shaped in a way which informs each diocesan synod in a way that best suits that body.

To impose a central restriction on form, or even on content, beyond the detail in clause 17 of the Measure seems to us to be unhelpful at best, and goes against the aim of producing enabling rather than prescriptive legislation in line with the Simplification agenda. The Steering Committee strongly resists the amendments to clause 17.

*The Chair:* Thank you. As the Committee does not support the amendment, it will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue. We do not see 40 members standing and therefore the amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 565**

I now call on a member of Steering Committee to move Item 565 “That clause 17 stand part of the Measure”.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* The item is now open debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 566**

*The Chair:* I call on a member of Steering Committee to move Item 566 “That clauses 18 to 24 stand part of the Measure”. No notice has been given of any amendments to these clauses and no members have given notice of an intention to speak against them.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 566 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 568**

*The Chair:* I now call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 568 “That Schedule 1 stand part of the Measure”.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I do so move

*The Chair:* Thank you. Item 568 is now open for debate.

*Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool):* This Schedule incorporates the unincorporated charity option, and it should continue to do so following our failure to debate Carl Hughes’s amendment. I want to use the opportunity to register concern at the way our procedures played out at that point. I nipped upstairs to do a quick count of the Synod. By my count there were some 124 members present, which means we needed a third of those present to stand to continue the debate on that amendment. That amendment can reasonably be regarded as fairly significant, not least because it reflected an opinion given by the Dean of the Arches, and I just want to express the view and hope that those in authority will look at the way our procedures worked in this case.

The fact, as Clive has often commented, that we have such poor attendance for legislative business is just a fact of life, but it does impact when we are looking for 40 members to stand. That is not a criticism of anybody, We are the people who have turned up for goodness sake, but I think our procedures are not helping us when we come to debate potentially significant items that come to us as amendments. With apologies for wandering slightly off topic, I hope the powers that be can look at that.

*The Chair:* Technically that was out of order. Is there anyone else standing? No. So we move to a vote on Item 568.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 569**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Lamming’s first amendment at paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 and I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment, Item 569. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* First of all, may I thank Muriel for the recognition of my attendance at both meetings of the Revision Committee. You will have seen from the suggestions I made that are recorded in the Report 2131Y that it is only a

limited number of the matters which I sought to persuade the Committee about that I have brought now to the floor of Synod.

Before I formally move the amendment at 569, might I echo the words of Keith Cawdron about the concern there is of the attention that other members – not those present obviously – are paying to legislative business. This is a very important Measure and I think it is not appropriate that we have such a sparsely attended chamber to consider these important matters.

Might I also say that the same applies to the Revision Committee. The second meeting of the Revision Committee had only four members present: the Chairman, who is a member of the Revision Committee, and three members of the Steering Committee, so they were in a majority whereas the Standing Orders require that when appointments are made to the Revision Committee, the Revision Committee members must be in the majority, and for obvious reasons, because the Steering Committee has brought the Measure to the Committee. It should be for others who scrutinise what the Steering Committee has brought and have a say in whether they think it should be amended or not. That is a matter I have drawn to Mr Tattersall's attention as the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee and it may be that we need to look at the Synod Standing Orders to see whether we should require quorums.

*The Chair:* Sorry, Mr Lamming, this is out of order.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* May I now turn to what I am concerned about. I say that in light of what we heard from Mr Cawdron a moment ago. What I am proposing at 569 is really a governance issue. Might I just declare an interest inasmuch as I am a member of the governance committee of my diocese. The current 1991 DBE Measure is excessively complicated about electing members to the DBE. You have to have a certain proportion from each of your archdeaconries. We had the complicating situation in my diocese for a long time where we had three archdeaconries but only two archdeacons, but whenever we had to deal with the elections to the DBE we had to revert to looking at them as three archdeaconries.

We now have much more flexibility in what is now Schedule 2 on page 21. What that now provides is that the DBE – this is for a sole diocese – comprises the bishop and at least ten other members. What you now have at paragraph 5 is they may be either appointed by the bishop, elected by the diocesan synod or co-opted by the DBE, with no requirement that there be any particular number or any minimum number elected by the diocesan synod. It seemed to me that there ought to be built in, even with the increased flexibility that these provisions are catering for, and which I endorse, nonetheless, there should be the ability of the diocesan synod to elect a minimum number of those DBE members and hence the number that I have specified at amendment 569 – at least three.

*The Chair:* I now call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than three minutes in reply.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* The Steering Committee is aware of and has personal experience of the challenges faced by DBEs in operating within the high level of prescription within the 1991 Measure. As DBEs have sought to modernise and reduce the size of their boards in line with best practice, and have also tried to ensure that members have the right mix of skills and experience, they have often hit difficulties because of an overly prescriptive approach to membership and particularly to the degree of elected membership within that Measure.

The approach throughout the drafting of the new Measure has been in line with the Simplification agenda to keep central prescription to a minimum and to ensure that actual decisions about size and composition are best made at diocesan level. One size does not fit all and needs will change as circumstances do. The guidance, which will be offered alongside the Measure, will give support to dioceses in making appropriate decisions about the proportion of elected or co-opted members and so forth as they prepare their schemes. It will be the schemes which hold that level of detail and this will allow for future adjustments to be made without revising the Measure.

The Committee was also very aware that in some cases DBEs would be constituted as sub-committees of the DBF and in others they have a kind of similar status within the diocese where they are separate. There are no such detailed restrictions on DBFs in terms of membership rules at a central level and it seems both unnecessary and undesirable, therefore, to impose them on DBEs. For these reasons the Steering Committee strongly resists amendments 1 to 3.

*The Chair:* Unless I see 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue, it will lapse. The amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 570**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Lamming's second amendment at paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 and I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment at Item 570. He may speak for not more than two minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* This deals with the number of members who may be co-opted to a DBE. At the moment, there is no limit on those co-options. My proposal is that the number of persons who are members by virtue of being co-opted must not exceed one-quarter of the total membership. It is very unusual not to have some restriction on the number of members of a committee or other body who can be co-opted.

We are talking about simplification. We are talking about making things easier and more flexible. But it is of interest that under the Church Representation Rules (which we have recently re-enacted) for PCCs the provision for co-options is not more than one-fifth of the membership or two, whichever is the greater. I have provided in this amendment that you could have up to a quarter of the membership who are co-opted. For example, if you had, let us say, a DBE of 15 members, the bishop and 14 members who were there by virtue of being either elected by the Synod or appointed, then there could be a possibility of five additional co-opted members.

It seems inappropriate for the very body who is making the decisions to be able to enlarge itself beyond a certain number and I suggest, members of the Synod, that to limit the number of co-options is consistent with good governance. I ask you to support that amendment.

*The Chair:* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than two minutes in reply.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I will not rehearse the same arguments again, but we feel very much the same applies to this as to the previous amendments. We really do feel this is something which should be in the scheme and not in the Measure. We do know that the scheme has to be approved by the diocese and by the bishop. It is not the DBE making up the rules with no checks. We, therefore, resist this amendment.

*The Chair:* Accordingly, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue. The amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 571**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Lamming's third amendment to paragraph 1 of Schedule 2. I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment, Item 571. He may speak for not more than two minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* This deals with joint DBEs. If you look on page 21 of the Measure it provides at 1(6)(b) that a scheme for the designation of a body as a joint DBE must include provision for each of the diocesan synods concerned to elect at least one person. It is interesting that there is provision for diocesan synods to not only be able to but have the right to elect when you have got a joint DBE.

My amendment proposes for "at least one person" we have "at least two persons". If we are going to have representation on the DBE by each of the dioceses that comprise the joint DBE, it is not unknown for the one person who is representing that diocese not to be able to attend a meeting. To have two who are elected, it seems to me, provides the

better governance. That is why I propose that we should amend the Measure in that respect to allow for two elected members per diocese.

*The Chair:* I now call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than two minutes in reply.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* The difficulty with this is that we really would be putting detail into the Measure again which is much more appropriately dealt with by a scheme. It is very difficult to know how a joint DBE will pan out – there is only one at the moment – and to know how big those might be, whether they might be actually more than two dioceses, and so it is much more appropriate again for this level of detail to be in the scheme.

I have some sympathy with the idea that you would want somebody from each diocese represented, but that does need to be dealt with at scheme level where people understand the composition of the two groups, how many schools in each size and the comparative relationships between the two, and so we resist this amendment.

*A Speaker:* Point of order. I am not sure that Mrs Robinson has understood that there is already provision for each diocese to be represented. It is a question of how many people.

*The Chair:* This is not a point of order.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* Just to clarify, one each, that is fine; how many more, we would like the scheme to sort. We resist it.

*The Chair:* This is resisted, so I need to see 40 members stand in their places to continue. The amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 574**

*The Chair:* We now come to Mr Lamming's amendment to paragraph 3 of Schedule 2 and I invite Mr Lamming to move his amendment, Item 574. He may speak for not more than two minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* We need to turn now, members of Synod, to page 22 and it is the provision about committees and delegation. What I am suggesting is that in paragraph 3(3) which currently reads that the members of, effectively, a committee or sub-committee may include persons who are not members of the DBE – and that is clearly desirable that it should be possible for the DBE to call on expertise outside their number to serve on a particular committee or sub-committee – that nonetheless there ought to be at least one member of the DBE on any such committee.

It is a matter that I raised at the Revision Committee. It was discussed in some detail. What was thought and what you will find in the Report is that what you need is a proper reporting mechanism from any such committee or sub-committee back to the main DBE. That is fine, but I suggest again as a matter of good governance that you should have at least one person – it does not necessarily need to be the chair of the DBE but that the chair of the particular committee or sub-committee ought to be a member of the DBE. How the other members of that sub-committee are comprised, it is obviously up to the DBE to decide when they appoint it, but you have then got that direct link back to the parent body. Members of Synod, I hope that you will support at least this amendment that I propose to the Measure.

*The Chair.* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than two minutes in reply.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* The Revision Committee considered amendments to this effect and on related proposed amendments during its deliberations, as set out in GS 2131Y in paragraphs 161 to 168. It was considered unhelpfully restrictive for the draft Measure to require the chair of each committee or sub-committee to be a DBE member. Such committees will have very different functions and purposes. To ensure proper connections between any committees and sub-committees and the DBE, the committee made an amendment, as Mr Lamming has said, to require the diocesan scheme to include a requirement for appropriate reporting processes.

The Steering Committee continues to believe that the structures and safeguards built into the Measure are fit for purpose and that to set restrictions on DBEs as to how they constitute their committees, of the kind proposed by Mr Lamming, would be not just burdensome but, in some cases, inappropriate. Such restrictions would go against the tenor of this draft Measure in terms of following principles of subsidiarity and local decision-making in line with diocesan need.

They might also actually be against the best interests of the DBE. For example, as we might hope, a DBE might decide to have an audit committee. It would be against best practice for the chair to be a member of the board rather than an independent person with relevant skills. I refer back to our earlier comments about the desire to allow dioceses to decide for themselves within the limits set by the Measure the size and skillset of their DBE, the composition of committees and to clarify their secure reporting structures by writing them into the scheme.

Boards may find it very hard to attract appropriately skilled members if the task for such volunteers in terms of chairing committees and sub-committees is included as this may well be seen as too burdensome. The Steering Committee, therefore, strongly resists this amendment.

*The Chair.* Thank you. The Steering Committee does not support the amendment, so it will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate. The amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 575**

*The Chair.* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 575, "That Schedule 2 stand part of the Measure".

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I do so move.

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote on this item.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 576**

*The Chair.* I call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 576 "That the Long Title stand part of the Measure".

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* I do so move.

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing so we move to a vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair.* That completes the Revision stage for the draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure which now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its full drafting. We now move to our next item of business.

THE CHAIR: *Ven. Pete Speirs (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 6.15 pm.

*The Chair.* Good evening, Synod. Sorry about that slight delay. Before we go into Item 13, the Chair of the Business Committee wants to move a variation in the order of business.

*Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you, Chair. As if we were not riveted enough, there is a little bit more excitement. I would like to ask you, if I may, to move not one but three variations to the order of business tomorrow. The first variation is to add to the agenda, after consideration of the draft Channel Islands Measure, the House of Laity Election Rules, the Clergy Election Rules and the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules.

Further, a second alteration to the order of business, to move back the item entitled Farewells to 12.45 and Prorogation to 1.30, which is the third alteration. Not one alteration but three. We hope, Synod, that if we make those alterations, with your help we will complete all our business.

*The Chair:* I now put this proposal for the variations in the order of business to the Synod.

The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

### **ITEM 13**

### **GENERAL SYNOD ELECTIONS 2020: ALLOCATION OF SEATS (GS 2162)**

*The Chair:* Now we move to Item 13. For this, you will need GS 2162. It is the General Synod Elections 2020: Allocation of Seats. I am calling upon Sue Booy as Chair of the Business Committee to introduce and move the motion. You have up to ten minutes.

*Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Friends, as we draw to the end of this quinquennium, we are going to turn our thoughts to the elections for the next Synod and, in particular, today, to the allocation of seats to the Provinces and dioceses. This is a complex calculation which takes into account the number of qualified electors in each Province and diocese. Because these numbers are not static – would that they were – the allocation of seats to each diocese, whilst it remains broadly the same, varies from one quinquennium to the next.

This afternoon, I want to try to explain briefly the process by which the number of seats has been calculated and then to ask for your approval for the arrangement set out in GS 2162 for both proctors in Convocation and members of the House of Laity. We are not concerned here with special constituencies or ex officio members of the Synod because the numbers for those constituencies are fixed. You will need GS 2162 and the Fifth Notice Paper which corrects the figures in the printed agenda based on inaccurate information received.

Our starting point is to consider the apportionment of directly elected members between the Provinces of Canterbury and York. The Business Committee considered a 75:25% split based on total numbers on electoral rolls. This allocation is illustrated in Appendix E. However, the Business Committee wishes to recommend to you the retention of the current 70:30% split which we believe offers a more balanced Synod between the two Provinces.

The calculations undertaken to reach the number of proctors and members of the House of Laity are based on the Rules governing elections in Canon H 2 and Rule 49 of the Church Representation Rules. Full details of those methods can be found set out in Appendix G. The starting point for the calculations is the number of the electorate as of

31 July 2019. Figures for this calculation were collected from and confirmed by diocesan secretaries. For the first time, worshippers in mission initiatives were included. Neither numbers of clergy nor of laity whose names are elected on electoral rolls remain static.

We note that over the past five years around four-fifths of all dioceses have experienced a decline in clergy numbers whilst only four dioceses have recorded increased numbers on electoral rolls. These changes affect the calculations. The allocation is made within each Province on a proportional basis and this involves a number of stages. These are set out clearly and in detail in GS 2162 beginning at paragraph 4.

Members will, I am sure, forgive me if I do not detain you with an exhaustive explanation of the process, as I am sure you have read them. Suffice to say here that seats are allocated on the basis of returns from the diocese, first to those who are directly elected, for example our deans, followed by allocation to Sodor & Man – the only diocese to have a specific maximum allocation of one – and then to the dioceses whose numbers indicate the minimum allocation of three seats. Once those are allocated, the remaining seats are apportioned according to the remaining numbers of clergy and laity returned in each diocese. The very exciting arithmetic mean deviser method is used to allocate fractions of seats thereafter.

The complexity of this calculation and the fact that the allocation is proportional to the total for the Province can mean that a decrease in numbers in a diocese does not necessarily lead to a decrease in allocation. It is possible for the actual numbers in a diocese to go down but its allocation of seats to increase because its proportion of the actual numbers represented for the Province has increased. This effect can be observed in the allocations for the Dioceses of Chelmsford and Oxford.

Much thought and care has been given to a process that offers us a General Synod which is balanced between the Provinces, gives smaller dioceses clear representation and ensures that the divide between North and South is not overexaggerated. I would like to thank the staff who undertake the enormous amount of research needed for this complex exercise and particularly to the Research and Statistics team for undertaking these calculations for us. I beg to move this motion standing in my name.

*The Chair.* Synod, it might be helpful if I explain to you how I intend to structure this debate. It does seem to me that there is a simple choice being put on offer and David Lamming's amendment gives that choice. What I am going to do is I am going to take a few speeches at the beginning and then ask David Lamming to speak to and move his amendment, which we will then debate probably for the bulk of the time that we are here. The matter is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester):* Mr Lamming asked us yesterday, “Is our concern for doing the thing right or is our concern for doing the right thing?” I am very grateful to Mr Lamming for giving me that quote and for all his work on behalf of Synod. I agreed with him yesterday but, today, I do not think I am going to agree with him. I am trained in public health and I know and understand a weighted average when I see one. I am quite sure the maths and the formula is right, but is that the same as this being the right thing?

I want to ask Canon Booy for grace over law, please. We have a situation in the Church of England where much power and resource is focused in the South and this reflects wider society. To say to our northern friends, “Well, it is not going very well, is it, and you can have less people” at this time just does not seem to me to be the right thing.

Just in case members of Synod have not spotted what is happening here, in all these calculations overall the Northern Province of York will lose members and the Southern Province of Canterbury overall will gain, even keeping the 70:30 split. If we are to be the Church, the Body of Christ, then we need to be sensitive and mindful to all parts of the Body.

It will not have escaped your notice that I am posh and from Winchester and Carol Wolstenholme has tried to teach me Geordie and I am not doing very well, “Eh pet”, but anyway. I cannot do very much about who I am but I believe passionately that I am less without my relationship with people who are different from me.

In Winchester Diocese, we really value our partnership with Newcastle Diocese. We have a diocesan conference every three years. Bishop Tim will tell you more about that. We met in October and our main business was to look at a deployment plan – many of you are doing this work too – and we talked about how the richer parishes might have to give up some resource to the poorer parishes. We had Carol Wolstenholme from Newcastle Diocese with us and Shane Waddle. They shared with us what is happening in Newcastle and their situation.

It put a whole new light on our situation because in Newcastle finances are very tough. They are not able to appoint and they are even looking at redundancies. I hope it is okay to say that, I do not mean to be patronising in any way, but just to share that, actually, we need to understand each other’s positions and perspectives if to understand our own. I want to ask Canon Sue if there is a way that we can keep the numbers the same as we have now and not reduce them. This may not be doing the thing right but I think it might be doing the right thing. I am not sure I am able to give this my approval because I want to hear more from my friends in the North.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* Representation is complex and it can be quite contested. It is not about delegation and it is not about being the messenger of somebody else. It is being yourself as that representative and links to being reciprocal, accountable and it relates to geography and numbers. It is about people and places. It is good,

actually, to be debating this item as we are. Perhaps it is something we often would just take as deemed business but, no, we are not.

It poses questions to us about what does it mean to represent and what does it mean to see others as representatives of others, particularly other places and people. We see these arguments set out in GS 2162 and it draws us to think a bit harder about who we are and what we are doing here.

The American founding fathers had a think about their Constitution and decided that for their upper House, the Senate, they would have two seats for each of the States. That means, today, California with 40 million people has two seats in the Senate and little Wyoming, not in size but in number, has about half a million people. Each of them has two representatives going, as it were, to the Senate, two Senators. However, in the House of Representatives, while there are over 400 members that is much based on population.

There are two ways of thinking. I will not go into the election for the American President which is currently beyond my understanding in all sorts of ways. We can see that representation has different models. Each has its benefits and its disbenefits, how we are elected and so on.

Currently, the proposal before us is for a 70:30 split in the House of Laity in the apportionment and a different model for the clergy, who depend on a number of electors not on electoral rolls. Surprisingly, the numbers are quite similar for both Provinces, North and South, 135 to 58 in the laity and 129 to 55 in the clergy. It seems to be quite a nice, balanced position and that is what is proposed. Of course, we know, apart from one particular category, that all dioceses have at least three seats allocated. There is that baseline to help us.

Changes have been mooted and calculations done, as we have heard from Alison. That is to some degree at the forefront of our thinking. Of course, in the wider political sphere and Parliament and so on, the North has sort of gone up the scale a bit about where it sits in the country. Maybe we have been a bit unsure about the North recently and diminished its importance.

In a way, I am quite glad that David Lamming has come with this amendment. He has made us think a bit harder than we normally do in this sort of debate. We do want to flourish together and we do want to encourage many people of all sorts and shapes and sizes to stand, particularly in the House of Laity, for the 2020 elections. I do hope we will have a good debate and listen carefully to what Mr Lamming says and then make up your minds. In coming from Durham, I hope you get it right.

*The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines):* I have served in both Provinces. When I moved nearly a decade ago from London back up north, I realised I was moving to a

different country, including as seen in the Church. I asked a question yesterday about membership because the Church of England is not a membership organisation. We are there to serve the whole of the population where we live. Unless we are going to sell the pass on that, then we need to not just consider the weighting of electoral rolls but the weighting of population that we are there to serve. For that reason, I would resist the amendment and go with the 70:30.

*The Chair:* David Lamming to speak to and move your amendment.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I began to consider this issue when we were looking at the revision of the Church Representation Rules on the Church Representation and Ministers Measure Revision Committee.

It is of interest that it is exactly two years ago to the day, 12 February 2018, that the Revision Committee decided to write into the Church Representation Rules the provision which we now have at Rule 49(4) which I will read: “A resolution under paragraph (3) ...” – and that is the resolution we are being asked to vote upon this evening – “... must apportion the number of directly elected members between the Province of Canterbury and the Province of York – (a) in the proportion of 70 to 30 (or as close to that as possible), or (b) if the resolution specifies some other proportion, in that other proportion (or as close to it as possible)” and hence the amendment that I have brought to Synod this evening.

Looking at the history of this provision, I inherited a copy of the original Synodical Government Measure of 1969 and the original Church Representation Rules, of course, were set out as an appendix to that Measure. It is of interest, although I have not been able to track the debate that there may have been at that time about how the apportionment was determined, that Measure provided that the apportionment should be 68:32 and so it was right through from 1970 until 2005.

In 2004, there was a CRR amendment resolution which had as its main provision to reduce the size of this Synod significantly. It was at that time that the proportions 70:30 were written into the Measure. Throughout the 50 years, there has been a provision for a minimum three members per diocese and so we cannot change that without changing the Church Representation Rules. I suggest, members of Synod, that this is a matter of equity.

We have the Northern Powerhouse and we are about, of course, to let Stephen Cottrell go and join the Northern Powerhouse with our blessing, but this is a matter of equity between electoral roll members. My argument to you – and I hope there will be other contributions in the debate supporting it – is why should an electoral roll member in Carlisle, for example, have a greater representation in a representative body than someone in the Southern Province? If it is suggested that the balance between the sizes of the two Provinces is wrong, then, of course, the answer to that is to move some of the dioceses from the South to the North. That, of course, is for another day.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Could you move, please.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I ask Sue Booy to respond, please.

*Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* I do not know if any of you have seen the film *Groundhog Day*? For those of you who are relatively new to Synod, we have been here before. I am going to resist Mr Lamming's amendment. I am sure that he was expecting that. You have heard all the reasons that I was going to offer from Mrs Coulter and from Bishop Nick, so I am not going to go into further details, merely to allow the vast number of you who seem to want to have a crack at this one.

*The Chair:* Synod, the Steering Committee are resisting the amendment, so unless 25 of you are standing this amendment will lapse and we will not be discussing it any further. Synod, are there 25 members standing? There are not 25 members standing and so the debate resumes on Item 13.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I regret we are not going to have an opportunity to vote on Mr Lamming's amendment, which I would have voted for. We talk a lot in this Synod about justice and rightly so because it is a Gospel issue, but the 70:30 allocation is unjust. All members of the Church of England are equal, but under this proposal some are more equal than others. It was unjust five years ago. The figures have changed since and it is even more unjust than it was.

Lay people in the Northern Province get more representation per head than lay people in the Southern Province. While the Church is not a democracy, our polity includes this democratic strand of representative synodical government alongside the theocratic. When it comes to synodical representative justice and fairness, the basic rules of democracy require that, so far as can be achieved, every electoral roll member should count the same whether they be in Carlisle or Canterbury.

It is said that the North needs extra representation in order to for its voice to be heard. The problem with that is that any English region could make the self-same argument. Why not extra seats for the South West? After all, it takes longer to get to London from Penzance than from anywhere in the North. Why not East Anglia or the West Midlands or the East Midlands?

In truth, special pleading for any region is highly subjective and impossible to evaluate. Why should the accident of history of the medieval extent of the Diocese of York determine whether a diocese should get an electoral privilege? The Dioceses of Derby, Southwell & Nottingham and Lincoln sit side by side in the North East Midlands. On what

basis in justice and fairness should Southwell & Nottingham in principle be entitled to more seats per head than Derby or Lincoln?

As Mr Lamming has pointed out, what is unfortunate is that the Northern Province has only 12 dioceses whereas the Southern has 30 and this does cry out for review, I think. It is not a matter for today, but if several dioceses were moved into the Province of York we would not, I think, be having this groundhog experience every five years.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Dear sisters and brothers, it may have come to some of your attention that I have landed a small palace for duty job in the North of England. It gives me extraordinary joy to speak up in this debate on behalf of the North but also on behalf of the pastoral and missional needs of the whole Church.

In the Bible, two and two rarely equal four. In the Bible, two and two usually equal three or 276. God either seems to be refining us or it is profligate extravagant growth. Therefore, although so many of the arguments we are hearing in this debate do probably make perfect mathematical sense, they do not necessarily make pastoral and missiological sense.

We all know that too much of our national and Church life defaults to London and the South. At a time when politically there appears to be at last renewed determination to take account of the needs, the talents and the opportunities of a North which has been neglected by our politicians, this is not the time for this Synod to be doing anything which would go against that. I am very, very glad that 25 people did not stand for Mr Lamming's amendment and – I am with Alison Coulter – I am even unsure about the modest changes that the 70:30 split gives to the Northern Province.

Somebody once said that if you stand still long enough you become a radical. I am grateful for the work of the Business Committee and the work that they have done. I cannot fault their logic but, Synod, I cannot help believing that this actually might be the time to stand still on this one and let the North be represented as it has been. As Bishop Nick so eloquently put it, are we in this Synod here simply to represent our congregations or serve our nation?

*Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds):* I have to declare an interest as I, obviously, am a proctor for the Northern Province and also a member of the Business Committee. It was William Temple, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said the Church is the only society which exists for the benefit of those who are not its members. As the Church of England, we have a vocation, a mission, to serve the whole of the nation, whatever faith or none.

The bishops sit in the House of Lords, not just representing members of the Church of England but as representing faith and spiritual values to the nation. Our Church schools serve not just the children of members of the Church of England but our whole communities. In our parishes, we serve our local communities by conducting baptisms,

weddings, funerals, running coffee mornings, food banks, toddler groups, youth groups, all those things, not for the benefit of the people who are members but for those outside of them, for the good of all.

It is vital, as we have already heard, that we hear from all parts of the country. It is not so easy to hear voices from the North. I appreciate, obviously, that other regions may have problems having their voices heard, but I do emphasise that the North has some of the largest cities in the country. The population split between North and South is more like 70:30, perhaps it might be even a higher proportion in the North than that, than 75:25, and so if we go on the 70:30 figure we are more reflecting the difference in population rather than just our electoral rolls.

When I joined the Business Committee, I was trying to improve the representation of the North on the committees and the governance things in this Church and I doubled that representation. There are still only two people from the Northern Province on that Committee. I would say we do want to keep up our representation and not to reduce it. I, therefore, welcome the decision of the Business Committee to continue to allocate seats in the relation 70:30 and strongly urge it continues because to do so is to recognise that we are a missionary Church called to serve and represent the interests of all the people of this nation, not just those on our electoral rolls.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* I will be very brief. Joyce put much more eloquently than I could have done everything I wanted to say, and I agree with Stephen.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* It may surprise members of Synod to learn that I am the archdeacon of a Northern archdeaconry, but I assure you that by Southwark standards it is so. Southwark Cathedral, which I am proud to number among the archdeaconries parishes – Mr Dean, if you are here and take note – is, in fact, well north of Westminster.

If we were to make allocations comparable to those that reflected size of electoral roll in our diocese, I suspect that the archdeaconry of Southwark would lose its voice. I would regret that. It is an urban, densely populated but also often a poor archdeaconry. It is a net recipient from the rest of the diocese, perhaps like the Province of York in relation to the Province of Canterbury. I am immensely grateful to the generosity of the rest of the diocese in enabling my archdeaconry to flourish.

I hope that in this Synod we can be generous to the Province of York and enable it not only to flourish but also to speak to our debates. Not only that. Yesterday I sat, as many of you did, in debate after debate in which we heard how important it was that we did not marginalise even further those who felt already marginalised.

It seems to me that this is not the moment to put our own house less in order by privileging those who are arguably in some ways already privileged in terms of size of church populations. Having said that, the North is a beautiful Province and the Diocese of Newcastle is second to none in terms of the stunningness of its scenery and, indeed, many of its clergy, some of whom have come from Southwark.

*Ven. Gavin Collins (Portsmouth):* I declare an interest as a member of the Province of Canterbury. I am a democrat. I believe in proportional representation. However, I also believe in generosity and grace. This Synod represents both Provinces and to do so we need substantial representation from both the North and the South.

As a member of the Southern Province, I am delighted that we are gifting Bishop Stephen to the Northern Province and I am proud that we have decided this evening to keep the deliberately skewed representation balance. That is important. Yes, democracy is important and principles of justice are important, but I think generosity and grace must trump them both.

*Ms Carol Wolstenholme (Newcastle):* I would like to declare an interest. I love my Southern colleagues and I love Winchester particularly. But what I want to say is for many of the debates and discussions over the past few days, we have been exhorted to listen to the voices of places where there is either less wealth or other issues.

We have been exhorted to hear their voices and those they represent. Well, it is a bit difficult if there are not many of us there to represent them. My message is really very simple, and that is please maintain the status quo so that the voices of the North are not reduced. I should say to end, oh, I think I am going to love my new person who is in a posh place in York.

*The Chair:* Synod, I wish to test your mind as to whether we have had enough debate on Item 13 and so I want to put a motion for the closure on this item.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands. The*

*Chair:* I call upon Sue Booy to reply to the debate.

*Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you, my friends, for what has been a lively debate, characterised, I think, by the hallmarks of our faith and life, doing the right thing, attending to justice and equity and being generous. I believe that the Church of England is here to serve the whole communities in which we live and minister, clergy and laity together, so that when we talk about people counting the same, in my head I am counting members of communities rather than numbers on electoral roll.

As the Archbishop-designate has reminded us, this is also a question of mission. For those of you who may be feeling tempted – Alison Coulter – to challenge even the 70:30

split, could I tempt you to wait five years because if we do not do this now we will not be able to be here in November. That may be a joyous thing. Gavin Collins, you said we had decided. I really hope that you are a prophet and I wish to commend to you the 70:30 split and the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I put Item 13 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Synod, that concludes the business for the day, but please stay in the Chamber for the wonderful worship to be led by the Community of St Anselm. Thank you very much.

*The Community of St Anselm* led the Synod in an act of worship.

## **Full Synod: Fourth Day Thursday 13 February 2020**

### **MORNING WORSHIP**

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 9.30 pm.

#### **ITEM 504**

#### **SPECIAL AGENDA I**

#### **LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS**

#### **DRAFT CHANNEL ISLANDS MEASURE (GS 2152A)**

*The Chair:* Good morning, Synod. We have the functioning bell back rather than that new-fangled thing which was no good. We are moving now to Item 504 for which you will need GS 2152, the draft Channel Islands Measure. This is the Final Approval stage for this Measure. Item 504 "That the Measure entitled 'Channel Islands Measure' be finally approved". I call on the Bishop to the Armed Forces, Bishop Tim Thornton, to open this debate. Bishop, you have up to ten minutes should you need them.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* Good morning. It is very good to be in front of you again and thank you for all your help in this matter. I just have two or three points to make. First of all, to repeat my thanks to all those people who have been involved in the process so far. If I may, I would like to pay fulsome thanks to all the members of the Steering Committee of this particular Measure for the fact that they did not have to come to a single meeting and did not have to utter a single word. I have to tell you they were magnificent in the way that they rose to that task in their generosity and sacrifice. Thank you very much to all of them. Again, just on the record, a very big thanks

to Lord Chartres and all the Commission and to Jonathan Neil-Smith for the extraordinary work they have done.

The second point I want to make is to say a very big thank you to Simon for mentioning this item in the prayers this morning, and, in particular, for reminding us of the people and the parishes that we are discussing. Often in Synod we can get caught up in the details of the Measure and the structure and forget the very lives of the people that we are considering. Please, in our debate this morning, Synod, can we remember the people, the parishes and the communities of the Channel Islands, giving thanks for them and praying for their ongoing mission and life.

Thirdly, I want to say thank you to all of you for the overwhelming support that you have shown for this Measure so far and to repeat the recognition that we are all indeed sinners, and from standing here looking out I can see quite a few miserable sinners in front of me this morning. As we recognise our sinfulness, so also every day, as I have to do in my life, we turn to Christ and say that we want to follow him each day. We need strength and support in doing that and to understand that we go on the journey of reconciliation. This is very much about the journey of reconciliation. We are not forgetting or ignoring that.

The fourth thing I want to say is in talking to the Bishop of Salisbury he has indicated to me that he would be more than willing, and, indeed, will publish the final Memorandum of Understanding on the website. I understand that will also be published on the Channel Islands' Deanery websites. It is not appropriate that it should be caught up in this Measure, but it is right and proper that you should see it when it is published and we can see that going forward.

Finally, members of Synod, may I say thank you to all of you for undertaking the work of this Measure as you have done all in one session of Synod, if you agree to vote in favour of this move. I wonder whether therefore, members of Synod, you might look to the fact that you have done something new by way of General Synod this time and whether that gives us the courage and confidence to think about different ways of doing things new in the future. I therefore now do move the motion in my name on the Order Paper.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I need to remind you, miserable sinners, that in the debate that follows motions for the closure, the speech limit or next business are not in order. If you would like to contribute in any way would you please now indicate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*The Bishop of Winchester (Rt Revd Tim Dakin):* Tim Dakin, Winchester, miserable sinner number 5. Sorry, no implications. I welcome this new Channel Islands Measure and I hope we will support it in this final stage. Personally, I hope that the new arrangements will enable the Church to flourish in the Channel Islands. My wife on one side of her family is from the Le Lacheurs of Guernsey. I wish the Channel Islands to flourish, as I

do her: with all my heart. I pray that the Channel Islands will have a fresh start with Salisbury. Prayerfully, we have been committed to praying each week in the Bishop's Chapel at Wolvesey for all the parishes in my care, including those of the Channel Islands. Each week we pray for the mission of the churches and so we have kept up-to-date with Channel Island parish news and have continued to pray for the parish life and the communities of the Channel Islands.

Painfully, this has not been an easy process for any of us. To hold together the need for good relationships, for truth and for change in the middle of one of the most complex safeguarding cases going back to 2008 has been very difficult. Ultimately, I asked Archbishop Justin for help for which I am most grateful. We agreed an interim arrangement and I delegated my pastoral care of the Channel Islands to Bishop Trevor whilst I worked on the case, knowing that there was eventually to be an Archbishop's Commission in order to find a way forward.

Providentially, it has been a lesson about how sometimes it is only a wider process that can bring a resolution and a reconciliation in a new pattern which can evolve, and in this case the relationship of the Channel Island deaneries with the wider Church of England. I am most grateful to Bishop Trevor for his committed care of the Channel Islands, to Lord Chartres for his work on the Commission, and to all my colleagues who have given so much in working for a resolution.

Under God I was asked to care for the Channel Islands. I shall pass over the care to the Bishop of Salisbury. I hope we can find the right way to make the transition prayerfully to reflect the ongoing place of the Channel Islands deaneries with all their unique life and culture in the wider Church of England.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* I am a miserable sinner, and a Guernsey girl. Ozanne is a Guernsey name. My father was born and bred on the island and we moved back when I was about four years old. This Measure, which I wholeheartedly endorse, affects my family, my friends and ultimately myself, as I look to retire back to Guernsey in a few years' time.

The Bailiwicks of Guernsey and, indeed, of Jersey are fiercely independent. We are very different in many ways to England, and you have heard about that over the last few days. We do not have political parties. People stand for what they believe and they get elected on that basis. We are also very different in the way that we "do church". I owe my Christian formation to my time in Guernsey growing up there. On Sunday mornings I would sing in the town church, which was a choir a lot like a cathedral choir, and in the evenings I would go to a charismatic evangelical house church. And I was welcome in both and I felt at home in both. When I go back to the island I am welcome in all churches. I worship in an evangelical church there.

There is something that is modelled in small communities which are self-sufficient which I think we can learn from. Many on the Islands have been listening and watching this debate. I have been thinking of my father, who sadly passed away last year, and what he would have thought of some of the interventions earlier this week. Many on the Islands, I am afraid to say, have long memories as to how they were let down badly by the British during The War, and therefore they look at England in a different light to perhaps the way that we understand. I hope this Synod will be able to give a very full unanimous voice to the endorsement of this Measure.

I was recently contacted by one of the clergy on the island who said, “Jayne, please could you do all you can to endorse this Measure? We have felt in exile for far too long and we want to come home. We want to be able to get on with the mission on the island. We want to be able to get on and move forward”. In that respect I really thank Bishop Tim for his words just now. I think it is quite fitting I follow that. There is a recognition that things have happened in the past, but the overall feeling, and I can witness to this, is a desire to move forward in love and in hope about what God is doing in the Islands. Please, Synod, can we give a very clear unanimous endorsement to this Measure?

*The Chair:* After Tim Barker, I will reduce the speech limit to three minutes.

*Very Revd Tim Barker (Dean of Guernsey):* I declare an interest as Dean of Guernsey. I hope that Synod will give Final Approval to the Channel Islands Measure this morning with a substantial majority. The recommendations in the Report of the Archbishop’s Commission that the Channel Island deaneries be attached to the Diocese of Salisbury has been welcomed without opposition by the Guernsey and Jersey deanery synods and by Salisbury deanery synod.

I am most grateful to so many in Synod for your support and to the staff of the National Church Institutions, especially Jonathan Neil-Smith and to the staff of the Legal Office and to the Business Committee for facilitating these debates over the course of this group of sessions.

It is important that the transition from the Diocese of Winchester to the Diocese of Salisbury is managed well. There is quite a lot of work to be done once today’s business is concluded. Having a Measure in place will give us even more confidence and encouragement in our planning for this significant change. We want to manage it well. This includes taking leave from the Diocese of Winchester in a good way that honours our many years of partnership in the Gospel, even if distance and difficulties of travel meant that the relationship was very much at arm’s length for many centuries. Conversations have already begun about how we do this.

This is, Chair, an appropriate occasion to mark our warm appreciation for the relationship with the Diocese of Winchester, its Cathedral and its Bishops over the centuries. Emblems that celebrate this relationship are to be found in the windows, the stonework

and the furniture of our churches and will remain. I warmly endorse the expression of thanks in an earlier debate in this group of sessions to Bishop Dakin for his welcome to the recommendations of the Archbishop's Commission and I thank him for his words this morning.

We are grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for his care for the Islands in recent years and for establishing the Commission. Lord Chartres and his fellow Commissioners have clearly understood the distinctive culture and history of Guernsey and Jersey, Alderney and Sark. We are much in their debt. The Diocese of Canterbury has provided the services and support we have needed in recent years. We have made good friends in east Kent and we pray for God's blessings on them.

Bishop Trevor Willmott has been assiduous in his care for the Channel Islands on top of the many demands on him when he was the Bishop of Dover. He has generously continued to offer episcopal care since his retirement last May. But it is time to develop a new and stable, life-giving and life-enhancing relationship with the Diocese of Salisbury. We look forward to the support of Synod and your continuing interest in the Channel Islands that will allow us to make this a reality as soon as the necessary processes allow.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* My wife would say that bishops almost always get the last word and in these debates I was the first to be called and I hope I am the last to be called now before we vote. I wanted to speak particularly because Bishop Tim, the Bishop of Winchester, has been extraordinarily gracious through this process, and I simply want to thank him both for what he has said now and for the way in which he and I have had private conversations. His graciousness and generosity in trying to seek a resolution to this has been exemplary throughout and I am very grateful to Bishop Tim for that.

The Chartres Commission – I am not supposed to call it that, am I? – the Archbishop's Commission on the Channel Islands chaired by Lord Chartres is really clear that the way in which the Church of England is working has changed significantly, particularly because of things like the Clergy Discipline Measure, safeguarding and all sorts of things that we are doing differently, which have put pressure on the relationship, and there needs to be a reset of that. This is not about saying reconciliation is not being addressed. It is. It is reconciliation with all of us, the Church of England. I thought the Archbishop put that really well in the first of the debates in this session of Synod.

I said there had been no episcopal visitation for confirmation between the Reformation and 1818 when the Bishop of Salisbury went on behalf of the Bishop of Winchester, who was infirm and elderly. I have to say, rather like Jayne Ozanne's comments about the impact of history on the Channel Islands, it is not really surprising that there is ambivalence about episcopacy built into this relationship. Trying to understand this distinctive and very significant relationship is one that Synod has had to engage with, which the Commission had to engage with and which we as a diocese will have to engage

with it, just like Winchester has engaged with it over a longer period. This is not a silver bullet. It is a reset of the relationship. We are going to be able to do things new. I absolutely commit that the Memorandum of Understanding become a public document, because otherwise how do we hold ourselves and each other to account?

The issue about how the transition will be effected now needs to be worked out and put in place. The conversation at Synod, the debate at Synod will help inform that process and I know that Winchester and Salisbury will want to work at that with the Channel Islanders in order to do things which are appropriate as we move into the new phase of life.

I am grateful for the support that Synod has shown this Measure, for the quality of the conversation and particularly for the relationships restated and, to some extent, re-established through the debate. I thank you and encourage you to vote in favour.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. Therefore I call Bishop Tim to respond. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton):* I am very grateful to all the speakers. I am slightly nervous that this may turn into something like an awards ceremony, so I will try and keep the thanks to a limit, but I would like to thank my mother very much. Please, I have only got five minutes, calm down.

Bishop Nick took some words out of my mouth. I was going to say to my fellow Bishop Tim, and to all of you, I am sure you would want to thank him for his graciousness. Thank you very much indeed.

Thank you, Jayne, for what you said and for grounding us back into the realities of life in the Channel Islands and particularly what you said about small communities. Thank you very much indeed to Tim Barker for all that he was saying and for underlining the importance of the transition. As Bishop Nick also highlighted, it will be important for us to think carefully about how that transition happens and I know that there will be ongoing conversations between the various parties to make that happen. I believe that we have heard all that needs to be heard. I now urge Synod to vote in favour "That the Measure entitled 'Channel Islands Measure' be finally approved".

*The Chair:* I therefore put to the question to Synod for Final Approval. The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Channel Islands Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 505: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 26, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 94 in favour, one against, with two recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 117 in favour, two against, with one recorded abstention. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair:* The Measure has therefore received Final Approval. The Channel Islands Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee. Thank you very much for a very good process and a very good final debate. Please remain in the chamber as we now move to the next item of business.

## **ITEM 507A HOUSE OF LAITY ELECTION RULES 2020 (GS 2164, GS 2165 and GS 2166)**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 10.01 am.

*The Chair:* Synod, we now come to business relating to the three sets of Election Rules. For this business, members will need GS 2164, GS 2165 and GS 2166. Two members have given notice of their wish for the Rules to be debated. There are also a number of amendments to each set of Rules. The procedure will be as follows. For each set of Rules, a member of the Business Committee will move the preliminary motion that the Rules be considered. That is the opportunity for any general debate on the Rules. If that preliminary motion is carried, the amendments will then be moved.

On Tuesday Synod approved a number of amendments to The Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 and to the Standing Orders. I am sure you remember those debates very well. The amendments before Synod now make equivalent changes to the Election Rules.

As the policy of the amendments was previously explained, and as the Synod accepted all the amendments, I will, in respect of each set of Rules, call the mover of the amendments to speak for not more than one minute when moving the first amendment to those Rules. I am informed that the Business Committee accepts all the amendments and does not wish to exercise any right of reply. After any debate, I will put the first amendment to the vote.

If the first amendment is carried, I will then call the mover of the amendments to move all of the remaining amendments to the first set of Rules en bloc. I hope you are following. After any debate, I will put all the amendments to the first set of Rules to the vote en bloc unless any member indicates a wish to speak to or vote separately on a particular amendment. Then the same abbreviated process will be repeated with the other two sets of Rules.

I now call on Mr Clive Scowen to move Item 507A "That the House of Laity Election Rules 2020 be considered".

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* This is the last piece of business from the Elections Review Group this week. This time you get three for the price of one, you lucky people. I intend to speak to all three of them in this speech before moving that the House of Laity Election Rules be considered.

Some may wonder why we need three sets of Rules relating to elections to the General Synod. The reason is that, despite the Synod's apparent unity, it is in fact a combination of three separate legal entities: the Convocations of Canterbury and York and the House of Laity. The power to make rules for the Laity elections derives from the Church Representation Rules, whereas rules relating to representation of clergy in the lower Houses of Convocation and of suffragan bishops in the Upper Houses are made pursuant to Canon.

These new Rules, all three of them, give effect to two significant policy changes: the introduction of online elections for each House, for which this Synod voted in principle, I think, over five years ago; and comprehensive rules on appeals relating to elections to the Convocations and the House of Laity. Subject to that, the new Rules largely consolidate and harmonise the old ones. In particular, the structure of the elections to each House, who does what and when, et cetera, is as it was.

The Rules on electronic voting are consistent for each House. There will be an online facility, known as the Elections Portal, for nominations and voting. The presiding officer for each election will run the online facility with the assistance of a body nominated by the Business Committee, which is extraordinarily likely to be Civica Election Services, formerly known as the Electoral Reform Society. Voters who do not provide an email address must use the paper-based system.

Concern has been raised about what would happen if a diocese were not ready to conduct an online election. I have to say to you – with complete confidence – – that we simply do not believe that there is any real risk of that happening. All the diocese has to do to conduct the online election is, as the Rules require, to appoint Civica to conduct the election using the bespoke system which they have designed for these elections and which has already been very thoroughly tested, with several dioceses volunteering to do that testing, including my own Diocese of London where it is probably the most complex.

We understand that some diocesan officers may be anxious about a new system, but a briefing day has been arranged here on 2 March for all those who will be concerned in running these elections at diocesan level, where all concerns, anxieties, worries and questions can be addressed in detail. It is also fair to say that they have already been extensively briefed. They have been consulted on the guidance under which the elections will be run.

The Religious Communities do not wish to participate in electronic voting, not, I think, for any ecclesiological reason, but anyhow, so the new Rules provide that their elections are

to be conducted by paper. The composition of the Religious Communities constituency will not change for the forthcoming elections because the new legislation in Amending Canon 40 for Religious Communities which was given final approval last July will not come into force until November.

The Rules provide that a nomination form, whether it is online or on paper, must include any title or preferred style the candidate has, and the voting form must specify the candidate's name as it appears on the nomination. A nomination form must specify for clergy the ecclesiastical office held and for laity the parish on whose roll the candidate's name is entered. A nomination form and a voting form must specify whether the candidate has been a member of General Synod rather than just of the particular House or Convocation for which the person currently wishes to stand.

Again, there is express provision for the registers of electors not to include co-opted members of deanery synods since they are not entitled to vote.

For the Religious Communities constituency, the presiding officer is to be the Provincial Registrar rather than the head of each religious community, for which the latter, I am sure, will be very grateful.

The rules on appeals are consistent for each House and provide for several new matters. They clarify rights of appeal relating to the eligibility of voters and the validity of a nomination. As with the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution, which we considered on Tuesday, they introduce two new procedures: a fast-track procedure for cases which raise a point of law, for example whether a vote should have been allowed, and a more lengthy procedure for cases which involve disputes of fact, for example whether the conduct of an election affected the result. The new Rules also make detailed specific provision about the findings which are possible on each type of appeal instead of the current general provision which does not fit in every case.

As with the Church Representation Rules amendments, the summary procedure will be for appeals relating to the validity of a nomination and for appeals against the result of an election on the grounds of whether a candidate was duly elected or qualified to stand or whether a vote should or should not have been allowed. There is not to be a freestanding appeal against the allowance or disallowance of a vote. That matter is instead able to provide grounds for an appeal against the result of an election. There is to be a two-day period for bringing the appeal, and the appeal is to be determined within seven days. An appeal will be determined by the Dean of the Arches and Auditor or by a vicar general or diocesan chancellor appointed by him.

The full procedure will be that, for appeals relating to the eligibility of a voter and for appeals against the result of an election on the grounds of whether there was a misrepresentation of a material fact, or how the election was conducted, or whether there is an error in the register of electors, there is to be a 14-day period for bringing a full

appeal, which will be heard by a three-person panel appointed by the Chair and Vice Chair of the relevant House. In both types of appeal the notice of appeal is generally to be given to the presiding officer for the election.

Once again, as the Chair has indicated, there is a large number of amendments to each set of Rules in the name of Mr Lamming. They all relate to the Election Appeal Rules and are parallel to those that he moved on the amendment resolution and, indeed, on the Standing Orders. I therefore intend to accept them all and hope that, as again the Chair has indicated, this time they can be agreed pretty much en bloc without substantive debate. Chair, I move that the House of Laity Election Rules be considered.

*The Chair:* Item 507A is now open for debate.

*Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn):* Chair, I am not a Luddite. I am not opposed to voting online, but I want to be convinced that we are actually ready for this and that nothing is going to go wrong. If we approve these Rules today, they will come into force on 15 July come what may. There is no failsafe mechanism to avoid operating under the new system. Even if, between now and July, in a particular diocese problems are envisaged, the presiding officer has no power to direct that they will vote on the existing system or by paper. Contrast that to what happens in Synod. We normally vote electronically, but our rules say that if something goes wrong the Chair can direct that we vote the old way and go through the doors.

This is a dual system, as we have heard. Some voters will vote online; some will vote using paper. That, it seems to me, has an inherent risk in it which I think those who have drafted the guidance – it is only draft guidance at the moment – realise, because on page 7 it says: “For an elector who does not provide an email address, it may nevertheless be prudent to notify the presiding officer that he or she wishes to continue to use the paper-based system”. He or she should have no requirement or need to do that. The fact that that is in the guidance suggests that they know that is a weak point in the arrangements.

I am also concerned about who provides what email address. Many of us have more than one email address. For the House of Laity, if you read the guidance and so on, the email address for a person will have passed probably through the hands of the PCC secretary, the deanery synod secretary and the diocesan electoral roll secretary, who will also know of the people and have other email addresses. How are we certain that the correct email address that the person wants to be used for this purpose is going to be used?

There are many other concerns that I have which are not really addressed in the guidance, it seems to me. My concern is that things will start going wrong, and, if they do, there will be lots of election appeals. And if there are election appeals it may well be that a whole election in one diocese for the House of Laity or another House will be declared invalid. When that happens, people from that diocese will not be present at the

opening of Synod and they will not be present until there has been a fresh election with whatever the problem is sorted out. This has happened before – I think it was 10 years ago, from the Diocese of Bath & Wells, where something went wrong with the elections for the House of Laity – and that meant not only were the people not there at the beginning of Synod, they were not members of Synod and they could not vote for any of the elections for the important boards and committees for which elections take place fairly soon after the new Synod is inaugurated.

So I need still to be convinced that everything is going to be okay and that we are not going to end up in the embarrassing position of more than one diocese not being properly represented because of things going wrong with this online voting.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)*: I was also going to make the point about this being rather late in the day, but I will not go through that again now. I agree with that problem.

What I would like to mention, which I am sure will not surprise quite a few people, is that I regard it as very unfortunate that there is still no demand for loyalties, trusteeships, affiliations and so on to be declared on election addresses. We do not now have the power to ask for those, but this is my last Synod and I am just making another mark about it. I hope for better things in future.

The other thing is that there is no mention of hustings. I fully understand why. I have had a conversation with the Legal Office about it. But it does raise the possibility that a diocese does not have to run hustings, and that must be a massive reduction of governance and representation and so on, so we can just trust that the dioceses will run hustings.

Of course, because of all this, there are no appeals because of misrepresentation; there cannot be. So that is another deficit, I think. Just to illustrate how important this is, if we look back to women bishops legislation – now, I cannot be absolutely accurate about this because the relevant page of GS Misc 1951 is not available on the website – but my memory, and I have reason to believe my memory will be quite good on this, was that the support for women bishops legislation in the dioceses was over 90% and rose on the second try in 2014. It was a strange thing then that when we got to the voting in General Synod on that matter we had great difficulty, as you will remember, in mustering 66%. It does make you wonder how well this General Synod represents the opinions of people in the dioceses and whether we should be doing all possible to make sure that it is better.

*The Chair*: Rhian Parsons, after which I will reduce the speech limit to three minutes.

*Mrs Rhian Parsons (Leicester)*: I know what you are all thinking right now: “Oh, she’s a young person. She loves technology. That’s going to be what she wants. She wants

electronic voting". But actually, as a young person, I do want to raise my concerns as well, and I do agree with Fr Benfield on this. Whilst technology is a great way to engage more people, things can go wrong. I have never known a technology system that just goes right the first time. Yes, I know this has been tested, but things can go wrong. We had it when we had the General Synod app. Yes, it has been resolved now, but there are problems with everything technology-wise.

Also, other than maybe one or two things happening with Royal Mail, the postal system works. I am sure everyone in this Chamber and everyone at deanery synod is able to post a letter to Church House or to the diocese to put their vote in. Why should we change a system that works and introduce an additional system which may not work?

Unfortunately, I just do not see the benefits of having an additional system which could cause problems such as the ones that Fr Benfield has already addressed. Do have a think about what this is going to add to the voting for the next quinquennium because I do not really think it is going to add anything.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells)*: I was one of those who was affected by that little technical difficulty some years ago when we failed to elect any lay people until the second group of sessions in that quinquennium. The issue that I have, I think, is a bit more immediate. I am lay dean of a rural deanery in Bath & Wells. We have just had our penultimate deanery synod for this triennium. Because of the eclipse of deanery and General Synods this year, there is a very big danger of a lack of knowledge and information being passed to deanery synod members who will be elected at the APCMs this spring.

The biggest issue that I have, I think, is not that the technology might not work – and it might not work, but then the postal system might go down as well, who knows – is that because we have this confluence of the two things happening at the same time, we will have a large number of people who will not have voted in anything before, and they will not have had a deanery synod meeting before they have a chance to vote.

I am encouraging all of the priests in my deanery, and I would encourage all area deans, lay deans, rural deans and lay chairs to do the same, and I have been encouraging all APCMs to suggest that those who are elected at deanery synod this year should attend the last deanery synod for the triennium as a taster session so that they have at least a chance to understand something of the synodical system before they engage.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)*: Anybody who has ever sent a bulk email to a large mailing list will know that a significant number of the recipients do not receive the email. They do not receive the email for any of the following reasons: one, because they have provided the wrong email address or because the email address that they have provided is no longer valid. Well, okay, you could say that is their fault.

Two, because a typo has been introduced somewhere along the way, perhaps a stray punctuation mark or some oddity, that causes the email address no longer to work. Three, because the mail server is having a hiccup, sometimes perhaps the ISP is just experimenting with its security settings and for some completely unknown reason. I sometimes get people saying, “Oh, I tried to send you an email and it bounced back”, and there is no reason for it on my side; it is just something went wrong technologically. Four, it goes into spam, either into the person’s visible spam filter, which he could find if he looked, or sometimes in the kind of invisible spam filter that the ISP has that causes it to disappear into cyberspace.

You see where I am going with this. If you send a lot of people an email, some of them do not get it, and sometimes it is not their fault. Really I just have a question, and it is: “What happens to those people?” If people are contacted and they do not receive the email, is there going to be some follow-up process to check emails that have been bounced back and to send them paper forms? What happens about those emails that simply disappear into cyberspace for no known reason? I would just welcome an answer to that.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Dr Rose Hudson-Wilkin):* I am only checking whether or not any thought has been given to whether this new system is actually going to enable us to see a more representative General Synod representing the whole body of Christ. With just sending emails around, where people do not get to see real people from a wide variety of life, whether it is North or South, whether it is working class, middle class, whatever it is, I am just concerned because, having been away from Synod and come back to Synod, I am somewhat disturbed by the Synod that I see and the Synod that we could continue to have if we go down a route that disenfranchises a wider variety of people.

A little plea for those dioceses with large numbers, in particular in those places where we have large proportions of minority ethnic people, to ask “What are they going to do to ensure that they encourage more people from a wider background to take part in the process?”

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* I want to echo some of the concerns which we have heard about sending e-mails. I may look as if I have lost a lot of hair and am long in the tooth and therefore not in tune with modern technology. Well, I have to tell you that I actually write software for applications that run on mobile phones and tablets, et cetera. I also administer a very large choir database – we have several hundred members – and it does amaze me the number of times that emails are bounced back because people have spelled their email addresses wrong or they have put the wrong email address in to start with.

If you have a Gmail account, you may be aware that you can also use the ending Googlemail, and the number of times that people, when we are trying to match people up

using their email address, because it is supposed to be unique, put in Gmail in their registration but then when they respond use Googlemail we do not get it. It really is an issue.

This is an important election. These are important issues. We need to make sure that everybody is included and that nobody is excluded because (a) they do not get an email or (b) they do not have an email address. I have serious concerns about this. Whilst I would love to go online and be able to do everything online, I do not think it is something which we should rush into.

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* To declare an interest, I am a member of the Elections Review Group which was responsible for some of the work on bringing forward these Rules. To declare professional expertise, I have also spent a lifetime working in information technology, and my specialist subject as it happens is email, but I think that is slightly beside the point.

We are getting fixated on the dangers of a lost email. The email address here is really a proxy for the identity of a person. It is the key that enables you to register a vote on the portal. Failing to receive a particular email along the way of the process would not inhibit someone's ability to vote at the end of the day.

My real reason for believing this will work is that I trust the organisation involved. My history of working in information technology for governments and for charities has been that you design carefully, you test thoroughly and you choose your suppliers well. All those three things have been done. Civica Election Services, known until a few days ago as Electoral Reform Services, the elections agency of the Electoral Reform Society, is tried and trusted. It runs elections like this for many professional institutions of a size and complexity at least that of the General Synod.

Currently, I have invitations in my email box to vote in elections for the British Computer Society and the Institute of Engineering and Technology, both of which are run by CES, are run well and are run in environments where people would pick them up very quickly indeed if it did not work successfully. So I understand some of the nervousness and I would absolutely encourage presiding officers and others to attend carefully to the detail and the consultation and briefing day that will be arranged in March, but I am quite convinced this can and should work.

I just wanted to say one other thing, perhaps, to Prudence and to the Bishop of Dover. An election which is digital by design but not digital by diktat may lower the barriers of entry to people who are not already enmeshed in the system of deanery and diocesan synods. When I was very first elected to this place as a callow youth of 25, I was not a member of a deanery synod at the time, and I relied on some personal introductions to get into the process. It may be easier for people if it can be done online to start with.

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells):* For those who are curious, I am standing here in a Pro-Prolocutor role because Simon Butler has to be elsewhere this morning. Synod, we are like those people who are standing on the edge of the beach thinking the water will be too cold and they do not really want to go in. In the way that we voted three times that the Channel Islands are wonderful, I want to say, “Come on in, the water’s lovely”.

I have stood in three previous elections. To pick up April Alexander’s point, hustings may work if you have a densely packed urban area, but most of us come from what I would call shire county dioceses. I have been to three sets of physical hustings and at the last one there were more candidates who turned up than electors. It was a complete waste of everybody’s time, although my diocese did also run an electronic hustings system and I am sure they will do again this time.

The problem we have with these elections, friends, is not that we do not trust the system we are about to put in because, as others have said, it looks like a pretty good system. The problem we have is that we have appallingly low turnouts in these elections. One of the things I hope this new system will do is, as Philip has said, get people to vote who do not normally bother, because they will get stuff in their inbox – hopefully – and they will be registered as people who have a right to vote.

I agree absolutely with April that manifestoes ought to be truthful and make declarations about where you stand in terms of committees and bodies, but at the end of the day we need more people to vote. If we want a representative synod – and you can define your representation in terms of what we used to call churchmanship, theological issues, ethnic minority or whatever – then we need the people to actually turn up and vote. We have a Rolls Royce of a voting system in the single transferable vote, and when it works well it gives you good representation. Please, Synod, stop fretting. Jump in. The water is lovely.

*The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Robert Innes):* My diocese covers 42 countries across Europe and beyond. I do not know if you can imagine running an election by post when you are communicating with Moscow or Rabat. Surface post is unreliable. It is slow, it is cumbersome, and it is expensive. Our diocese runs on email, we are highly networked, and we have to use technology. Moving an election to email will be a huge bonus for us. It will make life very much easier for us. Please, Synod, do grasp this new opportunity for our sake at least.

*The Chair:* I am going to reduce the speech limit after Jeremy Sheehy to two minutes.

*Revd Jeremy Sheehy (Manchester):* This is my first time addressing Synod. I little thought it would be on something as exciting as Election Rules. I am sorry to differ from the Bishop in Europe, but I want to echo and support some of the reservations felt by such as the Bishop of Dover a few minutes ago. I find the group of my electoral roll of about 300-plus who it is most difficult to involve in doing things by email are both those

who have most recently joined the congregation and very much the not inconsiderable proportion of our electoral roll who are from BAME backgrounds, especially those whose certainty of residence in this country is either questionable or only recently decided, who tend for all sorts of very understandable reasons to be very, very concerned about giving anybody email access to their lives.

Our own deanery synod met last week. It will not meet again until the very eve of these elections. 15 July 2020 is not now very far off. The Iowa caucuses were not an extraordinarily successful example of apps and electronic voting. Like others, I have particular concerns about the very vagueness of the term, "provide an email address". One of our local Church schools, where I am the chair of governors, has recently gone back from using electronic provision of papers to using paper provision exactly because of problems with exactly which email addresses should be used for what purpose by what people. I hope to encourage you, Synod, to think once again about making all these changes quite so quickly.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth):* I stood to speak without having prepared anything. Notwithstanding the genuine concern expressed by other speakers, and I do understand that, I do not actually think we have any option. It is going to happen, and we, those of us who are considering standing again, rather than our colleagues who are retiring, need to think about how we are going to make this work. It is up to us to go back, to talk to our PCCs, to be there at our APCMs, to encourage people to stand for deanery synods, to go to the deanery synods inasmuch as it is possible to go – I accept that not all synods are meeting in the time – and explain what is happening and ask people to think carefully about remembering to look in their inboxes and vote, to do all that we can to make this work. Colleagues, I would suggest that a lot of it is up to us as well as whatever the new Electoral Reform Society is now called – I cannot remember its name. It is not impossible and we should have a little bit of hope and go out there and make it work because we do not have any other option right now.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* As well as Chair of the Business Committee, I am Chair of the Elections Review Group. I was sitting on the platform six or seven years ago when every speech was in the opposite direction asking why we had not got on with this.

Synod, whilst I do not want to detain you, you do need to be clear that this thing that you want requires these Rules to be passed, and if they are not passed, we will doubtless be here in July trying to make last-minute tweaks to make that which you say you think you want today work. Can I urge you to allow us to get on with business that many of you have been telling me you want to discuss later this morning and get this thing which you have wanted for ten to 15 years done. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order. I propose a motion for closure.

*The Chair:* I am happy to hear Mrs Debrah Mclsaac – the two-minute speech limit remains – after which I will certainly test the mind of Synod, if necessary.

*Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury):* I have a question for you. Is there anything that prevents the returning officer from verifying the email addresses that they have got before the process starts? Can they add on additional safeguards and protections to verify receipt in advance of the formal process starting?

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. I therefore invite Mr Scowen to reply to the debate. Clive, you have up to ten minutes if you really need them.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Well, that was a rather more extensive debate than I confess I had anticipated. It is good to see there is so much interest – for a change. I do not really know what I can say to convince Fr Benfield and others that we are ready. I can tell you that I am convinced and so are the members of the Election Review Group and so are the Church House staff who have been involved in this process for the last few years as we have worked with what is now Civica, as we have worked through not only the Rules but the guidance, and sought to cover every point.

One or two points raised this morning may well find their way into further refinements to the guidance, but we are convinced that we are as ready as we can be and will ever be for this thing that, as Sue Booy said, Synod voted for by a large majority in the last quinquennium. Nobody since then has suggested that they wanted to change their minds until today. I ask that you stick with it, and as Stephen Lynas said, test the water and you will find that it is warmer than you think.

On the question of hustings, they cannot be made mandatory, but the guidance does deal with them and encourages them. It encourages dioceses to have electronic hustings and to think about ways in which candidates can communicate through the diocesan website with voters and interact with them. But it is a matter for dioceses. I have to tell you that in London we have not had hustings for 20 years at least because nobody came. Even in London, where we do not have a problem of huge distances, always more candidates than electors turned up. If we can use electronic means to engage voters, that seems to me to be a great deal better than trying to run physical hustings.

The point about misrepresentation is that people can make false statements in their election addresses. I am sure no one here would ever contemplate that, but it is not unknown. Where that happens, and if somebody were then elected, that would be grounds for an appeal. It does not rely on hustings to have misrepresentations made.

Rhian Parsons asked why change a system that works. Well, yes it does work, but this Synod decided it wanted to change largely to save money, largely to save staff time and

to have a system that made full use of the technology which is now available to us. Yes, of course things can go wrong with technology, but things can go wrong with the post.

Tim Hind expressed a concern about lack of knowledge. The eclipse that he referred to of deanery and General Synod elections actually occurs every 15 years, rather more reliably than that of the sun. It may be worth thinking about whether there is a case for altering things so that does not happen, but we cannot do that today. There is no reason at all why a deanery synod could not meet before the elections this summer and autumn.

The bulk email problem: yes, that could be a problem. We were asked at the end whether the presiding officer could verify the emails. We will think about that and no doubt it will be discussed at the meeting on 2 March. We certainly do want to make this work. Just as emails can get lost, so can the post.

The Bishop of Dover is anxious about the representative nature of Synod, and I completely agree with her. Some will know that I was one of those who thought we could do better in terms of the electorate for the House of Laity, but Synod decided to keep the current system so we have got to do our best with that.

I do not believe that making electronic voting the main way of voting will disenfranchise anybody. Anybody who does not want to provide an email address will continue to be allowed to vote by post. Frankly, those whose residence status is parlous are unlikely to provide any sort of address, let alone an email address, so I do not know how you can help people in that position. It should be noted that these email addresses that are provided for this purpose are not going to be made public and can be disposed of after the election has taken place.

I am grateful to Philip French and Stephen Lynas for their support and particularly for Philip's experience of the work of Civica Election Services – and what a very, very professional and high-quality outfit they are. We were all impressed by them when we had meetings with them as part of this process.

I am grateful to the Bishop in Europe. I do not know how they managed before, but I am glad we are helping them to communicate with Outer Mongolia, which is in the Diocese of Europe – it really is.

Jeremy Sheehy referred to the difficulty of doing things by email. Again, I reiterate that no one has to give an email address and, if they do not, the old system will work for them. "Provide an email address", I have to say, seems to me as clear an expression as you can get, and I do not understand why it is thought to be vague.

Thank you, Synod, for your concerns. We recognise that there is anxiety. There is always anxiety about a new system. Please believe me. We have done all we can to make it work. Things have gone wrong with the old system. If a diocese really is determined to

be incompetent it will be, whatever the system. It is no more likely to happen with this than with anything else. Friends, to borrow – almost – a well-known expression, “Let’s get electronic voting done”.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 507A to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 587**

*The Chair:* Item 507A having been carried, I now call upon David Lamming to move his amendment at Item 587. David, you have up to one minute to do so.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Members of Synod, especially perhaps Jonathan Alderton-Ford, who I see is sitting up in the gallery this morning, may be relieved to know that this is going to be almost the last time I speak in this group of sessions.

*The Chair:* Please give Mr Lamming his minute.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* The amendments that we passed to Standing Orders and to the Church Representation Rules a day or so ago can perhaps be summarised in the Latin phrase *audi alteram partem*, lawyer’s language meaning hear both sides. We have approved that principle in respect of the other two sets of Rules, and this morning we are being asked to approve that principle in relation to the three sets of Election Rules. There is another Latin phrase which perhaps sums it up succinctly, *mutatis mutandis*. With that way of putting it, I formally move Item 587 standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you, David. Item 587 is open for debate. I see no one standing. We put Item 587 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 588 TO 601**

*The Chair:* I now ask Mr Lamming formally to move Items 588 to 601.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I formally move those items inclusive.

*The Chair:* Items 588 to 601 are open to debate. I see no one standing. I put Items 588 to 601 to you.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 507B**

*The Chair:* I now ask Mr Scowen to move Item 507B “That the House of Laity Election Rules 2020 be approved”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Chair, all I want to say to Mr Lamming is *gratias tibi ago*. I so move, Chair.

*The Chair:* I am so glad Synod is moving into the ancient tongue, but I am not going to try and say this in Latin. Item 507B is now open for debate.

*Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield):* Chair, may I just take one moment of Synod’s time to say how grateful I am – and I never thought I would say this – for all the lawyers who are here present and actually take our legislative business as so very important. I say this because I think there are many who feel that legislation is a time either to go and have a cup of tea or leave it to those who understand it. We were actually founded, as a Synod, as a legislative body of the Church of England. I do hope that we, and those who go after us, will take legislation seriously. It is serious. Yesterday we had a lot of legislation, and we have had some more today. It is what is going to make our Church work both here and in our parishes, deaneries and dioceses. Can I personally put on record my thanks to those who do look so carefully at our legislation.

*The Chair:* Latin and gratitude to lawyers. Whatever next? I see no one else standing. I therefore invite Mr Scowen to reply to the debate if he wishes to do so.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I just want to say I agree with Liz. Thank you for that extensive debate. Can we please now approve these Rules?

*The Chair:* I therefore put Item 507B to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* The House of Laity Election Rules 2020 have therefore been approved.

## **ITEM 508**

### **CLERGY ELECTION RULES 2020 (GS 2165)**

#### **ITEM 508A**

*The Chair:* We therefore move on to Item 508, the Clergy Election Rules 2020. I call Mr Scowen to move Item 508A “That the Clergy Election Rules 2020 be considered”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* All I really need to say on these is that these apply, like the Laity Election Rules, *mutatis mutandis*. I hope we have managed to cover all the matters

of concern and debate in the last debate, so I am not anticipating a huge additional extra contribution but, heigh-ho, I could be wrong. Thank you, Chair. I move.

*The Chair:* Item 508A is open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put Item 508A to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 602**

*The Chair:* I now call upon Mr Lamming to move his amendment at Item 602 with up to one minute.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I think I perhaps ought to start by declaring an interest as a lawyer and, with that, to thank Liz for her kind remarks. In particular, in relation to these amendments I would like to repeat the thanks I gave the other day to Chris Packer for all the work that he did on these amendments over the weekend.

Having said that, I simply ask you to acknowledge what I said a few minutes ago in relation to the Laity Rules and regard it as taken as read. I move Item 602.

*The Chair:* Item 602 is open for debate. I see no one standing. I put Item 602 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 603 TO 616**

*The Chair:* I therefore ask Mr Lamming formally to move Items 603 to 616.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Items 603 to 616 are open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put Items 603 to 616 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 508B**

*The Chair:* I therefore call on Mr Scowen to move Item 508B “That the Clergy Election Rules 2020 be approved”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Chair, I move “That the Clergy Election Rules 2020 be approved”.

*The Chair:* Item 508B is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put to you Item 508B.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Item 508B is carried. I therefore declare that the Clergy Election Rules 2020 have been approved.

## **ITEM 509 CONVOCATIONS (ELECTIONS TO UPPER HOUSE) RULES 2020 (GS 2166)**

### **ITEM 509A**

*The Chair:* We move to Item 509, the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020. I call on Mr Scowen to move Item 509A “That the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020 be considered”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Punxsutawney – I mean London. Somebody understood that. Groundhog, yes. Chair, the only thing I want to say about this is that I am afraid these Rules reveal that the bishops are a little ahead of us because for the Upper Houses of the Convocations there was to be no possibility of paper-based voting since we considered it inconceivable that a serving bishop would not have an email address. I will not tell you what the Archbishop just said.

*The Chair:* I will if you ask me later.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Apart from that slight difference, in all other respects these Rules mirror the other two that you have already approved, so I move “That the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020 be considered”.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Clive. Item 509A is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put Item 509A to you.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

### **ITEM 617**

*The Chair:* Item 509A having been carried, I call Mr Lamming to move his amendment at Item 617. The usual one minute.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I think I need to say *mutatis mutandis* only once more, but I will add to the comment that Clive Scowen just made. If you look at the top of page 11 of your Order Paper, you will see the reference in line 2 to notification by email. I did query that and the difference between this Rule and the other sets of Rules, and I was informed that the House of Bishops had actually agreed that they should all use email. So there you have it. They have given us a lead in Synod. I formally move Item 617.

*The Chair:* Thank you, David. Item 617 is open for debate. I see no one standing. I put Item 617 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEMS 618 TO 629**

*The Chair:* I ask Mr Lamming to formally move Items 618 to 629.

*Mr David Lamming (St. Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* For the very last time this Synod, I do so move.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Mr Lamming. Items 618 to 629 are open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put Items 618 to 629 to you.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 509B**

*The Chair:* I now ask Mr Scowen – and this is the last time he will be called – to move Item 509B “That the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020 be approved”.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I hope not the last time ever, but anyhow. In moving this motion I just want to record some thanks: first, to you Synod for your engagement with this process this morning and for a thoughtful debate, which has been helpful, and certainly some of the points made will be considered further as we perfect the final guidance and proceed towards the holding of the elections.

I also want to thank and echo David Lamming’s thanks to Chris Packer who, in addition to working all last weekend on those amendments, has spent a huge amount of his time in drafting and redrafting the Elections Appeals Rules, all of them that we have considered this week, particularly every time the bodies concerned changed their minds and thought of something new we ought to put in, away he had to go and draft more. I think we should record our special thanks to him.

I want to thank again the members of the Elections Review Group who have worked on this tirelessly for most of this quinquennium. Finally, Chair, I want to thank you and those who have advised you for enabling a much more expeditious way of dealing with this this morning than we managed earlier in the week. I hope this sets a model for the future.

Chair, I move “That the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020 be approved”.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Mr Scowen. The Item at 509B is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put to you Item 509B.

*The motion was put and carried by a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Thank you. That item is carried. I declare that the Convocations (Elections to Upper House) Rules 2020 have been approved.

Thank you very much indeed, Synod. That completes this business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden-Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 11.09 am.

## **ITEM 14**

### **SPECIAL AGENDA IV**

### **DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS**

### **THROUGH HIS POVERTY (GS 2149A AND GS 2149B)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 14, a Diocesan Synod Motion from the Diocese of Leeds. For this business members will need GS 2149A and 2149B. Members will find a financial statement on page 8 of the Sixth Notice Paper. We have about 45 minutes or so for this debate and with three proposed amendments members will realise that we are trying to fit this quart of a debate into a synodical pint pot.

In order to allow an opportunity for debate on the main motion, as amended or otherwise, I plan to take the amendments at the outset of the debate and hope we might deal with those swiftly. There will be a three-minute speech limit from the start. As ever, these are merely my observations from the Chair and, of course, the progress of business is in your hands, Synod.

I now call Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons to move the motion at Item 14. She has eight minutes.

*Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds):* Chair, members of Synod, thank you for the opportunity to bring and debate this motion from the Diocese of Leeds, the bit of the diocese that is the Inner Bradford Deanery Synod.

I hope that you have been able to read and reflect on the GS papers. In his background paper William Nye remarks that the motion did not define disadvantaged communities. I guess that was because it came from a deanery synod in Bradford where all parishes experience disadvantage in some way, so for them it is self-evident. Maybe for those of us who work in some of the poorest neighbourhoods, or with particular groups of people who find themselves on the edge of society, whether through homelessness or drugs, broken relationships or misfortune, it is self-evident.

The Secretary General also gave a very helpful historical sweep of the various attempts of the Church of England to respond to the challenge of sharing the Gospel with those living and working in what could be described as working-class areas, who may not have a culture of high literacy and classical music, but, nevertheless are made in the image of God and possess insights into the sacramental and communal that are of great depth. The motion is trying to get us to reflect on the fact that Jesus crossed those boundaries. What can the Church of England learn from him and his ministry in its evangelistic and pastoral tasks? How can we become a Jesus-shaped church?

Our motion is saying that there is often a disconnect between how we see the Church, as something offering loving service, and how people in the poorer areas of Bradford, Leeds and many other places see the Church. There is that disconnect for people in our local communities between what the Church is about and what Jesus was about, and this was identified by the Bradford Deanery Synod as being a key issue that needed urgent attention. Lord, give us the grace to see the Church as others see it, was an underlying concern.

The other day I took a funeral of a 59-year-old man who had lived on the estate where I am vicar all his life. I was talking to his partner and it transpired that they had never been inside the church that is 300 yards from their home. They had no sense that the building or the people who went there had anything to do with them. I am hoping we might be able to continue to build that relationship.

We want to affirm the hopeful New Wine schemes of renewal that have been taking place recently, the things that are bringing fresh capacity for new birth in the Church, and we are aware that money is going to various initiatives. The vigorous debate on estates ministry last year added much to our thinking. However, we want to suggest that more needs to be done to bring about a serious culture change within the Church as a whole.

The supporting paper from the diocese is called "Through His Poverty". We have drawn on a verse from 1 Corinthians 8:9, "For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sake He became poor, so that you through His poverty might become rich". We do so because we suggest that a key question is how a Church in which so many of us are relatively affluent is to identify credibly with the more disadvantaged strands of society, both among our members and beyond our borders.

We suggest that we need to address issues that spring from becoming a church that has too frequently elevated priesthood and diminished prophecy. We suggest that our trickle-down theological model is in contrast to that of Jesus, where the least are exalted, the children are present in the Kingdom of God, the common people hear him gladly, and the theologians of his day are deeply challenged. We believe that the energy for such things is already emerging in the life of the Church, often in lowly places, but there is a need for recognition and reaction that realises the need for wider change.

Such change is not simply to do with giving greater priority to disadvantaged communities. It is about ensuring that the experience of Leslie Hunter, quoted by the Secretary General, is not to be repeated. Bishop Leslie found that even though there were insights and discovery about faith and God from the steelworks, the mainstream church proved impervious to the missionary's message.

We believe the motion has today got wider implications. The lifestyle of Jesus and those who followed him has deep attraction for those who are concerned about the insatiable search for an ever-more luxurious lifestyle and the impact that this has upon planet earth, as we were discussing earlier this week, and upon the poorest peoples of our planet, of whom we are reminded by the presence of our colleagues from different parts of the Communion.

“What is the Spirit saying to the Church?” has to be a key question. We suggest that our request that our motion be responded to with some kind of study needs careful and prayerful response. The concern of Jesus to ensure that his ministry was built on right foundations and that he would be clear about the temptations that could distract or dilute or divert him led him to spend an extraordinary period in the Judaeen Desert that enabled these things to be identified. It was far from an academic exercise. In other words, will there be reflection with and learning from those in disadvantaged communities, about what the Church looks like, about how we together make up the body of Christ which is the Church? Will the wider Church be prepared to listen and act on what it hears?

Thank you to the Business Committee for tabling this motion. I look forward to the debate and urge you to vote in favour of the motion standing in my name.

## **ITEM 64**

*The Chair:* I now invite Revd Dr Jason Roach to speak to both of his amendments at Items 64 and 65, but formally to move only Item 64. Dr Roach, you have four minutes given that you are speaking to both of your amendments.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* Thank you, Diocese of Leeds, for bringing this motion to us. My hope is that we can share stories of much good that is already going on even as we challenge ourselves to do more.

I spoke this morning to a 26-year-old man who has been coming to church on a housing estate every Sunday for a year and to our midweek Bible study, with no background in Christian things and not yet professing. I asked him, “Why do you keep on coming?” He said, “You knocked on my door and said ‘hello’. You helped me to stop getting evicted from my home. I feel like you are my friends, so when my mum says to me I should stay away from the church, I say, ‘no way’.”

Jesus said, “Love your enemies like your Father does, who sends rain on the righteous and the unrighteous”. And many are doing that as we seek to adorn the message of Jesus who became poor to bear our sins so that we might become rich and inherit his righteousness.

The background paper gives a real sense of the development of spirit in which this motion was intended. I fully support it but I think we can substantially improve on it with two changes. The first, amendment 64, is about wording. As worded, this motion communicates something rather different from what was intended. It asks why we as the Church of England are not as good as Jesus at communicating with or attracting the poor. Simple answer Synod: we are not Jesus. Even my long-suffering wife has never said to me, “You, Jason, have the words of eternal life,” or “No one ever spoke like this man”. Since we do not have the ability to heal the sick, cleanse lepers, forgive sins, raise the dead, our ministry will never have the impact or effect of Jesus.

What it intends to communicate though, as we have heard powerfully from Kathryn, is that Jesus clearly had a special interest in drawing in those who were on the margins. I have used the words of Jesus himself in his first sermon in his home town to define the shape of his ministry, namely that he came to bring good news to the poor – poor spiritually but also situationally. My secondary school English grammar teacher would still not be happy, but it moves us in the right direction and clarifies the intent.

On the second issue – this is amendment 65 – it seemed to me worth putting some flesh on the bones as to what any research that we were calling for might look like. I want to be very clear that I have done this in such a way so as not to limit any research, and so it starts with the words “such as”. It does not limit the scope of any research but suggests, I feel, some helpful directions.

There are three key areas, I think. First, how we select and train clergy. We need new pipelines into ministry, not just pipelines that ease people into pre-existing TEI set-ups that make no accommodation for their culture, but considering new forms of selection, training and deployment that take into account people’s socioeconomic diversity. There are places that are pioneering this. The most effective people for reaching communities are people from that community. We want to make that possible.

Secondly, we want to recognise that there will be resource implications. We heard last year from the Bishop of Burnley, who raised this so well in our debate on estates ministry,

that if we are serious there will be implications. And of course, as the background paper says, it makes sense to take SDF funding initiatives into account.

Thirdly, the final little change is to recognise that there is lots good already going on across this nation. And in looking at how we can do things better, we do not want to miss the opportunity to celebrate and hear the stories of those who are already doing fantastic and innovative work.

Am I moving these amendments? I am moving just 64. I beg to move amendment 64 standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Dr Roach. Canon Fitzsimons, as the mover of the main motion, to comment on the amendment.

*Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds):* I had been minded not to accept Jason's amendment, but I discussed it with him. And I would like to accept this motion in order that we can have a really good debate on what is happening and not get tied up in process.

*The Chair:* Canon Fitzsimons has indicated that she supports the amendment and so debate can continue on Item 64.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I am a member of Archbishops' Council. I am grateful that the two amendments have been accepted because I seconded them.

For Christmas I bought myself this book, David Sheppard, *Batting for the Poor*, and I absolutely loved reading it because it brought back to me the fact that we have in David Sheppard a man who spent his entire public ministry from Islington pre-gentrification, through Canning Town, through Peckham, where he was Bishop of Woolwich, and to Liverpool, batting for the poor. In fact, he had a half century of public ministry. It was David Sheppard who helped to found the Evangelical Urban Training Project to bring evangelicals into this world and to tell the stories which Jason is calling for in point 3. It is now called Unlock. It is still going and it is doing great work.

It was David Sheppard who inspired the former vicar of my parish Ted Roberts to go with an ordained local ministry scheme which started in Bethnal Green where I worked, went through Bermondsey where I live, into Southwark Diocese where I am now lay Chair. It was David Sheppard who was the driving force in the *Faith in the City* Report, which I think is the best thing the Church of England did in the second half of the last century.

We are calling for studies and research but, please Synod, let us not forget the lessons of the past and the amazing example of Bishop David Sheppard. I commend the amendment, the motion and I also plug his book.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I am sorry, Synod, you are hearing from me again, but I think what I hope to say needs to be said in this debate. The motion points out that we are not as effective as Jesus – and of course we are not Jesus – but I think we can learn from what Jesus did in terms of how we might become more effective.

It is worth reflecting on what the Gospels show us. Before he did anything in his ministry he was baptised in the Holy Spirit. He triumphed over temptation in the wilderness. He returned to Judea full of the Holy Spirit, and he proclaimed, “The kingdom of God is at hand. Repent and believe the good news”. He did not just proclaim that. He demonstrated the inbreaking kingdom of God. He cast out unclean spirits. He healed all kinds of sickness and disease in everyone who came to him for healing. On occasion he even raised the dead. And then he said, “Anyone who believes in me will do what I have been doing and even greater things”. After Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit was poured out, the infant Church proclaimed the same message that Jesus had proclaimed, and it did same things that Jesus had begun to do, and they turned the world upside down.

I do not want to diminish all the important sociological considerations and all the particular detail, and I am sorry slightly to disagree with my friend Jason Roach. No, we are not Jesus, but Jesus has promised that we will do the things that he did if we will trust him, if we rely on the power of his Spirit. That seems to me to be a vital consideration when we think about why we are not impacting the disadvantaged, the poor and the marginalised in the way that Jesus did. It was the words that he spoke and his ability through the power of the Spirit to meet crying needs for deliverance, for healing, for wholeness that caused the common people to hear him gladly as the Scripture records. Yes, he did have the words of eternal life. Yes, no one spoke like him. Yet he gives us the power also to speak words of eternal life in accordance with what he has revealed in Scripture and in accordance with the power within us.

Synod, if we are serious about reaching our nation – our whole nation – for Christ, re-evangelising England, then we will give attention to these things: the power of the Spirit and his ability to do in us far more than all we can ask or imagine.

*Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester):* I merely wish to remind you that the poor are present not simply in urban communities but also in rural communities. I am sure you are conscious of that, but coming from a largely rural diocese, we are hugely conscious that the poor are present everywhere. Someone will no doubt remind me that the Church spends a disproportionate amount of its income on supporting rural ministry but, with great respect to you, we do it largely to support ministry to people who too often look like me or the female version of me, that is, approaching, or at septuagenarianism, largely

middle class, not desperately needy, at least materially. We are ineffective in reaching the rural poor.

I hope that this motion will be universally supported and that its reach will not simply be into urban communities but into rural communities as well, and that we will think imaginatively how to do that.

In our village, we stand outside the village shop and offer to pray for people as they go in and out because it is the poor people who access the village shop because lots of them do not have transport to get anywhere else. We need to think and act imaginatively and boldly and, with due respect to Dr Roach, I agree with Clive Scowen, that if we imagine that we cannot do what Jesus did in reaching the poor and the marginalised, then we will not do it. Let us be bold, think imaginatively, redistribute our resources in an effective way, and be sure that we do not forget the marginalised and poor wherever they might be.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so I put the amendment at Item 64 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 65**

*The Chair:* I invite Dr Roach formally to move his amendment at Item 65.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I do so move.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Canon Fitzsimons to comment.

*Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds):* We are happy to accept this clarification of what the report would be about.

*The Chair:* This amendment has support and so the debate can continue now on Item 65. Canon Wharton.

*Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool):* The greatest passion of my life is Jesus. The thing which I am most passionate about doing is sharing Jesus's love with people in the most deprived urban communities in our country. I have spent the past 15 years leading churches in Liverpool and five years in Leeds before ordination. There is no way, therefore, that I could do anything other than support this motion from the Diocese of Leeds. However, when I first read it, I felt that it did not quite say all that it might, and that there was more that could be said which would be of value, which would bring to us an appropriate challenge and encouragement as we seek to consider our engagement with our most disadvantaged communities.

That is why I am delighted to support Jason's excellent amendment because I think it takes us further in the right direction. It helpfully reminds us that fundamentally the Gospel is good news for the poor. If the Gospel does not work in our most deprived urban communities and among the poorest people, if it cannot be good news there, then where can it be? And so, as I enthusiastically support an amended version of this important motion, just a word on each of the three points within this amendment.

We simply must do better at selecting and training people from our most disadvantaged communities. We cannot, surely, imagine that the people from those places are less intelligent than others, that they have less capacity, that they are less loved, gifted, called, chosen, that they have less to offer to the wider Church, that they are less able to lead. And if we do not believe those things, then why is that our leadership, lay and ordained, does not fully reflect the variety of all of our communities? We must make it a priority to seek to change this.

I am a trustee of St Mellitus College where a pilot project is underway to begin to imagine this process differently, but more must be done across the whole Church. It is also true, I think, that we must provide more resources for our most disadvantaged communities. I recognise, of course, that every single community, every ministry, every group can argue that they need more resources, and they are not infinite. It is complex, I understand that, but I would ask that we do not forget these communities. They are so often forgotten by government, by politicians, by councils, but never forgotten by Jesus.

Finally, it is true that we must share good news stories because there are so many. Currently, we are planning full immersion baptisms for some people who recently came to faith at Alpha. There is so much good news as churches make a difference in their communities, as lives are transformed, as God is at work. I would urge Synod to vote for this amendment, and then I hope for the amended motion and to state clearly our absolute commitment to ongoing mission and ministry in the most disadvantaged communities in our country.

*Revd Canon Chris Tebbutt (Salisbury):* There is clearly a concern about where the resources are coming from for investing in this initiative, and I would like to make a point about releasing of resources through clergy housing. Back in the year 2000 I moved to the largest vicarage in my diocese. It was built in 1820, had seven bedrooms, two staircases and a cellar. It was surrounded by a large estate of three-storey 1960s housing association flats, and, being in the third most depressed ward in the diocese, we stuck out like sore thumb in our manor house. Back then, with a family of five, it cost me, I think, £2,000 per annum for heat and light. In view of our new 2030 net zero carbon target, I hate to think what the diocese will do with this house, now inhabited by the Archdeacon.

After much discussion, where our PCC suggested pulling it down and building social housing and a new eco vicarage, we were rehoused a mile up the road, and with regret.

There was clearly a diocesan attachment to our spooky manor. But then I suddenly had neighbours who would speak to me. My heating bill more than halved. It enabled me to build proper relationships with the community. It provided an economic and secure home for my family, and it improved my ability to focus on my ministry rather than spending half the week trying to maintain a wild, nearly half an acre wilderness garden and a plumbing and heating system that seemed to be continuously breaking down.

My point is that clergy housing is a hugely important factor in terms of mission and evangelism. Inappropriate housing sends out totally the wrong message and tone to the community. It affects the wellbeing of clergy and their families, and it can release significant resources for use by the diocese. Let us ensure that our clergy housing is appropriate to the community and parishes in which our ministers serve so that it does not form a barrier to sharing the good news of Jesus Christ with all, disadvantaged or not.

*The Chair:* Bishop of Dover, and then I shall test the mind of Synod on a motion of closure on this item.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Dr Rose Hudson-Wilkin):* I would like to support this motion and the amendment, in particular. I am always intrigued when we talk about mission that we begin to get bogged down by resources. We are the greatest resource in terms of the people of God, and actually we are also the greatest turn off to those who are poor and disadvantaged.

What I mean by that is those who are poor or disadvantaged, they are not wanting to come to a church or to join something that people are not excited about, and frankly we are not excited about the Gospel. And if we are not excited about the Gospel, how do we expect others to catch it and want to be a part of it? And so I would just put out a huge plea to say let us not get bogged down as to where we are going to find the resources to do this. Let us become those resources. Let us get out of our comfort zones where we gather under our labels and spend an enormous amount of time just talking shop. Let us start living what it means to be the people of God. Let our changed lives begin to change the lives of others around us.

*The Chair:* Under Standing Order 31 I put a motion for closure to the Synod on Item 65.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I put Item 65 to the vote.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

## **ITEM 66**

*The Chair:* I now invite the Reverend Catherine Pickford to speak to and move her amendment at Item 66.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle):* I speak as a trustee of the Church Urban Fund. Thank you to Kathryn and the Diocese of Leeds for this important motion, which draws our attention to the emphasis of Jesus's ministry on the disadvantaged in our society and the commission that we share to bring good news to the poor, release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind.

Thank you also for highlighting the need for research and study to help us understand how we can become a Church which attracts and serves those in our communities who suffer from disadvantage of all kinds. I think that my amendment strengthens and sharpens the motion in three ways.

First, it draws our attention to relevant work which is already being undertaken. The GRA:CE project is a major piece of research commissioned by the Church Urban Fund, the Church of England and the think tank Theos. It is a three-year project, whose conclusions will be launched this November, exploring the links between social action, discipleship and church growth through interviews, observations and case studies from across the country in rural and urban areas, as Martyn has highlighted. The research is exploring what the Church is currently doing in terms of social action and discipleship, what that means in terms of church growth, and how we can build on that, to encourage churches in their work in social action in the future.

Because of its terms of reference, the GRA:CE project has concentrated on those suffering from a wide range of forms of disadvantage, from socioeconomic deprivation to isolation and loneliness, especially in rural areas. Interim reports suggest that the findings of the project will be encouraging and valuable and will provide a firm and current basis for the study that this motion proposes.

Secondly, expressed aims of the GRA:CE project help to sharpen the aims of the motion by exploring the connection between social action, discipleship and church growth. The GRA:CE Project names and explores the connections which are not always easily identified or understood between the work we do for the most disadvantaged in our wider communities and the number of people coming to faith in Jesus.

Third, this amendment places the motion in the context of the ongoing work of research and study, which needs to underpin our strategic planning. It draws the attention of the Archbishops' Council to the work already been undertaken and asks them to continue to explore the consequences of the way in which we spend our resources and energy as a Church, so we develop ways to intentionally prioritise those who are disadvantaged in society, as Jesus did. I beg to move the amendment 66 standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Canon Fitzsimons to respond.

*Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds):* Thank you, Catherine, for drawing our attention to this particular piece of work. We understand this amendment as really strengthening our motion.

*The Chair:* Canon Fitzsimons has indicated that she supports the amendment at Item 66, so the debate can proceed.

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester):* On coming to Synod, initially we were discussing the needs of the homeless. I worked then in Salford. Having worked in Salford 18 years, I am very interested in the homeless and have spent long times with poor people in the inner urban area. And at that time I remember thinking if we followed through on what we were voting for, which was to devote more resources to the care of people that I was working with, we would need to reintroduce the modern equivalent of the poor workhouses of the past.

We do not realise that the state is not actually out there to help us to do the caring. And we have reached people, I remember Daniel, a young, homeless man whom we brought to baptism and worked well with for over 10 years. What he needed was somewhere to live. And though all our efforts took us to the Mayor and back, there was nowhere suitable for him to live. He is still homeless. If we keep on deciding to allocate more resources, we are going to have to become politically much more aware of how to do that because you cannot bring people to faith in the Lord Jesus when they are cold and hungry and poor.

Honestly, I was going to vote against that last amendment for the reason that it constantly said again: more, more. This amendment is sensible in my opinion. It builds on what is already being done in social care work, and I really hope we can support this one, at least to take attention towards that element of this particular motion.

*Revd Brunel James (Leeds):* I have been ordained for 21 years and spent the majority of that time working in the poorer parts of West Yorkshire. This motion asks a straightforward question, which the Church needs to have constantly in mind. So, without pre-empting the ongoing study that this debate calls for, I just want to give a straightforward answer to a straightforward question from my own experience.

I think the main reason very few people come to church in the areas where I have served is simply that they are so overstretched in their lives. They are just focused on getting by, surviving, doing their work and then recovering, and then going out the next day and doing it again. They get their kids to school, they make sure they are fed and have clean clothes, and then they get up again the next day and have it all to do again.

So, so many people do not have the time and the energy to engage with what the Church has to offer, to become part of our common life. But, thank God, some, despite all the pressures, do find time and energy to give their focus to the Church's ministry. I think that is the reality, but what are the implications for our thinking and our planning?

Well, the one thing we have to do is have a realistic expectation of what success looks like in poor areas. Growth is possible, investment pays off, but we have to be clear that the more spectacular results we sometimes see in better-off communities where people have more time and more energy to devote to the Church is going to rarer in poorer areas. Our society sociologically acts like a centrifuge. It is constantly spinning out and concentrating wealthier folk into certain areas and the poor into other areas. If you go on the Church Urban Fund website and look at their parish searching tool, you can see exactly how the statistics break down.

As a Church, we have got to constantly be redistributing resources in the opposite direction. We have got to work against the social current. And we must, must, must keep advocating for social justice. Why should poorer people be struggling just to get by? Why is the minimum wage not a living wage? Why should ordinary people be so hard pressed, stressed and exhausted, have so little time and energy for the rich social and spiritual life that our parishes do offer?

I just want to conclude with a positive story about how ministry does work effectively in poor areas despite the fact that people just do not have the time and energy to be part of Sunday church week by week. One of my churches has space in it for 600 people, but only 30 present on a normal Sunday. But four times a year, Harvest, Christmas and Easter, we do a joint service with our local primary school, and the church fills up with children, staff, parents and grandparents, and we do have a brilliant act of worship that expresses the Christian identity that still is there despite everything.

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Leeds, after which I shall put a motion of closure, if needed.

*The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines):* I will be very brief. This Synod repeatedly asks or commits money for research or for projects, and I constantly find myself asking but what are you going to drop? In my early days on Synod a couple of decades ago, everything we did seemed to have a final clause that said "and commit to the colleges and courses for inclusion in the curriculum", and I regularly used to get up and say, "So what is going to go if you are going to do this?"

This is why I am so grateful for Catherine Pickford's amendment because we do not need to duplicate the research. And it seems to me that what the motion is asking for is already being delivered in the GRA:CE project, among others, and therefore we ought to concentrate on getting the best out of that rather than trying to duplicate it for our own sakes.

*The Chair:* I would like to test the mind of Synod with a motion for closure on Item 66.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* We move to a vote on the amendment at Item 66.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* So, our debate now moves to the main motion, Item 14, as amended by Items 64, 65 and 66.

*Revd Canon Ruth Newton (Leeds):* I am speaking in support of the motion. As a Church, we have had to face up to a number of difficult truths, and there has been, and dare I say, there is something wrong with the culture of the Church because it alienates the very people that the Church is called to stand alongside, be they young people, BAME people, victims of abuse, poorer people, and I would add those with this disabilities, who are disproportionately affected by poverty.

in 2016, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation discovered that half of those living in poverty lived in a household with a disabled person. Disabled people are frequently prevented from accessing our worship and our buildings due to the fact that so often heritage trumps accessibility. I hope that as we work out how to make our buildings more environmentally friendly, we can also use it as an opportunity to make them more accessible.

At this Synod, we have learned how uncomfortable we are with difference, how we other people, how our welcome only extends as far as people who are prepared to become like us, and how often we fail to check our privilege. Far too often, we are patronising, we think that we know best, and we fail to listen properly. But on Tuesday we heard the Pastoral Principles restated. It seems that although they arose from the context of our discussions about sexuality, they have a far wider pertinence across many of the debates that this group of sessions has had, including this one.

History has shown that words, studies and reports do not always make the difference hoped for, but without them we are speaking and acting from ignorance. Inaction is not an option and we do seem to have a will for culture change. Dare I suggest that in the Pastoral Principles we already have at least one tool to enable us. As we seek to engage with all of our most disadvantaged communities, and maybe even in all our encounters, can I encourage you to take the Pastoral Principles seriously.

*Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together):* I have got a number of points and I will try to be brief. Listening to the debate so far there is a few things that have struck me, particularly this word “disadvantaged”. I think that wording is interesting and I already see some nods around the C hamber. It is interesting to think who we classify as

disadvantaged. Could deaf people be involved? People with other disabilities, BAME people? So that is one thing I would just like us to consider as part of this debate.

Secondly, Dr Jason Roach, in his amendment, which I fully support, mentioned a number of points which I would just like to bring again to Synod. Who is in our research, who is representative in our research and who we deliver that to is important. We have talked a lot this week about people representing others and who it is that as a Synod we represent. And I think that category of representation is important in how we consider this motion, too.

The other thing is what has just been mentioned about speaking about those who are poor, and those who are deaf and who have other disabilities, for example, who are blind. But I particularly want to speak to those who are deaf, who are much more likely to be on benefits that have been cut recently. That means that their income is reduced, and that also means that in our employment – maybe deaf people have access to employment but – achieving employment at a higher level is much more difficult, so that again affects their disadvantage and their quality of life.

Also we need to think that whoever is conducting this research needs to be aware of the barriers, barriers to employment, all sorts of barriers to achievement and barriers to education. The learning is not always enough. Some deaf people, for example, in our communities are in poverty – not just a certain amount of people – but it could be that it is poverty on top of being deaf, and so those people who are deaf in our communities are struggling because of that poverty.

Please, when we go ahead with all of this research, I want to urge us to keep in mind the right people being involved in that research in order for those studies to be representative. I also support what has just been said by the Bishop and others, that we have research out there already. Let us look at what is out there and use that as we go forward. Let us not spend more resources on doing things again. Let us look at what is there. That is important. We also need to make sure this research gives us the true facts. Thank you very much.

*Mr Keith Lesley (Salisbury):* When reading the supporting papers to this motion, the phrase, “Jesus’s remarkable capacity to care, relate and communicate with people in communities” stood out for me. I do not have the time to talk to all in such a powerful statement, so I shall limit myself to “communicate”.

We all know the phrase, “In thought, words and deeds”. It is how we communicate. Words matter for, if we are being honest, they reflect our thoughts. They guide our actions and with these actions we build our culture. Let us try several words that we have used extensively over the past few days. When it was recommended to me that I might stand for Synod, I was not sure what was meant and I had been an Anglican for decades. Surely, we mean the Church of England Central Conference? How about quinquennium?

Now there is one to roll your tongue around. Surely, we mean a five-year term? What about covenant? Hardly an everyday term, is it? I will not go on to theological and prophetic.

In our first speech at this conference we majored on shepherds, the good ones. How many of the 3.5 million people living on council, sorry, social housing, estates, know what shepherd is all about? Unless they have been to a city centre farm, it is likely that some have even seen a sheep. If they are lucky, shepherds are what mum puts in pies. I know, I know, this is here and, well, estates, well, that is where they live and we talk differently to them, do we not. But do we? I know there are honourable exceptions to this and I fully acknowledge them and have been listening to you.

Words are how we are reported and the 3.5 million people, if they happen across them, and they have not got a clue what we are talking about, their indifference towards us grows and they will not come to God. Poverty can often be equated to a lack of education, but that does not mean they are thick or of low intelligence.

I am a street pastor of ten years experience and many are the times they come up and thank us for being on their patch. We help them in their needs, "You are always here for us", and the one that I listen out for, "You're the God people, aren't you?" That is our aim. If we are going to do anything in this area, we have to be consistent and we have to plan for longevity. We have to be around and around and around. We have to be there, listening and acting for them to try and reach those latent saints.

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Burnley and then I shall test the mind of the Synod on a motion for closure.

*The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North):* Philippians 2:6, Christ Jesus did not regard equality with God as something to be grasped but emptied himself. Jesus joyfully lets go of power in order to empower us, and thereby he sets a pattern for the Christian life. It is always good when Synod considers this kind of motion, but in some ways I wish we did not. It is very easy to vote for it, but do we understand, are we willing to take the consequences because to be a Church of the poor means the joyful relinquishing of power.

It will mean, like Christ, us setting power aside so that others might be empowered. It means every person here making genuine sacrifice. Because being a Church of the poor is what this motion implies; not just getting our message across a bit better; not just a few patronising nods in the direction of the socially excluded; not just hoping a few drops of living water will trickle down from well-resourced churches.

No. To achieve what it asks for requires a revolution in our common life. It means doing what Jesus did, placing at the heart of the community the bound woman, the blind man, the poor widow, the child, and letting them sing, letting them show us the way of faith.

But are we really ready to let go of power in order to empower others? Are we ready for the sacrifices that a Church of the poor will entail? It will mean placing our best leaders in our urban communities. It will mean redeploying resource from richer areas to poorer; reversing, for example, the deployment trend which means that Oxford now has four times more stipendiary clergy than Blackpool, because that is the wrong way round.

It will mean well-endowed dioceses modelling Gospel generosity and reversing that profound injustice in our common life. It will mean stopping those processes whereby 40% of church building closures are in the 10% most deprived communities. It will mean returning to the estates we have abandoned. It will mean daring to take risks with leaders whose backgrounds and life experiences differ from our own. It will mean a changed evangelistic approach, relinquishing our lazy presumption that we know the good news and those people over there do not and so going into areas of depravation as beggars seeking bread, finding in company the Christ who is present in the hungry and forgotten.

Maybe it will mean more. Maybe we are now genuinely being called to be a Church of the poor, to give up the grandeur and trappings we are so used to, buildings like this, gatherings like this, big houses, inherited wealth, everything maybe except Jesus. Maybe the call of the Church in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is to sit in the dust, who knows, but that is what this motion calls us to consider.

We have seen again and again this week how distasteful a powerful Church has become, the Church that excluded the Windrush generation; that unvoices the abused; that prices the poor out of the ministry of the Church. The invitation behind this motion is to be Church differently, to give it away, to be Church of the poor and for the poor. Church for the rich is for the rich only. A Church for the poor will be Church for everybody. A vote is one thing. A changed life is another.

*The Chair:* Under Standing Order 31, I put the motion for closure on Item 14.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I invite Canon Fitzsimons to respond to the debate. She has very kindly indicated that she will try and do so in two minutes.

*Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Leeds):* I am really grateful for all the contributions to this debate and for what has been heard, hopefully by us in the Chamber but also throughout the different departments, areas and dioceses of the Church of England. But what I actually want is not just words, that the research is not just words, but that the culture of the Church can actually be changed by both listening to the voices of those on the edge and then acting on what we hear. Bishop Philip's words are really important. That will mean change for everyone. Please vote for this motion in knowledge of what you are doing.

*The Chair.* Thank you, Canon Fitzsimons, admirably succinct. I put now Item 14, as amended by Items 64, 65 and 66, to the vote.

The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

*The Chair.* I am sorry that it was not possible to call the very many people who had indicated a wish to speak in this debate. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 12.09 pm.

**ITEM 15**  
**SPECIAL AGENDA III**  
**PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS**  
**LEGAL AID REFORM (GS 2163A and GS 2163B)**

*The Chair.* Synod, we come now to Item 15 on the agenda. This is the Private Member's Motion on Legal Aid Reform standing in the name of Mr Carl Fender. Synod members will want to refer to GS 2163A and 2163B. Time is, unfortunately, short for this debate and so I will give notice now that, after the mover of the motion has spoken, the speech limit will be three minutes. I now invite Mr Fender to speak to the motion standing in his name. You have up to ten minutes.

*Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln):* Synod, a small declaration of interest: I do legal aid work in some of the areas affected by LASPO and I would probably do more if it were not for the legislation. Our faith speaks generously about the rule of law. It has deep roots within Scripture. It has particular values of equality before the law, unhindered access, representation and fair judges. It is the obligation of Government to deliver all of these, and democratic governments strive to do so through their own laws, but the principles are also enshrined in international conventions.

The importance of access to justice cannot be underestimated. Access to justice is fundamental to the rule of law because, without it, the rule of law can be nothing more than a concept, an ideal. If access to justice is absent, legal rights cannot be exercised, and legal obligations cannot be enforced, nor can public or private bodies be challenged through the courts or individuals brought to account. Access to justice is essential to a humane, just and civilised society. It should be a priority for the Church.

Three short examples of stories given to Amnesty International: first, a mother facing legal proceedings regarding her child, unclear about her options, feeling intimidated by an alien process, anxious and concerned with the consequential risk that her child's voice and interests may not be heard clearly; second, a man from an African country with refugee status in the UK, trying to secure reunification with his wife, children and a niece by bringing them here to the UK but struggling to navigate a complex legal process; third, a man facing eviction, but ineligible for legal aid at a much earlier stage and where earlier

intervention could have avoided the stress and anxiety and the risk of being made homeless.

These are just a few representative examples of many situations being encountered across the country and why seeking a retrieval of legal aid provision should be an imperative for us. GS 2163A sets out in some detail the legal aid provision of the regimes before and after LASPO. Large groups of formerly eligible people now find themselves in a permanent eclipse: most parents of children, workers, those in receipt of benefits and those with immigration problems.

The parameters of its spotlight are greatly diminished. Those affected by benefits changes face the double whammy of no legal aid to challenge the Benefits Agency. Those most in need also face additional challenges: disability, literacy or numeracy problems, language barriers. The emotional toll will be obvious.

I could have liberally sprinkled this speech with many a quote from Scripture, but the only one I would ask us to reflect on is from a recent sermon I heard based on Mark 6. To recap: after John the Baptist's death, Jesus went by boat to a quiet place across the lake. The crowds followed him. It was Jesus's dialogue with his disciples in verse 36, before he fed the 5,000, that is an important lesson for us here. It was the disciples' advice to Jesus to send the crowds away to the towns and villages to buy food for themselves, but Christ had compassion on the crowds because they mattered.

People matter. People mattered when the 1949 Act was passed. Recall the words I cite in GS 2163A. The White Paper preceding that legislation said the aim was to "provide legal advice for those of slender means and resources so that no one would be financially unable to prosecute a just and reasonable claim or defend a legal right". True, the Government made savings through LASPO, but once we reach the post-austerity era – if we have not already – we may or perhaps will not see the money come back.

The passage of time allows changes caused by austerity to become the new norm. That should be a concern for us. Lingering beneath the LASPO regime is a theory of self-interest that, increasingly, makes the individual, in whatever circumstances they find themselves, the economic determiner at the beginning and end of any legal redress.

A consequence of that is to convert public concern about legal support to one of private endeavour. It engineers a gradual change over time, turning away from those less deserving than ourselves, turning away from reality, and from the question of who or what we really are today as a people, the values we share and the nation we want to be in the future. We should avoid the mindset adopted by the disciples in this matter.

I have written about an emerging two-tier system, and we should take steps by passing this motion to call for a reversal of that trend. A system which increasingly places a value on private resources risks seeing the consolidation of that inequality. In my paper, I have

set out in some detail the current state of legal aid restrictions on those groups in our communities affected by them.

The reports cited in the motion were inspired by the first signs of when the effects of LASPO started to be seen. There has been research since then by the Equality and Human Rights Commission and the UN in 2018. Very helpfully, our Secretary General identified other areas of research done during 2019 in his own background paper. The debate will continue to move, and many groups await the next response of Government at the end of this year perhaps. But it is my view that any changes will only nibble at the edges.

A more recent softening of the means testing regime is favourable to those in scope only. One needs to be cautious about savings statistics as well. Are the savings referable only to what I am talking about, or do they relate to court closures or criminal legal aid, matters which I am not addressing here?

In the concluding paragraphs of my paper, I spoke about that upside-down world of inequity. I hope my address and the contents of my paper have persuaded you to support this motion. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Item 15 is open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Fiona Gibson (St Albans):* I wish to draw Synod's attention to one very specific aspect of the current legal aid arrangements which has a direct link with the incredibly important debate we had yesterday addressing our need as a Church to take concrete action and do whatever we need to do in order to support the survivors and victims of clerical sexual abuse. We know that, as well as the victims and survivors of clerical abuse here with us in this Chamber, we are also in the presence of victims and survivors of abuse perpetrated by those in other organisations.

The legal aid system, as it stands at present, has a direct impact on all of those survivors and victims. Legal aid is still available for abuse survivors and victims, but the means threshold is so low that so few clients are unlikely to qualify. There are some firms who do still have franchises; however, they are few and far between.

One solicitor I know well, who is an expert in this field and lost their legal aid franchise some years ago, can think of fewer than five solicitors' firms nationwide who still have legal aid franchises. Survivors or victims must, therefore, rely on solicitors who are willing to take their cases on a no-win no-fee basis. If they are successful, the client pays a success fee, which is capped at 25% of their damages. Without legal aid provision, solicitors therefore have to take some risks, screening enquiries and having to ultimately

decide not to take on some cases, something they find very hard but know far worse it is infinitely more dreadful for the survivor or victim as they are denied access to justice.

Overall, under the current system, survivors and victims are worse off than they were before because they are not easily able to access a legal aid solicitor as there are so few left. They may not even qualify for legal aid because they earn too much or own a house, and as no-win no-fee agreements are the only viable alternative these days, they never end up with 100% of their damages because of the success fee deduction. On legal aid, the client usually ended up with 100% of their compensation.

To me, this is another clear example of an unfair two-tier system. Just as we showed yesterday that we rightly wish to end the deep wrong of funeral poverty, surely we also wish to end the deep wrong of justice poverty. I urge Synod to support this motion.

*Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* It has now become practically impossible for a litigant to obtain legal aid in what are termed private family law cases, that is, cases simply between the couple concerned and their children rather than involving an application by a local authority in care proceedings. Yet private family law applications exceed public ones by a factor of more than three to one, 49,250 to 15,800 using December 2019 figures.

Almost one third of separating couples turn to the family court to resolve issues regarding their children. Yet for most of these, unless significant domestic violence has occurred, there is no legal aid available. The results can be seen in family and housing cases throughout the country. Cases which ought to have been brought are not brought. Cases which have been brought lack the benefit of legal screening and legal presentation. Hearings take longer, and the risk of erroneous adjudication increases.

In 2018, the retiring President of the Family Division was reported as saying: “Anyone who thinks we currently have a network of courts which enables proper access to justice is deluding themselves”. We all know there is a problem, but why is nothing done about it? There are, I suggest, two reasons. First, the alleged need to keep reducing public expenditure along with erroneous comparisons with expenditure in other countries with entirely different judicial systems and snide comments about lawyers getting rich on legal aid when no solicitor with an eye to his or her pocket would dream of handling legal aid cases. Funding for legal aid is one of the many victims of ill-judged austerity.

The second reason perhaps is lack of continuity in public office of cabinet ministers with oversight over legal aid. Just consider the number of Lord Chancellors we have had in the last seven years: Grayling, Gove, Truss, Liddington, Gauke and now Buckland, almost one Lord Chancellor a year. Now some of them were able individuals – I use the word “some” deliberately – who did begin to understand the problems, not merely of legal aid but also of our prison and probation services, but none with time to bring about significant improvements. I support this motion.

*Mrs Carolyn Johnson (Blackburn):* I am very grateful to the previous speaker for the points he made about private law cases because that will shorten what I have to say considerably. I am a family law barrister who does all legal aid work. Just to make it clear that all the care work that I do – which is when children who are at risk of suffering significant harm are taken into court by the local authority – is legally funded, as are all the experts that are required in many of those cases which involve non-accidental injury, sexual abuse, child abuse, all kinds of torrid evidence. That is properly legally aided. It is, as Mr George explained, the private law.

What I wish to support is the third paragraph of the motion, which is calling on Her Majesty's Government to respond positively to these reports and explore ways of alleviating the impact. I do not believe that children should be brought into these proceedings whereby their parents are using them as weapons in the court process. What I would ask the Synod to support is funding legal aid for solicitors to give that initial advice and help before applications are made. That would not only decrease a huge amount of court time, but it would also decrease the emotional aspect.

What we do in Blackburn, and what I urge other churches to do and other dioceses, are run what we call Separated Parents Information Programmes. At the moment, those are funded through the Courts Service but only when applications are made. The way to ensure that parents get this advice would be for those courses to be made mandatory and funded. These courses are funded by the Courts Service. They could fund the churches. They could bid to do these courses and thereby see the parents separately, not as in mediation, and explain to them and ask them if they really want a judge to make the decisions about their children.

I support this motion, but I would ask all churches and all dioceses to look at providing those sorts of courses which are properly funded. We would not need any further resources at all.

*The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson):* Six years ago this month, a gifted young boy called Zane Gbangbola died from gas poisoning during a serious flooding incident in Chertsey, Surrey. Teams had been sent to the area from Hazmat, the specialist fire brigade units dealing with hazardous materials, and from Porton Down and readings were taken which showed there were levels of hydrogen cyanide present in the house, a highly toxic gas used during the Holocaust, which had been washed down from a flooded landfill site nearby.

The local authority, who initially denied the existence of the site, contended that Zane had died not from the hydrogen cyanide but, rather, from carbon monoxide poisoning emanating from a faulty petrol pump discharging floodwaters from their basement, so leaving Zane's parents not only grief-stricken but also feeling that the blame was somehow being shifted onto them for their son's death.

Yesterday morning, I attended an event in the House of Lords commemorating Zane's life at which his parents spoke passionately about the need for an independent panel inquiry, a cause for which they have gained the support of 50 MPs in an Early Day Motion and 104,000 signatories to their "Truth about Zane" petition.

The biggest issue here in relation to this debate is not the question of which gas poisoned Zane and, incidentally, permanently confined his father to a wheelchair. It is rather what Andy Burnham described at yesterday's event as the scandalous lack of parity at inquests when local authorities are involved, grieving parents having to borrow and beg for legal representation, literally rattling tins on the streets as Kye and Nicole, Zane's parents, have done, or raising money through crowdfunding, while the authorities are paying through the nose very often for top-quality QCs. In the end, money talks. And it is only the extraordinary tenacity of Zane's parents metaphorically banging on the door of the unjust judge in Jesus's parable that has got them thus far. Even now that is not nearly far enough as the original verdict remains uninvestigated and unchallenged. Present at yesterday's event were also representatives of the Hillsborough families and of the Birmingham 21, who have equally been refused legal aid over the years, a terrible indictment of a system which in situations such as these gives no justice for ordinary people.

Zane's case, and that of others in similar circumstances, is indirectly covered in today's helpful paper from Mr Fender, and I want to add to his mention of Frank Field's Private Member's Bill the so-called Public Accountability Bill introduced by Andy Burnham before taking up his role as Mayor of Greater Manchester, a piece of legislation which sought to deal with the inequities of legal funding surrounding inquests such as Zane's.

I wholeheartedly support this motion and would encourage us all to do so and encourage my friends in the House of Lords to revisit Andy Burnham's Bill so that grieving parents do not have to devote great chunks of their lives establishing the truth about the deaths of their loved ones.

*The Chair:* After Stephen Hofmeyr, I am going to call the Bishop of Southwark and I am afraid then, because of time, I am going to have to test your mind on a closure.

*Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford):* I declare an interest. I am a barrister. Having said that, my practice is in the field of commercial international disputes, which is unaffected by legal aid. Of more relevance for present purposes is the fact that I am a recorder, that is a part-time judge presiding over criminal trials in the criminal courts and have been for 15 years. I generally sit in criminal cases for a minimum of 15 days each year and, as such, I have direct (albeit limited) experience of the criminal justice system in action.

I can confirm from personal experience that the legal aid system brought into force in 2013 has had a dramatic adverse effect on the criminal justice system and its administration. Significant numbers of people within our communities, who are either too

poor to be able to afford legal representation or who suffer disproportionately because of illness, disability, difficulties with literacy or numeracy or language barriers, are most affected. The number of people who appear as litigants in person has increased significantly, and they are being placed at a distinct disadvantage. No or inadequate representation is unjust and leads to injustice. Justice flows from God's heart and from his character and, as his followers, we are enjoined to do justice. Justice can only be administered fairly on a level playing field. As we all know, it is more difficult to hit or kick a ball uphill than it is to hit or kick a ball downhill. In order to achieve a level playing field, legal representation is generally essential, but is increasingly unavailable.

Unless there is universal access to justice, there will be injustice, and borrowing the words of Bishop David Sheppard that we heard earlier today, and consistent with my analogy, we need, Synod, to bat for the poor. May I encourage you please to support motion.

*The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Christopher Chessun):* Chair, I am grateful for the motion in the name of Carl Fender which I urge members, as others have, to support. I have a few brief points. The first is to recognise where the cuts came from. The second, as we have already acknowledged, is the impact. The third is to urge a remedy.

In the year 2009-10, legal aid provision was running at about £2 billion, making our system one of the most expensive in the world. Not surprisingly, there were cases where significant amounts of money were paid out in instances where some felt there was little merit, but then systems will do that on occasion and the wider value of legal aid was being lost from sight. The impact of the very significant restructuring of legal aid was severe and has had very detrimental consequences across the land, not least in communities such as south London where there are significant pockets of deprivation.

I was struck at the end of last year by the comments of the then President of the Supreme Court, Baroness Hale. She spoke of the enormous difficulties that cuts have had for cases that come before the family courts, mentioned also by the Dean of the Arches and others. On top of the trauma of family breakdown, individuals have to navigate whether they have the financial resources to access legal help. As Lady Hale put it, "It is unreasonable to expect a husband and wife or mother and father who are in crisis in their personal relationship to make their own arrangements without help". And indeed, as Lady Hale pointed out, additional resources available at an early stage can prevent the need for a court hearing. There are further reports of one or other parent giving up on a custody dispute because of lack of finance. The withdrawal of legal aid in immigration cases affects an area where the legislation alone runs to 1,200 pages.

There is a case then for a new consensus on legal aid, one that goes beyond the Government's current review. It is a pressing need. Not only is the well-known maxim pertinent, "justice delayed is justice denied", but justice impeded by economic deprivation is in reality injustice. Current provision distances justice from ordinary people. I hope that this debate and motion make their contribution in the need for a new consensus.

*The Chair:* Synod, I am aware that there remain many members wishing to speak, but I am afraid at this stage the clock is against us. I wish now to test your mind on whether Item 15 has been sufficiently debated. I therefore put the motion for the closure.

*The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* I therefore invite Carl Fender to reply to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

*Mr Clive Fender (Lincoln):* Thank you very much for your contributions. Before I pick out particular points from the speakers who spoke to this motion, may I just thank those who signed the list to get this on the agenda and also the warm encouragement I have had from members of Synod in this group of sessions prior to this debate.

I am going to start with the last speaker, Bishop Christopher, because one of the points that was made was about consensus. The one thing that I think stands out from all the research I did in my paper and arguments that the Government makes against a more generous provision for legal aid is the fact that they are unwilling to have a genuine debate about where the state should meet its citizens on this issue.

We could debate issues about savings, about alternative types of provision, for instance, mediation. That is one of the things that the Government has tried to put in place as an alternative to the provision that we had before 2013, but I think what is being avoided here is a genuine debate about what the provision should look like. For a long time, for perhaps 60 of the 70 years that we have had legal aid, since 1949, nobody really questioned the level of provision, and then we have had this change since 2013.

I am extremely grateful to my sisters and brothers in law who spoke to this debate. Fiona Gibson, you spoke very movingly about the two-tier system that exists and also about the advice deserts that are being encountered more and more. That is something that I wrote about in my paper. To the Dean of the Arches, thank you very much, and to Carolyn Johnson as well. The point that you made there that I think I would pick out is that there are dedicated people doing legal aid work – Carolyn, you are one of them – but if you saw the *Newsnight* debate covering the Windrush deportation earlier in the year where one of the people speaking to that issue on *Newsnight* on Monday evening was somebody working in the third sector. Increasingly, that is what is being encountered. People who are no longer able to find a solicitor are falling back on third sector providers, charities and volunteers. I think that is increasingly going to happen unless we try to send a message to Government that we do not approve of the current state of legal aid provision.

The Bishop of Guildford, thank you very much. What I pick out from that is an important issue about equality of arms. We can never get a perfect balance of equality of arms in cases, but, increasingly, what this provision does, where we are now, sees a widening of

that gap. You told us very movingly about the inquest and about the little boy who was affected by that disaster. You told us there is very clearly an inequality of arms of bigger interests being represented by Queen's Counsel and the family struggling to find any representation at all.

To Stephen Hofmeyr, thank you. Again, you told us of your own direct experience of those groups disproportionately affected by legal aid cuts. What I have spoken about and written about are people who, because these cuts affect the people in the lowest economic strata of our society, are disproportionately people who are disabled, who have literacy and numeracy problems and language problems as well.

Synod, thank you very much for your contributions to this debate and your support for it.

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* Point of order. Given that Carl's motion is asking for action and a response by Her Majesty's Government, it would be good to have an accurate record of the vote. Would you order a count of the whole Synod?

*The Chair:* That has my consent. We will move to a count of the whole Synod.

*The motion was put and carried, 218 voting in favour, none against, with one recorded abstention.*

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, Synod. That concludes this Item.

THE CHAIR *Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 12.46 pm.

## **ITEM 16 FAREWELLS**

*The Chair:* Synod, the end is in sight. We now reach Item 16, Farewells. I invite Dr Jamie Harrison to deliver a farewell for Chris Palmer.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* Chris is hiding, I think, on the platform. Chris, can you show yourself so we know where we are focusing on in this farewell.

Chris joined the Corporation of what we have to call the Church House formally in July 2010, so when he leaves in the summer he will have been Secretary of the Corporation for ten years, almost exactly to the day.

Joining the Corporation was something of a step change for Chris, having served for 33 years in the Royal Navy, ending his service as Commodore of the Fleet Air Arm at Yeovilton.

His Service days soon percolated into his time at Church House, and it was not long before he was ensuring that at all matters were “shipshape and Bristol fashion” with requests for extra cleaning duties to ensure that all the brass met with his high standards.

With firm leadership and a tight grip on the helm, as Secretary of the Corporation, Chris has overseen, as I think we all would agree, a significant investment of the Corporation’s charitable funds for improving Church House while maintaining its financial security. This business acumen has enabled the Corporation to complete a programme of improvements to the common areas and the facilities at Church House for the benefit of staff and visitors alike. These improvements have included renewing the lifts, new shower facilities, upgrades to reception areas and installation of more energy-efficient boilers.

When not fulfilling his duties at the Corporation, Chris assists with Royal duties at Buckingham Palace. As one of the Royal Stewards he meets and greets dignitaries at prestigious national events, and puts people at ease when they arrive at the Palace to receive their gong.

Chris leaves with the Corporation in fine health. Chris, we wish you a long, healthy and very happy retirement. We pray that you go with our blessing and with God’s blessing. Thank you, Chris.

*The Chair:* I now invite Loretta Minghella to deliver a farewell for the Rt Hon Dame Caroline Spelman.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* Synod, it is my absolute pleasure to have been asked to give the farewell tribute to Dame Caroline Spelman, until the election our Second Church Estates Commissioner. Dame Caroline is unable to be with us in person today but is watching our proceedings from Birmingham. Good afternoon and a big wave from us all.

Synod, Caroline is a woman of extraordinary gifts who has been breaking down barriers all her life. She was the 29th woman to be appointed to the Cabinet and the first to be asked by Her Majesty the Queen to be the Second Church Estates Commissioner. As a champion of “Women to Win” she mentored many women younger and older to encourage them to take up roles in public and political life, and I know she was delighted to join the Church Commissioners just at the time that a number of women were joining the Bench of Bishops.

Having held posts as Secretary of State for the Environment and Chairman of her party, she brought wide and deep knowledge and experience and enormous statecraft to the role. Quickly across her brief, she answered hundreds of Parliamentary Questions, ranging from the Church’s approach to marriage, to its investments, to metal theft and the persecution of the Church overseas. However, now and again an MP would ask a quirky question which she would handle with grace and good humour. One of the most

memorable was perhaps a question on the Church's policy on hedgehogs. To the great surprise of her colleagues in the House of Commons she answered to say the Church did indeed have a policy to support hedgehog husbandry in its churchyards. Of course, Caroline, you would often remind us how much you depended in your role on Simon Stanley, your Church political adviser, and to watch you work so closely and so effectively with him was a joy to behold. You were a star team.

In the four years she held the office, and alongside a busy role as a constituency MP, Caroline went into bat for the Church on a number of occasions with the Government, over supplementary schools, the apprenticeship levy, funding for church buildings, freedom of religion and belief, immigration controls, – to name a few, – working closely with the Lords Spiritual to support and amend legislation and hold the space for faith in the public square.

Her experience and depth of knowledge has contributed greatly to the briefing of the Lords Spiritual and the whole College of Bishops as well as the Board of the Church Commissioners through some of the key moments during the last few years. But she also gave time to the wider Church, visiting parishes, projects and even taking a parliamentary delegation to Jerusalem and the West Bank to understand the experience and perspectives of Christians living there.

Caroline was prepared to challenge the Government about its future relationship with the European Union, always with quiet integrity and working across political boundaries to secure what she saw as the strengthening of civil society, the building up of the common good and preservation of national unity.

Caroline has in many ways modelled a sacrificial life of public service. Her work in recent years came at a great personal cost, and she has written publicly and movingly about the frequent threats made against her life and those closest to her, and the impact on her and all of them. She persisted in speaking truth to power despite these threats, right up to her last day as a Member of Parliament. Her courage and determination have been truly inspirational.

Caroline, I want to finish with a personal word from the Third Commissioner Dr Eve Poole and myself. Over the last two years, for the first time and I hope not the last, the Church has had three women in the Church Estates Commissioner roles. You know that these Estates Commissioner roles are not easy, but you have been so generous to Eve and me with your time, your encouragement and your wisdom. At times the roles have seemed almost doable. We became, in your words, the Three Musketeers, all for one, all for the one Jesus Christ.

Caroline, Eve and I say this: we love you, we hold you in our prayers, and we thank you, as Synod thanks you, for your great service to the Commissioners and to the Church.

*The Chair.* I now invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to deliver two farewells, beginning with Charles George.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* I would like to add a sentence or two to what Loretta just said. My own experience of working with Caroline was absolutely wonderful, and my own experience of watching her work during the period of difficulty in politics over the last couple of years, working across political boundaries, demonstrated her Christian commitment to reconciliation, her political courage and her steadfast desire to see the right thing done. I would add my appreciation.

But here is another person who we do not see very often and we only hear occasionally, but we owe a huge amount to him. When the Human Rights Act was passed in 1998, I do not think anyone would have guessed that the first appeal under the Act to reach the House of Lords, in those days still an appeal court, in fact what is now called the Supreme Court, would be concerned with the ancient obligation of a lay rector to repair the chancel of the parish church, arising, funnily enough, from a parish very close to my own.

The appeal reached the House of Lords in 2004 and leading counsel for the appellant was Charles George QC. I am glad to say he succeeded in persuading their Lordships that a PCC is not a public authority for the purpose of the Human Rights Act, and that the Court of Appeal had been wrong to decide otherwise. As Lord Nicholls said in his speech, the Court of Appeal's decision had "wide financial implications for the Church of England, going far beyond the outcome of the particular case". Had the final appeal to the House of Lords gone the other way, not only would PCCs have been bogged down through having to take all their decisions in the light of legislation that even Governments find hard to apply, PCCs would have lost all protection of the Human Rights Act themselves, including in relation to religious freedom. We dodged a bullet there. We owe a considerable debt to Charles for that outcome.

He did not start as a lawyer. He took a First in History at Oxford, and began his working life as a history master at Eton, publishing his book *The Stuarts: An age of experiment* in 1973. I do not think he taught me. You did not, did you? But you must have been there when I was. I was in a lower class, I suspect.

He published while he was there his book *The Stuarts: An age of experiment*, but a different vocation presented itself. Ever since he had read Agatha Christie's *Sparkling Cyanide*, the Bar had seemed interesting and he was called by the Inner Temple in 1974. Even in his early years at the Bar, Charles appeared in high-profile cases, including litigation involving the GLC and London Transport in the wake of the Fares Fair controversy and other cases dealing with the conflict between central and local government that very much marked the 1980s.

Things took a distinctly ecclesiastical turn in 1986 when Charles appeared for the Rector of St Stephen's, Walbrook, Chad Varah, in one of only two cases that have so far been

heard by the Court of Ecclesiastical Causes Reserved. Before a court comprising two Lords Justices of Appeal and three bishops, Charles was led (that is the senior counsel, the QC in charge) by the late Peter Boydell, although the main argument for the Rector involved disputed issues of legality and – wait for it – what constituted a table. And these intricate arguments were advanced by Boydell. The Law Reports note that: “George, following, referred to Luke 22:14 and John 13:28”. Between them, they persuaded the court that an altar – or Holy Table – was no longer illegal merely because it was not movable or because it was made of stone, and that Henry Moore’s 10-ton cylindrical piece of marble could remain in the church where it is to this day, not surprisingly.

Having by the 1990s become a distinguished public and planning law silk, it was natural – given his commitment to the Church – that he should become increasingly involved in ecclesiastical law. He became Chancellor of the Diocese of Southwark in 1996, a role which he served with distinction until he was appointed Dean of the Arches and Auditor in 2009. When he was interviewed by *The Times* as its Lawyer of Week in 2015, Charles was asked, “What was your most memorable experience as a lawyer?”, to which he replied, “Being sworn in as Dean of the Arches in the Crypt Chapel at Lambeth Palace”.

Charles’s was the first appointment of a Dean of the Arches and Auditor to be made after advertising the vacancy and interviewing candidates. And he has been ground-breaking in other ways. Under his gentle but firm guidance, the faculty jurisdiction has been simplified and the burdens it places on clergy and churchwardens reduced through radical deregulation. More than ever can now be done in churches and churchyards without the need for a faculty. It is thanks to the trouble Charles has taken that both Church people and those concerned with the national heritage have confidence in a system which allows the Church to control what changes can be made within its own buildings. This is a privilege we cannot take for granted, but under Charles’s guiding hand, the ecclesiastical exemption is as firmly fixed as it ever has been.

In addition to his practice at the Bar, he served as a Recorder and as a Deputy High Court Judge, and he has made a distinguished contribution to the work of this Synod and its committees. His interventions in debate have always been judicious and persuasive. His contribution to legislative reform, including as the first Chair of the committee responsible for scrutinising Legislative Reform Orders, has been much appreciated. His support for younger members of the legal profession seeking to venture into the areas of ecclesiastical law will be remembered, as will his support for modernising ways of working, and the development of professional training for ecclesiastical judges.

He also throws a very mean at the party at the Faculty Office, which is one of the highlights of the year – that is not in my text. Above all, many of us will miss him as a wise counsellor. I am sure the Synod will join with me in wishing him a happy and well-earned retirement with Tehmina and the rest of his family.

*The Chair:* I now invite the Archbishop to deliver the farewell for the Archbishop of York.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* It is only right that the final words from me today, apart from prorogation and blessing, in considering saying farewell and thank you to people, is for Archbishop John Tucker Mugabi Sentamu. Sadly, he is not with us in person, nor could we manage to get him to appear on a big screen, electronically, all the way from Fiji – or wherever he is at the moment.

He has gone to visit parts of the world which are suffering the effects of climate change right now. He has gone, typically, to respond to an invite for him to go and preach and be alongside those who are suffering, a pattern of his life throughout his ministry.

So I am talking about him without him being here. He will not like it. But then I am reminded of the words of the prophet Ezekiel, “We are a rebellious house”, words, remember, which were the title of a report written about us by a Partner in Mission report to the Church of England which Sentamu himself quoted in his 2018 Presidential Address.

Of course, speaking about Sentamu when he is not here is both dangerous but also deeply liberating. For it does mean that I cannot see him as I embarrass him, and it does mean that we can show our gratitude, thanks and love for him without him being able to stop us. From 2005, he has been Archbishop of York, and I simply do not have the time to recount the so very many ways in which he has had an impact on the life of this Church. He has shown his love for us, a truly Christian love, by both making us laugh and annoying us profoundly, by encouraging us and challenging us, and always he has done it because of his love for Jesus Christ. He is a disciple who daily turns again to follow.

Of course, his time in General Synod did not start when he became Archbishop, nor indeed when he became Bishop of Birmingham. He first appeared here in 1985. His legal mind, his passion for the Gospel show through in all he has done and said. We know that his Ugandan experience, the place of his birth, was as a judge, as imprisoned, beaten, persecuted, fleeing for his life and an exile. Which other Archbishop in the last few centuries has so shared in the ecumenism of suffering? Which other can thus speak with such authority? Which other has purchased that authority with bruises and blood?

We all know of his interests and the priorities he sets for himself and for others. He is always keen to listen to people and specially to spend time with those beyond the walls of the church. We were privileged to hear him reflect on his pilgrimage around the Diocese of York at one of the bishops’ meetings. The mission he did, walking all over the diocese, everywhere sharing the Gospel and praying the Lord’s Prayer, was truly remarkable and has set an extraordinary challenge and impact.

I cannot find a record of another Archbishop of York doing this since before the Norman Conquest. He is an Archbishop in the mould of the Saxon saints. His leadership of the bishops in the Northern Province in recent years has stirred us all into thinking again

about our priority to evangelism. His leadership, like all good prophetic leadership, leaves many feeling uncomfortable and asking questions. We need more.

Of course, the whole country has been helped by his focus on the dignity and worth of all people. Historically, one of the key moments for him was his work on the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. He has said that he himself was stopped at least eight times by the police – perhaps this takes us back to our Windrush debate – and why we have to change, and that he is the only Bishop to have been stopped by the police in that way. I am sure that is still true. I suspect it might not be.

During this series of sessions, we have spoken of Windrush. We have spoken of racism. We have recognised our failures. With the loss of Sentamu, we lose a visible reminder of what we need to do. The diocesan bishops are more monochrome. We risk being complacent. We look less like our country. To honour his memory, his lifelong, bitter, cruel and wicked experience of institutional racism, which has existed and does still exist within the C of E, we must be dedicated to action not just words.

He is passionate about many things. His commitment to young people, to education is clear. His concern for the poor and the marginalised, his strong sense of justice and the need to speak out on many occasions is evident in all he does and says. We have gained so much from him in so many ways. We will miss him.

I will miss him personally. I am grateful to him, to Margaret, for their friendship, for their support and work with me since I became Archbishop. Most of you will know that he was made Yorkshire Man of the Year, and on that occasion, as I suspect on many others, he pointed out it was only right that he became Yorkshire Man of the Year, after all he is John Tucker Mugabi Sentamu, and Mugabi is, Ibagum spelt backwards.

There are still several months to go before he retires, and there will be a great big party in York in June, at which love will be poured out and many people will rightly say many things to him and about him. He does not want anything said about him. He was insistent that I should not say anything today. He will be very cross with me for saying what I have, so perhaps you might avoid telling him. Of course, he would be the first to say that he is not perfect, that he is annoyed and upset at times, as well as inspired and led. He is very conscious of that. It is part of the beauty of his humanity, of his three-dimensional character, of his depth.

But my view is that in this place we want to say thank you to him. Thank you, Sentamu, may God bless you, Sentamu, and the Church of England will miss you, Sentamu, and the wider country will miss you. There are not a lot of bishops who are so well-known outside the Church, where every taxi ride you take in York, they tell you about Sentamu.

It has not always been an easy time that you have given us, but perhaps that is because we did not deserve to be given an easy time. We are a rebellious people. And there is a

real prophetic element to your words. Your prophetic action springs from the reality of suffering, which, to our shame, as I have seen in private, has often been inflicted by the Church. Now we can do no better than thank you and seek to do better, with humility.

We are a rebellious house, and I am being a rebel now by speaking out to say to you, all those many thousands of miles away, thank you for being obedient to your call, to the voice of the Lord calling you. Thank you for being you, thank you to you and Margaret for your example of love and service, dedication and sacrifice. We hope and pray that you have a wonderful time, full of the Lord's blessing in the next phase of your life and ministry.

It will not be a retirement, I suspect, as anyone else has known it. Of that we can be pretty sure. We can also be sure we will continue to hear his voice. So please join me in saying thank you to the Archbishop of York John Tucker Mugabi Sentamu. He is physically far away, so we will have to make a lot of noise, but, as he is not here, let us not be inhibited in showing our love and thanks for him and Margaret, our love and affection for their witness and his words and presence among us. And let us try to show not only in our appreciation but also in our actions that we will let his prophetic ministry bear its full fruit in our Church, which is God's.

*The Chair:* That concludes this item as we approach prorogation. Thank you.

## **ITEM 17 PROROGATION**

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Following Sue Booy's important change of timetable yesterday, this prorogation has 13 minutes to take. So – it is such a jolly bit – in accordance with Standing Order 45, I prorogue this group of sessions.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury* led the Synod in prayer.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury* prorogued the Synod.

## INDEX

- abortion, opposition to 95–6
- abuse:
- by clergy 8, 77, 80–81, 83–6, 92–3, 213–33, 363
  - historic cases 92, 214, 215, 217, 222, 226, 229
  - and power 214, 217, 221, 223, 360
  - and redress 76–7, 80, 83–6, 214, 217–28, 231–2
  - survivors 80–86, 213–33, 363–4
  - see also IICSA; safeguarding
- accountability 4, 303–4
- and safeguarding 17, 217–18, 220–21, 223, 227
- Acts of Synod 34
- adultery, and ordination 94
- Affirmation of Baptismal Faith* 76
- affluence, and disadvantage 346–61
- All Churches Trust 89
- Amending Canon No. 40 330
- amendments, acceptability 7–8, 9
- Amnesty International 361–2
- Anglican Communion:
- and climate change 237, 240
  - and evangelism and discipleship 15
  - guests of Synod 3, 347
  - and Lambeth Conference 13
  - and Living in Love and Faith project 149
- Anglican Consultative Council:
- and climate change 235, 254
  - and Living in Love and Faith project 149
- Anna chaplaincy 101–2
- Annual Parochial Church Meeting, and deanery synod
- representatives 138–40, 143, 333
- anti-Semitism 6, 193, 194
- apportionment 63
- Apprenticeship Levy 64–5
- Archbishop of Canterbury,
- Presidential Address 13–18, 35–6, 223
- Archbishop of York, farewell to 374–6
- archbishops, and diocesan boards of education 296
- Archbishops' Council:
- Budget 2020 63
  - questions to 54–67
- archdeacons:
- Articles of Enquiry 202
  - training for new archdeacons 89, 114
- Archdeacons National Development Officer (ANDO) 89, 114
- Article 7 business 75
- BAME heritage Christians:
- and disadvantage 357, 358
  - and elections to General Synod 199, 334, 337
  - ordinands and clergy 111, 184, 192–4, 196–7
  - and racism 184–90
- benefit claimants:
- and legal aid 362
  - sanction on 44–5
- bias, unconscious 186–9, 190, 193–4, 199, 202, 267
- Big Church Survey 65, 294
- bishops:
- acting 204–6
  - and cathedrals 117, 122, 130–32
  - and diocesan boards of education 296
  - as focus of mission and unity 121–2
  - in House of Lords 96, 262, 319
  - and Living in Love and Faith project 151
  - senior staff 132
  - suspension 204–5
  - training for new bishops 89
- Bishops' Mission Orders 293
- Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure 2014 102, 332
- body of Christ, Christians as 18, 24, 29, 152, 226, 315
- Bonn Agreement 1931 106–7
- Bridge Report 165
- bullying:
- by bishops and archbishops 223

- of clergy 38, 41, 99–100
- Business Committee:
  - and General Synod elections 313–22
  - questions to 49–51
  - report 3–12, 23
  - variation in order of business 4, 101
- C4 Safeguarding Training 88
- Canon Law:
  - A 5 68
  - B 16 71–2, 93–4
  - B 30 68
  - Channel Islands 24, 27
  - H 2 104, 313
- Canterbury see Archbishop of Canterbury
- carbon emissions:
  - reduction 48, 236–7
  - zero 235–6, 238–41, 246–7, 249–50, 255, 352
- carbon footprint, measuring 100, 236
- carbon reduction target 234–56
- Caring for God's Acre* 235
- cathedral chapters:
  - and bishop 117, 122, 130–32
  - and dean 116–17, 132
  - and lay people 119
  - and reduction in carbon emissions 241–2
  - and senior non-executive members 116–17, 131–2, 133–4
- Cathedral Duties Test 130
- cathedrals:
  - and abuse 225
  - administration 116, 126–7, 133
  - attendance 118
  - and Charity Commission 117, 118, 120, 124, 128
  - and community rolls 124–5, 169, 172
  - councils 116
  - and deanery synod
  - representation 117, 124–5, 169
  - and financial reporting 117–19, 126–7
  - and mission 116
  - parish church 117, 124–5, 169
  - and racism 196
  - and reduction in carbon emissions 241–2, 256
  - and removal of clergy from office 117, 128–9
  - residential canons 117, 128–9, 130–31
- Cathedrals Working Group 116, 119
- Catholic Education Service 105
- Central Readers' Council 98
- Central Stipends Authority Report 43
- Centuries of Marginalisation, Visions of Hope* 46–8
- change, cultural 18
  - and climate change 242
  - and engaging with the disadvantaged 346–61
  - and safeguarding 220–21, 229, 231
- Changing Market Towns project (Ely) 288
- Channel Islands Measure 4, 7, 21–33
  - Final Approval Stage 322–8
  - Memorandum of Understanding 21, 23–4, 323, 327
  - Report of the Archbishop's Commission 19–21, 24, 25, 102, 166
  - Revision Stage 165–8
- chaplaincy:
  - Anna chaplaincy 101–2
  - Armed Forces 290, 295
  - to Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 47–8
- Charities Act 2011 133
- Charity Commission, and cathedrals 117, 118, 120, 124, 128, 131, 133
- Chichester diocese, and IICSA 214–15
- Child TrustFunds 280–81
- children:
  - abuse of see abuse;
  - safeguarding
  - and church attendance 65–6, 104, 288
  - engagement with 65, 97–8

- see *also* ministry, with children and young people
- Children and Youth Ministry 4, 50, 55, 271–95
- children’s workers 284
- Christian Climate Action 249
- church, inclusive 276
- church buildings:
  - and accessibility 357
  - sustainability 105
- Church Buildings Council:
  - and climate emergency 239
  - questions to 105–6
- church closures, and deprivation 106
- Church Commissioners:
  - and cathedrals 117
  - and climate emergency 240, 245
  - women as 370–71
- Church of England:
  - attendance by children and young people 65–6, 104, 271–2, 288
  - definition of member 125–6, 135, 136–7, 292, 317
  - website 55
- Church House:
  - and cost of fringe meetings 104
  - Housing Team 53
  - staff 100, 147, 253, 338
- Church Lads and Girls Brigade 291–2, 295
- Church Minister Apprenticeship 64–5
- Church Representation and Ministers Measure 169, 317
- Church Representation Rules:
  - and allocation of General Synod seats 104, 313, 317
  - and co-opted PCC members 309
  - and deanery synod term limits 138, 139, 146
  - and election appeals 169–80, 329, 330–31, 344
  - and electoral rolls 125, 169, 173–4
  - and habitual/non-habitual worshippers 117, 124–5, 169
- Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2020 4, 168–81, 328, 330
- Church schools:
  - Eco Schools 235
  - and links with parishes 356
  - and relationships and sex education 105
  - rural 290
  - secondary 291
  - as serving whole communities 319
  - and worship 65–6
- Church and State see government
- Church Urban Fund 354, 356
- churches, resource churches 279
- Churches Child Protection Advisory Service see Thirty-One: Eight Churches’ Funerals Group 259, 261–2, 264
- Churches Network for Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 47
- Churches Together in England Enabling Group, Fourth Presidency Group 107
- churchwardens:
  - election 124, 125
  - term limits 138, 141, 144
- Churchwardens Measure 170–71
- Civica Election Services 329, 335, 337, 338, 339
- civil partnerships 67–76, 151, 205
- Civil Partnerships, Marriages and Deaths (Registration etc.) Act 2019 66–7, 69–72
- clergy:
  - abuse by 77, 80–81, 83–6, 92–3, 213–33, 363
  - bullying 38, 41, 99–100
  - conduct 16
  - decline in numbers 314
  - deployment 315, 348, 360
  - engagement with the disadvantaged 346–7
  - housing 52, 352–3
  - LGBTI 7
  - removal from office 117
  - remuneration review 43–4
  - retirement housing 53–4
  - see *also* Clergy Wellbeing Working Group; Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing;

Theological Training Institutions  
 Clergy Discipline Measure 2003  
   37–40, 70, 205  
   and safeguarding 86, 102, 215–  
   16  
   Sheldon Hub report 16–17, 37,  
   39, 41, 90–91  
   tribunals 90  
   Working Group 89–92, 100  
 Clergy Election Rules 341–3  
 Clergy Support Trust 54  
 Clergy Wellbeing Working Group  
   34, 35–6, 37, 40  
 Clerk to the Synod, questions to  
   104–5  
 Climate Action 100+ initiative 238  
 climate change 4, 7, 15, 234–56,  
   374  
   and investment 235  
   and measurement of carbon  
   footprint 100, 236  
   and young people 234, 237, 243  
 Climate Emergency 100, 233–56  
 climate justice 234, 246, 248  
 CMEAC *see* Committee for Minority  
   Ethnic Anglican Concerns  
 College of Bishops 72–3, 185  
   and Living in Love and Faith  
   project 149, 159  
 Committee for Minority Ethnic  
   Anglican Concerns 185–6, 194,  
   197  
 common good 320  
 common tenure 36, 38, 40, 128,  
   217, 221  
 Communications Team 80  
*Communion and Disagreement* 79  
 Community of St Anselm 322  
 conscience, and doctrine 79, 161  
 Convocations (Elections to Upper  
   House) Rules 2020 343–5  
 Corporation of the Church House  
   105, 369–70  
 Council on Biblical Manhood and  
   Womanhood 70–71  
 Council of British Funeral Services  
   259  
 Council for Christian Unity,  
   questions to 106–7  
 Court of Ecclesiastical Causes  
   Reserved 373  
 Covenant for Clergy Care and  
   Wellbeing Act of Synod 4, 7, 16–  
   17, 34–42, 91  
 Covid-19, and Holy Communion  
   96–7  
 creation theology 234, 237, 246,  
   250, 255  
 crematoria, funerals at 108, 260,  
   264, 266–8  
 Crown Nominations Commission,  
   Election Process Review Group  
   98–9  
 culture, and evangelism 346–61  
 curacies, and apprenticeship levy  
   65  
 curates, and first appointment 110  
  
 Darlow funding 57  
 Data Protection Act 55–6, 83  
 deaf people:  
   and funeral poverty 268–9  
   and poverty 358  
 deanery synods:  
   and cathedral representatives  
   117, 124–5, 169  
   details of lay members 55–6  
   and elections for General Synod  
   143, 330, 333, 337  
   and mission 143  
   term limits 9, 102–3, 137–47  
 debt, and funeral poverty 263  
 declarations of interest 31, 174–5,  
   180, 224, 230, 280, 307, 319,  
   321, 335, 361  
 Dementia Challenge 102  
 deprivation, and church closures  
   106, 193  
 Dignity at Work guidance 100  
 Diocesan Accounts Group 107  
 diocesan advisory committees  
   (DACs):  
   and Church Buildings Council  
   106, 239  
   and support for mission 106  
 diocesan boards of education:  
   and bishops 296  
   and boards of finance 300–301,  
   304–5, 308  
   and diocesan synods 296, 297,

- 303–5, 307
- joint 296, 300, 303–4, 305, 309–310
- membership 307–310
- subcommittees 310–311
- unincorporated 296–7, 300–301, 306
- Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 1991 295, 307–8
- diocesan boards of finance:
  - accounting practices 107
  - and boards of education 300–301, 304–5, 308
  - and funeral fees 108
- Diocesan Environment Officers 100–101, 236, 244
- Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors 87, 230
- diocesan secretaries, and General Synod communications 103
- Diocesan Synod Motions:
  - Leeds 345–61
  - London and Truro 100
- diocesan synods:
  - and boards of education 296, 297, 303–5, 307
  - details of lay members 55–6
  - term limits 138–9
- Diocese in Europe, pro-cathedrals 119–20
- dioceses:
  - apportionment 63
  - environmental programmes 100
  - funding sources 56–7
  - historic assets 57–8, 245–6
  - Investment Committees 108–9
  - Lowest Income Communities funding 56–7, 60
  - Sustainability Funding 56–8
- disability:
  - and housing adaptations 52–4
  - and humanity 15
  - and poverty 357, 369
  - and vocations 111, 113
- Discerning in Obedience* 98–9
- discernment, and Living in Love and Faith project 151–2, 159
- discipleship:
  - and children and young people 272–3, 280, 282, 284–5, 287, 288
  - and evangelism 15
  - and social action 354
- discrimination, and racism 47, 181, 183–9
- diversity:
  - and candidates for ordination 111
  - and race 187, 197
- doctrine, and liturgy 69
- Draft Cathedrals Measure 4, 78–9, 115–20
  - Revision Stage 120–37, 169
- Draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 4, 78, 295–312
- Early Years Training Group 294
- Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 70
- Eco Churches 236, 238, 240, 249, 255
- Eco Dioceses 235, 249, 255
- Eco Schools 235
- ecumenism:
  - guests of General Synod 3
  - and safeguarding 87
- education:
  - and disadvantage 359
  - Relationships and Sex Education 105
  - theological 52, 61–2, 109–110
  - see *also* church schools; diocesan boards of education; Theological Training Institutions
- election appeals:
  - and Church Representation Rules 4, 169–80, 329, 330–31, 344
  - and Standing Orders 207–9
- elections:
  - electronic 329–30, 331–40, 343
  - and hustings 332, 336, 338
- Elections Review Group 137–9, 169, 171, 329, 335, 337–8, 345
- electoral rolls 56, 125, 169, 173–4, 281
  - and General Synod seats 313–14, 317, 319–20, 336–7
- End to Paupers' Funerals (Private Member's Motion) 257–70
- Energy Footprinting Tool 100, 236

- environment, and mission 48–9, 236
- Environment Working Group 4–5, 100, 236, 243–4, 248–9, 253, 255
- environmental programmes 48–9, 100
- episcopate, women in 23, 74–5, 102, 197, 332, 370
- Equality Act 113
- Equipping Christian Leaders in an Age of Science 49
- estates evangelism:
  - and clergy 346, 348, 360
  - and deprivation 345–61
  - and funeral poverty 263
  - and leadership 360
- Estates Evangelism Task Group 58
- Ethical Investment Advisory Group 245
- evangelism:
  - Anglican Communion
  - perspectives 15
  - see also estates evangelism; mission; witness
- Evangelism and Discipleship Team 55, 271, 274, 288
- Everyday Faith* 55
- Extinction Rebellion 248–9
- EYTG see Early Years Training Group
- faculty jurisdiction:
  - online 106
  - simplification 373
- Faith in the City* 349
- Faith and Order Commission:
  - and Jewish-Christian Relations 6, 52
  - questions to 51–2
- families:
  - access to legal aid 365–7, 369
  - and *Growing Faith* 98
  - and legal aid reform 365–6
  - work with 273, 274–5
- farewells 4, 13, 369–76
- fathers and children, ministry to 97–8
- Finance Committee 108
  - questions to 107–9
- Follow the Star* 55
- food banks 45
- Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of Abuse* 86
- fossil fuels, and climate change 234, 239
- freedom, religious 44, 372
- freehold:
  - and residentiary canons 128–9
  - and safeguarding 217, 221
- Fresh Expressions 66
  - and young people 273, 293
- funerals:
  - costs 269
  - fees 108
  - paupers' 4, 257–70
- gender justice 15; see also transgender people
- General Register Office 66–7, 103
- General Synod:
  - allocation of seats 104, 313–22
  - app 5, 206, 333
  - communications 103
  - cost of fringe meetings 104–5
  - dates 5–6, 11
  - elections to 13, 51, 143, 199, 313–22, 327–41
  - guests 4
  - issues of trust 8–9, 49, 67–8
  - Legislative Committee 328
  - new members 2–3
  - number of speakers 10
  - and photography 6–7
  - size 317
  - staff 5, 12, 43, 270
  - term limits 139
  - see also House of Bishops; House of Clergy; House of Laity
- Generation Z 273, 295
- Generosity and Sacrifice* 43–4
- Gibb Report 226
- Glasgow, climate change summit 235
- God's Tent (Newcastle) 289–90
- God's Unfailing Word: Theological and Practical Perspectives on Christian-Jewish Relations* 6, 51–2
- government:
  - and Anna chaplaincy 101–2

- and benefit sanctions 45
- and climate change 240–41, 252
- and funeral poverty 265
- local 257–8, 265–6, 270
- and marriage registration 66–7, 103
- and Relationships and Sex Education resources 105
- and Windrush scandal 181–2, 200
- see also House of Lords; Legal Aid Reform; Second Estates Commissioner
- GRA:CE project 354, 356
- grandparents see families
- greenhouse gases 234
- Growing Faith* 50–51, 55, 98, 273, 288–90, 293–5
- Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy 35, 36
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities 46–8
- and authorized sites 47
- chaplaincy to 47–8
  
- headship, male 86
- Holy Communion:
  - admission to 71, 93–4
  - and Covid-19 96–7
- homelessness 355
- House of Bishops:
  - Declaration 58
  - and deemed business 72, 74, 75–6
  - Delegation Committee 72, 74–6
  - and diversity 375
  - and elections 343–4
  - and Living in Love and Faith project 149, 159, 162
  - Pastoral Statement on Opposite-Sex Civil Partnerships 67–76, 205
  - questions to 67–101
  - and safeguarding 80, 220–21
  - Standing Committee 75
  - teaching document see Living in Love and Faith
- House of Clergy, allocation of seats 104
- House of Laity, elections to General Synod 51, 104, 313–18, 328–41
- House of Lords, bishops in 96, 262, 319
- housing:
  - clergy 52–4
  - and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities 47
- Human Rights Act 1998 372
- humanity, and disability 15; see also image of God
- hustings 332, 336, 338
  
- identity 15
- IICSA (Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse) enquiry 7, 77, 84, 85–7, 122–3
- response to recommendations 212–33
- image of God, creation in 95, 159, 185, 227, 265, 346
- inclusion:
  - and racism 187
  - radical 9, 158, 161
- Innovation funding 59
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 238, 246
- investment:
  - and climate change 238, 243
  - environmental sector 108
  - social impact programme 109
- IPCC see Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
- Iranian Christians, ministry with 114
- Issues in Human Sexuality* 71–2
- Iwerne project 87, 220
  
- justice:
  - access to 361–9
  - and climate 234, 246, 248
  - and the disadvantaged 256
  - gender 15
  
- knife crime 46
  
- laity:
  - and bullying of clergy 38, 41, 99–100
  - and civil partnerships 71–2
  - discipline for 99–100
  - and vocations 111, 112

- and witness 17
  - see *also* House of Laity;
- leadership, lay
- Lambeth Conference 2020 13–15, 100, 235
- lament, need for 156, 190, 194, 198, 217–20, 232, 267
- LASPO see Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012
- Law Commission 66–7
- lay ministry:
  - and age limits 98
  - see *also* Readers
- leadership, in estates evangelism 360
- leadership, lay:
  - BAME 199–200
  - and church doctrines 68–9
  - and safeguarding 216
- Leeds diocese, synod motion 345–61
- Legal Advisory Commission 97
- Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO) 361–3
- Legal Aid and Advice Act 1949 362
- Legal Aid Reform (Private Members Motion) 361–9
- Legal Office 36, 56, 124, 132, 173, 325, 332
- legislative business:
  - Channel Islands Measure 4, 7, 21–33, 165–8, 322–8
  - Draft Cathedrals Measure 4, 115–20
  - Draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure 295–312
- Legislative Reform Order 102, 373
- lessons learnt reviews:
  - and abuse 81–2, 213, 216–17
  - and the Windrush scandal 183
- LGBTI Christians:
  - clergy 7
  - and Living in Love and Faith 8–9, 68, 159–61
  - and mental health issues 159
  - and safety 159–60, 162
  - and young people 159, 276
- LICF see Lowest Income Communities Funding
- Life Events team 261–2, 264–5
- LInC funding see Lowest Income Communities Funding
- Living Churchyards* 235
- Living in Love and Faith project 8–9, 68
  - Co-ordinating Group 149, 156
  - cost 76–8
  - and engagement with Scripture 152, 155–9
  - group conversation 152–6
  - and mission 162
  - and Pastoral Advisory Group 68, 72–4, 147–64
  - and Pastoral Principles 68, 74, 76, 148
  - and questions 157–64
  - resources 76, 78, 149–52, 156, 161–3
  - thematic working groups 149
  - and theology 156
  - and young people 164
- Living in Love and Faith* report 13, 49–50
  - and House of Bishops Statement on Civil Partnerships 67, 70, 72–4, 205
  - presentation 148–52
- Living Ministry cohort study 111
- local government, and funeral poverty 257–8, 265–6, 270
- Lodge v Bulloch* judgment 90
- London diocese, synod motion 100
- Lowest Income Communities Funding 56–7, 60, 109
- Makin inquiry 82–3
- Marks of Mission, and the environment 225, 236, 237, 239, 242, 247, 254
- marriage:
  - teaching document see Living in Love and Faith
  - traditional teaching 67–9
- mental health issues 159, 224
- Messy Church 260, 272–3, 282, 291, 292, 295
- ministry:
  - with children and young people 4,

- 50–51, 97–8, 271–95
  - with the disadvantaged 348, 352
  - funding 110
  - self-supporting/stipendiary 64, 109–110
  - to Persian and Iranian Christians 114
- Ministry Council:
  - Quality and Formation Panel 113
  - questions to 109–115
  - and TEIs 61–3
- Ministry Statistics 110–111, 113–14
- mission:
  - among Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities 46–7
  - and cathedrals 116
  - and environment 48–9, 236
  - Five Marks 14, 225, 236, 237, 239, 242, 247, 254
  - and Living in Love and Faith project 162
  - mission initiatives 314
  - and safeguarding 217, 226
- Mission and Public Affairs Council:
  - and environmental programmes 48–9
  - questions to 44–6
- Missional Youth Church Network 273
- Moodle Virtual Learning
  - Environment 114
- Motivating the Million* 55
- mutual flourishing 161
  
- Nashville Statement by the Council
  - on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood 70–71
- National Church Institutions, staff 325
- National Clergy Register 93
- National Deaneries Network 138
- National Estates Church Network 111
- National Investing Bodies (NIBs),
  - climate change and investment 235, 238, 243–5
- National Safeguarding Steering Group 219, 229, 230
- National Safeguarding Team 77, 81, 83–4, 86–9, 213, 215
  
- National Society Council, questions to 105
- Near Neighbours 44
- New Wine 346
- new worshipping communities,
  - leadership 110–111
- No Easy Answer* 45–6
- NSSG see National Safeguarding Steering Group
  
- Old Catholic Churches 106–7
- Ordinal 16, 37, 41
- ordinands:
  - BAME heritage 111, 184, 192–4
  - disabled 111, 113
  - from underrepresented groups 111, 113
  - funding 63–4
  - numbers 109–110
  - on residential or part-time courses 63–4
  - self-supporting/stipendiary 64, 109–110
  - women 110
  
- parents see families
- Paris Climate Agreement 2015
  - 234–5, 236, 238, 245
- parish church councils (PCCs):
  - and climate change 251
  - and co-opted members 309
  - and funeral fees 108
  - and safeguarding 8, 87, 215, 231
  - see also electoral rolls
- parish resources website 55–6
- parish returns 236, 279
- Parish Safeguarding Handbook 87
- parishes:
  - rural, and church schools 290
  - rural, and deanery synod membership 140, 145
  - and mission funding 59–61
  - and work with children and young people 272, 277–9, 283, 285–7, 289–90
- Parliament, Second Estates
  - Commissioner 370–71; see also government
- Parochial Fees Measure 108
- Parochial Fees and Scheduled

Matters Amending Order 2019  
 108  
 Past Cases Review 92  
 Pastoral Advisory Group:  
   and *Living in Love and Faith* 68,  
   72–4, 147–64  
   Pastoral Principles 68, 74–6, 148,  
   357  
 pastoral care:  
   and funeral poverty 258–9, 261,  
   269–70  
   and sexual abuse survivors 220  
 Pastoral Guidelines 153, 162  
 Patronage (Benefices) Measure  
 1986 89, 102  
 Pensions Board:  
   investment in low-carbon  
   economy 238, 245  
   questions to 52–4  
 permission to officiate (PTO),  
 removal 80, 93, 97  
 Persian Christians, ministry with  
 114  
 Peter Ball case 214, 215, 217, 222,  
 226  
 photography, in General Synod 6–7  
 politics, and need for reconciliation  
 372  
 poverty:  
   and climate change 238  
   and debt 263  
   diocesan synod motion 345–61  
   and disability 357, 369  
   and justice 364  
   and paupers' funerals 257–70,  
   364  
   rural 350–51  
   in urban estates 263, 345–61  
 power:  
   and abuse 214, 217, 221, 223,  
   360  
   and the disadvantaged 359–60  
 Presence and Engagement 51–2  
 presentations 4, 8, 49  
   on Channel Islands Measure 19–  
   21  
   on *Living in Love and Faith* report  
   148–52  
 Presidential Address 13–18, 35–6,  
 223  
 private law cases, and legal aid  
 364–6  
 Private Members' Motions:  
   End to Paupers' Funerals 257–70  
   Legal Aid Reform 361–9  
   Windrush Commitment and  
   Legacy 4, 181–203, 227, 360, 375  
   prophecy, prophetic ministry 375–6  
   Prorogation 376  
 Provinces, and General Synod  
 representation 313–21  
  
 Questions 43–115  
   cost 12  
   online 5  
  
 racism 47, 181, 183–90, 192–203,  
 375  
 Readers, and age limits 98  
 reconciliation:  
   and Channel Islands Measure 20,  
   24, 26–33, 167, 323–4, 326  
   in the Church 121–2  
   and politics 372  
 relationships, same-sex 151, 159  
 Relationships and Sex Education  
 (RSE) resources 105  
 religious communities:  
   and electronic voting 329–30  
   and safeguarding 87, 216  
 Remuneration and Conditions of  
 Service Committee (RACSC) 108  
 question to 43–4  
 Renewal and Reform 279  
 Research and Statistics  
   Department 65–6, 112, 271, 314  
 resource churches 279  
 Resourcing Ministerial Education  
 63  
 Roma heritage people, mission and  
 ministry among 46–8  
 Royal Peculiars 124–5  
  
 Safe Spaces project 86, 88–9  
 safeguarding:  
   at parish level 8, 87, 215, 231  
   and Channel Islands Measure  
   167, 324  
   and DBS checks 230  
   and mission 217, 226

response to recommendations of IICSA report 212–33  
 training 86–7, 88, 112  
 Safeguarding Agreements 80  
 Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 2016 86, 102, 215  
 safety, for LGBTI Christians 159–60, 162  
 St Mellitus College 352  
 St Stephen's House, financing 62  
 Salisbury Diocesan Synod, and Channel Islands Measure 21, 22  
 Sarum College 21, 24  
 science and religion 49  
 SDF see Strategic Development Fund  
 Second Estates Commissioner 370–71  
 Secretary General, questions to 101–4  
 Separated Parents Information Programmes 365  
 Serious Youth Violence (SYV) 46  
*Setting God's People Free* 6, 55, 112, 139, 140–41, 289  
 sexuality, teaching document see Living in Love and Faith  
 Share Foundation 280  
 Shared Conversations 72, 78  
 Shared Discernment Framework 63–4  
 Sheldon Hub, Report on CDM 16–17, 37, 39, 41, 90–91  
 simplification 146, 171, 296, 308–9  
 Simplification Task Group 142  
 social action, and GRA:CE project 345  
 Standing Orders:  
   and election appeals 207–9  
   SO 15(2) 9, 204  
   SO 22(3) 184  
   SO 28 7  
   SO 31 226, 231, 353, 360  
   SO 37 181, 233, 327  
   SO 45 376  
   SO 51 24  
   SO 55(C) 165  
   SO 57 118  
   SO 57(6) 298  
   SO 58(4) 299  
   SO 59 120, 299  
   SO 107 148  
   SO 131 207  
   SO 135 208–9  
 Standing Orders Committee report 173, 203–212  
 Statistics for Mission 65–6  
 Stephen Lawrence Inquiry 275  
 Strategic Development Fund (SDF) 57–61  
   and BAME Anglicans 199  
   and estates evangelism 58, 349  
   and rural parishes 59–601  
   and work with children and young people 285, 288  
 Strategic Investment Board 57–60, 109, 243  
 Strategy and Development Unit 56–7  
 street pastors 359  
 suffragan bishops, as acting diocesans 205–6  
 Sustainability Funding 56–8  
 Synodical Government Measure 1969 181, 317  
  
 teaching document see Living in Love and Faith  
 Theological Training Institutions (TEIs):  
   and disabled ordinands 113  
   funding 61–3  
   and *God's Unfailing Word* 52  
   independent students 113–14  
   and new ways into ministry 348, 352  
   and study of biblical languages 113  
 theology:  
   and abuse 86, 213, 220  
   and climate change 234, 237, 246, 250, 255  
   and Living in Love and Faith project 156  
 Thirty-One: Eight 81–2  
 Together Network 44  
 TPI see Transition Pathway Initiative  
 training, for children and youth ministry 275–6

transgender people, and Bishops' Guidance 76  
 Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) 238, 240, 245  
 transitional funding 56–7  
 transparency:  
   and boards of education 303–4  
   and Clergy Discipline Measure 39  
 Traveller heritage people, mission and ministry among 46–8  
 tree planting, community 48–9  
 Triennium Funding Working Group 60, 243  
 Truro diocese, synod motion 100  
 Trussell Trust 45  
 trust:  
   in Church of England 222, 231  
   in General Synod 8–9, 49, 67–8  
   in Living in Love and Faith group 155–6, 162  
 Truth Project 214, 225  
 TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006) 218  
 Turning Up the Volume 185–6, 187, 198

Unlock 349

virtual learning 114

vocations:  
   and disability 111, 113  
   lay 111, 112  
   and peripatetic people 112

Vote 2 budget 105

voting:  
   by Houses 139, 147, 181  
   by whole Synod 33, 203, 233, 251, 270, 286, 327, 369  
   electronic 329–30, 331–40, 343

welcomes:  
   to Anglican Communion guests 3  
   to new members 2–3

Westcott House, external review 61–3, 114–15

Windrush Commitment and Legacy (Private Member's Motion) 4, 181–203, 227, 360, 375

witness, to children and young

people 4  
 women:  
   in male-headship congregations 86  
   ordinands 111  
   see also episcopate, women in  
 Working Group on Clergy Wellbeing 34, 35–6, 37, 41

Year of Pilgrimage 118

young people:  
   and church attendance 65–6, 104, 271–2, 288  
   and climate emergency 234, 237, 243, 253, 254  
   engagement with 65  
   as General Synod members 11, 51  
   and knife crime 46  
   LGBTI 159, 276  
   mission to 50–51, 55, 97–8, 271–95  
   and rural parishes 259–60  
 youth evangelism 271  
 youth violence 45–6  
 youth workers 65, 279, 284

*Index created by Meg Davies*