

Report of Proceedings 2016

**General Synod
July Group of Sessions**

Volume 47, No. 2

Officers of the General Synod

Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

Canterbury

The Revd Canon Simon Butler

York

The Ven Cherry Vann

The House of Laity

Chair

Canon Dr James Harrison

Vice-Chair

Canon Elizabeth Paver

Secretary General

Mr William Nye LVO

Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

Chief Legal Adviser and Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Secretary to the House of Bishops

Mr William Nye LVO

Legislative Counsel

Mr Christopher Packer

Secretary to the House of Clergy

Mr Jonathan Neil-Smith

Deputy Legal Adviser

The Revd Alexander McGregor

Secretary to the House of Laity

Mr Nicholas Hills

Officers of the Convocations

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of Canterbury

Revd Stephen Trott

Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Synodal Secretary of the Convocation of York

The Ven Alan Wolstencroft

Registrar

Ms Caroline Mockford

Contents

Full Synod: First Day (Friday 8 July)

Introductions and Presentations	1
Welcome to Anglican and Ecumenical Guests	2
The EU Referendum	5
Presentation by the Archbishop of York on his Pilgrimage of Prayer	26
Report from the Anglican Consultative Council in Lusaka, April 2016	31
Report by the Business Committee (GS 2024)	35
Appointments to the Archbishops' Council	42
Church Commissioners' Annual Report	44
Questions	47

Second Day (Saturday 9 July)

Legislative Business:	
Draft Mission and Pastoral etc (Amendment) Measure	91
Draft Legislative Reform Measure	112
Draft Inspection of Churches Measure	122
Draft Amending Canon No. 36	129
A Vision and Narrative for Renewal and Reform	144
<i>A Church of England Vision for Education: Report</i>	159
<i>Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders: Report</i>	175
Archbishops' Council's Annual Report	187
The Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for Apportionment for 2017	192
Prorogation	206

Full Synod: First Day Friday 8 July 2016

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod. I would like to thank those who are leading the continuous praying presence for Synod today. The day will start with a short period of worship led by the Synod Chaplain, the Revd Michael Gisbourne, after which the first item of Synod business for today will begin.

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

Introductions

The Chair: Thank you very much, Michael. We now come to Item 1. In a moment, I am going to read out the names of the new members of the Synod or those here in a new capacity. Please stand in your places when I mention your names and remain standing, so that we can greet them all with applause at the end. The new members are: The Rt Revd Martyn Snow, Bishop of Leicester; the Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave, Bishop of Lichfield; the Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft as Bishop of Oxford; the Revd Dr Patrick Richmond replacing the Ven Jan McFarlane from Norwich, who was consecrated Bishop on the Feast of St Peter and St Paul. Are you the only one? We will greet you in the name of the Lord. The Bishop thinks he is responsible for Leicester winning the Football League. It is possible, it is quite possible.

Presentations

The Chair: Item 2, Synod, I can report that the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury and the Lower House of the Convocation of York have elected, respectively, their Pro-Prolocutors and their two Deputy Prolocutors. They are for Canterbury the Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas and the Revd Jane Morris, who unfortunately is unable to be here due to illness, so we will remember her in our prayers; and for York, the Revd Canon Paul Ayers and the Revd Paul Benfield.

Could I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to join me on the platform to greet them? Could I also invite the Prolocutors of Canterbury and York to come to the platform to present, respectively, the Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas, Pro-Prolocutor of Canterbury; and the Revd Canon Paul Ayres and the Revd Paul Benfield, Deputy Pro-Prolocutors.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Your Grace, I have found someone in the Church of England with a sillier title than mine and so I present to you the Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas, newly elected Pro-Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Oh, I thought you were looking at me because you were talking to him.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): No. Newly elected Pro-Prolocutor of the Lower House.

Ven Cherry Vann (Manchester): Archbishop, I present the Revd Canon Paul Ayers to you, newly elected Deputy Prolocutor of the Convocation of York. I also present the Revd Paul Benfield to you, newly elected Deputy Prolocutor of the Convocation of York.

Welcome to Anglican and Ecumenical Guests

The Chair. We now come to Item 3. We welcome our ecumenical representatives, in particular the following newly appointed ecumenical representatives. After naming them, I will invite them to stand together and then we will greet them both. Please remain seated until I invite you stand. The Very Revd Dr Angus Morrison representing the Church of Scotland and the Revd Dr Claire Potter representing the Methodist Church. May I invite them to stand so we can greet them both.

In addition to our nine ecumenical representatives who are with us at each group of sessions, in July we always welcome some additional Anglican and ecumenical guests. Unlike the nine ecumenical representatives they attend on one occasion only and do not have speaking rights. I am going to ask them to stand and invite you to greet each one of them in turn when I have introduced them.

On this occasion we welcome Mr Andreas H. Aarflot, adviser to the National Council Department of Church Order, Church of Norway. Remain standing while I say something about you. Mr Aarflot is a political scientist and adviser to the National Council of the Church of Norway with a particular focus on matters of Church order and canon law. He is a member of the governing body of the Conference of European Churches and also serves on the Executive Committee of the Church's Commission for Migrants in Europe. True? God bless you. Thank you very much.

Dr Ritchie, Secretary General representing the Representative Church Body, Church of Ireland. Mr Ritchie is the new Secretary General and Chief Officer of the Representative Church Body of the Church of Ireland. A fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants and an engineering graduate, he was formerly Executive Director of De Lage Landen Ireland. He is a non-executive Director of Concern Worldwide, having previously worked as an engineer for Concern in Cambodia and Rwanda where he helped to manage the construction of refugee reception centres. We congratulate you, thank you. Landesbischof Ralf Meister (Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland) Co-Chair of the Meissen Commission, who will be giving the ecumenical address. Please stand and I will say something about you, Sir. Bishop Ralf Meister is the Landesbischof of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Hanover, one of the largest Landeskirche of the Evangelical Church in Germany. Previously he served as the General Superintendent (regional bishop) in Berlin. He also has worked in the Department of Political Theology at the University of Hamburg and has been a longstanding contributor to religious broadcasting on German radio.

Earlier this year he was appointed as the new Co-Chair of the Meissen Commission which

is responsible for implementing the commitments between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany under the Meissen Agreement. Of course, the other Co-Chair is the Bishop of Leeds. We greet you most warmly in the name of our Lord. I would now like to invite Landesbischof Ralf Meister to come on to the platform to deliver a greeting to the Synod on behalf of the ecumenical guests.

Landesbischof Ralf Meister (Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland): Your Graces, members of the Synod of the Church of England, dear brothers and sisters in Christ. It is a great honour to attend this General Synod of the Church of England and to convey to you today the cordial greetings of the Evangelical Church of Germany.

I bring to you the greetings of the Council of the EKD, by the Chairman of the Council, Bishop Professor Heinrich Bedford-Strohm, the greetings of the Plenary Church Conference and the Presidium of the Synod, personally from the Chair of the Presidium, Mrs Schwätzer.

When I give these greetings I do it as the Bishop of Hanover and there is (you know it better than me probably) a common bond between us because King George I was King of Great Britain and Ireland from 1714 and ruler of the Duchy and Electorate of Brunswick-Lüneburg, which was the Kingdom of Hanover.

Dear brothers and sisters, you come together in turbulent times. I am aware that the decision of the Brexit is a national democratic decision but, with due respect to that, it has an enormous impact on the international, especially the European, situation and for Germany as well.

Please allow me to make short remarks about the new fragile European situation and our responsibility as Christians. First, I was irritated that the main reaction in Germany about the Brexit was a discussion about the financial and economic consequences of this Referendum. The European dream was, and is, a dream of humanity and justice and not a question of whether the stock market is placed in London or in Frankfurt or about the future of the single market. But, most important, the idea of Europe is based on shared values and peace.

Recently, we remembered the Battle of the Somme in 1916 and when we look for some voices which proclaim a European perspective rooted in Christian values, we find this voice in words and music from your nation: In the *War Requiem* by Benjamin Britten, with the poetry by Wilfred Owen. Owen fought in the war zone of the Somme and died in 1918: "My subject is war and the pity of war. The poetry is in the pity. [...] All a poet can do today is warn." Owen spoke that as a Christian.

What a strong sign of hope and reconciliation it was when the War Requiem was first performed in Coventry Cathedral in 1962. It will be the Christian charge to warn of a separated Europe - in all the tendencies for a new nationalism and the modern attraction of political populists. A Europe split in gated national communities will undermine a common period of social, economic, cultural and peaceful welfare in Europe. But the duty for the Churches in Europe is not only to warn, but to give our people the hope that the liberation in God's Grace will be the condition for a profound understanding of freedom,

justice and peace.

Second, we in the EKD are on the way to celebrate the jubilee of the Reformation in 2017. It will be the first jubilee in 500 years which we celebrate in a deep ecumenical understanding with other denominations, parallel to a fruitful and a religious dialogue with Jews and Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs and others. So we realise that the "Reformation is [in German, Weltbürger] a world citizen." It inter-connects us in a strong line with Christians all over the world.

The Meissen Agreement states: "We will take steps to closer fellowship in as many areas as possible, so that all our members together may advance on the way to full visible unity." This is, first of all, an ecumenical sentence, first for us, for your Church and mine. But this is a sentence of faith and hope and it is also a strong political proclamation for worldwide responsibility as Christians, the responsibility to take the challenges of the modern, complex and anxious world as an invitation from God himself to work for his Creation.

In this world "right" answers are not easily found, but we have the task to witness our belief in God, to practise tolerance and to engage even in difficult dialogues. Christianity has a history of inter-denominational persecutions, discriminations, violence and war. We know that it took centuries to come from "conflict to communion." May we owe our countries the story of the long way to the house of our neighbours. Yes, we owe our people the story of tolerance and acceptance, of respect and dialogue, of reconciliation and peace in the light of the Gospel.

We need a strong common narrative of Europe in which our Christian experiences are still decisive. Christians are resilient and resistant people. We are strengthened in the hope from the Creator of heaven and earth. The liberating message of the Gospel was in the midst of the Reformation and we listen to that message in a different context in exciting times, like these troubling days in Europe.

The Reformation was a catalyst for a new understanding of the Church's role in society. In that tradition we stand in England as well as in Germany, in the Anglican Church as well as in the Evangelical Church in Germany.

Let me end with a word from the protestant theologian and martyr, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, from his "Letters and Papers from Prison":

"Choose and do what is right, not what fancy takes.
Not weighing the possibilities, but bravely grasping the real.
Not in the flight of ideas, but only in action is there freedom.
Come away from your anxious hesitations into the storm of events.
Carried by God's command and your faith alone.
Then freedom will embrace your spirit with rejoicing."

God bless your Synod.

The Chair: We are grateful for your warm words, Landesbischof, thank you very much.

Thank you, Synod. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 3.00 pm.

The Chair: Members of Synod, before we move to the next item of business, I understand that the Chair of the Business Committee wishes to propose a variation to our Agenda. The details are on the Fifth Notice Paper and so I invite Canon Booy's to address the Synod.

Revd Canon Sue Booy's (Oxford): Thank you very much, Chair. The gist of what I am about to say, as the Chair has told you, is on the first page of the Fifth Notice Paper and I think you will realise the reason for my standing at this stage. I wish to move a variation in the order of business, following the direction of the Presidents, under Standing Order 4(3), of the addition to the Agenda of a debate on the EU Referendum. That debate is to be taken immediately.

Following the debate, the Agenda will resume as printed with the Archbishop of York's presentation, the presentation on the ACC and the Business Committee Report which stands at Item 6. After that, I propose that we debate Item 10, GS 2026, the report which Synod asked for on Discerning and Nurturing Senior Leadership.

I further propose that the rubric preceding Items 7 and 8, Appointments to the Archbishops' Council, be amended to read, 'not later than 6 o'clock', therefore allowing us to make the on-going appointments to Archbishops' Council detailed in GS 2025. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Canon Booy's. This variation needs the general consent of the Synod, does it have the Synod's consent?

The motion was carried on a show of hands

The Chair: It clearly does, thank you. That means that the order of business will now follow that which is set out on page 4 of Order Paper 1.

The EU Referendum

The Chair: We move now to Item 24, a debate on a motion on the EU Referendum. This is an item of urgent business added to the Agenda by the Archbishops under Standing Order 4. May I remind members that this is a debate on the motion standing in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the precise terms of which may be found on Order Paper 1. I hope that we shall be able to maintain the forward-looking approach of the motion throughout our debate today.

It may help members if I indicate that I intend to move to deal with the amendments at an early stage in the proceedings so that we might then return to a substantial debate on the main motion, as amended or not. I call upon his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to move Item 24. Your Grace, you have up to ten minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod, recognising the result of the recent referendum on the United Kingdom’s membership of the European Union, welcome the Archbishops’ call for all to unite in the common task of building a generous and forward looking country, contributing to human flourishing around the world, and encourage all members of the Church of England to play their part actively in partnership with everyone in Civil Society in pursuit of this task.’

The length of the Referendum campaign, the high turnout and the clarity of the result means, it seems to me, that whatever our view of what we would have preferred, we must now deal with the world as it is and seek not merely survival after Brexit (if we were one of the 48%) but the common good, the flourishing of all our citizens and the seizing of the opportunities offered to our nation, above all, to witness to the Kingdom of God.

The Referendum result was a huge event, either for good or bad, depending on your view, but in any case huge. Earlier this week, the House of Lords debated a full two days, a very unusual event, on the Referendum outcome. As the debate went on, and I sat through much of it and spoke towards the beginning, it became clearer and clearer how big an event it is. We think of the economic aspects and other aspects, but there are also aspects around civil aviation and numerous other areas. It seems to me to be clear that, although we will leave the EU two years after the section 50 notification has been given, in all probability, the impact and the legislative programme that will follow will keep all of us occupied well beyond that period, in fact beyond the active service of most of us at this Synod.

Although it would be easy to be either utopian or cataclysmic and apocalyptic, I think that Synod would be deeply mistaken to fear in either direction. I want to look at the context in which we find ourselves and then raise some challenges that lie before us.

First, the context. It is perfectly clear that the result and the Referendum campaign exposed deep divisions in our society, of which we were aware already. They are especially complex because they are divisions, in part, about our identity as a nation, whether in England or other parts of the UK, and identity is always more difficult to deal with than issue driven politics.

A key issue was around the questions of integration - integration of those who have migrated here either very recently or over the last two or three generations - but also integration within the different parts of our society. In mentioning that, it is also important to mention the question of integration of those of our citizens who live within the European Union. The Bishop in Europe, Bishop Robert, will talk more about that in a few moments, I suspect, if the Chairman calls him. We need to remember that we have over two million anxious expatriates outside these shores. We also have an equivalent number of residents in this country who feel fearful and rejected, many of them with very, very good reason.

The result has released a latent racism and xenophobia in all sectors and challenges the prevailing consensus of tolerance and acceptance, thus threatening other areas of

welcome liberalisation. As I said, we are going to face a period of profound uncertainty.

One of the greatest uncertainties is when and what is the effect of a section 50 notification to the European Union that we intend to leave; whether it is ever reversible, should we choose to do so; or whether, once given, that is it, and how we negotiate during that period.

Faced with such uncertainty, which will affect us economically, socially, spiritually and every other way, I want to put before the Synod three challenges and a conclusion.

The challenges are this. Alistair Campbell famously said to Tony Blair, "We don't do God." Well, I trust that the Church of England, and in particular this Synod will, in this debate and in the many that will follow it on the consequences of the Referendum and the outworkings of that, give sufficient evidence to the world to be convinced of us doing God a great deal.

To do God means not to accept fear as the decisive force in our thinking, although we need to be real about its effects on us and the effects of insecurity. The eternal God is our refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms. God is Lord of history and sovereign in events. We are in His hands.

He raised Jesus Christ from the dead. He gives us the Holy Spirit to equip us to live as God's people in all times and circumstances. Paul reminds us that nothing can separate us from the love of God: the Psalmist brings troubles and victories and lays them before God.

This is a time for remembering the authority and power of God revealed in Jesus Christ and of the good news that we have in our hands for all people in this land. All around the world Christians suffer and yet trust. We can do no less. We are to be led by our theology which must define our politics, our fears and our hopes.

If we are going to do that, we have to tackle especially the issues of integration. Integration, as I said, means not only with those who come from different cultures or who have come over much of the period since the Second World War from abroad, but also integration within our own land. If we are going to do that, we have to tackle issues of inequality. We have seen the very sharp increase in child poverty, the signs that inequality is growing in our land. Greater equality seeks the common good and opens opportunities for aspiration in all households. The shock of Brexit must be one that forces us into a juster and a fairer society and a more equal one.

If we are going to do that, we must renew our commitment in the areas of education, the fresh vision for education which has recently come to us. We must develop a workforce that is capable not only of using trade deals but of trading under them. We must recognise that we are going to have to be agile, educated and have that agility and education based in value in a way that we have never had to do before - and those values best come through the Christian education that we offer.

We need to renew our commitment to public health, to mental health, to housing, those

areas which in the 19th century and in the late 1940s we led the country with great courage and determination. We need to address integration vigorously and with courage. We cannot allow the fifth richest economy on earth to say it cannot afford to help the poorest people on earth.

We need a forward foreign policy that is based in development and love for the poor, those caught in conflict and suffering around the world. The outbursts of the last two weeks may pass, but the signal has been set at danger for our cohesion and the Church must respond with a fresh effort in integration.

I am deeply moved by the words of the Landesbischof Meister. As one who has worked at Coventry and who bears the Cross of Nails, I say, Sir, that we will listen to your words and, although we may have left the European Union we have not left Europe. Although we will leave the European Union, and although the politics may change, the cross of Christ and the work of the Spirit links us irrevocably to you forever.

Lastly, a conclusion. The clearest inspiration for all this to those outside the Church, the best way in which we will communicate, the way we bring hope in anxious times, is to be a holy community and one which is recognised in its conduct as manifestly holy.

That must mean that we keep the needs of the poorest in this country and around the world at the front of our minds. We must manage our own disagreements, whether over sexuality or other matters, with transparent love and delight and not with words and actions that discredit the hope of unity. We must be renewed in joyful and boundless love for each other and our neighbour, expressed in action, shown in worship and prayer.

These years of uncertainty that we face before us are a moment for the Church to rise in its witness, confident in its Saviour, honest about its faults, committed to the truth of the Gospel. This is not a time for fear. I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 24 is now open for debate. I call the Bishop in Europe followed by - not because of episcopal command - the Second Church Estates Commissioner, Ms Spelman. I have determined to give the Bishop in Europe seven minutes, given the duality of his role as both Bishop in Europe and the Archbishop of Canterbury's representative to the EU institutions. Thereafter the speech limit will be five minutes.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Dr Robert Innes): I am the only episcopal member of this Synod to live on the European continent, so I bear a particular responsibility for saying how recent events look from across the Channel. I live in Belgium, the country in which many of the battles of two Great Wars were fought. Belgians see the EU as a vital part of the peace-building and reconciliation of post-War Europe. As I often say, "You can't understand Brussels without first visiting Ypres".

Everyone understands that the EU is imperfect but my Belgian friends are deeply shocked and saddened that Britain is walking away from it. In our church in Brussels the Referendum result has caused the shedding of tears. I know men and women who have given their whole careers to building the European institutions. They contributed administrative and diplomatic skills of the highest order that were widely respected

amongst their European colleagues, and now they feel their country has rejected their life's work. In my European diocese, a few people are pleased with the result, but many more are deeply upset. One older man in Paris said to me, "I have never been so ashamed of my country". A lady in Geneva said to me, "I have found it hard to stop being angry". Shame, anger and deep sadness are typical of the emotions that I encounter.

My diocese includes retired British people living in Spain and rural France. They are desperately worried about how they will access health care; how their pensions will be affected; whether they will even have the right to remain. These are often not particularly wealthy people, but ordinary working people who thought that they could safely retire to a warmer place, and they now fear becoming pawns in a complex negotiation about migration. Let me be clear, from my European perspective, this Referendum and its result represent a sad loss of national vocation, an abject failure of political leadership and a squandering of the birth right of our young people.

But we must move on. We are where we are. This Synod shares with the people of Britain the responsibility of living with the Referendum result. For Remain supporters, that means refusing to bear grudges against those with whom we profoundly disagree. For Leave supporters it means facing and understanding the deep pain that many are feeling. Together we must rebuild a sense of common purpose and work through the chilly economic times which are already coming upon us.

Beyond the shores of this island, our Christian brothers and sisters in Europe are shaken by what we have done. One of the particular roles of the Church is to demonstrate our continuing commitment to them. At present Britain seems to be a country anxious to build fences; my job as a bishop is to build bridges. There have been English-speaking churches and chaplaincies in Europe for over 400 years. We have been in Europe since long before the EU was created and I want to assure this Synod we are staying in Europe. Our people in Athens have worked alongside the Greek Orthodox Church in feeding the victims of the debt crisis. Our people in France have stood shoulder to shoulder with the local people in Charlie Hebdo marches. Our parishioners in Germany are working with fellow Christians in the welcome of refugees. On the European continent our diocese endeavours to build personal, emotional and spiritual ties across people and nations. Christians on these islands can do that too.

Finally, I say to English parishes that now is the time to strengthen your partnership links in Europe. Now is the time to consider linking with a diocese in Europe chaplaincy. Now is the time to write a friendly letter to someone you know in a European church. The Referendum has severely disappointed many of our European compatriots. Whichever way we voted, now, more than ever, we Christians must work on cross-border, cross-European bonds of friendship, understanding and trust.

I close with a poem that has some prophetic words to say from our generous island Anglican spirituality: "No man is an island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend's or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

Rt Hon Mrs Caroline Spelman (ex officio): I am grateful to Synod that it found time to address such a pressing issue in our national life. In the interests of transparency, I did campaign to remain. Now the nation must look forward and not back because aspects of the campaign have left us with a very divided nation, and the Church needs to continue its work as a uniting force in our communities; supporting the vulnerable, the marginalised and challenging xenophobia. Indeed “No man is an island”.

The Referendum result has put our country back on the global frontline. No longer under the umbrella of the EU, we will have to tackle the challenges and inequalities, which are exacerbated by globalisation, climate change and migration in a way we have not done for years.

The bishops in Parliament will need to keep a close eye on the Government to ensure the country retains its diverse, internationalist focus through the aid budget, G7, G20, NATO and the UN. The Church can feed back to Parliament the impact the EU negotiations are having throughout the Anglican Communion worldwide. As we move forward, for the UK to succeed in the wider world, we will have to work harder to genuinely bring the whole country with us on our journey ahead. We as the Church of England have to think afresh how we reach the vulnerable and the marginalised. In this respect, I commend the Mission and Public Affairs Council’s work on welfare reform and the *Thinking Afresh About Welfare* report from the Revd Canon Dr Malcolm Brown.

The Church has a particular mission to the communities it serves in the UK and around the globe and it must seek to address the very real concerns and divisions which have come to light during the campaign, and take steps to heal those divisions. I have been deeply saddened, as I am sure many of you were, to see the stories of increased racial hatred against EU citizens, as well as those of other communities who may have been here for generations. I listened carefully to the anger expressed on the doorstep and I know that one of the greatest challenges both for the Church and for Parliament will be addressing its causes.

We need that model that comes from Leviticus where it says: “Do not seek revenge or bear a grudge against anyone among your people but love your neighbour as yourself”. Given its timeless significance, small wonder Jesus emphasised that last phrase “love your neighbour”.

The Church must be seen in its communities visibly living out its mission to break down barriers and build bridges. The Church has a particular and unique reach into communities, alongside a toolkit of spiritual language which enables the Church to address these challenges far better than politicians, especially in the time of current turmoil. The Church and State need to work together effectively to heal the country - socially, economically and politically - and we need constructive engagement as critical friends.

A really good example of this is the Near Neighbours project which has proven that for only a small investment thousands of community projects can be launched impacting the lives of over one million people so far. The funding by DCLG in its third phase is timely

and allows the Church to disseminate best practice across its networks. It has also proven it can be practical and appropriate to use the Church of England parish structures and its public duty of care for all souls as an alternative means to deliver public policy aims where these are consistent with the Gospel.

The nation, as the Archbishop of Canterbury set out in the House of Lords this week, needs a vision and a set of values to which it can reconnect at the start of the process as we negotiate to leave the EU in the years ahead. This is a great opportunity for the Church to step beyond its walls and engage with our communities. This is the time for the parishes to work together. As Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians, "Just as a body, though one, has many parts, but all its many parts form one body, so it is with Christ." The Church has the potential to offer great leadership in this area and can bring healing and a listening ear to our communities.

To conclude, to take an excerpt from one of the prayers we use in Parliament every day, my prayer for this Synod is that will lay aside all private interests, prejudices and partial affections, in the hope that all our counsels may be to thy glory. These next few years are a great mission of opportunity for the Church of England and the Anglican Communion that I hope we can all grasp.

Revd Canon Graeme Buttery (Durham): If you came to Hartlepool - and let us face it why would you not - you will find lots of statues as communities of a certain age tend to have. We have statues of the great Victorian founding fathers of West Hartlepool, Ward Jackson and William Gray and people such as that. God bless William Gray; it was his money that built my church. We have two even more important statues. One down at the marina is of a monkey. If you need to know why Hartlepool would honour a monkey, I will tell you the story afterwards. Confusingly, it is not a monkey, it is an ape, but that is a different story. The other one on the Headland, where the codheads dwell, is of Andy Capp, that well-known cartoon layabout and fictional character. We have a statue of Andy Capp because his creator comes from Hartlepool.

The thing that surprises me given Andy Capp's fictional nature is that from much I have read, thought and heard since 23 June, I am under the impression that Andy Capp voted in the European Referendum, and not just once; apparently, if you believe some folk, he voted 17 million times. That is very clever because Hartlepool does not like to vote. In the police and crime commissioner elections the first time round the turnout was 11%. To get 72% for this is interesting.

What I am going to say I do not necessarily believe, or even agree with, and I am no spokesman for the folk of Hartlepool. I am not their elected representative. They are big enough, daft enough (or clever enough) to speak for themselves, but this is what a parish priest thinks. The good folk who voted 70% to leave and 30% to stay were angry. They were angry at all sorts of things, but the vote was not some incoherent rage. Please, please never get that idea. It was a shout, but it was the sort of focused shout that kung fu masters give before they start a contest. It is the sort of grunt you will hear as two scrums come together in conflict on the rugby field. It was a focus, an idea, a concept and a belief that all too many folk in Hartlepool and other places feel has not been heard for well over 40 years, on this and many other issues.

It beggars my belief that if you give folk a voice you could ever be surprised that they will give one of the two possible answers. You might not like it; you gave them the choice.

But, it was not just the rage. It was about a powerlessness that these people have. The European Union has poured vast sums of money into places such as Hartlepool and it is a very ethnically monochrome place, so why on earth would they vote the way they did? Since we joined the European Union, the shipyards have sunk, the coal mines have collapsed, the steel works - dare I mention it - have rusted and the chemical works have dissolved. The jobs that came were "lasses' jobs", and even they did not last because when, three to four years ago, the call centre company that had set up in Hartlepool decided to downsize and move to India, Hartlepool lost 600 jobs in one day. In a community of 95,000, that is not clever, and no number of grants from the European Union can make that right anywhere near quickly.

It is about wanting their voice heard. It is about saying, "Look what's gone wrong". It is about, "Every time you ask our opinion you then tell us 'we have given you something different'." It does not matter whether it is general elections, local elections, police and criminal commissioners or anything else, they are pleased to be asked; they ask to be heard and just sometimes that their voice will make a difference.

It is also about aspiration. It is precisely because they are such a monochrome place that they quite like other folk, even folk from as far away as Stockton. They still think you need a passport. But, it is about the idea of a community which has gone or which they have never had. If you want to see the difference in what happens when local folk make local decisions with lots of money and power, then come to Dye House and I will show you what a big local is like and the difference it can make. These people have not had that power for a very long time, if ever, and they just want a bit of it to make a difference.

I am pleased at the motion we have before us which calls us to unite; uniting not just so we have a forward-looking country but so that we make a difference to the world. So let us indeed unite, Archbishop. Let us unite around some of the themes you mentioned. Let us unite around a workforce which does not have the tyranny of zero hours' contracts, where jobs move anywhere except Hartlepool, mysteriously. Let us unite around an education which is universally available for everyone, where you do not get older and sicker and die earlier the more you move across town. Let us have the sort of aspiration and hope which does not have a divide of north/south/east/west or anything else. Let us start here and now and appreciate the voice and talents - God given - of every single person.

The Chair. I call the Revd Paul Hutchinson to speak to and move his amendment at Item 25. He has three minutes.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): I beg to move:

'Leave out "recognising" and insert "mindful of".'

I was in Hartlepool on 23 June. What is recognition? At its most basic, it is re-cognition;

a bringing something back to thought, maybe a well-known face or a familiar path. I doubt many of us will need to bring the Referendum back to thought at this point. It has been the new reality of these last two weeks; a new reality that has seen a major rise in hate speech and hate crime; a new reality that has shown us that those vulnerable and marginalised communities such as Hartlepool and Sunderland - where the last speaker and I have both previously served - may have power in some sense, but they are now very vulnerable to being the most affected by the cost of change. This is a hard and difficult new reality. Recognition is not simply a bringing back to mind. It is also a word that carries overtones: overtones of approval, acceptance, acknowledgement of legitimacy or authority. Ambassadors are recognised at court. New countries and regimes are recognised by the existing family of nations. Experts - yes, remember them - are also recognised as such.

I think many of us here are struggling with these overtones of approval or acceptance in relation to the Referendum. Many of us are well aware of the unretracted misrepresentations in the campaign. Many of us are conscious that we were given Referendum legislation with no provision for its outcome. We know too well that the process lacked the requirement for a special majority that major constitutional and change would normally need, here in Synod and elsewhere.

We have heard voices of regret. We have seen campaign leaders step back. We have had our eyes opened about the lack of clarity that the vote has delivered. There is a great deal about which we are unsettled.

For those of us who struggle with the overtones of approval, we need a new word; a word more neutral than "recognises"; a word that allows both those that are happy with the current status and those who are not to stand alongside each other and the Archbishops in this motion. I offer the words "mindful of" as that more neutral replacement. I invite Synod to approve this amendment so that those with reservations about where we now find ourselves do not have to recognise the result, and can vote with a good conscience for the main motion. I move the amendment that stands in my name.

The Chair. The Archbishop of Canterbury to comment.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I am very grateful for the suggestion of the amendment and thank you for the way in which you put it forward. I would however wish to resist it, partly because I think "recognise" is not an expression of approval. You recognise things you dislike, such as Brussels sprouts, or garlic in my case; you recognise people with whom you have difficulties; you recognise challenges. It does not mean you approve of them; it merely means you acknowledge that they exist and you do not try to pretend otherwise. I would want to resist this because I think it could make the Synod look as though it was saying that we rejected the result of the Referendum in one way or another. I think that might be the subtext that would be interpreted, and that would be unhelpful. Thank you very much.

The Chair. The debate now is on Item 25 and speeches should be addressing the particular wording of the proposed amendment. I remind you that a three-minute speech limit is in force.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Despite his Grace's warning, I want to support this amendment because I do not think it would be saying that this Synod rejects the outcome of the Referendum. It recognises its true status. We are in danger in this country of falling into a constitutional heresy. We are a parliamentary democracy. It is Parliament that legislates for us. It is not advisory referenda. The Referendum was a clear expression of view by a narrow majority, fewer than 40% of those entitled to vote voted to leave. To my mind, to say that this therefore has to shape the future of our country for ever is not only folly; it simply flies in the face of the constitution under which we are governed in this country. Clearly the Government cannot ignore it, but there are an enormous number of possible outcomes if it does not feel that it has to be governed for ever by a narrow majority which is a minority of the electorate. I think "mindful of" enables us to move forward recognising that we have to live with what has happened. Clearly the Government needs to enter into negotiations in Europe - it cannot ignore what has happened - but, equally, being mindful of what has happened also enables us to embrace the possibility that things will change, and that new ways of being in relation to the rest of the European Union could emerge. If we are going to be hopeful in the sovereign God, then we should not exclude any possibility. I do not want us to give the Referendum any status beyond what it has as an advisory one. I want us to keep open before us all the possibilities of a new relationship with Europe, which does not necessarily involve leaving.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): Point of order: motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: I would be very glad to hear from you then, Mr Gray.

Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I would wish to resist this amendment. I had the privilege a little while before the Referendum of chairing a hustings meeting in my church. Two hundred and fifty people turned up. It was an extremely boisterous, lively, polite and highly engaged occasion in which very many members of the public, a lot of whom would not normally be in church, were there. It was a privilege to be involved in it.

During the days that followed, partly as a result of the profile that the church was able to have, I had more conversations about politics, and indeed the Gospel, than I have had with a great many people before or since. That too was a privilege. What I found time and time again was a very considerable number of people genuinely and powerfully wrestling with heart and mind as to where they were going to put their cross in the box. They struggled with views of migration; they struggled with views of economy; they struggled with views about regulation; they struggled with views about sovereignty, and they were each searching hard. As I found out in many an interesting anecdote, many of those who were scratching their heads and worrying that they were given a pencil with which to mark their cross and that it might be rubbed out in the subsequent count, had never voted before. If we accept this amendment we are in danger of saying we are not sure we like to listen to those people. We might not like the result that we got, but we got it, and taking Clive Scowen's argument, "recognising" does not affect any constitutional issue at all. We are in the same place as Parliament; what happens happens, but we must recognise the cries that we heard, not least from Canon Buttery, and we must not accept this amendment. Thank you.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): On a point of order, Chair, I beg to move a motion for closure on Item 25.

The Chair: That has my permission, Mr Freeman.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I put Item 25 to the vote.

The amendment was lost on a show of hands.

The Chair: Now I would like to invite Mrs Barron to speak to and move her amendment at Item 26.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): I beg to move:

‘After “European Union” insert “(a)”’

And

‘At the end insert as a new paragraph–

“(–) commend the work already carried out by the Church in bringing communities together and recommend that as a minimum every bishop identify a champion in their diocese to assess what more the Church could do and to make recommendations for creating stronger and more constructive links between local communities as a basis for achieving this common task.”’

I think this counts as my maiden speech. I asked a question last time, but I have not really spoken before.

I must say I welcome heartily the inclusion of this debate in our session and fully support the words of the motion. However, in putting down the amendment which stands in my name, I would like to see the original motion go further.

The Referendum campaign itself, the results of the vote, and what is now happening have opened up wounds in our society which have been festering for some time, and this was made very clear by the Archbishop in his opening speech. As Christians, whichever way we voted - I put my hand up and say I voted to remain - we must surely want to work to heal the wounds and to address the underlying causes of the diseases which manifest themselves through these sores. Probably the ugliest of these sores is the vicious racism we have seen in some areas, but there are also issues of poverty, unemployment, marginalisation and hopelessness.

It is excellent that the Archbishop has issued this rallying cry to all members of the Church of England to help with others in building a generous and forward-looking country and, of course, the Church must always be there to give hope. I believe that the Church would appear far more credible if the motion went beyond exhortation, and that is why I have tabled my amendment. As members of the national Church we need to step up to the plate and give leadership, especially at this time of apparent absence of leadership in civil government.

I have suggested my amendment in order to give a little more substance to the original motion. I have no wish to detract from it, this is meant to be in addition and it is not everything that can be done; I have said “as a minimum”. It does not require, it recommends, and it is not prescriptive, but I think it is a start to putting flesh on the bones.

You can read the motion. I have suggested that each bishop as a minimum specifies somebody who can take this forward in their area and build on the invaluable work already done by the Church. I feel that too often the Church appears to the rest of society to be irrelevant; we are not, and it is surely completely in line with the Renewal and Reform agenda to make this abundantly clear. Let us be brave, let us “do God”, and show our worth in helping to address the ills revealed by the vote to leave the EU.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Barron. I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to comment.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I am very grateful to Mrs Barron for her proposed amendment. I am minded to support the amendment and to accept it. I particularly note her helpful comments that this is additional to; it is not meant to replace something or scrap anything. It is worded as a recommendation.

I think this issue around unity and integration that Canon Buttery with exceptional eloquence put in front of us is one that the Church should be at the very forefront of tackling. We are already doing it, as Caroline Spelman said, through Near Neighbours and in routine day-to-day work in so many places across the country, through chaplaincies and parishes. I think Mrs Barron’s amendment enables us to focus a bit more.

I hope, with the Archbishop of York, we may discuss ways in which we can give perhaps more flesh to the bones and more impetus to that. I have already had suggestions from various people about how we focus on issues of integration in unity, as I said in my speech, not only as regards people who have come to this country but also within the deep and profound divisions revealed within this country. I hope that the Synod would consider accepting this amendment. Thank you.

The Chair: Item 26 is now open for debate. I remind members that this is the particular matter under consideration and speeches must be directed at the amendment.

Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford): Chair, I just want to make one short suggestion which I hope will build on Enid Barron’s amendment. The St Ethelburga’s Centre for Reconciliation and Peace in London, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is patron, has for many years been developing a programme of training peacemakers. We focus our work mostly on training young people, millennials, who go back into their communities as peacemakers doing community work in various communities in and around London working with refugees and many other people.

It is difficult for us to reach much beyond London, but it occurs to me there is absolutely nothing that should stop us from training trainers from dioceses, so if any diocese is interested in sending people to St Ethelburga’s to have the training programme that we

have in training peacemakers we would greatly welcome that. In that way, hopefully, we could extend the work that we do into other parts of the country so that other dioceses, building on Enid Barron's amendment, could also train peacemakers at community work and community reconciliation.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on Item 26.

The Chair: That has my permission, so I will put it to the Synod. The motion for the closure of Item 26 has been proposed.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I put Item 26 to the vote.

The amendment was carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: We return now to the debate on the main motion, Item 24, as amended by Item 26.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett: This message is still quite emotional, I still feel quite raw, though I have spent much time processing the outcome of the Referendum as I have had to work through this topic with the children in my parish school and with my own young child.

Let me say first that I understand the need for fearlessness as we work for reconciliation and healing and bridges of conversation and engagement between what seem to be almost two halves of the country in numbers, in areas of the country rural and urban, Scotland, Ireland and England, young and old, and all the other differences that have been pointed out so far. I understand the complexities of kneejerk binary responses and dangers of vilifying those who do not agree with our particular perspective. In my own family some voted to leave. I say some in my own family in that way because they voted on the basis that there were too many immigrants.

I even get that as people live in areas with high levels of local unemployment and high levels of inward migration for low income jobs, some have felt forgotten and marginalised and voted to be heard as they cried out their local problems and their pain. While I cannot understand, I do get it. This is probably because I have lived in this country for a good part of the past 40 years, and over that period I have lived in Northern Ireland and Wales, as well as England. I have lived in Belfast, Swansea, Brighton, Coventry, and now London.

During that time, I have witnessed a country that moved from a lack of understanding of ethnic difference to a high level of tolerance of others with different coloured skins or accents. I have no rose-tinted spectacles and I know that there was still a great deal of conscious and unconscious bias operating in institutions and among individuals, but I felt

that in most circumstances I, and those like me, different from the majority members of the UK by ethnicity and colour, could be myself and be accepted.

I do not come from a polarised position thinking that all BAME people hold the same views as me. My own family is very blended and integrated with different ethnicities and colours making up our family, and I know that holds true for many people here too. However, when I read the racist postings, and continue to hear them, and listen to friends of all shades and accents who have been racially abused, when I listened to my own daughter who asked me on the day after the Referendum vote if we had to leave, I am hurt remembering all the past hurts of racism that happened to me.

Yes, let us as a Church continue to speak and demonstrate the open, inclusive and affirming love of Christ that is our USP. Let us continue to work to build bridges. Some of us now find ourselves consciously moved back into the vulnerable and marginalised categories and have our identity questioned, and some of us are scared and really hurting.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): Point of order: motion for closure on this item of business.

The Chair: I would like to hear some more debate. If you wish to try this motion later I will receive it then, but we will continue for the moment.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): Chairman, I am very grateful to the Archbishops for enabling this debate to take place. It seems to me, however, that we need to take a much more radical look at what has happened. It seems to me that the Referendum has revealed the shifting of tectonic plates in England comparable to what has happened in Scotland where politics has shifted away from the old parties and the old politics and has replaced them with a new party which is partly protest, partly nationalist, but above all a rejection of Westminster and the political and financial world which it sees subsisting there. It seems to me that the Referendum has revealed a similar mindset among many people in England and Wales and there is a disturbing sense of unreality as leadership elections now take place - or do not take place, we do not yet know - among the Westminster parties.

I think there is every reason to think that when the next general election takes place in 2020, or sooner, those parties at Westminster will face the same rejection at the polls as they have experienced in Scotland. The reality of how politics and economics are widely perceived can be now seen revealed in the regional Referendum results. Apart from the prosperous centres in London and certain cities, most of England and Wales have by a majority rejected a political narrative which has prevailed since the 1960s. The polls also indicate that a majority of Christians reject what we have come to share in political life and economic life in this country. The problem is there is a deep democratic deficit and the Westminster consensus, which it seems to me that people are rejecting, includes the Church as an institution, so we need to take account urgently of the decision by a majority of UK citizens actually I think to vote against Westminster and its political narrative.

I think that we have to engage much more closely and effectively with people throughout this country and hear what they are saying about politics and economics and find ways to support them, the working people who feel disempowered, who feel that their

democracy has been taken away, who feel that they have only had this one opportunity to say what they really think to the political classes. I think we need to hear their voice much more loudly and clearly, and we need to find ways in which we can engage with that voice and that rejection of our settled political narrative.

Revd Lusa Nsenga-Ngoy (Rochester): I wholeheartedly welcome this motion as it lays out the basis of the kind of society I wish to be part of; one in which equal value is assigned to every human being regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, creed or any other characteristic.

As a child of the Congo, I know all too well and understand the aspirations of any nation for autonomy, self-determination and independence. But, as evidenced through humanity's history, independence is always best stated in commonality of purpose and value and is always best experienced through interdependence. Sadly, the prevalent narrative of stigmatisation and polarisation around Brexit has not contributed to fostering a vision of mutuality of purpose and interdependence. Instead, we are witnessing an increase in racist and xenophobic expressions and behaviours.

I am the proud father of two beautiful children. Like most parents, I formulate a number of dreams and aspirations for their future. As I watch them grow, I am overcome by fear that the dreams of their father may ultimately not come true. I am painfully aware of the reality that by virtue of their ethnicity there is no level playing field for my children, and, sadly, even within our Church. The credibility of the Church's voice on this issue depends on the extent to which we can be seen modelling within our own structures what we are advocating. On the issue of racism and xenophobia, as in other issues, unless the Church is seen to be living out what it is espousing to wider society, its calls ring hollow.

For the past three years I have been acting as Chair of the National ME Vocation Advisory Group. The group is tasked with the responsibility of addressing the historic imbalance in terms of vocation to ordained ministry. Last year, we produced *Everyday People*, a booklet relating vocation journeys of many women and men from a minority heritage. All the testimonies in the booklet spoke of positive outcomes of people's vocation journey. Sadly, our evidence demonstrates that the now normative experience of ME Anglicans exploring vocation places them in a system that at best can be described as opaque, framed in the hermeneutics of suspicion and stereotypes. There are many ways that those who are excluded feel and interpret that exclusion. An example that many of us are familiar with, and may not appreciate the impact of, is the usual iconography in our churches, which reinforces that exclusion felt by so many.

As we brace ourselves for the possibility of a bumpy ride of mixed political and economic uncertainties, the Church must lead the way to demonstrable change with courage and audacity.

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs): Members of Synod will be aware of the tragic events that took place in Birstall during the middle of the Referendum campaign with the murder of one of our local MPs, Jo Cox. I just want to pick up out of that experience on one remark that Mrs Barron made when she spoke of the Church being seen as increasingly irrelevant in the wider context. I think what was fascinating at

that time was the way in which the world's media looked to the Church to comment into these situations precisely because it appeared that we had - as someone put it to me - a vocabulary to enable us to speak in these tragic and difficult times in a way that others outside the Church did not have. That is a particular contribution that we as Christians, together with other people of faith, can continue to make in these uncertain times, and it is vitally important that we do make that contribution.

I want heartily to endorse the motion as amended, but, just to pick up those words of Mrs Barron, encourage us all in our dioceses, in our churches, in partnership with others of the Christian faith and other faiths, to hold out that message of hope, to speak with that different voice, that prophetic voice, into the life of our nation at this huge time of transition and change. I think, as Christians, we have something vital to contribute that the world desperately needs to hear and, indeed, wants to hear. Thank you.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): I warmly welcome this debate, but I would like to encourage us as a Church to learn from it. It is only this week that we have had the Chilcot Inquiry, which has shown us what we have all known, that winning peace is far more difficult than waging war. I would suggest that this debate, which so focused on winning a war, made no plans for winning a peace. I hope that as we as a Church look to model debate that we move forward into a world where we can truly understand the other.

I am perhaps one of the few people who will stand today and say I voted to leave. I did so after spending two years at Oxford University researching the international institutions. I have long and detailed reasons for leaving, which many of you will disagree with, but I have been very scared to voice that for the weight of feeling and the victimisation, the demonisation of those of us who had a different view from the main majority within the Church.

It is terribly important that we do not label, that we do not presume to understand why people have voted the way they have. I think we need to sit down and learn to listen, perhaps disagree, and instead of seeing families torn apart and friendships ended that we seek to truly get to the bottom of what is going on, because to win a peace is a far more difficult and costly thing.

We are about to go into all sorts of very difficult conversations, as you well know. If we do not look to how we build a future after that debate we will, I fear, have the same shock that many of us experienced only last week, even if the pollsters showed that it was too close to call. Please, Synod, let us build a future where we win peace.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Ms Ozanne has said most of what I want to say, so let me just say this. As we travelled up to Synod today and I have been looking at Facebook there has been the usual, "Oh, what we are going to waste our time doing at Synod? There's going to be the usual, 'Do we have to have presentations? Do we have to do this or that?'" and, particularly, "Why are we spending two days in shared conversations?" has been around and around.

It strikes me that the prophetic gift that we have now of having two days where we learn whether it is possible to disagree well is a good opportunity to do something that we might

well see as a gift to our nation and that we can take back from here and model in all sorts of different ways, not least over the ways in which this has deeply exposed the scars and divisions in our nation. Let us see the opportunity of the next few days as an opportunity to learn to do something that we can then speak with more confidence to the nation.

I would just urge those who are sorely and honourably tempted to stay away on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, for the sake of this wider issue to think again and come and join in.

Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool): When the EU Referendum took place I was leading a silent ordination retreat; it was a surreal experience. I woke up early in the morning and found that I was astonished by the unfolding result, and then I was astonished that I was astonished. Why had I not seen this coming?

One reason I think is that I assumed that when push came to shove people's inherent suspicion of change and desire to maintain the status quo would kick in. Whatever we may think of the decision and the outcome, a vote for Brexit was bold and it was brave. In many, although not all cases, it was a declaration of people's dissatisfaction with our society as it currently is and of their desire for change.

In Liverpool, of course, we voted for the most part to remain. More than one person has told me that part of the reason for this must surely be that you cannot buy the *Sun* in Liverpool. It is true, nonetheless, that in many deprived areas the length and breadth of England many people voted overwhelmingly to leave. Without commenting on any personal opinions about the vote, and recognising that not all people in deprived areas voted to leave, and not all people who voted to leave were from deprived urban areas, nevertheless what was it about, what was going on? I think we have to recognise that for vast numbers of people in our inner cities and urban estates, life is incredibly tough at the moment. There is unimaginable deprivation. People feel forgotten, ignored, neglected, abandoned, rejected, despised, disempowered and marginalised. They are voiceless. They do not think that anyone cares about them or is on their side. They have lost confidence and faith in politicians, but often also in many other public sector organisations and institutions.

As the Church we have an amazing opportunity, but not just an opportunity: a responsibility, a duty. Whatever we may personally feel about the issues around Brexit we need to recognise that for many people in the poorest churches and communities we serve their vote was cast as a protest against the way life feels for them right now.

As the Church, whatever happens in politics, let us be the ones who stay. Let us be the ones who stand alongside. Let us be the ones who listen. Let us be the ones who advocate. Let us be the ones who feed and clothe and care and advise and support. Let us be the ones who speak out for, and with, and on behalf of. When it feels all others have abandoned our inner cities, we must not.

With permission, to close I will quote Bishop Philip North's recent *Church Times* article: "This Referendum shows that it is time to renew the urban Church. If the political classes

can offer only austerity, abandonment or cynical exploitation, it is vital that the Church speaks more loudly than ever the language of hope.”

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: You might be able to tempt me then, Mr Freeman. Thank you.

Miss Fenella Cannings-Jurd (Salisbury): Something that has been touched on by many of the speakers, particularly the Bishop of Europe, is the impact of this vote upon young people. What I would like to emphasise is that our mission to young people and our response to Brexit cannot be disentangled from each other. My experience as a young person in the university setting is that there is a genuine sense of despair about what the future holds for British and European students alike. The Gospel is a gospel of hope. Now more than ever it is important to reach out to those young people who are struggling and who are scared for who hope is sorely lacking. The Gospel of Christ will not solve their problems, but it can and will offer a light in times of darkness, and that is what we should really be considering. Thank you.

The Chair: I call the Archbishop of York. I am sorry, I saw the Archbishop before I heard you, Mr Freeman, but perhaps you will get to me just after that. Your Grace, you have five minutes.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Thank you, Mr Hargreaves-Smith. Members of Synod, I was with a group of 34 teenagers from Holy Trinity Academy in Barnsley and from Archbishop Holgate’s academy in York on pilgrimage to Taizé in the South of France when we heard the Referendum result. I witnessed the utter shock, sadness and anger of young people from our own country who, in the few days that they had been there, had reached out in friendship and fellowship with other European young Christians. To them, it seemed to make no sense at all. They found themselves having to apologise repeatedly how sorry they were. Taizé’s worship, bible studies, communal eating and drinking came into their own, giving hope to those young people.

Despite the fact that a week is a long time in politics, and two weeks an even longer time, wounds are still sore and there is a sense of unreality about the days in which we live. Worst of all, those who habitually look out for any excuse for xenophobic extremism, racism and violence have seized upon this as legitimation, as an encouragement for their activities. Though condemned by remainers and Brexiteers alike, it is a sad reality of the situation we are in.

Mostly in situations of conflict we call for unity and reconciliation too quickly, mostly because the anger of others as well as our own is unbearable and painful and we indeed want to end it, but it cannot end until it has been faced and it cannot be faced until it has been allowed out.

We have to find ways, not violent ways, of allowing it out. This means theologically accepting that unity and reconciliation are part of the eschatological hope of Christians and anger is part of the meanwhile in which we live.

In that meanwhile we shall not always, or even usually, know whether some particular rage we experience in ourselves or others is proper outrage at injustice or our own hurt pride or the result of reactivated hurts from our past. The hard bit is that only by letting the anger out will we ever stand a chance of knowing.

What often happens is a rush to attack the anger of others and expect them to calm down for the sake of a harmony that is not yet. Speaking personally, I have been there. Don't I know it. The truth is, and many of us have wished it were not. So, God is in this for the long haul. A dear friend's mother of 96 said, "Isn't it time God called it quits?" A good question, but God has not indeed and has promised not to do so.

That must mean that even our worst rages may seem only destructive but are, nonetheless, indispensable energies needed for the coming of the Kingdom. That must mean that in ways we cannot yet see the anger fuelled by the Brexit vote and the anger engendered by it are both energies we need for future human flourishing, so we had better not calm them too soon. It would be a mistake to react too swiftly - do you remember the Gadarene swine?

Aristotle has something to teach us:

"Anybody can become angry. That is easy. But to be angry with the right person and to the right degree and at the right time and with the right motive and in the right way, that is not within everybody's power and is not easy; wherefore goodness is both rare and laudable and noble."

As the Apostle Paul says, "Be angry, but sin not." That is not easy.

Total transformation means the changing of lives so that the maladies that cause division are eliminated - total transformation based on renewal as was the case in Archbishop Desmond Tutu's restorative justice in the South African context; and Nelson Mandela's encouragement to black people, particularly the young, to focus their rage into acts of reconciliation. Similarly, I want to appeal to all young people in England to do the same: focus your rage into acts of reconciliation.

Nelson Mandela said this:

"No one is born hating another person because of the colour of their skin or their background or their religion." No, nobody is born like that. "People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite."

My brothers and sisters in Christ, we have the Good News of God in Jesus Christ where in the Cross of Jesus love is stronger than hate. Let us live and proclaim that Gospel, for the one who went to hell and back, Jesus Christ, is forever with us till the end of time. That wonderful Canon from Hartlepool actually put his finger on the problem: do not quickly run away from the anger. Let us find a way of letting it out in a way that becomes recreative.

Let us, "Look to Him, the pioneer and perfecter of our faith. He endured the Cross, disregarding its shame, and is seated at the right hand of the Father".

And even so we say, "Come, Lord Jesus, come!"

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. A motion for closure on Item 24.

The Chair: I am willing to test the mind of the Synod. Mr Freeman has proposed a motion for closure on Item 24.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to respond to the debate. He has five minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I want to start by thanking the Synod for what has been a really very good debate indeed, certainly one of the most thoughtful and well-spoken that I can remember in my rather short time at the Synod but, nevertheless, it has been most helpful.

Thank you especially to all those who spoke but also to those who had prepared to speak but were not able to do so. I think there were too many speakers to run through and comment on each one but I want to pick out a few themes. The first of them is the theme of compassion, of suffering alongside.

I think we heard clearly from a number of people both the pain that is felt amongst categories of people who voted very strongly to remain but were part of the minority, and among those who voted to leave but are in a community in which they are in the minority although in the majority of the whole country.

We need to recognise the pain that there is and that has been raised and caused through this Referendum. As a Church, we need to find ways of demonstrating that we hear that. To do so is not to demean the majority. This resolution recognises that the Referendum took place and the result happened and we do not, in any sense, reject that or hate the majority.

Quite the reverse. It was a robust and vigorous campaign, sometimes too much so, but generally speaking it was one in which more people than for very many years took part. We must not, in any sense, demean those who by a majority voted to leave. But compassion means listening carefully to what Bishop Robert said and others said about the genuine anxiety and pain that is felt by many members of the Church of England, in the Diocese in Europe and within England itself at the outcome. We cannot demean them either, and much comment in the wider media seems to have done so.

As Robert said, they are by no means all comfortably paid, excessively pensioned bureaucrats, if such exist at all, which I doubt. Many of them have moved to Spain and places like that where I have taken retreats in the archdeaconry there and have seen

already that the effect of a declining pound has left them in a grave and difficult situation which has become more so. They are experiencing very genuine poverty and need.

Secondly, we need to acknowledge fear. There is deep uncertainty about where we are going across the whole country and that was raised in a number of speeches. Going back again to Canon Buttery, the way in which this may impact inward investment, the way in which this may impact the future of large employers in communities that cannot afford large employers, is something that is both unpredictable and a reason for anxiety. As the Church, how are we going to stand alongside them?

Thirdly, I think the Archbishop of York put it most clearly: it is often too soon to talk of reconciliation and healing, and that has been my very long experience, not only here but in places of war and civil conflict where thousands of people have been killed. If you speak too soon, while, literally or metaphorically, the guns are still blazing, it shows that you are not listening.

The Archbishop put that extremely clearly, and we need to find a way in all our local communities and chaplaincies and wherever we are of demonstrating that we are listening carefully in the way that Canon Graham and the Archbishop put so eloquently and clearly, whether it is with younger people who see a future of deep uncertainty which they did not expect or whether it is with people who find themselves marginalised.

As someone spoke to me recently, having attended a meeting in the North East of England, an area that I know with much affection and some experience, when they spoke of Gross Domestic Product, of GDP, someone shouted from the audience, "It's your GDP not ours." We need to listen and we need to recognise the huge mountain that we have yet to climb. This is going to take, as I said earlier, a very, very long time.

We need to brace ourselves for a long process in which the needs expressed to this Church in its national role will become larger and larger and more and more important that we rise to meet them, not with our own resources but with the resources of the God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead. For as always, in all human situations, because of the God we worship, this is a time not only of fear, which we must hear, of compassion which we must show, of patience which we must practise, but of opportunity, of hope, of gift, which we must receive and pass on in abundance.

The Chair. We move now to a vote on Item 24.

The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs): Point of order, Chair. In view of the importance of this debate and interest in the wider community, I wonder if you would be willing to countenance a count of the whole Synod?

The Chair. If there are 25 members standing we shall have a count of the Synod. There are clearly 25 members standing (After a pause). Members of Synod, I can only apologise for the situation we have encountered. There are two options at this stage as we cannot safely conduct a vote by electronic means.

We have a choice, therefore. In a moment, I will ask you if you would be willing,

notwithstanding the decision that was just made, for there to be a vote on a show of hands. The other option will be to vote by the physical means, the old way, as some of you will know it, through the doors. That will take some time and clearly have consequences for our business. I would ask you now to show if you are content for the vote to be conducted by a show of hands.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. Whilst the Synod remains in prudent mode, can I put to you, therefore, Item 24 as amended by Item 26.

The motion:

‘That this Synod, recognising the result of the recent referendum on the United Kingdom’s membership of the European Union:

- (a) welcome the Archbishops’ call for all to unite in the common task of building a generous and forward looking country, contributing to human flourishing around the world, and encourage all members of the Church of England to play their part actively in partnership with everyone in Civil Society in pursuit of this task; and*
- (b) commend the work already carried out by the Church in bringing communities together and recommend that as a minimum every bishop identify a champion in their diocese to assess what more the Church could so and to make recommendations for creating stronger and more constructive links between local communities as a basis for achieving this common task.”*

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. Thank you, Synod, for your patience, at the end of this debate in particular. That ends this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Ven Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 4.40 pm.

Presentation by the Archbishop of York on his Pilgrimage of Prayer, Witness and Blessing, including a Short Time of Worship Using the Pilgrimage Prayers

The Chair: We now come to Item 4, a presentation on the Archbishop of York’s Pilgrimage of Prayer. I would like to invite the Archbishop to come and address this Synod.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): You have been given a pack and in there you are going to find four things. The one that you want to take out at the beginning is the prayer beads. They are very easy to open. Do not try to do it from the top. You have got to go in the middle like that and prise them open and they come

out at the other end.

Has everybody got there yet? Hold onto the white piece of paper and then go to the bottom like that and it just comes out. Okay? I am grateful, for these beads are made in Egypt through the courtesy of the Archbishop there and they are simply to help us say the Lord's Prayer. It is not a rosary. It is just my own invention to make sure the body and mind are working together.

I am going to lead you through what I did when I was on pilgrimage. I had been invited and I want to thank you, first of all, for remembering me and Canon Joanna Udal, my pilgrimage companion, as we walked around the Diocese of York in very challenging weather conditions. So I want to thank you all. Countless good moments on our journey renewed our trust in Christ and rejoiced that we saw the Holy Spirit doing wonderful things. Amazing. I could be here all night, so I am not going to go into those amazing things.

On our Pilgrimage I prayed the "Our Father" around five times every day for six months, sharing it with over 25,000 people. That experience taught me that this prayer actually says it all.

I began each prayer session by sharing how this prayer expresses in greater simplicity the very heart of the good news of Jesus Christ. It is a prayer that nourishes our life-long abiding in Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.

I want to invite you to participate in this with me today and to hear and reflect on our Lord's teaching to his disciples and us to pray - as recorded in Matthew 6, verses 9 to 15; and Luke 11, verses 1-4. We read: "Jesus was praying in a certain place and, after he had finished, one of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples'."

Jesus was praying. As God's "beloved son", Jesus during his earthly existence often took time to stop and enter into this conscious, intimate relationship with the Father. Prayer for me is the act by which we take ourselves voluntarily, with open hands, into the presence of God aided by the Holy Spirit. "Lord, teach us to pray..."

The disciples were Jews and prayer was an essential part of their lives. They had prayers for all occasions - morning and evening prayers, prayers before meals and so on. What kind of praying did they want from Jesus?

What Jesus of Nazareth gives them is no new liturgical text. He gives them something only "the one who came from above" can give - something new and powerful, something very unique. Praying as he prayed is a gateway through which they can enter into the same kind of relationship with the Father.

Let us then examine briefly the two parts of the "Our Father."

"Pray in this way", said Jesus.

First, the God to whom we pray: "Our Father who art in heaven. Hallowed be thy name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

This section has three divine diamonds which speak of "Our Father's name", "Our Father's Kingdom", and "Our Father's will."

May "Our Father in heaven's name, Kingdom and will" - that is: His power, His wisdom, His holiness, His rule of justice and peace - be made known and honoured and glorified by all God's creatures.

This has an evangelistic zeal to it. We know, through Jesus Christ, God's name, God's Kingdom and God's will, so we should have a burning desire to make them known by our witness. As we honour and glorify our Father's identity (Name), we do His will, we live His Kingdom as ambassadors of Jesus Christ.

The glory of God is the first thing that God's children adopted by his Grace in Christ should desire. It is the object of our Lord's own prayers: "Father glorify your name." It is the purpose for which the world was created.

Gerard Manley Hopkins wrote so beautifully: "The world is charged with the grandeur of God." It is the end for which the saints are called and converted. It is the main thing we should seek that God in all things may be glorified, says 1 Peter.

Our truest joy is unceasingly doing "our Father's will". This is the highest test of love, coupled with desiring that all humankind may know it, submit to it, and live it.

In this first part of the "Our Father" we express how Jesus Christ brings us into a new relationship with God. It is as if, when we say, "Our Father in heaven", we let Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit take us by the hand and lead us into our Father's home (John 14:2). By His Son, and His Spirit - the two hands of God - the Father embraces His prodigal children and draws them to Himself.

As we pray these three petitions: "Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done", we are praying that the entire world may discover God's true identity and dwell in his house. And we give our life to God so that, through us, God can share this divine life with others.

So, our purpose is this: to glorify God; to honour His name; to desire and delight in His kingdom; and to be ever ready to do His will.

For His is, "... the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever".

So we set out on pilgrimage in order to witness to God's love and light in the simplest realities of our life, and bless what we see the Holy Spirit is doing. As we walked, there were so many fantastic things God was doing. Friends, it was amazing to be simply blessing what you saw: healings, people finding faith, people who had just moved home saying they wanted to know about the Church, people suddenly requesting to be baptized. Thank God in those days there were a lot of floods so there was a lot of water which you

could baptize them in.

We now turn to the second part of the “Our Father”.

“Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses; as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil”. (Matthew 6:11-13)

Jesus Christ tells us not to take any provisions with us for the journey (Luke 9:3). This is a pilgrimage of trust: at each stage God will give us all we need.

On our pilgrimage of trust, the first gift God offers us is our daily bread - material and spiritual support - which is Christ himself, who nourishes us and sustains us by giving us here on earth a foretaste of heaven.

This is an invitation to acknowledge our entire dependence on God, for the supply of our daily necessities.

Friends, it is interesting to note that in Exodus 16 - the story of the manna in the wilderness, the temptation of Jesus regarding bread (Matthew 4:2-4); and the story of the multiplication of the loaves, followed by a discourse on the bread of life (John 6) the gift of bread in these passages occurs in an uninhabited place. In the desert, human beings are able to welcome things as gifts from God. On our pilgrimage we suddenly found ourselves at times in a desert where Christ by his Spirit did indeed feed us.

When we pray, “Give us this day our daily bread” we are asking God to sustain us during our pilgrimage with the Holy Spirit, so that we may bring God’s living water, God’s light, God’s love into the deserts of this world.

The second gift God offers us is forgiveness so that we can begin our journey again. New beginning is possible because “Our Father” is full of, as in the Hebrew - *hesed* and *emet* (Exodus 34:6-7a) - a compassionate and gracious God abounding in steadfast faithfulness, friendliness and mercy. God forgives. Even if yesterday we were inattentive to “our Father’s call” God remains faithful; and by forgiveness God sets us back on the road today. God’s greatest miracle in us is his constant forgiveness. Our Father in heaven never tires of forgiving us.

When I said this in a school assembly during my pilgrimage, Fred, aged eight, said, “Sir, does God forgive us even if we haven’t done anything wrong?” Friends, how would you have answered?

Well, I asked Fred whether he had ever failed to do things he should have done: to brush his teeth, or not make his bed when his mum asked him. “Yes, yes,” he said, “Not giving his mum a letter from the head teacher”. “Yes,” he said. Then I said, “Fred, those things weren’t wrong things you did. They were good things that you did not do.” For most of us, our greatest failing, by the way, as I have begun to discover with myself, is not doing good. In my Christian journey, where I am failing is not doing bad things – although sometimes I am capable - but not doing good things which I should have actually done.

But forgiveness covers both the wrongs we do and the good we do not do.

At the end of the assembly, Fred came to me and said, “Sir, I will start making my bed. I will brush my teeth. And I will give that letter from the head teacher to my mum. It is still in my bag!”

When we say no to self-righteousness and self-justifying we can develop the habit of seeking mercy and forgiveness. The Lord, as it were, washing our feet (John 13:10). And likewise we wash each other’s feet and forgive others as God in Christ has forgiven us.

The third gift God offers is his assistance and deliverance, especially at times when we are most vulnerable, so that our trials themselves can be transformed into springboards to take us even further ahead. The valley of tears can become a place of living springs (Psalm 84:6). But we must know our spiritual dangers.

“Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil”. Only Christ can deliver us.

Temptation and evil are like a bird of prey: a hawk, an osprey. We can never stop them from flying above our heads, but we can prevent them from building a nest in our hair. I apologise, I have not got much hair; you have got such, and at least you can stop them from making a nest in your hair. That is what, “... lead us not into temptation, deliver us from evil” means; being aware of it, but praying that Christ will help us so that it will not take root.

The good news is this: “We do not know how to pray. The Holy Spirit intercedes for us” (Romans 8:26).

“Jesus also ever lives to intercede for us at the right hand of the Father” (Hebrews 7:25, Romans 8:34).

I love the story of a little girl of three who one day came back from her nursery able to say the alphabet. She kept on saying it again and again and again. At bedtime her mother asked her to say her prayers before she went to bed. She knelt by her bed, closed her eyes and prayed, “A, B, C, D, E, F, G ...” and went on right to Z. She said the whole alphabet. Then she said, “Jesus, please turn all that into prayer. Amen”.

That is what Paul set out in Romans: we do not know what to pray, but the spirit does. The Holy Spirit interceding for us “with sighs too deep for words as we make our inarticulate groans/grunts” (Romans 8:26-27)

In this way our pilgrimage resembles more and more closely to that of Jesus of Nazareth, his paschal mystery which transfigures death into a road of endless life.

Now living and dieth no more (Acts 2:24-28).

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) led the Synod in an act of worship

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): In the pack you will find there are two other pieces of paper. One is a little prayer card which we used before we set out and I would encourage you to use it before you set out on any journey. It has some good things to say. The bookmark is prayers I wrote while I was on Lindisfarne. It has been a great privilege to share this with you. I trust you will take the material. Do not be like everywhere we went where people wanted to hand it back; and I realised I was in Yorkshire! Thank you very much and God bless you richly.

The Chair: That concludes Item 4 and we now move to the next item.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 5.05 pm

Report from the Anglican Consultative Council in Lusaka, April 2016

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod, ecumenical friends and visitors. We come to Item 5 on the agenda, which is a presentation on the Anglican Consultative Council which took place in Lusaka in April of this year. I invite Maggie Swinson and Stephen Cottrell to share their experiences with us.

Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool): There will be a loop of photographs on the screens. The 16th meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council took place this year in Lusaka, the capital of Zambia, and part of the province of Central Africa, which comprises Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The Church of England was represented by myself, the Bishop of Chelmsford and the Revd Canon Rose Hudson-Wilkin. Elizabeth Paver was present in her capacity as Vice-Chair of the ACC and the Archbishop of Canterbury was there being himself.

Bishop Stephen will talk more about the theme of the meeting. I would like to start by offering a few personal reflections. We have received a question from a member and that will be answered at the end of the presentation.

For the Province of Central Africa and the country of Zambia, holding our meeting was what my vicar would call “big licks”. The importance of the meeting was evident in the attention to detail, the yards of material that had been specially produced, special vestments for the bishops, the hospitality at various receptions and the welcome we received in the parishes on the second Sunday. We were welcomed with choirs and bands wherever we went, and as we boarded the buses for the journey to the airport we were serenaded again by a choir, one at each of the hotels.

The Zambian Vice-President spoke at the first of the dinners, and the President himself attended and spoke at the opening Eucharist, giving up a whole morning for the service and the march past that followed; evidence of the importance of our visit to the country and not just to the Church.

It is a province that does not yet ordain women, but the Primate gave special permission

for women to preside at our daily lunchtime Eucharist and a number of the ordained women on the ACC preached in the parishes we visited, to an enthusiastic reception.

Our worship and study together was the framework in which the ACC met, providing an unparalleled opportunity each day to study the book of Ruth together, using drama and art as well as the written word. I was on a table with bishops from Australia, Sudan, the Old Catholic Church in Haarlem and Japan, whose bishop had a translator with him, priests from South Korea and Liberia and with one of the youth representatives who was from South Africa.

Through our study and conversation we discovered many shared joys and challenges and many that were particular to our local circumstances: the devastation to local communities when large employers move into and then out of small towns in Australia. The ongoing issues facing the area hit by the earthquake and tsunami in Japan, where people still live in temporary accommodation and the land is still highly radioactive; the challenging relationship between neighbouring nations, North and South Korea; the multiplicity of challenges facing Sudan; and - which was probably the most surprising thing to me - the reality that young women in some tribes in South Africa are still at risk of abduction and forced marriage if they go out alone in rural areas and (rural or not) effectively lose their identity on marriage, not just changing surnames but being given new first names. These are realities facing our brothers and sisters in the Communion. They were the ones that I heard about but others on other tables will have heard of different situations again.

Although I have been part of a parish with mission partners - they were called "missionaries" in those days - it was not until I experienced the breadth of the Communion, at a meeting of the Anglican Communion representatives at the World Council of Churches in Canberra in 1991, that the Communion became a reality to me; a reality in my life and my heart rather than just in my head. It became something to work for, something which I saw had strong spiritual value. Subsequent experiences through the ACC and other cross-province engagement I have been privileged to experience have increased my commitment to and enthusiasm for our Communion, in spite of the difficulties which it experiences over some issues, which of course are issues that divide us within our provinces and divide many other provinces too.

One of our challenges, whether as members of the ACC, members of this Synod or members of local churches, is to foster an understanding of the Communion which reflects its reality: a worldwide family of about 85 million Christians in 165 countries under one Jesus Christ. Yes, we have different views on some things within and without and between provinces, but we also have an opportunity to make a difference through our common work, witness and mutual support.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): The theme of our meeting was "Intentional Discipleship in a World of Difference". Sadly, we did not spend as much time discussing this theme as I would have liked, but since the ACC is the nearest thing the Anglican Communion has to a Synod and the only regular opportunity - once every three years - for bishops, clergy and lay people from every province in the Anglican Communion to meet together, there is just lots of other stuff to discuss. But neither did we spend ten

days discussing “sex and Americans”, as some commentators had suggested we might.

The big news about the meeting was actually rather dull. Virtually everybody came and we spent ten days discussing issues of mission and discipleship and enjoying what unites us: our worship of God and our following of Jesus Christ. Yes, there are differences of opinion on all sorts of subjects, but there is also an astonishingly deep foundation of unity which is all about God and his call to us in Christ and not very much about us at all. Surprise, surprise, the Anglican Communion really is a family. That is like all families we quarrel, we disagree, we make up, and our love for each other and our belonging to each other is what really matters and is what keeps us together. In this family, water is thicker than blood. Our baptismal identity trumps all our other belongings. Discipleship is at the centre, and was at the centre of this ACC meeting, resonating with our own priorities as a Church of England.

One of the resolutions from the ACC calls upon us to make discipleship a priority and to consider whether some sort of season of discipleship might be helpful, and this is something in due course we will need to look at. The report which prepared the way for the conference “Intentional Discipleship and Disciple-Making - an Anglican Guide for Christian Life and Formation”, which is published by the ACC and available from their offices, is to be highly recommended. It looks at discipleship from different perspectives, both historically and from around the Churches of the Anglican Communion. In particular it provides a stimulating summary of what successive Lambeth Conferences have said on the subject. I was particularly moved to read how the 1998 Lambeth Conference asserted that, “... unless Christians are encouraged corporately ‘to go to school with Christ’, to be nourished by teaching and sacrament, and to grow up into his likeness, they cannot bear the fruits of discipleship”. As such, “... the Church is a school in which the gift of teaching is acknowledged but in which all the teachers are themselves learners”, and “the Church [is] to be a teaching community, not simply for its own sake, but for the sake of its mission in the world.”

Already in the Chelmsford diocese we are picking up on this idea of the Church as a school for disciples and this may have some wider resonance across the Church of England. How would Church be if we reimagined what we do - and I mean what we do on Sunday mornings - around the injunction of the Lord to make disciples?

What else did I take home from two weeks in Lusaka? First, the fantastic hospitality of the Zambian Church and people and the joyful exuberance of their worship, especially the singing. Zambian Christians have concocted a heady brew of Catholic Anglicanism, charismatic renewal and African song and dance. It was infectious.

Secondly, studying the scriptures each day with a small group of Christians from all over the world not only taught me how we bring to and take from the Scriptures our own cultural perspectives but showed me how the Bible speaks to and challenges every culture, I am more convinced than ever that discipleship is not an exam to be passed but better understood as a tree to be planted. Too often we in the West see discipleship as a programme, and unwittingly end up with a two-tier Church; those who have done the programme and then the rest of us, that terrible, “So-and-so is a real Christian” kind of thing. Rather disciples should be something to be planted and nurtured.

Thirdly, I have been reminded that culture is not linear, in the sense that there is progress from so-called less developed cultures to so-called advanced ones. We are genuinely in different places and from these different perspectives see things differently; even the Bible. Therefore, we need to walk together, to talk together, to listen together and to learn together. The fact that we did this at ACC 16 is a triumph; the triumph of the Gospel and therefore the triumph of love. The Anglican Communion is alive and well. It is strong not in spite of its differences but because of them. We are a Church that at our best does not try to paper over cracks or exclude those who, in their own faithful discipleship, see some things differently.

Of course, there will be consequences to this and we search to find ways of navigating our way through these together.

In the Anglican Communion our dirty washing hangs in public. But, as WH Auden once wrote: "Private faces in public places are better and wiser than public faces in private places". He was, of course, an Anglican. We did have one question from a member of the Synod which Maggie is going to briefly address.

Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool): We had a question regarding the participation of the Episcopal Church in the ACC in light of the decision of the Primates' Meeting. The communiqué from the Primates' Meeting said: "It is our unanimous desire to walk together. However, given the seriousness of these matters, we formally acknowledge this distance by requiring that for a period of three years the Episcopal Church no longer represent us on ecumenical and interfaith bodies, should not be appointed or elected to an internal standing committee, and that while participating in the internal bodies of the Anglican Communion they will not take part in decision-making on any issues pertaining to doctrine or polity".

The presence and standing of TEC as participants in the ACC in Lusaka is fully consistent with that communiqué. Members did not stand for election to the Standing Committee but were able to vote for the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee as that is consistent with the communiqué. There was no requirement for any sanction or rebuke to be delivered to TEC by the ACC and the ACC did not address any matters by way of its resolutions which pertained to doctrine or polity and would therefore have excluded the participation of TEC.

The Chair: Thank you very much indeed. That was most interesting, enlightening and encouraging. Members of Synod, that concludes this item of business. We will move to the next item on the agenda, the Report of the Business Committee, in a moment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR Dean of Southwark (*Very Revd Andrew Nunn*) took the Chair at 5.23 pm

Report by the Business Committee (GS 2024)

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. We move on to Item 6 on the agenda, the report by the Business Committee. You will need GS 2024 for this item. Before we begin that, just a couple of notices. I have been asked to remind you that on your mobile device, or whatever bleeping machine that you have got, can you ensure that it is turned to silent, because not all of them are at the moment. The Synod team apologises for the glitch that has happened with those voting cards that we have collected. They need to have them all back, please, so that during the night, while we are sleeping, they can be reprogrammed. When you leave, could you put your voting card into one of the boxes that the members of staff will have down in the entrance to this hall. Thank you very much indeed for that.

As you can feel, we are under pressure of time, so we will be looking for a short debate on the Report of the Business Committee, if that is at all possible. Of course, I am in your hands as far as that is concerned so we can get to the following item.

I invite Canon Sue Booy, Chair of the Business Committee, to speak to her report and then to move that the Synod take note of the report. Sue, you have got up to ten minutes but I have been praying for a long time that you are going to speak for less.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

I will do my best. Friends, this is an unusual Synod in two respects: I am introducing the Agenda and yet we have been going for some time.

This is a very rare occurrence. The last emergency debate was in February 2012 responding to recent violence in Nigeria, a subject of equal seriousness, and I think, though I may be challenged - but in the bar later, please - that there has not been another in my 15 years here. This reflects the level of our concern.

The scheduling of debates on current and important issues has been something that has concerned Synod members for some time. Whilst this particular power is one to be used sparingly, we will continue to explore ways of opening up the agenda to matters of public importance.

This Synod which has opened unusually will also end in a way that is an equally significant departure from the norm, but this time one that has been anticipated and planned for some time. Synod will be prorogued on Saturday evening, allowing us to participate in a specially designed version of the Shared Conversations following on from those that have taken place in the dioceses. From Sunday afternoon, the Shared Conversations design team will lead the work that we do together which happens outside our Standing Orders, and that accounts for the fact that we will be prorogued on Saturday evening. The Business Committee has worked with David Porter and the team to create clear space

on which we can listen and attend to one another so that we may grow in understanding together.

I should say now that we did not fully appreciate the preference of the design team for Synod members to be participants for the whole period of conversations, and I apologise for the inconvenience and disappointment that this has caused to those with other important commitments who have to leave early.

This is a short group of sessions, but I dare hope that you will find it perfectly formed containing, as it does, a range of business that reflects the work we are called to do together. I hope that later in the Agenda we will be debating the report called for by Synod on *Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders*, and on Saturday we have the opportunity to review in debate the work of Renewal and Reform and our vision for education.

Legislative business forms a large part of our work tomorrow and we will need our commitment and concentration to move through this with pace and proper despatch. Many of you will have read and heard annual reports in your own parishes and in July we do this kind of thing in Synod.

The Archbishops' Council will present their report for 2016 tomorrow evening and we will debate the 2017 budget.

It is possible that during Synod we will not have time to debate the Commissioners' Report as a result of the change to the order of business. However, in the conversations that took place around that decision it was suggested to me that those who had points to raise with the Commissioners would be welcome to attend their reception.

At this stage we do not know the precise position in relation to items of deemed business, which will have an effect on the pace of the Agenda tomorrow

I have two important practical reminders for you. Please ensure that you have reviewed the security arrangements and that you and your visitors observe these for everyone's safety. May I also remind you, importantly, to declare any interests that you have relating to the subject of a debate at the same time as declaring your name and number. Please note that we are now colour-coded: your lanyard reminds you of the dining hall in which your meal will be provided, unless it has been transferred. Please do not court embarrassment by turning up in the wrong place.

It is important to us all that Synod is supported in prayer and worship, particularly over these coming days. Our Synod Chaplain has arranged a programme of worship for us to share and our work and conversations together will be supported by the continuous praying presence and by seven chaplains. On your behalf, I would like to thank them for giving their time and Michael for the generosity and grace with which he inhabits the role of Synod Chaplain.

Whist I am in thanking mode, and they are walking behind me, I would like to thank the staff with whom we work. They are tireless in their commitment to ensure that all goes smoothly for us.

Finally, and perhaps more seriously, I would like to thank you all and assure you of my own prayer and listening as this Synod continues. In so many ways, we are part of a significant journey of faith; a journey that is both private and corporate. More than ever over the next few days we will be conscious of the attention that needs to be paid to private and corporate alike as we give each other our full attention. May God's grace surround and inhabit us all.

The Chair. The report now stands open for debate. Those who wish to speak please indicate by standing.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Chris Corteen (Salisbury): We are already in a session that has been truncated for very good reasons, so therefore we are limited in what we can get through in terms of business. We have already been chivvied along this afternoon and, in fact, this debate is being chivvied along. I am a little concerned when I read the Business Committee's Report about the sessions in February, because again they will be truncated, possibly because there will be some space required by the Archbishops to reflect on some aspects of what might happen later on with our Shared Conversations. With the amount of business that has got to be got through, again I think we will be chivvied along in February and will not be given enough time to properly debate some of the very important matters. We do have to move through business in a timely manner when you look at what it is we have to get through.

For instance, in February - I declare an interest here - we are looking at the Lay Ministry Working Group Report and the Lay Leadership Report. We do not want to be chivvied along in those very important pivotal reports under Renewal and Reform. I would suggest either the February Synod is extended so that we can properly give time to the business in hand or we all have the November dates in our diaries, do we not, for contingency - that is the whole point of them, that we freed up that time for the possibility of contingency business - which I suggest the Business Committee should consider using.

Finally, we have Diocesan Synod Motions and Private Member's Motions stacking up and the Business Committee's Report is saying they do not know how they are going to fit those pieces of business in at this stage, which is very disappointing. Thank you.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I have three very short points. One is to do with the Blackburn Diocesan Motion on welcoming people who are transgendered. It will be a very long time before that finally gets to the floor of this Synod and an even longer time since Blackburn diocese debated it. Without wanting to give the House of Bishops business beyond what they already have, we wonder whether they might welcome a suggestion that they offer a welcome to people who find themselves in that situation before we debate it on the Synod floor so that when we finally do it will be welcomed with acclaim.

Second, the Amending Canon No. 36 deals with two Private Member's Motions and I am agreeing with both of them. I am wondering when we come to debate that Canon if we

could present both halves separately and vote separately on each Private Member's Motion.

Finally, and it has been alluded to already, we mentioned Shared Conversations in February but it is not in the list of future business for the February sessions. Thank you.

The Chair: I was just wondering after the next speaker whether there was anybody friendly enough to propose a motion of closure, but I will look for that then.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Last November, the Archbishop of York promised a report on the Crown Nominations Commission in 2016 and at the last group of sessions in London, Francis Spufford asked a question about the effect of the work of the Commission of increasing the number of diocesan representatives. Two weeks ago we received the report GS Misc 1147. That report at paragraph 13 indicates that a theological review of the work of the CNC is to be commissioned to be presented for discussion in 2018. Meanwhile, Oxford diocese have put down a motion inviting the Archbishops to initiate a review into the role of the CNC, including consideration of alternative methods of appointment of diocesan bishops. I note that the motion is included in Annex 2 to the Business Committee's Report in the forecast of General Synod business in February 2017.

Regardless, however, of whether that motion is debated then, will the Business Committee please ensure that there is an opportunity for Synod members to debate the report GS Misc 1147 in February and to allocate sufficient time for a proper debate into the various issues it raises? On that latter point, has the Business Committee taken into account the disquiet voiced after the last group of sessions in February about certain debates being cut short whilst several members still wished to speak, for example, the report of the Task Group on Evangelism and the proposed amendment to the motion on resourcing ministerial education?

Mr Keith Cawdron: Point of order: motion for closure.

The Chair: That has my support. Does it have the support of Synod?

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I declare an interest as having a Private Member's Motion down for signature, mission and administration, about releasing time and money for the Church. I discovered as a result of talking with Church House that the final time for signing Private Member's Motions in this General Synod is ten o'clock tomorrow night, which is a very, very short period I have to say. Therefore, I would like to request whether the Business Committee would consider exceptionally allowing until Tuesday when we finish the Shared Conversations or, alternatively, allowing those who are about to drop off the end to have a further group of sessions because it is such a short period. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you. We have been talking about the vote and it was probably more even. Are there others who wish to continue the debate?

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): Already today we have been talking about how good it is to share and have good conversation and good disagreement in connection with sexuality, in connection with Europe, in connection with the worldwide Church. There is but one area where that is not welcomed in the Church at the present time and I have to tell you that is in connection with the serial mishandling of historic sexual abuse cases in the Church. That is a no-go area.

We have asked if we could have a statement from the bishops explaining what is happening in connection with the review that has been announced in connection with the Bishop Bell matter. The Bell matter is exhibit A for me. I do not really know what is happening there, but I do care passionately to get our processes right. The situation at present is that the Church has told us that they will not speak about it today; they will not make a statement until this Synod has gone home. If they relent, will you please ensure that we get 15 minutes so that we can do this?

I finish with one remark. It is an adaptation from Brendan Behan: "The situation is rarely so dire that it cannot be made worse by a bishop's cover-up".

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): The question I have concerns paragraph 58 of the Business Committee Report where it refers to considering trialling scheduling a London group of sessions to include a Saturday in February 2018. Please would the Business Committee consider providing Synod with a summary of the responses to the consultation that they conducted?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Can I tempt you to a motion for closure after the next speaker?

The Chair: You can tempt me certainly.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): I would be grateful to ask the Chair of the Business Committee whether she would welcome ideas as to how we request emergency debates as members of Synod. I congratulate the bishops on the previous emergency debate, and on securing that, but I wonder if they could advise us, the more ordinary members of General Synod, how to do such a thing? Four years ago, as the Government sought to redefine God's creation and ordering of marriage, I twice sought an emergency debate on the issue and my requests were refused. Given that it is an unusual thing to do, when matters of extraordinary import that affect the nation are being changed at critical moments, and this happens certainly year-by-year in the current political climate, it would be good if the Chairman could help us to know how we might be able to raise the issues that affect our nation at this time.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on this item.

The Chair: That still has my support. Does it have the support of the majority of Synod?

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I invite Canon Sue Booy now to respond to the debate. I am no longer chivvying, so you can have five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): How generous. Thank you very much indeed for your thoughtful and considered responses to my report.

Chris Corteen, yes, you might have felt chivvied. Actually, I have had some really interesting conversations with new curates recently about pace and chivvying and the difference between something that goes on for a long time and something that feels as if it is just right. That was after I had attended Eucharist that lasted one hour and 50 minutes and I really wanted to speed them up. We do try to get a really good balance between getting a good number of people to speak, but probably not everyone who stands, and to get the right amount of time. Sometimes it works better than others. There will always be people, I suspect, who are disappointed in what we might call the big debates.

In terms of the time that is set aside in front of us, Business Committee will meet in September and we have currently - and I hope you have, because I do - five days set aside in our diaries in February and we will use all those five days if we need them. I have said that, unless something really urgent comes up, we do not plan to use our November dates, and I am still keen to stick to that. Clearly those of you who were here in the last quinquennium will know that when something urgent comes up we do use November dates.

Whilst I am talking about that, I will respond to Debrah McIsaac about flagging up the possibility of using a Saturday morning in February 2018. Can I refer you to the Business Committee Report last February which had a short summary of the results of the poll. I do not have it in front of me. If I am wrong about that, you are very welcome to come back to me outside of the floor of Synod. They are there and you are very welcome to see them. There is no magic about it.

Andrew Dotchin, inter-prophecy, it will be a very long time before this motion comes to Synod. At the moment it is in the forecast of business. I have some advice for you. You cannot vote separately by splitting the Amending Canon, but you can make suggestions to the Revision Committee that the part that you wish not to see there could be dropped. If you want to take that action, your route for that is through the Revision Committee and I am sure that the legal department would be happy to help you with advice.

David Lamming, I am aware that there is a lot of interest in the CNC. My goodness, I would be, would I not. It is so nice that we are going to have a Bishop of Oxford among us later in this group of sessions. I hear your request to have a proper debate. I think one of the things that the Business Committee will need to do is listen to all the different parties and to work out, as is our role, how best to order the business so that we get a debate that has everything needful before us, or a series of debates.

I think I have already covered in my reply to Mrs Corteen the point about lots of people wanting to speak. The Panel of Chairs does a great job for us but they cannot possibly call everyone who want to speak, and every debate that ends does end at the request of a Synod member. I am getting the light, perfect. I am nearly finished, I promise.

Mr Oldham, we cannot do what you ask in relation to this Synod but I will take advice and speak to my colleagues on the Business Committee. Mr Sewell, I hear your concern. You asked us to make time. We have demonstrated in this Synod that when asked about something important by the Archbishops we make the time.

Mrs Williams, currently, an emergency debate can only be scheduled at the request of the Archbishops. I refer you to the migrant debate where one of the things that we tried to experiment with was to schedule a debate without giving you the motion. Currently, there are two ways open to you. One is to seek a change in the Standing Orders and the other is to write politely to the Archbishops. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you. I now invite Synod to vote on Item 6, that the Synod do take note of this report.

The motion:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. Thank you very much. Now the eagle-eyed of you looking at the clock and looking at the Agenda will realise that I need to call Canon Booy back to move a variation in business, please.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): There are some puzzled looks. It is a very simple request to you that we bring forward the timing of Item 8. I have not got my Notice Paper in front of me. Item 7, the rubric currently reads 6 o'clock and I would like to suggest that we bring that forward to 5.53, she said looking carefully.

In doing so, can I communicate to Synod, something which had the red light not caught me out, the information that all of the legal business scheduled for tomorrow as deemed business is remaining deemed business. Although I am not into prophecy, that does mean that I anticipate that we will have some time tomorrow to take items that we have not taken this afternoon.

The Chair: So, Synod, I am now putting to you that, as proposed by the Chair of the Business Committee, Items 7 and 8 on the Agenda are now brought forward to now.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is carried. So that is what is going to happen. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 5.47 pm.

Appointments to the Archbishops' Council

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. We are now coming to Item 7 on our Agenda to be followed by Item 8. These are both appointments to the Archbishops' Council. You have all the details you need, really, on Order Paper 1. I am going to invite the Archbishop of York to begin by speaking to moving Item 7. He has up to ten minutes, should he need that long.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): No, I do not think so. Thank you, Bishop David. In the spirit of keeping the Synod on track and, with your permission, in moving Item 7 I shall also speak to Item 8. I shall then move Item 8 formally when we get there. Have I got your permission, please?

The Chair. That has my permission.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I beg to move:

‘That the appointment of the Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy as a member of the Archbishops' Council for a term ending on 31 December 2019 be approved.’

I do not intend to use this time to sing the praises of the two people Canterbury and I wish to appoint to the Archbishops' Council for further terms. Again, I refer members to paper GS 2025 for the notes.

New members may not be aware - and may actually be surprised - that the Synod has a role in approving the appointments Canterbury and I wish to make to the Archbishops' Council. But it does, and reasonably so since people appointed to the Council are also ex officio members of the Synod.

When we are considering appointments to the Council, Canterbury and I always seek to identify the skills available to the Council amongst those elected to it by the Synod and try to make appointments that will complement the virtues of Council members and bring out-of-the-box perspectives - both to the Council and to the Synod. We are currently in the process of doing that for an appointment we will bring to the Synod for the February group of sessions when Philip Fletcher steps down.

I should like here to pay tribute to Philip Fletcher who leaves the Council after ten years at the end of this year. Philip has brought a breadth of knowledge and expertise to the Council that have enabled him to oversee a turnaround in the fortunes of Church House Publishing as well as chairing the Mission and Public Affairs Council for the past five years. His energy, wisdom, skill and effectiveness have served all of us well and we are indebted to him. He leaves extremely large shoes to fill and I invite the Synod to thank him in the usual way.

Despite what I have said about not singing praises, I should though just add how valuable Roz's passionate concern for deprived areas and urban ministry - daily life for her - and Rebecca's efforts to relay to the Council how millennials relate to the Church are to the Council's discussions.

Rosalyn and Rebecca remain necessary to the Council's work, not only because of the skills and perspectives they bring to it but also because of the continuity and stability they bring to the Council at a time when, following elections during the winter, half its membership is new. The Council needs that stability as it builds its strength for the future. I, therefore, ask Synod to approve these appointments.

The Chair: Item 7 is now open for debate. I see no one standing; therefore, Archbishop you have no debate to reply to and I think we can go straight to a vote on Item 7.

The motion:

'That the appointment of the Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy as a member of the Archbishops' Council for a term ending on 31 December 2019 be approved.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. I now look to the Archbishop to formally move Item 8.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I beg to move:

'That the appointment of Mrs Rebecca Salter as a member of the Archbishops' Council for a term ending on 28 February 2019 be approved.'

The Chair: Thank you. Item 8 is now open for debate. I see no one standing; therefore, Item 8 will be put to the vote.

The motion:

'That the appointment of Mrs Rebecca Salter as a member of the Archbishops' Council for a term ending on 28 February 2019 be approved.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Again, that is very clearly carried. That brings Items 7 and 8 to a close. I shall go down to the foyer where I am happy to autograph copies of the front page of the *Church Times* for those of you who have seen me on it.

Church Commissioners' Annual Report

The Chair: Well, I was not expecting to see you all again so soon. We were not quite sure what was meant to be happening and who chairing, but we are sure that the Order Paper is very clear that we are going on to the Church Commissioners' Annual Report. This is Item 9 on your Order Paper and I am going to invite Sir Andreas Whittam Smith to begin to address us.

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith (ex officio): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

Thank you very much. I am amazed to find myself standing up here at this moment. All weekend I have been wondering if I would get on at all, or perhaps be postponed to the February sessions or something.

Anyway, here we are at a very important moment for the management of the Church Commissioners' Funds, as you would realise. The consequences of Brexit have been traumatic under various headings but not least to those of us holding the Church's funds in our hands and having responsibilities of stewardship.

Just to go back a little bit to the 2015 result, we achieved growth of just over 8%. You may remember that our target is inflation plus 5% and we clearly beat that last year. More importantly perhaps, we have beaten that target in every time span we measure; that is the last year, last five years, last ten, last 20 years, and the one I am most proud about is the last 30 years, because the last 30 years includes the substantial losses which the Commissioners notoriously made in the early 90s.

Although those losses were real and the money has gone, nonetheless our average annual gain in that entire 30 year period has been 9.7% per annum, which is 6.3 points above the rate of inflation. At the annual meeting of the Church Commissioners a few weeks ago I was quite gloomy about the outlook and I warned that it would be very difficult for us to make the sort of returns I have just described to you in the near future.

There is the slowdown of the Chinese economy and, also, what has been undermining confidence very much indeed is the realisation that governments do not any longer have the means to deal with the recession, should we enter one. They cannot cut interest rates any longer because they are as low as they will go. They can try this so-called quantitative easing, which is pumping money into the economy, but what we know from our experience of that is that it drives up the prices of assets but it does not actually do very much for economic activity.

Governments could and should spend much more on infrastructure but they are frightened of raising the volume of government spending. What is eating into confidence is the notion that governments have lost control, essentially.

Then comes Brexit. We are all saying what we voted, so I voted to remain. Emotionally,

I was in favour of leaving. I do not like the European Union very much but I voted to remain because of what I perceived, as many did, to be the economic consequences which I did not care to visit on our fellow citizens, and now we see them in front of us.

How well prepared were we for this result? To some extent, we were well prepared. We have been steadily selling property for the last two years in quite big sums. A lot of the property which we still own, and will go on owning for quite a long time, either has reversionary potential or it provides opportunities for active management.

By reversionary potential, I typically mean our agricultural holdings where the tenant farmer has a right hand on their tenancy by perhaps two or three generations and, until that process comes to an end, those properties are valued at much less than their vacant possession value. When that ends we can expect an uplift. It also refers to our London estate, the Hyde Park Estate, where much of our property is let out on long leases and when the leases fall in we can, of course, achieve a big uplift. That protects us against some of the unfavourable movements in property markets.

We have also gone on investing as much as possible in opportunities which were distanced from every twist and turn of the stock market. Some of these would, for instance, be credit strategies where we make funds available when companies are being reconstituted after some sort of financial problem.

We have also built up new asset classes. A lot of our resources now are involved in private equity which has been giving us a return of 12.5% per annum for some time. This is where private equity managers typically invest in companies for around three to seven years and try to turn them around. From our point of view, they very often succeed and we are very happy with that sort of investment.

Secondly, we have built up large holdings of forestry in the United States and in this country. It is a remarkable fact that starting from nothing five years ago we are now the second largest owners of forestry in this country after the Forestry Commission, which is a remarkable achievement. In a way, it shows how undervalued forestry is. It has so far served us extremely well and returned well above what we expect from our investments.

Where is our portfolio today after the events of the last two weeks? From our point of view - and you may be surprised to hear me say this - the decline in the value of sterling has been of great benefit. 45 per cent of our assets are owned outside this country and those assets have appreciated immediately as a result of the fall in the pound. That has produced a very hefty gain for us.

You can see that in the financial markets. The FTSE 100, which has all the big companies with many overseas assets, is up; and the FTSE 250, which has the much smaller companies, is down. We have certainly benefited from that. On the other hand, I mentioned property, the closure of a number of property retail funds to investors, so they cannot get their funds out as they thought they could, has cast a pall over property markets. Nobody knows how much commercial property markets are down until we actually get a transaction between a willing seller and a willing buyer, but people are guessing that values may be 10% to 20% down.

I would say that, on balance, we are slightly up at the moment since the day of the Referendum. I would say that is the case on balance, but until we see transactions we cannot know exactly where we stand.

There is that phrase about, 'Canaries in the coal mine', and there are two which I am keeping my eye on. We used to worry a lot, and still to do to some extent, about over-borrowing. But there is something else which is happening, which is when there is a shock to the world economy investors rush to what they think are safe assets. They rush in such numbers that a sort of crowding develops. So if the music stops or the events change, they find it very difficult to exit and have to take quite big discounts to get out. That is very dangerous and we seek to keep away from those markets as far as we can.

Secondly, as you will have read, there is a persistent fall in the yields on Government securities, which is always, and has been, a classic danger sign that many people simply do not believe in economic recovery and they prefer to take very low returns in the gilt edged market than chance their arm with equities. That is another canary in the coal mine.

The Chair: You have two minutes.

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith (ex officio): The minute you have let me have allows me to tell you what this will do to our distributions. I asked my colleagues to say if our assets drop by 5% per annum for five years, 5 plus 5 plus 5 plus 5, where would we be? Would we still be able to maintain our distributions? The answer is yes.

The second question is, how many years could we go with minus 5s until we could not maintain our present level of distributions? The answer to that is eight. I do not know whether you think that is cheerful news but it is some reassurance. Thank you.

The Chair: Item 9 is now open for debate, but we do not have much time this evening.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): In view of the increase in child poverty and the increase in poverty in general in this country, I wonder whether the Church Commissioners will consider investing in social housing and also in credit unions? I feel both of these very worthy causes will be seen as the Church doing something very active to assist people in current situations.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): Thank you very much for your report and congratulations on your returns and in continuing to outstrip inflation. There is an underlying challenge though around growth and economic growth, which is that it implies the greater use of the world's resources, which implies more pollution.

As you know very well, we are facing huge challenges in terms of carbon output reduction and we need to see a reduction in carbon emissions by 2020 in real terms. I congratulate the Commissioners on supporting the Transition Pathway Initiative, but do you think it is

going to be fast enough for us to be moving towards a low carbon economy by 2020?

The Chair: Thank you. I see nobody else standing at the moment and so I am going to call on Andreas again. We are very close to quarter past. I do not know whether you are going to get it in before quarter past? Can we have an extension by five minutes, Synod? Yes. Any against that? No.

This motion was carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Okay, we have extended by five minutes. Andreas, you have up to five minutes.

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith (ex officio): Thank you very much indeed. Thank you for those two very good questions. On child poverty, how could one not notice what is going on. First of all, you asked about credit unions, we did contribute substantially to the setting up of the Church Credit Union.

Secondly, we do have a lot of what we call strategic land, which is agricultural land where there is a good development prospect. In bringing that to the market we always, more rigorously than almost anybody else, insist on a high proportion of social housing wherever we can and so we are very aware of that issue.

On carbon reduction, we review our portfolio pretty much all the time to see where we are on the companies in which we invest. You may have seen that we successfully put down with American Partners resolutions at the meeting of the biggest American oil companies, and also with BP, and they supported our resolutions, which is a way of showing that engagement between large investors, especially groups of Church investors, and companies in the energy fields does gradually make a difference. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. That now brings us to a vote on Item 9, that the Synod do take note of this report.

The motion:

'That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. That brings to an end Item 9. That also brings to an end the business bit of the afternoon. Please do stay where you are though to join us in worship to complete this bit of our time before we go off for our suppers.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn* took the Chair at 8 pm

Questions

The Chair: Good evening, Synod. Two notices as we begin. One is that the text of the

Archbishop's presentation is available to pick up from the information desk after this session. A big thank you to those of you who did return your vote cards. If you have not or did not realise that you needed to, please return your voting card after we have finished here. There will be members of the Synod staff downstairs with boxes for you to put them in so overnight they can be reprogrammed for tomorrow, so you will be the right person with the right card.

We move into the final business for the day, Item 11, which is Questions. I love listening to "Just a Minute" because the rules are very clear: no deviation, hesitation or repetition. Those of you who are seasoned Synod members will realise that we have very clear rules about this particular game for this evening. If you intend to ask a supplementary question, it has to be a question. It needs to be on the subject of the original question or the answer. You should not be asking for an opinion or setting us a kind of hypothetical situation to deal with. If you fall foul of any of that, you will hear the bell go and we will pass on to somebody else. If you intend to ask a supplementary then you will need to make your way to one of the microphones down here because there is no roving mic available.

EU Referendum

The Chair: We will begin questions 1 to 8 relating to the EU Referendum.

1. *Mr Clive Scowen (London) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In the context of the uncertainty and fear which have followed the result of the EU Referendum, what leadership does the House of Bishops intend to offer to the Church in its mission, both to the people of England and in Europe; and in particular will they (i) make it their priority to take this opportunity to commend Jesus Christ as the only true hope for this and every nation and the one who, when He is lifted up, has promised to draw all people to Himself, and (ii) encourage all clergy and laity to do the same?

The Bishop of Norwich replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Both the numbered points in the question are permanent priorities for the House and, I hope, for the whole Church. The first is the foundation for all mission activities and the second is at the very heart of episcopal ministry.

More specifically, I want to take this opportunity to commend the numerous parishes and dioceses that have responded to local people's fears, especially to people from other countries and cultures, by witnessing to the welcome that the majority of the population still offers and which the ministry of the Christian Churches epitomises.

In an almost unprecedented period of political vacuum, neighbourliness, expressed across political differences, may be the most important way to enable the country to recover a sense of shared purpose. The Church of Jesus Christ is a school for good neighbourliness. I am confident that, in the hope of Christ, we can rise to that vocation.

Mr Clive Scowen: It is encouraging to hear that commending and lifting up Jesus Christ is the hope of the world, and that encouraging the whole Church to do the same is a permanent priority of the House of Bishops and that promoting evangelism is at the very heart of episcopal ministry. Will the House now give attention to the best way in which they can do that very thing which is at the heart of their ministry so as to make a really

distinctive contribution which only the Church can make to bringing hope, healing and unity in our society.

The Bishop of Norwich: I am sure the House will consider this when it next meets. It is worth remembering that the House is a Synodical body. It is very useful for doing some things such as, say, the pastoral letter before the General Election, but my guess is the response to the Referendum is best led by the Archbishops in the way that it has been led and by individual diocesan bishops. Like many others, I issued a statement on the day after the Referendum, making many of the points that you make in your question. We should not underestimate the individual leadership of bishops in their dioceses as well as the Archbishops in relation to the nation. I do not think the nation is waiting to hear from the House of Bishops. It might be - because I have got things wrong about the Referendum - the one thing the country wants to hear. I take your point entirely, but I do not think bishops should only speak as a House of Bishops; they should speak individually.

2. *Revd Jason Roach (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House consider what lessons we might learn about how well the Church of England understands our nation, given the publicly aired views of our leadership on Brexit compared with the outcome of the Referendum?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied: The House of Bishops is constantly seeking to examine its understanding, in all sorts of areas. There is a difference between understanding and agreeing, and different Bishops have different views on numerous issues, some of which match the national mood and some of which do not.

Revd Jason Roach: In your response you articulated that there were different views among bishops. Where there are theologically sound views that do speak to these concerns, would it be helpful for them to be aired in the public square, particularly as it seems we are particularly out of touch with the lower socio-economic groups and that sort of thing?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you very much. It is a point we consider a great deal. It is in the charge to all bishops when they become diocesan bishops - and having done the confirmation of election for the Bishop of Oxford, he will remember this from last Thursday - that they are to engage in the public square as individuals as well as a House, as the Bishop of Norwich was just saying. That is very much part of what they are expected to do, and we would expect each other to continue to do; both listening and responding publically. I think you will find most of them do. Sometimes they agree with what they hear and sometimes they do not; they are individuals. But thank you.

Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): If we are considering how well the Church of England and the nation understand one another, will the House of Bishops take this opportunity to commend to HM Government that the Synod has a practice of requiring two-thirds majorities for serious matters when it debates them?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: How long do you want the answer to last? I think that is a very interesting thought, which we will doubtless take under consideration. That is

probably the best way of putting it. Although I really like it.

3. *Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the recent Referendum result has highlighted various serious tensions in British society, and put many in fear of xenophobic treatment, could advice and resources be made available to local churches to help tackle these issues, and to promote the Christian teaching of 'Love your neighbour'?

The Bishop of Leeds replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Referendum has certainly been followed by a sharp rise in racist incidents, at least as measured by the fivefold increase in reports to the police "True Vision" hate crime site in the following week. There have been reports of invidious and divisive leaflets being distributed in my own diocese across West Yorkshire and a number of cases of racial abuse.

Leading figures in our Church have spoken clearly and in various forums/media about the serious issues involved. The Mission and Public Affairs Division is working with many other organisations to promote reconciliation and integration, justice and compassion in local communities as well as at national level, and is assembling advice and resources to be made available to local churches on an ongoing basis, drawing from local experience as well as national sources. The first such briefing will be issued before the end of July.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel: Given the success of the "Thy Kingdom Come" initiative and the need for healing in our nation at this time, could the Archbishops perhaps similarly lead a national day of prayer to which all parts of the Church could respond?

The Bishop of Leeds: I think I would refer that to my colleagues on my right, the Archbishops, as the question is to them. Recently there has been a day of prayer. There is no reason why there should not be another one, but it is not for me to say.

4. *Revd Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the recent murder of MP Jo Cox, allegedly by someone with sympathy with far right causes, the active engagement of far right groups in the fringes of the European Referendum, the spate of post-Referendum racist attacks with approving far right social media commentary, along with the continued far right demonstrations in our towns and cities; will the House of Bishops seek to put pressure on the Government to hold an inquiry into their current activity, causes for their growth, and ensure they are properly attended to within the existing constructs of the Preventing Violent Extremism strategy and legislation?

The Bishop of Leeds replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: We were all horrified by the murder of Jo Cox, and will continue to pray for her immediate and wider family and the local community in Batley and Spennings. Jo was a remarkable MP and I salute both her work and the hugely impressive tone in which Brendan Cox has spoken, through the family's grief.

We shall continue to respond to the recent spate of violent words and actions against members of minority groups. We shall continue to promote hope not hate, respect not

rejection. While robustly condemning what is utterly wrong, we must not reinforce the vicious circle of hate by hating the haters.

Extreme groups of this kind are already in scope of the Government's counter-extremism strategy, and we shall continue to urge that analysis of, and solutions to, the greater prevalence of extreme views and groups are included as a part of the Government's programme.

Revd Canon Peter Adams (St Albans) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the days following the European Referendum and vote to leave, the incidence of physical or verbal racist attacks, especially on people of Eastern European origin and Muslim people, has risen sharply. At the same time citizens of the European Union nations are living with uncertainty as to their future residential status, and family units of mixed nationality are under particular pressure. Would the House of Bishops seek from the Government a clear statement that the status of EU migrants already in the UK will be guaranteed sooner rather than later? Further to that would they consider advice to churches on addressing the needs of all made vulnerable in the present period of uncertainty?

The Bishop of Leeds replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: It is important that EU citizens living and working in Britain are reassured as to the security of their residence in Britain, with their families; just as it is important for British citizens working in the EU to have similar assurance.

These matters are all part of the complex negotiations that lie ahead; but as the question implies, the sense of insecurity goes further than legal status, and it renders the people concerned vulnerable in a variety of ways. At the least, these EU citizens living in Britain should have official assurance that their status will not change in any way before (a) full legal agreements are reached with the EU and (b) the basis on which they originally came to this country is honoured.

In relation to racist attacks, and on the question of advice to churches, I refer to my earlier answer to Question 3.

6. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the United Kingdom's Referendum decision to leave the European Union, what steps are the House of Bishops and in particular the Diocese in Europe taking in order to maintain and build relationships with our European neighbours at all socio-economic levels?

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England has long-standing bilateral relationships with the Churches of continental Europe that predate our membership of the European Union and its predecessor the European Economic Community. The Church of England is also a member of the Conference of European Churches, a fellowship of some 114 Orthodox, Protestant, Anglican, and Old Catholic Churches from all countries of Europe, plus 40 national councils of Churches and organisations in partnership. These relationships will be particularly important after the Referendum decision to leave the EU to enable us to build and maintain relationships with our European neighbours at all levels.

Mr Gavin Oldham: The reason why I referred to all socio-economic levels in my question was because I am deeply aware of the high levels of unemployment and particularly youth unemployment throughout Europe which has driven the migration to occur. Would the Bishop in Gibraltar address that point about how the Church will engage with those people who have been driven by economic despair to come to this country to try to find some reconciliation for them, and not just the lifestyle migration, which I think he is talking about here.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe: When I was in Hungary, I was talking to the Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, a senior religious figure in that country and I said to him, "What is your biggest problem in Hungary?" and he said, "Emigration. We are losing all our skilled young people to places like London". It is not that they are driven by desperation so much but they can see there are better opportunities for work and better pay and so they are attracted to those European capitals, of which London is a prime example, where they can get the best opportunities for them and their families, and then maybe they will return to their countries at a later stage. For example, the Diocese of London is responding to that by setting up churches catering for people coming from other European countries. There is some work going on in the Church of England to work with incoming migrants.

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): Would the Bishop agree with me that this is the time for investing in our European ecumenical relations, not divesting from them or diminishing them? As our relationships are changing, we need greater understanding, not less.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe: I think the Bishop of Leeds makes a very important point. This is a time when our engagement with Europe as a Church is needed more than ever. Our European neighbours are very worried by the political moves which appear to be distancing the UK from the continent. The Churches have played a very important role in establishing friendship and solidarity, independent of the political situation. I would encourage the Church authorities and national institutions to consider how resources might need to be redeployed in the light of the Brexit result.

7. *Revd Paul Hutchinson (York)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What plans does the House of Bishops have to monitor the impact (numerical, financial and/or other) of the Referendum vote on 23rd June 2016 to leave the EU upon the congregations and clergy of the Diocese in Europe?

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: We in the Diocese in Europe naturally feel vulnerable amid the present uncertainties, but within the Church of England, we know that we are "family", and mutual bonds with other dioceses and national structures will remain strong.

Until we know how the Government approaches its negotiations to leave the EU, the long term impact is unclear. Two million UK citizens live, work and travel in the other 27 Member States. They all currently enjoy the right to work, as well as access to pensions, health care and public services that are only guaranteed because of EU law.

The chaplaincies of the Diocese in Europe serve people of many nationalities, and uncertainties extend beyond those who are British citizens. The impact of the Referendum on exchange rates is already being felt and the NCIs are monitoring this closely. The long term trends – financial, social and legal – will be followed attentively.

Very Revd Timothy Barker (Channel Islands): Will the House of Bishops also ensure that the interests and concerns of the Crown Dependencies, the Isle of Man and the Bailiwicks of Jersey and Guernsey are not overlooked in the continuing work that goes on in the UK?

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe: I very much hope so. Those do not lie in my jurisdiction. The Channel Islands are in the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester, as I understand it --- No, it is Canterbury. I am a little bit out of date. And the Isle of Man is clearly under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Sodor and Man. They will no doubt advocate the positions of their own constituencies.

8. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Church Commissioners: On June 23rd the British people voted to leave the European Union. How is that decision expected to affect the National Church Institutions? What action is being taken to mitigate the impact of the result and what opportunities have been identified?

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Others have commented on the Church's healing and unifying role following the Referendum. As for the Commissioners' investments, the immediate impact has not been significant. In fact the sharp fall in sterling against other major currencies benefitted us since almost half our portfolio is invested outside the UK. We have high cash levels at around 12% of total assets because we remain cautious about the outlook for markets in general.

We shall remain watchful, patient and focused on the long term. The investment team and the Assets Committee are ready to act should attractive opportunities present themselves as a result of increased market volatility.

Mission and Public Affairs Council

9. *Revd Mark Barker (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the Mission & Public Affairs Council: In the light of the continuing horrors that we hear of coming out of Syria, what pressure is being brought to bear by the Church of England on our Government and world leaders to intervene and particularly to prevent the ethnic cleansing of minority groups within Syria, including of our brothers and sisters – who are being persecuted and killed?

Mr Philip Fletcher replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: On 8th March 2016 the Bishop of Coventry led a short debate in the House of Lords pressing for a political solution to the civil war in Syria. In April 2016 the bishops of Leeds, Coventry and Southwark travelled with Christian Aid to Iraqi Kurdistan where they met with refugees displaced by the conflict in Syria. MPA staff are helping the bishops take forward in Parliament and with Government concerns arising from this visit. In May 2016 the Bishop of Coventry joined with other civil society leaders in pressing for a cessation of hostilities in civilian areas, such as Aleppo, and for a resumption of humanitarian aid.

Sadly, this work is ongoing.

10. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Does the Council support the proposal, made recently by a Welsh civil servant, to launch a scoring system to identify and publicise faith-friendly employers, similar to the one created by Stonewall to identify LGBT-friendly employers; and, if so, is the Council prepared to take some steps to help establish such a scheme in England?

Mr Philip Fletcher replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: No. There would be no ready consensus on the objective criteria needed to identify a 'faith-friendly' employer. Precedents from the USA are not promising. There are better ways, I suggest, to seek to ensure that employers take account of the needs and wishes of employees and to allow faith groups to flourish.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Philip, could you explain a little why you think "objective" criteria are important when most of this is quite subjective?

Mr Philip Fletcher: I think the Prolocutor puts his finger on the problem of trying to set up a general system which should in equity, or certainly in law, be based on properly objective criteria for a set of issues which are inherently likely to be more subjective in character. I refer in my answer to the poor precedent from the United States, where some organisations have set up very narrow criteria designed to demonstrate Christian friendliness with a fairly narrow definition of "Christian". I suggest that would be unhelpful. There are other things such as the Charter of Human Rights, which clearly safeguard the right to freedom of faith and religion, which I suggest are far more important and which we should be seeking to safeguard.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Mr Fletcher has partly answered my question, but not entirely. He says there are "better ways to seek to ensure that employers take account of the needs and wishes of employees and to allow faith groups to flourish". Will MPA now help employees to understand what those ways might be? Will MPA take some proactive role in helping that desired outcome to come about?

Mr Philip Fletcher: Quite what role the MPA can play I am not sure, and I would be happy to explore with Mr Scowen when outside the full assembly. Certainly after the vote two weeks ago and other noises that have been made, I suggest it is important we continue to safeguard human rights in the interests of all - of all faiths and of none - to ensure that those are properly safeguarded. There is clearly a role in educating employers and others about what that means, as we can see with various notorious or other cases that have come to public attention and sometimes to the courts' attention in recent years.

Crown Nominations Commission

11. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: The *Archbishops' Guidelines on the Implementation of "Choosing Bishops – the Equality Act 2010 (Revised)" (GS Misc 1044)* were stated to have been prepared so that the relevant information can be provided to members of the CNC in the light of their responsibilities for nominating bishops. The Guidelines include statements which

allude to the ‘*content and manner*’ of a candidate’s public disagreements with the Church’s teaching on homosexuality and ‘*the manner in which that disagreement is expressed*’. In the interests of treating all candidates fairly, what plans are in place to provide criteria to elucidate such terms as ‘*content and manner*’ and ‘*the way in which that disagreement has been expressed*’?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: As a central member Mrs Alexander was part of the discussion on this issue at the recent central members’ meeting. In relation to “content and manner” it was noted that it was acceptable to disagree with the House of Bishops Statement on Issues in Human Sexuality but that statements should be within the Chicago-Lambeth quadrilateral and demonstrate a serious and thoughtful attempt to engage with scripture. With regard to the way in which disagreement it expressed, it was noted that demeaning and disparaging those with whom one disagrees is inappropriate; a bishop must be capable of disagreeing with people without them feeling a sense of personal attack.

12. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In the interests of fairness to all candidates, what plans are in place to make it clear that the advice given to the CNC in the *Archbishops’ Guidelines on the Implementation of “Choosing Bishops – the Equality Act 2010(Revised)” (GS Misc 1044)* applies equally to the ‘*content and manner*’ of statements and publications which might be construed as homophobic and to ‘*the way in which disagreement*’ with a liberal view on sexuality ‘*has been expressed*’?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: It follows from the fundamental calling of a bishop to be a ‘focus of unity’ that what is said in the guidelines about the possible relevance of the ‘content and manner’ of public statements applies equally to all those who comment on issues of Human Sexuality. As Mrs Alexander is aware from her membership of the CNC, consideration is being given to re-issuing the guidelines in due course to state that expressly

Ms Jayne Ozane (Oxford): Would the Archbishop as Chair, when looking at reissuing the guidelines, perhaps consider doing what the Methodist Church recently has done in defining what constitutes homophobia, given the difference between what is perceived as homophobic and what is received and experienced as homophobic. Given the fact that our brothers and sister in the Methodist Church have seen this as important enough to define, I would ask that the Archbishop thinks about giving a similar set of definitions and experiences and examples for us as a Church to consider.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you. That is a very helpful question. I certainly take on board the significance of that, and particularly the very useful distinction you make between perception and reception, with applies in that and a number of other areas of course, not least in the Five Principles. It is certainly something that I will consider, but it is not for me to decide alone. It is not one of those things where I wake up one morning and say, “I think we will do this”. It has to be done together with the Crown Nominations Commission for something as important as that, together with the House of Bishops.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): In light of the fact that an answer given in this

arena some years ago to the question: "Was a conservative expression that 'same-sex practice was outside the will and blessing of God' - in the best way possible but clear - in itself a definition of homophobia?" and the answer was given, "No, it is not necessarily". Would reassurance be given in any answer to the previous question to making that point clear as well?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I am grateful to David for the question. You talk of arenas; it feels like a bit of a left and a right here. I think that would certainly be something that should fall as part of the consideration.

Revd Canon David Banting: It was Bishop John Gladwin who gave the answer.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: That is most helpful. I do appreciate that.

13. *Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: As part of the process of discerning candidates for nomination to a diocesan see, what advice is given to the members of a Crown Nominations Commission by its Chair and the Secretaries as to the matters to be taken into account in deciding which candidates are invited for interview and, before deciding on which candidates to interview, what efforts are made to bring out into the open any views held by members which might militate against any particular nomination?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied as the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: This will differ from CNC to CNC. The Secretaries provide a memorandum following their consultations in the diocese and the Archbishops share their views on the national needs of the Church. Members are also given a draft role and person specification. In the light of these, and the Diocesan Statement of Needs, the Commission agrees the priorities and challenges of the ministry to which they are nominating. The Archbishops chair the discussion and provide advice to ensure that the process is conducted within the Standing Order and other relevant guidance. Individual members may come with different views about the requirements of the diocese and we work hard in every Commission to create an open atmosphere in which they can share these with others as they engage in discussion and prayer.

14. *Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: What plans exist to review the Standing Orders of the General Synod by which the Crown Nominations Commission is constituted, particularly SO 141 governing business and procedure?

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: The central members of the Commission keep all elements of the Standing Order under regular review. Should they feel that any specific proposals ought to be pursued, the Synod will be informed (as it was in GS Misc 1147 in relation to Standing Order 136(3)) and proposals will be brought to it for approval in due course. As part of this continuing process of deliberation central members have recently been considering the possibility of revising the two-thirds voting requirement to require a majority of two-thirds of those present and voting rather than two-thirds of the Commission's voting members"; but they have not yet reached any conclusion on this.

Mr Anthony Archer: I thank the Archbishop for his answer. Am I correct in saying that implicit in his answer must be the fact that at some CNCs, members, whether central members or diocesan members, and who by definition must have been present, have chosen to abstain from voting, which perhaps is suggestive of games being played?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: If I were to answer that question it would breach the undertaking of confidentiality given. But thank you for asking it.

Faith and Order Commission

15. *Mr John Freeman (Chester)* asked the Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: Has the Faith and Order Commission considered whether it is not time that the Church of England joined our Porvoo Lutheran brothers and sisters and Methodist Covenant partners in signing the “Joint Statement on the Doctrine of Justification” with the Roman Catholic Church as a step forward in improving ecumenical relationships all round?

The Bishop of Coventry replied as Chair of the Faith and Order Commission: The question of whether the Church of England should make a response to the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* was raised by FAOC in 2013, in the context of preparations for the 500th anniversary of the Reformation in 2017. Two members wrote papers evaluating the *Declaration* positively in relation to Anglican doctrine, which were then passed on to the Director of Unity, Faith and Order for the Anglican Communion. This work by FAOC forms part of the background to Resolution 16.17 passed by ACC-16, which begins by asserting that the ACC “welcomes and affirms the substance of the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (JDDJ), signed by Lutherans and Roman Catholics in 1999”. It may be that the Church of England would want to find an opportunity to support that resolution in some appropriate way, and I should be glad if it were to do so.

Mr John Freeman: Thank you, Bishop, for your reply indicating the Church of England's support for signing the joint statement in an appropriate way. Is there anything mere mortals like me can do to expedite matters?

The Bishop of Coventry: Every encouragement that you can give on every level for it to be considered. It is probably a question for the Council for Christian Unity and, depending on their judgment, it may even be a question for the Business Committee of this Synod to consider. The more you can do to keep it alive, Mr Freeman, the better.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville CR (Religious Communities): In the light of the previous answer given, can I ask the Business Committee, through Bishop Christopher and the Council for Christian Unity, to consider pressing for an ecumenically fronted and excessively resourced debate on the good gospel of justification by faith?

The Bishop of Coventry: I can certainly pass that on. A debate on the gospel seems like a good thing to me.

Church Commissioners

16. *Dr Michael Todd (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: What steps are being taken to revise the Green Guide covering standards for new-build parsonages, and is there an intention to set comparable standards for parsonages which are bought already built and also those that are already in ownership, recognising that the contemporary expectations for housing have advanced considerably and that domestic circumstances are also very varied?

Mr Andrew Mackie replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: There are no current plans to revise the Green Guide. Although the Guide is primarily a guide for new-build parsonages it is, in practice, widely regarded by both clergy and diocesan parsonage boards as a benchmark against which to assess the suitability of existing parsonages and houses being purchased as parsonages.

Dr Michael Todd: Much is changing in society's expectations for housing standards and we, like everybody else, need to adapt accordingly. Could I ask you to re-visit this issue, especially with regard to energy performance and other environmental issues? Although the EPCE standard minimum for rentals will not directly apply to clergy housing, could we not set similar standards, in particular so that occupiers will have more assurances regarding the likely energy costs, and so that over time we can seek to improve that minimum standard?

Mr Andrew Mackie: Thank you very much for that question. It is clearly important that the sorts of environmental issues in particular that you talk about are constantly kept under review. As a whole, as was said in the answer to the question, I do not think there is a clamour for a revision of the Green Guide, but that does not preclude a proper consideration of the sorts of things that you are talking about.

Revd Mrs Sonia Doragh (Liverpool): May I start the clamour? I am watching my new vicarage being built in the back garden of my existing vicarage. There will not be solar panels on it. We asked if that could be considered but, as the Green Guide does not give measures to environmental consideration, particularly solar panels, it has not been considered. I would like the report to be revised in that measure. If we could consider that, that would be amazing. Thank you.

Mr Andrew Mackie: In view of the reception to the question, I think it would be very churlish of me to say anything other than we will take a lot of notice of that and re-visit again whether there is anything more concrete we need to do as far as revision is concerned. Concrete gets a bad press. Whether to achieve the sort of thing that you are talking about requires all of the apparatus involved in a wholesale revision of the Green Guide, I am not sure, but we will look at it and we will take notice of the particular example that you have very first-hand experience of, so thank you for that.

17. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Church Commissioners: It is understood that the Church Commissioners paid, or contributed to, the £15,000 paid in settlement of a civil claim regarding alleged sexual abuse by the late Bishop George Bell. Will the Church Commissioners please (i) confirm the accuracy of this information and, if others (whether insurers, the Diocese of Chichester or any other accountable Church institution) contributed to the settlement, state the amount(s) of their respective

contributions, and (ii) state whether, in addition, the Church Commissioners made any, and if so what, financial contribution to (a) the complainant's legal costs (including any success fee) and expenses, and/or (b) the costs and expenses (including the fees of experts) of the Diocese of Chichester incurred in relation to the said claim.

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The Commissioners contributed to the settlement of the claim, but did not pay the whole. The damages paid were £16,800 and the claimant's legal costs were £15,000. In addition, the Diocese of Chichester's costs were £18,000. These figures include the costs of a medical expert instructed by the claimant and another instructed by the Diocese of Chichester. The Commissioners paid £29,800 towards the damages and costs, with the balance being funded by a donation from a private individual, not an insurer or another Church institution.

Mr David Lamming: I thank Sir Andreas for his answer and for the additional information given, but in the light of the answer will you say whether insurers were asked to contribute to the settlement and, if so, whether and why they declined to do so? Who was the putative defendant on whose behalf the settlement was reached with the claimant? I am assuming that court proceedings were not issued. Will you please state the particular specialty of the medical experts instructed respectively by the claimants and by the diocese of Chichester?

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith: You are accrediting the Church Commissioners with far more involvement in this case than you might think. We have a discretion to pay bishops' costs, as you probably know, and we make judgments on what costs to bear on a variety of factors. In this case, the answers are really clear in my answer. I do not think I can add to them. There are the damages; there are the claimant's legal costs and there are the Diocese of Chichester's costs. We paid £29,800 of those and a private individual came forward, not an insurer, and paid the rest. I cannot add to that.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): There is a very simple question on the table: did any insurer decline to indemnify?

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith: I have no idea whether an insurer was involved. We were not told about such a case.

Mr Martin Sewell: Who would know?

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith: The Diocese of Chichester would know.

Mr Martin Sewell: Will that information be made available?

Sir Andreas Whittam Smith: I cannot speak for the Diocese of Chichester, I am afraid.

18. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners: Whose authorization was required for the expenditure of central Church funds on the defence of Bishop Richard Inwood in the proceedings brought against him by the Revd Canon Jeremy Pemberton in the Nottingham Employment Tribunal?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith replied: The Church Commissioners have a discretion to fund legal costs as an expense of a bishop's office. Their Board of Governors has delegated authority to exercise that discretion to the First Church Estates Commissioner and the QC Commissioner acting together. We agreed, after consideration, to fund Bishop Inwood's costs, as acting Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham, in defending the proceedings brought by Canon Pemberton.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard: Thank you for your reply. I am told that the legal fees incurred by the Church in defending the bishop were over £1 million. Is that correct? How will the precise figure be reported to Synod?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith: We do not report those figures; to do so would open the door to all sorts of vexatious claims.

19. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Church Commissioners: Which bodies fund the posts of Programme Co-ordinator and Projects Co-ordinator for the Church of England's Shared Conversations on Scripture, Mission and Human Sexuality?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith replied: The Church Commissioners have made available £300,000 towards the overall costs of the Church of England's Shared Conversations on Scripture, Mission and Human Sexuality. This will fund the majority of the costs of this work. In due course dioceses will be asked to fund the remainder of the costs as part of the General Synod charge.

Mr Jeremy Harris: An information sheet provided by the Archbishop's Reconciliation Ministry in May of this year states that the role of a project co-ordinator for the Shared Conversations is funded through Trinity Wall Street, a most prominent church in the Episcopal Church of America. Is this information accurate?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith: I have no idea whether that information is accurate or not. All I know is what we did, which is what you see in the reply in front of you: we made available £300,000 and in due course the dioceses will be asked to make up what is left of the balance. I do not have any information about the diocese of New York at all.

Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro): While I understand you do not have that information, could you explain where we might find that information?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith: I do not think I am particularly well-placed to advise you about that. You ought to apply maybe to the Secretary General who may give you some guidance.

20. *Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: As part of their commitment to transparency and good governance do the Church Commissioners take account of who else is co-funding projects before releasing funds?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith replied: Yes. Co-funding and partnerships can add real value to projects and programmes, where the aims and objectives are aligned. The

benefits and any risks associated with co-funded projects are assessed before decisions are made whether or not to agree funding for projects or programmes where this applies.

Mrs Susannah Leafe: With respect, if you are not aware of who else is funding the things that you are funding, how can we be sure that you are making good assessments of the risks associated with co-funded projects?

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith: I do not really view this as a co-funded project in the traditional sense of that word, which means a joint venture when you are extremely careful about your partners. We are just making our contribution as asked by the Archbishops' Council.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): To avoid all these silly games that are going on, to the best of your knowledge does the Episcopal Church of the United States have any funding responsibilities for the Shared Conversations or any of the work around it? That would clear up this silliness.

Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith: I am sorry not to blow away this frightful cloud which is overhanging us all, but I have no idea at all.

Pensions Board

21. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark) asked the Chair of the Pensions Board:* The new 'Transition Pathway Initiative' is a significant achievement by the NIBs and the letter that we have received from the CEOs explains why this has caused a delay in the publication of their 'engagement framework' by June 2016 that was requested in the motion passed *nem con* by Synod in July 2015. Can Synod be assured that robust engagement urged on the NIBs by the July 2015 motion will be well under way by the February 2017 meeting of Synod, bearing in mind that the letter only says "we expect to be able to present Synod with a detailed update" by then?

Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio) replied: The development of the Transition Pathway Initiative has been a major undertaking by the National Investing Bodies (NIBs). When launching in September this initiative will help inform how we assess climate risk within our investment decision-making, provide a basis to judge progress of companies and inform the way we engage and vote. In parallel to developing this initiative and tool we have continued to engage actively with companies and seen shareholder resolutions passed at Anglo American, Glencore and Rio Tinto. The Commissioners have also seen the highest level of support for a climate change resolution at ExxonMobil. The Transition Pathway Initiative will provide a framework for robust future engagement and this will be under way by February 2017.

Canon Giles Goddard: Thank you for your reply. I have already welcomed the Transition Pathway Initiative this afternoon, but let me welcome it again. Given that the Paris Summit last December concluded that global carbon emissions must start falling by 2020 to avert catastrophic climate change, will the framework be robust enough to mean that if sufficient progress is not seen by the beginning of 2018 the NIBs will carry

out their threat of disinvestment?

Dr Jonathan Spencer: I will not repeat what the First Church Estates Commissioner said in answer to a similar question this afternoon. I think I would make two comments. The first is that it was clear from the outcome of the Paris Conference that there is a gap between the public policy measures that are in place internationally and those that will be required to deliver a 2 degree world or, ideally, 1.5 degree world over the coming decades. Therefore, there will need to be further public policy interventions by governments around the world to get us on to that course regardless of what we do as investors.

Second, the role that the Transition Pathway Initiative can deliver is it can give us hard evidence on the progress that is or is not being made at the level of the major firms and other business enterprises. That will help to tell us whether things are on track or not. This is very much territory where the old McKinsey slogan is relevant that if you do not measure it you cannot value it. What we are contributing in this field with colleagues in other investing bodies is an academically valid measurement tool and I do not think we should underestimate the value that will have.

Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham): As the NIBs pursue robust engagement, what ethical or moral arguments are the NIBs using for continuing to invest in ExxonMobil, whose board demonstrate little or no intention of changing their policies to reduce the risk of climate change?

Dr Jonathan Spencer: I am not sure that I would share that view quite. The Investor Coalition, led amongst others by the Church Commissioners, achieved a 38% vote in the recent ExxonMobil AGM, and I think that is a very high figure, particularly given that Exxon were resisting it. I think we should persist with that track next year in the expectation that we will get a higher vote and gradually shift Exxon's view about what is acceptable behaviour in the light not just of the NIBs but of a wide selection of investors from around the world.

22. *Mr Bill Seddon (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: It is very encouraging to learn the progress being made on developing a climate change framework and the plans to profile in the first year four sectors whose carbon emissions are particularly significant. Is there a timetable for covering the entire market and will the tool take into account the impact on companies operating and domiciled in countries with differing climate change policies?

Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio) replied: In the first year our intention is to cover four energy intensive sectors (oil & gas, mining, utilities and auto). When launching the Transition Pathway Initiative we will also be indicating our intention to cover other sectors over the coming years. We will be prioritising sectors that are the greatest contributors to climate change. The tool will be profiling companies by sector and not by domicile or different national climate change policies.

Mr Bill Seddon: Please could you inform Synod what contact there has been with the G20 Stability Board Taskforce on climate related financial disclosures and how this

initiative complements the Transition Pathway work?

Dr Jonathan Spencer: The short answer to the first part of that question is very recently Pensions Board and Church Commissioners' staff members met with people from the Taskforce for what I gather was a productive exchange of views. I think that the work that they do, which is more in the public policy sphere, complements nicely the work that we can do as investors. They have the public policy levers at their disposal.

As I was saying in answer to the previous question, we can provide some of the hard numbers on an academically validated tool - we are working in collaboration with the Grantham Institute of the LSE here - which I think will give some hard-edged numbers rather quicker than the Taskforce would have accomplished on their own.

23. *Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: Since 2011, S2P (the state second pension) has been portrayed as a component of the clergy pension. In July 2015 the Pensions Board produced a leaflet "State Pension Changes" showing the effect of the April 2016 redesign of state pension changes: for older clergy the change is minimal, but newly ordained young clergy will see their pension reduced by £2,300 per annum. When is it intended to communicate this change of benefits, clearly, so that clergy have the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to buy a 'top-up' pension?

Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio) replied: We recognised that State Pension changes would affect some of our members so we produced the 'State Pension Changes' leaflet. The feedback we received told us that the leaflet explains the changes clearly.

We told all members about this with their 2015 benefit statements and provided links to our website. We have reminded members and provided further links to the leaflet with their 2016 benefit statement.

We encourage members to plan for retirement and regularly draw their attention to material and resources that can help. Our website provides a direct link to the State Pension forecasting service and other sources of expert guidance, such as the Pensions Advisory Service and the Money Advice Service.

We also provide a good value and tax efficient Additional Voluntary Contribution (AVC) facility for members who want to make additional savings for retirement and we continue to remind them about this option.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel: Given this change to the State Pension does result in a significant reduction in pension provision for some clergy, is it sufficient to advise members of this change by a web link in a letter that covers several different subjects and the letter gives no indication of the potential importance to some clergy of this particular item?

Dr Jonathan Spencer: We are not experts and cannot be expert in the particular financial circumstances of individual clergy, particularly because the changes being discussed here have different impacts on different people at different ages. All we can do is point people towards sources of advice and information and encourage them to

review their financial position from time to time. It is a fact that the younger you are the less interest you take in pensions when there is the most you can do about it; the older you are the more you worry about your pension when the die is pretty much cast. We can encourage people to take an interest in these matters in a timely way but we cannot make them.

Archbishops' Council

24. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Based on information held for pension entitlement by the Church Commissioners' Clergy Payroll, what is the breakdown of the total numbers of the stipendiary clergy as single/married/in a civil partnership?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied: Information of this kind is not held by Payroll, but by the Church of England Pensions Board. However, personal data of this kind can only be used for the purposes for which it was provided - on a confidential basis - by individual scheme members. It is not collected for the purposes of reporting. We cannot, therefore, make this information available.

Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Given that information is collected in other purposes, for example, for gender and ethnicity, with very good reason, would it not be helpful if this information was collected by the Ministry Division for macro purposes?

The Bishop of Oxford: Thank you. That is something that would need to be taken under consideration. It has been raised in Synod in two separate questions, so I think we will give due consideration to that, but clearly we cannot release, as the answer indicates, information collected for another purpose without the consent of those who originally gave it.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): The Bishop will be aware that depersonalised data that has been collected on a personal basis can be disseminated in other ways, but in the event that such depersonalised data is not available, can he tell me what the percentages are that have been used in the assumptions for the Pension Fund relating to these categories of people?

The Bishop of Oxford: I would not be able to provide that information as not being somebody involved with the Pension Fund, Tim, but I suggest, should you request that information from the Pension Fund, they will be able to yield whatever information they lawfully can.

25. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Many dioceses are seeing encouraging growth and diversification in lay ministries, including that of preaching. What provision is made by Canon, diocesan directions or advice about who may preach regularly in a Church of England church, and has consideration been given to changing it in the light of changing circumstances?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied: It is a welcome development that such growth and diversity are emerging in dioceses. Canon B 18.2 provides a wide

degree of flexibility about who can preach with the authority of the bishop. In a number of dioceses this flexibility has been used to permit lay people who are not Readers or licensed lay ministers to preach on a regular basis. Such permission is given generally after a short course of preparation. The Lay Ministries Working Group is developing a picture of the ways in which dioceses are encouraging such ministries and of their authorization or recognition by a bishop. It hopes to recommend by the end of 2016 a national framework for lay ministries and will propose changes where these seem necessary. The overall aim is to clarify, simplify and minimise the process of authorization and recognition, and to include only those ministries where it is strictly needed.

Revd Charles Read: Given that currently a number of dioceses issue guidelines for the interpretation and implementation of Canon B 18.2 in their own individual advices - and the diocese of York, for example, has some very good guidelines in my view - is it envisaged that the Lay Ministries Working Group's work will render those diocesan guidelines redundant?

The Bishop of Oxford: No, I do not think it is, Charles. Thank you for the question. The Lay Ministries Group is trying to draw together an accurate picture of what dioceses are doing and, where there is good practice, that can be made more widely available. Canon B 18.2 is very clear that the regulation of preaching is a matter both for the minister locally and for the bishop of the diocese.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Given that there is already huge flexibility, which is what you have said in your answer, and that many people are already authorized to preach, to lead worship, to take funerals, and do other things in certain dioceses not a million miles away from where I work, will the Lay Ministries Working Group take on board that probably more regulation and a national framework, or indeed the encouragement of more rigorous diocesan regulations, would not be susceptible to helping lay ministry become more flexible? Will they exercise a self-denying ordinance to stop issuing regulations and let lay people get on with it?

The Bishop of Oxford: Thank you. I would hope that will be the case. I draw your and Synod's attention to the final sentence of the answer: "The overall aim is to clarify, simplify and minimise the process of authorization and recognition", so that is the approach being taken.

26. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the last bullet point of para 8 of GS 2038 do the words "legal and cultural constraints and the institutional inertias that impede necessary change" include, among other things, the culture of clericalism, which can be defined as an over-emphasis on the role and status of those who are ordained (a small minority) which unintentionally impedes the calling, resourcing and mobilising of the gifts, talents, discipleship and service of those who are not ordained, who comprise the vast majority of the whole Church?

Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio) replied: An important part of the Vision and Narrative for Renewal and Reform is to encourage clergy and laity to live out their common baptism as disciples of Jesus Christ, wherever they are called. This requires a major culture

shift within the Church. It needs all God's people prayerfully and determinedly to discover their vocation to love God and serve others. Practical steps include work by the Simplification Task Group on amendments to Canons E7 and E8 on the licensing of lay workers. The Lay Ministries Working Group is looking specifically at the licensed lay ecclesial ministry.

The Lay Leadership Task Group is developing recommendations on how the Church can do more to support Christians in formal and informal leadership roles within the workplace, community, family or Church structures. Avoiding undue clericalism is part of the answer, but the challenge is much wider than this.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Matthew, thank you very much for all that you are doing as Chair of the Task Group and for lay leadership. Thank you for your answer to my question. I very much welcome the phrase that this requires 'a major cultural shift' within the Church as a punchy summary of the sentence in GS 2038 that I was asking about.

My supplementary is this: would you agree with me that a key element of achieving this major cultural shift in the Church is the renewal of individual and collective discipleship, which is our response to the call of Jesus to follow him in the power of the Holy Spirit in every aspect of our lives?

Mr Matthew Frost: Thank you for the question. Indeed, we are seeing that a critical issue for us to look at is what it really means to live out our common baptism, both clergy and lay alike, and what that really means in practice in the whole of life. What we are really wrestling with is the issue of the framing of the word. I think 'clericalism' we recognise is not very helpful. What we are discovering is that the best way to think about this is what more can we do also to strengthen relationships between lay clergy wherever these are not working for whatever reason. Both of those issues, the issue of healthy, fruitful relationships between lay and clergy, and how do we equip our common baptism to the whole of life, not just in Church life but also in work life, in our community, are absolutely central to our work.

Mr Clive Scowen (Lambeth): Have I understood correctly that although the group Mr Frost chairs is called the Lay Leadership Working Party that, in fact, it is looking at lay vocation and lay outworking of the call of God in their lives rather than specifically at leadership?

Mr Matthew Frost: It is indeed. As we have thought about the term 'leadership', it has become very clear to us that the foundation of lay leadership is indeed discipleship. If I think of any leadership programme I have been on, especially Christian leadership programmes, a good 70% is all about discipleship and formation.

27. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What representations are the Archbishops' Council proposing to make on the Government's White Paper 'A BBC for the future' presented to Parliament in May by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport?

Mr Phillip Fletcher (ex officio) replied: The Bishop of Chelmsford was a member of the House of Lords' Select Committee which issued the report on the BBC Charter Renewal, 'Reith not Revolution', and he made a submission to the consultation which preceded the White Paper, asking the BBC to do more to reflect the diverse communities of the UK. The White Paper includes a specific emphasis on this priority.

The Bishop of Leeds remarked in a House of Lords debate that "religion needs to be taken more seriously by the BBC in its future shape and remit".

The Archbishop of Canterbury has said recently that "the promotion of religious literacy should be a specific duty for the BBC across its broadcasting services".

Following the White Paper, further action on the BBC Charter rests with the Secretary of State, and we shall respond to any developments or opportunities for debate that arise in due course.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I declare an interest as the Managing Director of Share Radio. In view of the crisp definition between religious and secular commercial broadcasters, I wonder if he could possibly say whether he has or has not, and if he has not will he, looked at the Ofcom licensing guidelines for commercial broadcasters to ensure that it reflects the same flexibility in the commercial sphere as we are asking of the BBC?

Mr Phillip Fletcher: I do not think that the Archbishops' Council is going to be the pontifical authority on this. We do note that one of the key proposals in the White Paper is that Ofcom should become the key regulator of the BBC, as it already is of other services, and we would expect to see a certain commonality. This is a White Paper, of course, it is a firm determination of Government intent, but we shall be looking very closely at the draft charter which the Government, if it sticks to its word, is to publish this month, and will be reflecting on the various points which the Archbishop and bishops made to see how far they are translated. I shall certainly look to see if Mr Oldham's point is translated into the constitution of the BBC going forward.

House of Bishops

28. *Mrs Helen Lamb (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Could you please clarify whether the St Michael's House Protocols apply equally to Synod members taking part in the Shared Conversations; to those organising and facilitating them; to the House of Bishops; and any official statements or pronouncements after the Conversations are concluded at Synod?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied: Yes, the St Michael's House Protocols apply equally to Synod members taking part in the Shared Conversations (including those who are members of the House of Bishops); to those organising and facilitating them; and to any official communications relating to the Shared Conversations.

Mrs Helen Lamb: Thank you for the clarity, but could you please confirm what public statements or press releases are planned to be made either by individuals or officers or

others who might be perceived to speak on behalf of the whole of Synod? How do we ensure that such statements abide by the commitment in the St Michael's House protocols to refrain from exploiting others with whom they have shared this space by misuse of what has been learnt? I am thinking particularly of words like 'walking together' and 'good disagreement', if that is not in fact the experience of everyone who had participated?

The Bishop of Willesden: Thank you. I think the whole point about the protocols is that we are trying to create a safe space. Many of us approach these next conversations with a certain amount of trepidation. There are questions about what will happen to what is discussed. The protocols are there to hold us to each other in saying that we will not misuse what is said. I am not aware, though I stand to be corrected, that there is any sense that we are going to produce any public statement out of this. I think we will reflect on what has been said in the Shared Conversations and we will be very clear about not saying anything that indicates a particular movement in the thinking of the Church of England. What comes out of the conversations is going to be reported back to the House of Bishops in terms of where people have got to and it is for the House then to decide what to do with that information. I do not think that we should use these next few days as a campaigning point either for or against different changes in understandings of what we do in the Church.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Who is the nominated spokesman from the House of Bishops who can explain the Church's teaching on sexuality and can explain what the Shared Conversations will or will not achieve given the undoubted media interest there will be following Tuesday lunchtime?

The Bishop of Willesden: The position of the House of Bishops is already spelt out very clearly in what we have said thus far. It is not intended that the House is going to say anything more at this stage.

Revd Dr Ian Paul: There is no spokesperson?

29. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Are reports in *The Church Times* that there will be cultural representation from outside of Synod, including members of the LGBT community involved in the Shared Conversations accurate; and, if so, how many of these representatives are there, what groups or organisations do they represent, how were they selected, and what is their intended role?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied: One of the three presentations on Monday - Changing Culture 1 (Mixed Group Presentation) - involves contributions from Christians who experience same-sex attraction or identify as LGBTI. They are not 'cultural representatives', nor are they there to represent any particular organisation. Their role is to share with Synod members their own faith story and relationship with God and how this has interacted with their sexuality. The speakers have been chosen because of their ability to articulate their faith journeys and because they offer a diversity of ages, backgrounds and views.

The aim of the session is not to provide answers but to provoke further questions and thoughts among Synod members by hearing stories from contexts beyond their immediate experience. As you will see in the programme, the presentations are interspersed with periods of work in small groups which will give all participants the opportunity to respond to what they have heard.

30. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Could the House confirm that the point of departure for the Shared Conversations that are to take place on Sunday and Monday will be the teaching of the Church of England regarding human sexuality found in the Book of Common Prayer, the 1987 Resolution of the General Synod and Resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied: The Shared Conversation is not a decision-making process around same-sex relationships. It is an opportunity for listening, reflection and encounter around the broader issues of Scripture, mission and human sexuality. It is a facilitated, relational conversation and not a legislative procedure. The basis for the Shared Conversation is the St Michael's House Protocols. These provide the framework within which conversations which are honest, respectful and constructive can happen.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: I thank the Bishop for his reply, but would like to ask what role will the Church's declared position play in the Shared Conversation, and is it binding? If it is binding then why are we having a Shared Conversation? If the Shared Conversation is not a decision-making process then why have we spent so much time and money on it?

The Bishop of Willesden: There are two separate questions there. There are clear public statements that the Church of England has made on issues relating to human sexuality, we have spelt out some of them, and those are the definitive resolutions on record of the Synod, of the Lambeth Conference, of the teachings of the Church, and I would add also what the House of Bishops has said on public record on issues like same-sex marriage. Those are all on the record. They are the raw material which we bring, along with ourselves, into this Shared Conversation. It is perfectly legitimate for people to bring both experience and theology into it. We are not leaving our theology at the door. What is being suggested is that the conversations should take place where we are open to each other and listen to each other, but within the understanding that the Church has particular positions which some will want to uphold and others will want to disagree with. The Conversations will have that on their agenda.

Why is it worth it? I think I said to you before it is about the certain amount of trepidation we all face in relation to what will happen as we go together into these conversations. There is an understanding that the Church has a position and that is the position we start from and the conversations will help us understand those who wish to dissent from that position and those who want to affirm it.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: Could you clarify the Church's position?

The Chair: Sorry, you have had your question.

31. *Mrs Helen Lamb (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Recognising that Standing Orders will not be applicable to the Shared Conversations, would it be correct to say that the Canons, specifically Canon A 5, remain authoritative throughout the Conversations?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied: The Canons are the legal framework underpinning the Church of England and thus are continually authoritative. May we, however, refer to the answer given to Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams which emphasises that the Shared Conversation is not a legal or legislative process. It is a relational opportunity for mutual listening and sharing, in which the expression of all personal faith stories and perspectives is encouraged. These Conversations are rooted in the St Michael's House Protocols.

Mrs Helen Lamb (Ely): Thank you for confirming. I just wondered whether you would consider updating for Synod the FAQs that we were handed for the Shared Conversations and suggesting that, rather than being really helpful, a Bible would be a vital part if Canon A 5 is still in place so that our stories are of a faith rooted and built up in Jesus' strength and in the faith as we were taught it, which I think is a faith from the Holy Scriptures and not a faith of the St Michael's House protocols, which are apparently important to have.

The Bishop of Willesden: I think you are asking me for opinion. If you wanted my opinion the answer would be that of course scripture is determinative because that is what the Church of England does. You have asked here what is the authority of the Church of England: it is scripture, tradition, the creeds and the Canons. They are determinative particularly for those of us who have taken canonical obedience as part of who we are, which is what applies to bishops and priests and some lay people who are licensed, so they are determinative. The Protocols do not trump what we believe as a Church.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): You have introduced 'determinative' now as well as 'authoritative', so thank you for those two reassurances. These questions come from the feeling that the reassurances asked for at previous Synods were offered but were not given in quite the same way. Where you say in answer to both these questions that the Shared Conversations are not a legal or legislative process, could you help us understand what therefore is meant by specifically Canon A 5, to which I might add the Articles, specifically 6, 7, 19 and 20, continue to be authoritative? What difference will that actually make on the ground over and around these conversations?

The Bishop of Willesden: The Church of England has not changed its position on these matters; they are still determinative and authoritative - both words are true - about what we believe as a Church, what we hold to. The conversations are about people who might seek to dissent from those things, people who want to affirm those things coming together and sharing their understanding and experience. I would urge all members of Synod who are here present to join in those conversations because it will not hurt you, it will help us to hear from each other, and if you were thinking, if I may say so, of

boycotting the conversations because you felt that they would compromise you in some way, I would say we need to hear your voice within those conversations because what you want to say may well be helpful.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Hon Dr John Sentamu): Lambeth 1:10, which people quote endlessly, has a section in it which says that we must listen to the experience of homosexual people. How could you do that without Shared Conversation? Would the bishop agree with me that is really the motivation behind this, and also the Pilling Report which recommended that as a Church we should have the maturity of listening, and you cannot listen unless you have got a conversation?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think that was a semi-rhetorical question.

The Chair: Questions 32 and 33 are being taken together.

32. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Chichester Diocese publishes on its website a comprehensive 54 page report by Dame Elizabeth Butler Sloss into its handling of the cases of sexual predators Roy Cotton and Colin Pritchard; that report balances victim confidentiality with the public interest in having confidence in due and proper process. Given the continuing public concern at the handling of the case of Bishop Bell, will the Church now issue a comprehensive explanation of why transparency can apply in one case but not the other?

33. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In answer to a question from Miss Prudence Dailey (Q.13) at the February 2016 Group of Sessions concerning the response of the Church to allegations made against the late Bishop George Bell, the Bishop of Durham stated that it was “legally impermissible for the Church to disclose any evidence used in the settlement [of the claim against the Diocese of Chichester]” and that the law “rightly affords [the complainant] protection to safeguard the confidentiality of their deeply personal information.” In the light of

i. The call by the George Bell Group for a proper review of both the process and the evidence that resulted in the statement issued by the Church of England media centre on 22 October 2015 effectively branding Bishop Bell as a paedophile;

ii. The Opinion by His Honour Alan Pardoe QC and Desmond Browne QC that there are no legal constraints to disclosure of the evidence and documents (suitably redacted to preserve the complainant’s anonymity) that the Church considered before settling the claim; and

iii. The fact that Dame Lowell Goddard has stated that “Bell’s guilt or innocence is not a critical aspect of this Inquiry, or of the Anglican investigation, or of the investigation’s case studies,” so that any reliance by the Church that the Goddard Inquiry will investigate this issue is misplaced;

will the House of Bishops now commission an independent inquiry as called for by the

George Bell Group and, if not, why not?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied: I will take Questions 32 and 33 together. I refer both questioners to the statement issued by the Church of England on 28 June in which it was announced that an independent review of the handling of the George Bell case would be launched shortly. The House of Bishops practice guidance states that once all matters relating to any serious safeguarding situation have been completed, the Core Group should meet again to review the process and to consider what lessons can be learnt to improve safeguarding practice in the future. It will be for the independent reviewer to consider what evidence they deem to be relevant and publish in due course their view of any lessons learned from the Church's handling of the case.

It should be noted that the Church has always recognised Bishop Bell's principled stand in the Second World War and his contribution to peace but it also has a duty to listen to those who make allegations of abuse.

Mr David Lamming: I thank the Bishop of Durham for his answer and for the announcement post the date for submitting questions that there is to be an independent review, not just a review by the Core Group. However, the review announced on 28 June is only into the processes used to inform the decision to settle the claim by the woman known as "Carol". The review will not be credible unless it examines all the evidence. In the House of Bishops on 30 June, the Bishop of Chelmsford said: "The Church remains satisfied of the credibility of Carol's allegation". Will the Bishop, and, perhaps on behalf of his successor, the Bishop of Bath & Wells, please now acknowledge that the terms of reference of the review must enable the reviewer both to review the process and to look at all the evidence, including that which was not looked at by the Core Group?

The Bishop of Durham: Thank you for that supplementary. The independent reviewer has yet to be appointed. The terms of reference will have to be agreed with that independent reviewer. When that reviewer is there, that is what they will be briefed to do.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): Because you have answered two questions together I am going to have to refer. I refer first of all to Alan Pardoe's opinion and Desmond Browne's opinion that there are no legal restraints to disclosure of the evidence and documents suitably redacted to preserve the complainant's anonymity. I refer back to comparing the Bell case to the Cotton and Pritchard case saying that in the one case that is already out there on the Chichester website, it balances victim confidentiality with the public interest in having confidence in due and proper process. I then ask why does it apply to one case and not the other? It is a very simple question. You tell us that there is going to be a review. We do not need to know if the review knows how to do this, we need to know if there is a core competence in the Church's people to do this sort of thing and to understand the law and confidentiality and how it applies in each and every case. We cannot assume that competence is there because we have not seen it demonstrated.

The Chair: Do you want to put that into a question, please?

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): It is very simple. Will you issue a comprehensive explanation of why transparency can apply in one case, that is Cotton and Pritchard, and not in the other, Bishop Bell? It is a very simple question.

The Bishop of Durham: The simple reality is you may quote two lawyers, and I could quote others, which I will not, who would disagree with that opinion. The review will take place and there is not an exact equivalence between the Butler-Sloss report and how the Bell case was handled and the report that has come out.

Revd Canon David Banting: I am very encouraged by your reply, thank you. I have been present at all Synods. I intend to be present for all Synods, just in case the previous Bishop was in any doubt, but I seem to have missed who or when your successor will be appointed, could you tell us who and when?

The Bishop of Durham: Yes, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Peter Hancock, and he takes on the role after this Synod.

Revd Canon David Banting: 1 August, thank you very much indeed.

Ven Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester): Thank you also for the answer. Our experience in Winchester is that we have very good relationships with the vast majority of funeral directors, but there are a few and those few not only have lax procedures on this but on other matters as well. We have some funeral directors, even though advised by the police of an individual with sexual offences against children, continue to use that person to book funerals. They are also the funeral directors who tend to pay fees direct to the name and hand of clergy rather than to the charities and also those funeral directors about whom we have unsubstantiated allegations about collections for charities simply disappearing. Is it appropriate in writing and raising this issue through Parliament to raise the regulation and oversight of the funerals industry?

The Bishop of Durham: I have a huge sympathy because that story would be repeated in diocese after diocese and, yes, we will, and if I may take her name in vain I think we could perhaps ask the Second Church Estates Commissioner to also look at this for us if she would be happy to have a conversation with us about it.

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): As well as safeguarding concerns, there are also financial concerns with these unlicensed clergy taking freelance crematoria funerals, some of whom are taking thousands of pounds a year which are legally due to the DBF and relevant PCCs; is there a strategy or guidance for dioceses about how to challenge these clergy who could be prosecuted for theft of significant sums and who might not be aware themselves of the 2013 change in the law concerning fees?

The Bishop of Durham: I know that there are at least a couple of cases where people have been prosecuted and we probably need to keep people alert, but the reality is that those who are taking such services are often outside our control.

35. *Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can it be confirmed whether or not DBS checks are in future to be required every three rather than five years; and, if they are, what is the estimated cost to the whole Church, and benefit, of such a change?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chair of the Joint Safeguarding Working Group: I will start by saying that a criminal record certificate is only truly accurate on the day it is issued. However, there is no official renewal/expiration date for a certificate. It is left to organisations to set the renewal period. The current policy in the Church of England, as approved by the House of Bishops, is to renew criminal record checks every five years. Of course, this period is kept under review. Three years has been mentioned as a possibility, as many charities, local authorities and schools adopt this timeframe for renewals, but currently no final decision has been taken to amend this renewal period. Obviously, before such a change is made an analysis of the relevant pros and cons would be undertaken.

Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson: Thank you very much for this answer. If this analysis of relevant pros and cons is undertaken, can Synod be assured that it would be both quantified and published?

The Bishop of Durham: I am sure that when this analysis is done there will be a clear communication about what the conclusion is.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Would it also, as part of that consideration, be possible to bring the renewal of the DBS into line with the requirement for the renewal of safeguarding training? At the moment the two things seem to be out of kilter and three years and five years only align every 15 years, which is quite a complex system for dioceses seeking to retain records and to get this in good order.

The Bishop of Durham: That is a very helpful observation as part of the consideration. Certainly, the three-year cycle does work quite well because you have to have a DBS when you have a new appointment and so on, but that is part of the considerations that we look at.

36. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the Bishop Bell case, has any consideration been given to the view that offering pastoral support to the complainant, independently investigating the complaint, dispassionately evaluating the evidence, and simultaneously managing crises whilst protecting the good name of the Church are incompatible objectives; and will consideration now be given to establishing a properly resourced, consistent, professional and independent central complaint handling body, removing the responsibility from dioceses with potentially variable expertise and processes?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Lead Bishop for Safeguarding: Developing a more consistent and professional approach to safeguarding across the dioceses and nationally is one of our key priorities as a Church, recognising of course that good safeguarding is fundamentally something that takes place in a parish context. There are a number of key elements to achieving this through national policy and

guidance, regulations, training and quality assurance, including the independent audits being conducted across all dioceses during 2016 and 2017.

These audits provide an important benchmark and areas for further improvement for dioceses and the national Church. The intention to develop a standards based approach will include how we provide pastoral and other support to those who are accused as well as those who make complaints of abuse. Indeed, a recent case review conducted by the National Safeguarding Team has highlighted this very issue. The Church of England must remain committed to responding to non-current abuse and abuse in the present day, as well as building a safer Church for the future based on prevention.

Miss Prudence Dailey: Has any consideration been given to the potential for conflict of interest in the Church carrying out the various different functions alluded to in my question in relation to the Bishop Bell case?

The Bishop of Durham: Quite specifically, in all these the history of conflict of interest is always taken into consideration. Every core group has to work at that particular bit on every example that we have.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): In view of the fact that many of the allegations are made against clergy, will the Bishop or his successor consult with the House of Clergy Standing Committee about procedures for putting in place future support and the work around those who have been accused of abuse?

The Bishop of Durham: Thank you for that question. One of the areas that has caused some concern is the level of support for clergy when they face allegations and that is firmly on the agenda, to seek to make sure that they are given adequate pastoral support when going through such processes because they are deeply painful and difficult.

37. *Revd Canon Mike Booker (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What steps have the House of Bishops taken to ensure that families, moving between dioceses that have sharply differing policies on the age at which children may be admitted to Holy Communion, do not find that their children are unable to continue to receive the sacrament?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Archbishops' Advocate for Children: The 2006 Regulations are clear and should be followed. A child admitted to Holy Communion under the Regulations should have this recorded on their baptism certificate where practicable or, if the certificate is not available, be given a separate certificate confirming the date and place of first admission. A child who presents such evidence must be admitted at any service of Holy Communion conducted according to the rites of the Church of England in any place, regardless of whether or not any permission under the Regulations is in force in that place or was in force in that place until revoked. So once admitted to communion under the Regulations a child cannot be refused communion in any church, whatever the local parish or diocesan policy and practice.

Revd Canon Mike Booker: I am grateful for the assurances given in the answer received. Could I ask, please, what assurances and guidance are available to parishes where the carefully considered decision has been made that children are not to be admitted to receive Communion and then families move into the parish where their children have an automatic right to receive, so undermining the local policy?

The Bishop of Durham: That will be down to each diocese to decide how it should determine that advice. There is no central advice on that.

Mr Colin Slater (Southwell & Nottingham): Question 37 brings us to a particularly significant point with regard to the issues that have just been covered. David Banting in his earlier question under question 34 only went so far. New members of Synod will not be aware of this but many of us who have been here for a year or three are, and I think it is the moment when this Synod should show its appreciation for all that the Bishop of Durham has done in very difficult circumstances in our name.

The Bishop of Durham: Thank you. It has been a privilege, actually.

38. *Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In an article by John Bingham in the Daily Telegraph on 21 May with a headline, “Don’t speak about your faith unless you’re asked to’ says Archbishop of Canterbury”, the Archbishop of Canterbury is quoted as saying that we ought not to speak about our faith unless we are asked to. Has consideration been given to whether an approach to evangelism of that kind is either effective or consistent with the Church’s current position (including the previous resolution of the Synod on faith in the public square) and can some dos and don’ts or case studies be issued to give people a feel of how we can effectively share the Good News in our workplaces and communities?

The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes) replied as Co-Chair of the Evangelism Task Group: The quote that John Bingham refers to was made at the Inter-Faith reception at Lambeth Palace. The answer given reflects the place evangelism has in dialogue between those of different faiths. Archbishop Justin has made evangelism one of his three core priorities and the Evangelism Task Group is tasked with pressing the work forward.

Every Christian needs to be equipped to share their faith in words and works. As 1 Peter 3.15 says: “Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect.” We can effectively share the Good News in our workplaces and communities when we are in good relationship with people, when we listen and share our lives and our conversations; talking about Jesus Christ in a gentle and respectful way. Because we start with relationship, there is only limited value in a list of dos and don’ts – but the Task Group will certainly consider whether there is merit in sharing some useful case studies more widely.

39. *Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How is the national Church ensuring that candidates from across the

whole breadth of tradition of the Church of England (including, but not limited to, the breadth guaranteed by the Five Guiding Principles) are being identified and developed for future senior leadership?

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development & Appointments Group: Diocesan bishops and their staff teams are encouraged to consider diversity, including Church tradition, when making nominations to the Strategic Leadership Development Programme. Annex 3 of GS 2026 shows how those nominated for, and participating in, this learning community self-define their Church tradition. Additionally, DAG will be running a development programme in December 2016 in partnership with the Bishops of the Society under the patronage of St Wilfrid and St Hilda. This will focus on supporting Traditional Catholic clergy in exploring a vocation to senior appointments. DAG are open to developing a similar programme for Conservative Evangelical clergy if required.

40. *Very Revd Tim Barker (Channel Islands)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given (1) the continuing difficulties of clergy recruitment in many dioceses outside the south east of England, (2) the high cost of repeat advertisements, (3) the important role of the Clergy Appointments Adviser in advising clergy looking to move from chaplaincies and extra-diocesan appointments and in the Capability Procedure, and (4) the importance of clergy being encouraged to consider appointments in unfamiliar places as part of the exploration of their vocation; what plans are there for the appointment of a successor to the Revd John Lee as Clergy Appointments Adviser to assist clergy looking for new posts?

The Bishop of Bath and Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Thank you for this opportunity to express the House's deep gratitude for John Lee's ministry over the years which I expect has touched the lives of many Synod members. During the last year a review of the Clergy Appointments Adviser role and office arrangements has been undertaken. It has explored three questions: What service is needed nationally on appointments and coaching in addition to work undertaken in dioceses? What should be the focus of the CAA role? And, how best should the service be funded? I have recently written to Bishops, Archdeacons and Directors of Ministry informing them of the outcome of the review and my letter is available to Synod members on the noticeboard.

Very Revd Tim Barker. I declare an interest as the Chair of the Archdeacons' Forum. When is a dean not a dean? I am grateful to the Bishop for his letter, which I saw at the beginning of Question Time, and for the offer in there to discuss the very difficult issue of the hard to fill posts. If, as a result of these further conversations, the need for further resource is identified, has this possibility been ruled out or is it something we can consider further?

The Bishop of Bath and Wells: Tim, in answering that question I am grateful that you have asked the question, not only because it gives me the opportunity publicly on behalf of the House to show our appreciation for the ministry of John Lee as the Clergy Appointments Adviser, and I am delighted to do that, but also because the question you have asked raises a number of significant questions. I think I am able to say to you that

certainly that has not been ruled out. There has been a very wide consultation and I have tried in that consultation to use as many different voices and to bring in as many people as I could. There is no clear consensus. I might ask on behalf of the House of Bishops who is to undertake the review. Those who will make those sorts of decisions are in the chamber and they have no doubt heard your question and my answer.

41. *Dr Yvonne Warren (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the changes in society and the expectations of the clergy, would the House of Bishops agree that the pastoral care of the clergy is of supreme importance in this day and age, and, if so, what national strategy is in place to achieve this objective?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I am confident that the House of Bishops regards pastoral care of the clergy as of the highest importance. I am also pleased to note that the Canterbury Prolocutor is initiating discussions on how to foster clergy well-being. Pastoral care for clergy is primarily a function carried out in dioceses, where it is overseen by the diocesan bishop. It is part of a network of care that includes services such as counselling; human resources; ministerial development review; continuing ministerial development programmes and occupational health.

National guidelines already exist for some of these. Ministry Division and RACSC keep in touch with, and to some degree, co-ordinate efforts with the range of work across dioceses and with charities such as St Luke's Healthcare and the Society of Mary and Martha. Recent national diocesan networks have provided an opportunity to share best practice and contribute to the development of diocesan well-being strategies.

Dr Yvonne Warren: Thank you very much for your answer. Given that pastoral care of clergy is missional as much as any of our other roles, will the Bishop be prepared to look at whether funding from the centre could be given to the dioceses so that all dioceses have the finance to fund pastoral care of clergy adequately?

The Bishop of Oxford: Yvonne, thank you for your question and, if I may, for your own work on clergy stress and care of clergy. It is always good to think about these and reflect on the use of national resources. However, my initial response would be that all dioceses have the money to resource this work effectively. It may be that in some cases we are not directing our resources properly. I would hope that as part of our continuous reflection and, also, as part of our learning from each other as part of the new peer review process, we will be examining how well our clergy are cared for, because the test of that is how the recipients of care feel not how the diocese feels it is doing, and that we would audit that sensibly and redirect our resources if we are not fulfilling our Christian and pastoral obligations in the fullest measure. It really is of vital importance, as you say, for the well-being of those who give their lives in ordained ministry and also for the mission of the Church.

42. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The General Synod Resolution of July 2002 recognised that there were "exceptional circumstances" in which a divorced person might be married in church during the lifetime

of a former spouse. How many such marriages (numerically and in percentage terms) have been conducted in Church of England churches in each subsequent year?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Information collected and reported by the Church of England at marriage does not include whether those marrying had been divorced and whether their former spouse was still alive. So these data are not routinely available. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) does collect the marital status of both partners at the time of marriage registration. For a fee, ONS could make a bespoke report from these data which would identify the number of divorced people marrying in Church of England churches. However, information is not collected to identify whether the former spouse was still alive at the time of remarriage.

Revd Canon David Banting: The decision in 2002 was a momentous change in the Church's Marriage Discipline after 22 odd years of serious debate and it was hard won. It was actually an amendment to introduce the phrase "exceptional circumstances", especially in the light of the Methodist Church's experience over the previous 20 years where what had been judged in their eyes originally exceptional had become by the time of our choice and change normal, 60% plus. In the light of the need perhaps to have responsible monitoring of any changes from exceptional to normal, may I ask if the fee for a bespoke report from the Office of National Statistics would be a legitimate General Synod expense for me to claim?

The Bishop of Norwich: I think that should be a question to the Secretary General rather than me about your expenses. There is an issue about the English language here. 'Exceptional' does not mean 'seldom'. It simply means, 'exceptional'. I can remember as a child having English spelling and grammar books that had the rules and then the exceptions that followed them. There can be lots of exceptions to rules and it is good to allow the Holy Spirit to enter our rule-book sometimes and I am not entirely sure that counting will help, really. Certainly, there are plenty of marriages, we all know that, that include somebody who has got a previous spouse that is still alive, and I imagine it has increased. There is no doubt about that, I think, but I do not believe that 'exceptional' means 'seldom' at all.

43. *Revd Kevin Goss (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Bearing in mind the 1987 General Synod Report which found a "number of very fundamental reasons to question the compatibility of Freemasonry and Christianity", has the House of Bishops already considered issuing pastoral and liturgical guidance to clergy faced with requests for services in 2017 of celebration and thanksgiving of the Tercentenary of the Foundation of the Masonic Order and, if not, will the House of Bishops please consider issuing such guidance?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The report of 1987 still stands and the House has not felt the need to revisit it. Issues regarding Freemasonry are dealt with by the National Adviser for New Religious Movements and Alternative Spiritualities, Dr Anne Richards. Any clergy faced with requests for services who require advice should contact her in the first instance.

Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford): I declare an interest as a freemason. We frequently use Church buildings for celebrations by civic and community groups and I just wondered what are the characteristics of freemasons that they should be treated differently?

The Bishop of Coventry: In terms of the use of Church buildings and the provision of liturgical acts, I am not sure that there is any great difference, really. Those liturgical acts must be fully Christian and express the Christian faiths robustly. That would seem to me to be the criterion for such acts of worship.

44. *Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that paragraph 79 of the Faith and Order Commission's Report on Communion and Disagreement (GS Misc 1139) states that, "the House of Bishops has a particular role in that task of discernment as to the nature of the disagreement that is happening in the life of the Church, and therefore the shape of the conversation that is called for", into which category does the House consider the matters under discussion in the Shared Conversations fall, and how did the House arrive at its conclusion?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The report was presented in its final form to the May meeting of the House of Bishops, where it was approved for release and commended for study. It is a substantial theological document, and some time will need to be given for it to be studied, evaluated and discussed within the Church. While the report identifies "a particular role" for the House of Bishops, it also stresses the importance of consultation that includes the whole Church. In commending it for study, the House of Bishops affirmed the hope of the Faith and Order Commission that this report can contribute to how the Church of England as a whole, including the House of Bishops with its particular responsibilities, addresses the challenges of discernment that follow from the Shared Conversations process.

Mrs Susannah Leafe: In the light of the Bishop of Willesden's answer earlier that the Church of England already has a position in scripture and tradition which is both authoritative and determinative, and in the light of paragraph 78 of the Faith and Order Commission's Report, which says that if we do not recognise and decide on what type of disagreement we are having, it is likely that a conversation will result in miscommunication and frustration and be repetitive and unproductive, why are we spending nearly a third of a million pounds having conversations this weekend?

The Bishop of Coventry: Is that a question for me in relation to this report? I think the answer has already been given. The teaching of the Church is clear. This is an opportunity to gather, to think together, to listen to each other. There are those who are totally committed to it, there are those who question it, and this is an opportunity to listen to each other. I have been most helped by Canon David Porter talking in terms of the function of this to take some of the toxicity out of the debate.

Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): Is the Bishop aware that probably most of us here are quite looking forward to the next few days?

The Bishop of Coventry: I imagine there are mixed feelings - as the Bishop of Willesden said, a certain amount of trepidation - but we are here as people who I think generally enjoy listening to people, particularly when people share their deep experiences. I hope we are people who are really serious about, and I am sure we are, listening to scripture together and considering how we relate to our culture. I am quite looking forward to it as well, I have to say.

45. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since by February more than a year will have passed since the appointment of Rod Thomas to the See of Maidstone, can an invitation be extended to him to report on how his role is helping foster the commitment to 'mutual flourishing'?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: In the ten months since his consecration, Bishop of Maidstone's ministry has developed to the extent that he has been invited to act as an Assistant Bishop in ten dioceses across both provinces. Bishop Rod's own website www.bishopofmaidstone.org provides a fuller account of his activities. His ministry – along with that of the Bishops of Beverley, Ebbsfleet and Richborough – helps enable the 'mutual flourishing' that the House of Bishops' 2014 Declaration on the Ministry of Bishops and Priests was intended to promote. If members wish to receive a wider report covering Bishop Rod's ministry, and that of the PEVs, this would be for the Business Committee to consider.

Mrs Mary Durlacher: Thank you, your Grace, for your encouraging answer and your efforts to take forward the commitment given two years ago in this room for mutual flourishing and the eventual appearance of the Bishop of Maidstone. A year will have gone by in February and, in the interests of providing equivalent treatment for parishes across all dioceses, which was paragraph 27 of the House of Bishops' Declaration, could more be done to encourage those diocesan bishops who do not currently offer Bishop Rod's ministry to parishes to do so in the interests of perception and reception?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you very much for the question. I do not think I would want, just initially as I begin to answer it - and this answer may take some considerable time - to make any distinction between the remarkable ministries of Bishops Glyn, Jonathan, Norman and Rod. I think it would be invidious to separate out one and say: He is in this category and the other three sort of are somehow in a lesser category or a different category, which I think comes out slightly as an implication in some of the questioning.

I value them enormously, as does the Archbishop of York. In fact, I had the pleasure of quite a lengthy meeting with Bishop Rod a few weeks back in order to discuss exactly the point that you are raising. With all four of them - well, three in the Province of Canterbury and I am well aware from past experience with the Archbishop of York in the Province of York - it is our policy to encourage diocesan bishops and staff teams and cathedrals to work collaboratively and excellently alongside these four different Bishops in their different roles and the different constituencies to which they minister so effectively.

One example recently would be the Bishop of Coventry, who at the culmination of "Thy Kingdom Come" on Pentecost Sunday involved Bishop Jonathan as leading part of the pilgrimage that went on at that point. So, yes, the answer is that we continue to encourage and I was most encouraged by the continuing acceptance of the ministry of all four of them and would hope that this will grow and develop as time goes by.

46. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of recent events and having regard to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the House of Bishops' Pastoral Guidance on Same Sex Marriage dated 15 February 2014, will the House of Bishops as a matter of urgency clarify whether:

- It is acceptable for licensed clergy of the Church of England to conduct public services (a) in which a couple who have already contracted a civil same-sex marriage receive public prayer for that marriage, and (b) which contains symbolic elements normally forming part of a marriage service, such as the exchanging of vows and the giving and receiving of rings;
- Bishops should give permission to their clergy to conduct such services; or
- Bishops should exercise discipline against clergy who conduct such services?

In particular, will the House clarify the meaning of the expressions "services of blessing" and "more informal kind of prayer, at the request of the couple" in those paragraphs, so as to avoid (i) any doubt as to what is acceptable, and (ii) the impression that the Church of England's doctrine of marriage has changed?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: Paragraph 20 of the House of Bishops Pastoral Guidance on Same Sex Marriage makes it clear that, whilst 'more informal prayer' is acceptable, 'services of blessing' should not be provided'. Public services of the kind described would therefore be inconsistent with the guidance.

When clergy depart from the guidance, appropriate discipline is exercised by their bishop. The small advisory group of bishops established by the House, which I chair, is considering whether there is a need for any supplementary guidance. It is also giving advice to fellow bishops on steps to be taken to maintain discipline. Thus far the number of cases referred to the group, whether about services of blessing or other matters, has been modest, which suggests that the guidance is honoured by the vast majority of clergy.

Mr Clive Scowen: Is the Bishop aware that it is alleged that a priest of the Church of England who recently conducted such a service overseas had been given permission to do so by her bishop, and will the House ensure that episcopal permission is not given for clergy to conduct such services in future?

The Bishop of Norwich: I am aware that various things have been alleged. I do not think that what you have just said is an accurate representation of what I know happened. I think there is very little evidence of confusion in this area. Sometimes it is certainly true clergy make bad judgements. At other times, some push the boundaries. It is a bishop's task to be able to tell the one from the other and administer discipline where necessary with that component that Pope Francis has made such a mark of his ministry called mercy.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I note in your reply that advice has been given to diocesan bishops on this topic, does that advice include a recognition of the Church's duty to support those who, like me, are quite clear that our love is God given and that God is calling us to celebrate our relationship not in some secretive hole in the corner, but publicly and joyfully with our friends, families and congregations?

The Bishop of Norwich: We offer advice in relation to the questions we are asked and we have never been asked a question that would require us to make that sort of affirmation, but it is certainly true that we give advice freely to bishops in relation to the sorts of disciplinary questions that arise. What we attempt to do is to honour the Church's teaching and honour the integrity of those to whom bishops and clergy are seeking to minister.

Secretary General

47. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General: Has an assessment been made of the monetary savings and release of time for mission and ministry that could be achieved by the Church as a whole if functions which are purely administrative in nature, particularly those undertaken by Diocesan Church Houses, were delivered in the most efficient manner without regard for subsidiarity?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Archbishops' Council has not made a comprehensive assessment of savings which might be achieved in this way. However, it is working with Diocesan Boards of Finance to assess whether and how the National Church Institutions could better support dioceses in just this way, by providing some more services centrally, to achieve efficiencies and save dioceses time and money.

Mr Gavin Oldham: Will the Secretary General commission a business plan to discern what is the potential as far as this proposal is concerned? If finance is an issue for that, will he make an application to the Church Commissioners to enable that plan to be produced?

Mr William Nye: That is very tempting, to make an application to the Church Commissioners, certainly. We are working with dioceses on how we can better support them in the sort of way that your question suggests, Mr Oldham. However, I would like to put together some work and an assessment, perhaps along the lines you suggest, about whether there are ways in which the National Church Institutions can support dioceses better and we will find resources to do so.

48. *Revd Andy Salmon (Manchester)* asked the Secretary General: Given increasing demands on parishes to produce statistical information, which – useful as it is – can be very difficult to provide (particularly in areas where the population is transient), has any thought been given to providing parishes with cloud based software to record attendance and, if so, when might it be made available? If that is not a possibility can consideration be given to what other assistance can be offered to help parishes manage and provide statistical information?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Research and Statistics team of the National Church Institutions are keen to work with parishes to make collection of statistics easier and more reliable. They would be pleased to consider proposals for improving systems and processes.

National Society Council

49. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: What arrangements, if any, are in place to ensure that the existing proportion of schools nationally that are Church of England schools is maintained, following the recent changes in the process for creating new schools, including the involvement of regional school commissioners, each of whose remit, by definition, covers only part of the country?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Free Schools are the key element in the Government's plan for new school provision. 500 Free Schools are promised during this Parliament and the Church of England Office is working with dioceses to ensure that we maintain our proportion of them, with a particular emphasis on increasing our secondary provision. The Education Office has retained a specialist consultant to assist dioceses in the delivery of this target and he has identified priority areas, potential projects and is actively supporting diocesan bids. He is working with the DfE and New Schools Network to bring a national perspective to what is often a regional decision. He is also training other bid writers who can, in turn, provide this support to diocesan education teams. We are committed to supporting dioceses in this way but in order to secure our proportion it is vital that all dioceses are proactive in developing proposals for Free Schools.

50. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Although the Government is no longer proposing to turn all existing schools into academies, the commitment to opening 500 new 'free' schools by 2020 remains in place. Very few bids for new Church schools are succeeding, despite the Church of England's record of providing excellent education. Given the high cost of each bid (£30,000), what proposals does the Church of England have for resourcing this invaluable provision to the nation?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: I refer to my answer to Question 49. The level of resource required to submit a bid for a Free School is considerable. The National Society is funding the provision of consultancy advice to dioceses. Part of the consultant's role is to identify areas where bids are most likely to be successful so as to avoid wasting precious resource.

Co-ordinating and sharing intelligence across the network of dioceses will help this bidding process but we recognise that other providers have access to significant funds which can make comprehensive and professional bids more compelling. We do not think that the future of the educational offer in a community should be determined by the quality of marketing or the amount of money spent on a bid, but dioceses need, as a matter of priority, to consider how to use their existing assets to ensure that they continue to enhance their provision as this is a unique opportunity to develop new schools.

Mrs Mary Durlacher: Thank you for clarifying that dioceses will be expected to continue funding bids. My question is, therefore, this: for dioceses like mine, Chelmsford, with larger than average population growth, therefore a greater need for new schools, will the national Church help with the cost of funding bids because we really cannot afford to keep losing £30,000 per bid?

The Bishop of Ely: I would love to be able to say, Mary, that the answer is yes, but I think we have to recognise that resources are limited and so there is a question about being strategic where the bids are being made. There is support from the centre for helping to make bids that are effective, but we cannot promise that there would be central funding, as far as I know at the moment, to underwrite bids. This needs to be a real priority set by the diocese itself.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Derby Cathedral is currently going through the bid process. Can I ask how the National Society Council is helping to articulate a model of a Church school serving the common good of all as distinct to faith schools serving the children of the faith? And how it is helping Government and decision makers about faith school applications to understand that distinction?

The Bishop of Ely: I am grateful for the question. It obviously demands quite a complex answer which cannot be supplied in the time that the Dean of Southwark will allow me. To be absolutely clear, what we are seeking to do and putting before the DfE all the time is that in our bids to provide new schools to meet fresh demands for our children that our Church schools are Church schools for all in the name of Jesus Christ. They are not faith schools simply to serve our own purpose as part of the distilled service of the Church of England for the common good of all.

Council for Christian Unity

51. *Revd Lisa Battye (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: Given the benefits of Christians working together for the common good within our increasingly multi-cultural society, how will the Council:

- (a) Chart the emergence of the many new, often small and independent, ethnic church groups that are forming within our communities?
- (b) Find ways at national level of attracting these groups into good relationships with the Established Church?

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: In 2015, we published an analysis of Christian demography according to ethnicity in England by region and by local authority (available at: <https://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/work-other-churches/resources/christian-demography-in-england.aspx>). We are engaged with Research and Statistics to find ways of gathering data on this subject. Churches Together in England publishes an online black and multi-cultural directory, which is immensely valuable in locating particular congregations.

In partnership with the ACO and Lambeth Palace, we are building networks with Anglican ethno-linguistic chaplaincies and congregations, which relate to their wider diaspora

communities. We engage with a growing diversity of Churches through Churches Together in England. We have published guidelines about extending hospitality to independent, ethno-linguistic congregations. We are working on guidelines for bishops about relating to such congregations, and are in discussion with the Simplification Task Group regarding amendment to the Church of England Ecumenical Relations Measure (1988) that could assist in this matter.

Ministry Council

52. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: In the most recent whole year for which records are available, what is the breakdown of those recommended for training at Bishops' Advisory Panels as single/married/in a civil partnership?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Information about the marital status of candidates for ordination is part of their personal file. It is gathered for the purpose of establishing their status in relation to Canon C4, in case a faculty is required for those who have married again after divorce. Personal data of this kind must be kept confidentially and can only be used for the purposes for which it was provided. It is not collected for the purposes of monitoring the outcome of the selection process or public accountability. We cannot, therefore, make this information available.

53. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: This year a Bishops' Advisory Panel was held for male candidates only, how often is such a panel held and why?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: All the Bishops' Advisory Panels (BAPs) in 2016 included both female and male candidates. Until 2015 one Panel per year was for male candidates only in order to allow BAP Advisers to serve who are opposed to the ordination of women and feel unable to be involved in the selection of women candidates. The Ministry Council will reflect on what future provision should be made in the light of the Five Guiding Principles.

54. *Dr Michael Todd (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What provision is made within the Initial Training of clergy to develop skills in working with people having dementia as well as their carers, bearing in mind the very considerable work being done in several dioceses, especially Carlisle, Lichfield and Truro?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: I am not aware of any specific provision in initial clergy training but that does not mean that there is none. The curriculum in all of the theological education institutions (TEIs) includes general pastoral training which addresses the situation of all age groups and a range of conditions. I am very aware of the rising significance and incidence of dementia in society, and of implications of this for both those who live with it and their carers. The importance of this condition for the pastoral and mission work of the Church is clear and I am grateful to be informed of the excellent work being done in the dioceses. I will bring this question to the notice of TEI Principals and remind them of the increasing importance

of this area of skill in training, and encourage them to draw on the resources of dioceses and other agencies.

55. *Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: In light of the ministry statistics published at the beginning of June, and the subsequent press coverage, what steps are being taken to prepare possible candidates for leadership roles as part of ongoing professional development at all stages of ministry?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: In order to fulfil the formational criteria on “leadership, collaboration and community”, training is given in colleges and courses on biblical and theological perspectives on leadership, authority, responsibility and power in leadership as well as developing skills in collaborative team leadership.

Formation is achieved through specific leadership modules, on-going Church contexts and supervision in reflective practice which enables students to reflect on their own leadership styles which is key to transition at ordination/licensing where that reflection in the course of practical work is essential. National CMD policy strongly advocates provision of professional development at transition points throughout ministry. This includes explicit leadership development programmes, and leadership development in, for example, first incumbents’ courses and new post consultations. The national CMD Panel resources diocesan officers by assisting in convening a national learning community of ‘leadership development practitioners’ meeting annually to encourage professional development.

56. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What progress is being made with ensuring that experience of methods of effective and practical evangelism is made central to the initial and continuing training of lay and ordained ministers (especially those on residential courses), so that the telling of the Good News of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ to those who are ‘harassed and helpless like sheep without a shepherd’ (Matthew 9.36 –TNIV) becomes embedded in the culture of the whole Church?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Theological Education Institutions, for example in their Annual Self Evaluation, show a firm commitment to forming lay and ordained ministers in all five marks of mission. Among both colleges and courses, there are examples of good practice in nurturing students in practical skills of faith sharing, often through the Common Awards module on Mission and Evangelism but also through wider placement and church attachments. Priorities for continuing ministerial education in this area are a matter for individual dioceses but I am aware of several where the priority of evangelism is being met through shared training for the whole people of God, recognising the key role of lay and ordained ministers. The formation criteria for initial ministerial education refer specifically to practical evangelism. Ministry Division staff are in discussion with the Evangelism Task Group and the Archbishops’ Missioner on how to make practical evangelism more central to both selection and training.

57. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: The “statistics for ministry” published on 2 June show a continuing decline in the number of stipendiary clergy, which is due to accelerate in the next ten years because a quarter of stipendiary clergy are already over 60 and approaching retirement. In addition to increasing vocations in England, what attention and encouragement is being given to recruitment from other parts of the Anglican Communion and to increasing the age of retirement; and, if not, why not?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: I agree with the assumption of the question that increasing vocations to ministry should be accompanied by an intelligent approach to deployment of those already ordained. I can assure the Synod that future deployment work will have this in mind.

The statutory retirement age for parochial clergy has recently been considered. Current arrangements were found to provide sufficient flexibility for clergy to continue in stipendiary ministry beyond the age of 70 to meet current and likely future requirements. Advertisements for posts are available on the web, bringing applications from ministers from other parts of the Communion. These applications can present difficulties under the Immigration Rules. Problems are also encountered where those from outside the UK train here and then seek to remain to undertake title posts. An approach is being made to the Home Office to establish a better understanding and improve outcomes from applications.

58. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: The “statistics for ministry” published on 2 June show a continuing decline in the number of stipendiary clergy, which is due to accelerate in the next ten years because a quarter of stipendiary clergy are already over 60.

Furthermore, detailed statistics show significant variation in diocesan age profiles: In some dioceses the proportion over 60 is as high as 40%. The Secretary General notes in his blog <http://cofecomms.tumblr.com/post/145510056717/renewal-and-reform-why-vocations-are-important> “individual dioceses cannot all maintain their numbers of stipendiary clergy while the total national number goes on falling.

If some dioceses do maintain or increase numbers, then for others the fall in numbers will end up being much faster.” In light of these realities, what steps are being taken to encourage realistic, strategic and fair deployment of stipendiary clergy among dioceses, or is it effectively a matter of dioceses competing to attract and retain clergy?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: I recognise that since the national system for allocation of stipendiary clergy was ended in 2014, there is no central mechanism for distributing clergy across the dioceses, though that system was becoming increasingly unsuccessful in achieving its ends. In place of it, dioceses are encouraged to develop their own strategies for mission, ministry and deployment, including vocational work to bring forward within a diocese the range of ministries required locally as well as contributing to the national pool of clergy.

The longer term solution to deployment is for dioceses to be more active in seeking ordinands, which the new RME funding arrangements encourage. In the meantime, a

national vacancies service is being developed to ensure that opportunities are placed before clergy. The Ministry Council will monitor and report to dioceses on deployment to support their planning and will keep the House of Bishops informed to encourage mutual support between dioceses.

59. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Are there any statistics available regarding the retention rate of clergy in parish ministry (e.g. what percentage of those who enter parish ministry are still in it five, ten, fifteen, twenty years later); and if so, do the statistics confirm or refute the perception that an increasing number of clergy are choosing to move from parish ministry into sector ministries?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Out of a total of 7,661 clergy in stipendiary posts in dioceses, in 2015 299 left for reasons other than retirement. These were replaced with 194 clergy moving from non-stipended posts. Of the 299 leavers, 20 moved into diocesan posts and 51 into chaplaincy posts. The number of paid chaplaincy posts declined from 1,190 in 2012 to 1,170 in 2015. Therefore, those taking paid chaplaincy posts are probably filling existing vacancies rather than new posts.

Of the 299 clergy who left in 2015, 105 moved into other parochial work, some of whom were paid locally in parishes. Of the 194 joining stipendiary ministry, 115 came from sector ministry or similar roles. The statistics suggest that there is not an increasing number of clergy leaving parochial ministry for sector roles but, rather, that some clergy move into sector ministry and then return to parochial posts. They also suggest a very high retention rate in parochial ministry, both in stipendiary and similar parochial roles.

Remuneration & Conditions of Service Committee

60. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: What advice is the Pensions Board giving to clergy greatly concerned by reports that the new stamp duty surcharge, introduced in April, is costing clergy, as well as others, thousands of pounds more in tax for the home that will become their main residence when they retire?

Mr Mark Emerton (Portsmouth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: The 3% surcharge to Stamp Duty Land Tax (SDLT) applies to a purchase of an additional residential property (buy-to-let or second home). Clergy who already own their own property (other than their own parsonage) will be subject to the SDLT surcharge in respect of the purchase of an additional property, as others would.

The understanding of Pensions Board Housing and RACSC is that the SDLT surcharge is not intended to apply to the purchase of a retirement house by clergy living in a parsonage (which they technically own as an incumbent) or residence provided to them by virtue of their office. We will be talking to the Government to secure clarification of the position.

The Pensions Board cannot offer advice to individuals and any clergyperson concerned about the impact of SDLT should speak to a qualified independent financial advisor (IFA). Any calls to the Board's helpline will be appropriately signposted.

The Chair. We have hit 10 o'clock and I am not minded to extend this session. Thank you to all those who have asked questions and supplementaries. Thank you also to those who have been providing the on-going praying presence during today. We very much value that in the background. I now invite his Grace, the Archbishop of York, to dismiss us with his blessing.

The Archbishop of York dismissed the Synod with the blessing at 10.00 pm

Full Synod: Second Day Saturday 9 July 2016

THE CHAIR: *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 9.30 am.

The Chair. Good morning, members of Synod. I hope you have returned refreshed and restored. We have a full day ahead of us with the excitement of lots of legislative business. We shall need to bear in mind the Psalmist's observation that the law of the Lord is our delight. To commend our work today to God we will start with worship.

Revd Michael Gisbourne (Chaplain to the Synod) and Revd Bertrand Olivier (London) led the Synod in an act of worship.

The Chair. Once again, good morning, members of Synod. Some of you will think that your prayers have been answered in that we are going to go straight from worship to a temporary adjournment of the Synod.

Temporary adjournment of Synod

The Chair. Before we get too excited at this point in the day, could I call on the Chair of the Business Committee for one further item of housekeeping.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you. It occurred to me that it would be helpful to you all if I were to make a brief statement about the DAG debate on the Report on Senior Leadership. I cannot answer the questions that are coming into me on Messenger and addressed to me in the dining room at this point, but should time open up at the end of this morning or at some stage this afternoon we will, of course, take that debate. I dare risk saying that that is what I personally hope will happen.

Legislative Business: Draft Mission and Pastoral etc (Amendment) Measure (GS 2014A)

The Chair. Well, after the initial excitements of the day, we now come to the substantial excitements and we come to Item 500, the Report by the Revision Committee on the Draft Mission and Pastoral etc. (Amendment) Measure - snappily titled. Members will need the Draft Measure, GS 2014A, the report of the Revision Committee GS 2014Y and Order Paper II.

Could I also draw members' attention to the Financial Statement on page 3 of the Sixth Notice Paper? That is the green Notice Paper. As is indicated on the Order Paper, we will have a general debate on the report followed by the formal process of considering each clause and the amendments that have been proposed. I call on Mr Geoffrey Tattersall, Chair of the Revision Committee, to move Item 500, that the Synod do take note of this report. Mr Tattersall, you have up to ten minutes.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester): I beg to move

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

Thank you, Mr Chairman, what an introduction. Members of Synod have the report of the Revision Committee and GS 2014A, which is the current post-Revision Committee draft of the Measure which itself received First consideration at the February group of sessions.

The Revision Committee process attracted a significant number of amendments and some clauses of it were the subject of very disparate comments and suggestions for amendment. You will note that the Steering Committee itself proposed a significant number of amendments.

The Measure as a whole has been welcomed by Synod members. On a number of its clauses, the only proposals for amendment received were minor or were suggestions for drafting improvements and, as time is limited, I do not propose to mention those specifically.

The proposals received and the Committee’s responses to them are fully set out in the report. However, there are a few clauses which I should draw specifically to the attention of Synod. The first is clause 4 which creates a statutory presumption in favour of a deanery plan when objections are being considered by the Church Commissioners.

This clause was inserted into the draft Measure by the Steering Committee who had been advised that this was a point from the Simplification Group’s Report for which provision had not actually been made in the draft Measure but it now is being made. Next, and more contentiously, a number of proposals were received for amendment to clause 5 (which used to be clause 4, just to make it easy for you), which makes amendments to the provisions in the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 relating to team and group ministries.

A number of Synod members made speeches at First Consideration which showed that they were unhappy with the proposals as they stood, in particular because of the much reduced role of patrons in team vicar appointments. The Steering Committee considered those comments and the representations made to the Revision Committee on this point and they agreed, as did the Revision Committee, that the draft Measure should be amended to restore the role of patrons in such appointments.

In addition, the Revision Committee considered representations made to it concerning the requirement for the consent of a majority of the members of the team to the appointment of a new team vicar. They agreed, on consideration, that the requirement should not be watered down to a requirement for consultation and that, therefore, what was sub-section 1 of the clause should be omitted.

However, the Revision Committee decided not to make any further amendments proposed to this clause. They considered that the very prescriptive requirements laid down in the Mission and Pastoral Measure for the operation of a team did not have a place in primary legislation.

Clause 6 (again, that used to be clause 5) attracted more amendments than any other provision. A number of those proposing amendments proposed that the clause should be omitted altogether and the status quo retained. The status quo dates from a period when the deprivation of a benefice constituted the deprivation of a property right and, therefore, the compensation payable under the existing provisions reflected that loss.

However, Synod may take the view that the world has moved on. In particular, income from glebe is no longer the property of the incumbent of a benefice and such provisions are unworkable in our modern context as they make pastoral reorganisation, however desirable that may be, impossibly expensive for some dioceses. The Revision Committee, therefore, rejected the proposals to admit the clause altogether.

However, in response to the proposals made, the Revision Committee substantially revised the compensation provisions. They accepted that six months' financial compensation and provision of housing was insufficiently generous and they replaced it with a 12-month stipend and housing as a minimum in every case.

They also accepted that in some circumstances, if a dispossessed officeholder agrees, but only if he or she agrees, it would be appropriate to replace the provision of housing with additional financial compensation. This might be appropriate in particular where a dispossessed individual is close to retirement age and wishes to have additional funds available for housing him or herself in retirement.

The Revision Committee considered that, in the light of the more generous baseline for compensation, it was no longer necessary to make additional provision for longer service. Instead, they considered it appropriate to add a new discretionary power for a bishop to make additional payments if thought fit. The draft also provides for a right to apply for an independent review of that decision, by a person appointed jointly by the two Archbishops, if the refusal to authorize an additional payment would cause exceptional hardship.

The Revision Committee also considered whether there should be a claw-back of compensation if a dispossessed officeholder found another suitable ecclesiastical office within 12 months of dispossession, but decided by a small majority that the payment of compensation should be by a single lump sum without any provision for a claw-back if that person obtained a new post within 12 months.

Finally, the Revision Committee considered the power of the Archbishops' Council in paragraph 7 of the amended schedule 4 in clause 6 - if you follow that - to amend the compensation provisions by order. Notwithstanding concerns expressed by some Synod members, the Revision Committee was satisfied that there were adequate safeguards on the exercise of such a power.

The Committee also received a number of proposals relating to clause 11 (it used to be clause 10) which deals with notices in relation to glebe land, but it rejected proposals that the clause should be omitted and accepted that incumbents and PCCs should continue to be notified of proposed glebe transactions, although the right to make representations to the Commissioners should cease.

Finally, a number of proposals were received in relation to clause 12 (it used to be clause 11), which amends the Patronage Benefices Measure 1986. The Committee was not willing to withdraw the clause but agreed to a number of changes in response to the proposals, accepting that there were some cases where patronage should continue to lapse to the Archbishop rather than the diocesan bishop and that the period before lapse should be extended.

The period will now be 12 months from the notice under section 7 of the 1986 Measure or the benefice becoming vacant, whichever is the later; not as paragraph 88(b) says, the earlier, but the later. In summary, the Committee have carefully considered the proposed legislation and have made some significant amendments to reflect concerns raised by members of Synod. In those circumstances, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

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 any matter which is the subject of an amendment on the Order Paper.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Dr John Appleby (Newcastle): I welcome this Measure and I am very happy with most of it. I have no criticism or comment. I wish to raise a question or a small observation, which perhaps should have been an amendment but I will confess I missed a trick and so I am asking it as a question. In clause 7 on bishop's pastoral orders at section 54A there is a provision for a bishop's pastoral order to create, alter or dissolve an archdeaconry. I raised this point by private correspondence but it does not appear in the Report of the Committee, and it was partially addressed.

The point I wish to make was that in the original proposed Measure the bishop could make these changes with only such consultation as the bishop thought necessary. That has now been improved so that it is necessary to consult the mission and pastoral committee of the diocese and such others as the bishop thinks fit.

I wish to ask the Committee and, indeed, ask whether Synod is satisfied that it would be better if the diocesan synod concerned should also be consulted. That would not limit the right of the bishop to make this reorganisation, but I feel diocesan synods would like to be consulted about the change to archdeacons.

Although it is a bit of a large leap, I think we have had enough in the last few weeks of people feeling that things happen which they have no control over and it would be advisable that diocesan synods knew what was going on because there is a sense of ownership and membership about archdeacons. It is not simply a management decision. My question is why did the Committee not consider it necessary to consult diocesan synods in changing archdeacons?

Ven Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester): I wanted to ask a question about the provisions in section 10 of the amending Measure, if that is okay. These relate to bishop's mission orders and, in particular, accommodate the Amending Canon where bishop's mission

orders are enabled to have indefinite duration rather than limited duration. I have only heard clergy who look after bishop's mission orders ask for two things on the floor of Synod.

That is a charitable structure that sits beneath the bishop's mission order which is agreed and has some standardisation to it, so that work does not have to be done every time and we can be absolutely sure that these charities have Anglican identity and belonging within the Church; and, secondly, for an ability to have real, proper lay representation in synodical government on the same basis as a parish.

As currently drafted, section 10 enables an enduring identity to be granted to a BMO without either of these things. Why are they important? To have something which is forever part of the Church of England, which does not necessarily have to have in its charitable structure Anglican identity which is tied to us only by BMO and by a licence, seems to me inappropriate.

In a parish structure the nature of the charity and the parish denomination necessarily go together. This is not the same with a BMO, where the BMO and the charity are separate and the charity needs to be addressed. Secondly, of course, the charity must be made up afresh every time a BMO is created and thought through every time. On the question of representation, one diocese I know has very creatively said they will be able to get synodical representation by affirming at diocesan synod that we will treat the membership role of one of these charities as equivalent to an electoral role.

Our legislation says synodical representation is based on membership of the electoral roll of a parish. Therefore, we need a form of governance and something within the terms of this Measure which enables that recognition, gives a structure with membership and enables it to be recognised as equivalent to a parish. At the moment, clergy who are licensed to a BMO may be here; laity may not.

We have seen the effect of excluding people from synodical governance and decision-making processes. This is a fundamental lack. I believe it to be bad theology, bad ecclesiology, bad politics and, moreover, bad faith towards those who are taking adventurous steps in mission. They deserve a voice here and we should give it to them and are poorer without it.

I do not suggest that these items should be on the face of the Measure, but a reference to a code or a form of regulations to be followed in granting indefinite identity and enduring identities to BMOs I do think is appropriate. I just wonder, and I ask the question, why is that not here?

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): I am not making any particular point about the particular legislation in front of us, but I would like to make a general point, that in attempting to work out whether I am happy or unhappy with proposed amendments, I would like to see the original legislation as amended with the changes with strike-through and the additions added in and I could then see much more clearly what the intention is in changing the legislation.

I have spent 20 years of my working life advising various government departments on draft legislation relating to pensions and I have never found any such difficulty as I do with the legislation presented before Synod in this form. If this were to be presented electronically, I would be perfectly happy with that, because I recognise that large amounts of paper would otherwise have to be produced. Could consideration be had to doing that in future?

Ven Luke Miller (London): I just wanted to thank the Archdeacon of Bournemouth for the firm call for people who are living and working in BMO churches to be able to have representation in Synod. We have done a lot of work on that in the Diocese of London and have taken steps towards it. It is an extremely important thing for all the reasons the Archdeacon gives.

There is just one thing to say though, and perhaps I can say this as one who has driven through getting synodical representation for BMOs; just as a reminder that not all BMOs seek that and that the legislation needs to continue to allow for circumstances in which it is not appropriate. Not that others outside say these people may not have synodical representation, but that the structure of the Church and the ecclesial community that is being created, with the consultations locally and the work that goes in in order to make that piece of work happen, is one which those people in it and those with whom they are working and with whom they are consulting decide is of a slightly different form.

One of the great benefits of the legislation has been its flexibility and its ability to create many different types of church in many different places and we need not to lose that. I want to say very clearly in the context of one who believes very strongly that all our churches should have synodical representation and that those voices which are hesitant about that need to recognise that everyone should be able to join in and to be part of our debates, conversations and our mission.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Just to echo the points of the Archdeacon of Bournemouth and the Archdeacon of London around bishop's mission orders, I think the general trajectory in here and in clause 10 is very positive. I think it is where God has been leading through Fresh Expressions; particularly the research that comes from the Church Army and the Church Commissioners around lay leadership and we are finding, increasingly, the licensing of lay teams and lay workers to be particularly important and how we do not allow an over-clericalisation which at times has permeated parish ministry to flow synodically into Fresh Expressions of Church I think is important.

I would want to make one further point as well, which is around the role of visitor and around the role of review. I welcome the greater flexibility that this gives in terms of review and around the role of visitors. It allows for greater contextualisation which can only be positive. My question, as one of those who reviewed one of the first bishop's mission orders in another diocese, is there was not a great deal of guidance as to what reviews and, indeed, what the role of visitors might look like beyond very limited legislative clauses. I wonder, similarly, again not on the face of the Measure but whether some sort of greater support, a register of those who are visitors, a register of those who might do reviews may allow for good practice to be shared more broadly?

The Chair. I see no one standing, so I call on Mr Tattersall to respond to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester): First of all, I thank all those who have responded to the debate. To Mr Appleby, you are probably right to say that you missed a trick by not asking us to amend the Measure to include reference to diocesan synod. I know that you have spoken to Bishop Pete, through whom all things go nowadays, and I know that he said to you - so it must be true - that if there is required to be consultation with the diocesan mission and pastoral committee, it is very unlikely that in the circumstances we are talking about there would not be consultation with the diocesan synod, and that is why it is not in. It is not in because we were not asked to put it in, but there it is. I think there is no problem about that because there will be consultation with the diocesan mission and pastoral committee.

In terms of the Archdeacons of Bournemouth and London and Mr Hill, I am glad that nobody is suggesting that this should be done on the face of the Measure because I think it would be wrong to put it on the face of the Measure. I think that we all recognise that there needs to be a code of practice - there will be a code of practice - and that the code of practice relating to bishop's mission orders needs to be drafted and published as soon as possible because it would be, obviously, helpful to do that. That is the intention of doing that and so I do not think the Archdeacon of Bournemouth need worry because there will eventually be a code of practice, hopefully very soon. As to the other points he made, no doubt these are part of the simplification process and they can be dealt with in that.

Finally, as to Mr Wilson, I share Mr Wilson's frustration that it is not easy to see how amendments pan out. Indeed, when I appeared before the Ecclesiastical Committee on the safeguarding measure with others we were told by Lord Lisvane, who knows a lot about these things, that it would have been much easier to have a Keeling schedule. When we discovered what a Keeling schedule was, we were able to reassure him that a Keeling schedule would, of course, show you the exact amendments in the context of the existing measure and it, obviously, is easier to do. It is not so easy to do in amending legislation. We do not tend to do things that way. It creates a lot more paper and it makes it look more confusing. You have a measure which shows you what has changed since you last saw it and we had hoped that that was good enough, but I am sure that those behind me will bear in mind everything that Mr Wilson said. Thank you very much.

The Chair. Thank you, Mr Tattersall. I now put Item 500 to the vote.

The motion:

'That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. We come now to the revision stage of the draft Measure. May I remind members that the amendments and the other motions appear on Order Paper 2. Under Standing Order 58(1) it is for the Chair to determine the order in which the clauses are to

be considered and, perhaps because of years of legal training, I have decided that they should be considered in the order in which they appear in the text. Where no notice has been given of any amendments to particular clauses and no members have indicated that they wish to speak against those clauses, I have given my permission under Standing Order 58(4) to the clauses being taken en bloc.

As this is the revision stage, we shall need to use the 40-member procedure under Standing Order 59(6). Where an amendment is moved by someone other than 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 to indicate that they wish debate to continue or a vote to be taken. If there are, we will continue with any further debate that there may be on the amendment and then vote on it, otherwise the amendment will lapse. When we reach that stage, it would be very helpful if 40 members so wishing to support continuation of the debate would stand promptly.

Clauses 1-4

The Chair. We now come to clauses 1 to 4 of the draft Measure. I invite the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 504 that clauses 1 to 4 stand part of the Measure.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

‘That clauses 1-4 stand part of the Measure.’

The Chair. Admirable brevity from the Bishop of Willesden. The item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. There is no need for reply, so I put Item 504 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That clauses 1-4 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. That is very clearly carried.

Clause 5

The Chair. I now invite Mr Clive Scowen to move his amendment to clause 5 at Item 505. Mr Scowen, you have up to five minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move:

‘Clause 5, page 7 *leave out* subsection (4) and *insert*–

“(4) Omit subsection (11) of that section (duty of rector to convene meetings).
(4A) For subsection (12) of that section (right of members to request meetings) substitute—

“(12) Any member of a team in a team ministry may, by notice in writing, request the rector to convene, within the period of twenty-eight days following the service of the notice, a meeting of the team for the purpose of discussing and reaching a common mind on a matter of general concern or special interest to the team ministry; and if the rector fails to comply with the request, the member may himself or herself convene the meeting.”

I would like, first, to express my appreciation to the Revision Committee for their willingness to engage seriously with those of us who made submissions. In consequence, I think the Measure is now in a much better state than when we last saw it on the floor of Synod.

My two small amendments this morning deal with a couple of outstanding points where the Revision Committee did not go as far as some of us felt was desirable. As I am sure all of us know well, section 34 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure requires a scheme establishing a team ministry to provide that both the team rector is the incumbent, but that also the team vicars are to have a status equal to that of an incumbent of a benefice. However, it is not unknown for team rectors to treat their team vicars as if they were curates rather than having full incumbent status.

I am sure no team rector present today would do that but it happens, I am told, in some places. It is important, therefore, that section 34 should contain some rights to give substance to that incumbent status. It does now continue to provide that team vicars have a role in the appointment of the team rector and of the other team vicars.

Section 34, as it stands, also gives a team vicar a right to call a meeting of the team if the team rector does not do so and also requires the team rector to keep members of the team informed of any statutory notices concerning ecclesiastical property and the benefice to give them an opportunity to express their views and then to have regard to those views before the team rector takes action in response to the notice.

Clause 5(4) of the amending draft Measure that we have before us proposes to remove those rights on the basis that such prescriptive detail has no place in primary legislation. Well, that might be okay if it were proposed to replace it with secondary legislation to similar effect, but that is not the proposal. The proposal is simply to remove altogether the rights that team vicars have to insist on a meeting of the team and to be told, as people with equal incumbent status, of statutory notices affecting the benefice.

In my view, if team vicars really are of incumbent status it is important that they should have those rights. It is important that they feel and know themselves to be truly contributing members of a team of equals rather than simply people who can be ignored in many ways when it comes to legal matters like notices and who have no right to make sure that the team discusses things properly. These may be detailed rights but they are important rights going in substance to the principle of equal status.

This amendment that I am moving now would secure the continuation of those rights by keeping in place sub-sections 15 and 18 of section 34 of the Mission and Pastoral Measure, which the draft Measure wants to repeal, and also substitutes a new sub-section 12 which has to be in slightly different form from the existing sub-section 12 because of the repeal of sub-section 11, which currently requires the team rector to convene team meetings and which I accept is probably overly-prescriptive.

I invite Synod to make this small amendment to ensure that real substance is given to the principle of the equality of status between team vicars and team rectors.

The Chair. Thank you, Mr Scowen. I invite the Bishop of Willesden to respond. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Chair, the Steering Committee would like you to resist this amendment. Let us have a little discursus on what we are trying to do here. Those who of you who have been around and are long in the tooth enough to remember when the Team and Group Measure and the amending consequences and the Mission and Pastoral Measure went through Synod will know that we were in a very different climate.

It was legalism. It was to let us make sure that absolutely everything about how we organise our teams and groups is properly regulated. We spent ages. It was one of the most tedious bits of legislation ever going through Synod and we have ended up with this slightly difficult stuff to operate. What the simplification process has suggested is that we should not be trying to regulate the ways in which the day-to-day working of teams and groups should take place on the face of the Measure.

I understand entirely Clive's motivation for trying to get some kind of clarity about what the relationships between team vicars and team rectors is. The trouble is it is no longer the right way of doing it. I would ask you to resist it on principle because we do not want to start shipping back into Measures things that relate to clergy relationships in this kind of way.

More broadly, I invite you to talk to any of the bishops and archdeacons here gathered and say: how is it that when you have a case of a breakdown in clergy relationships that you deal with such things? You do not summon the team rector into your study and say, "Well, you have not complied with clause 12 in here, mate, have you?" Because, actually, before that you will have discovered there is a pathological relationship going on between the team rector and the team vicar and you will have tried, through conciliation and through other processes, to deal with it.

Actually, to stick it on the face of the Measure really is not particularly helpful. The code of practice will continue to address some of the issues about how we regulate such relationships, but it is not just teams that occasionally malfunction in relation to how clergy work together. Vicars and curates, vicars and associate vicars, vicars in groups, all sorts of other clergy relationships can and sometimes do go wrong, unfortunately. I do not think it will help you to have something particularly in the Measure that says: Well, you have got to convene a meeting and, if you do not, someone else will do it for you. I would

therefore ask you to resist this. I understand the spirit in which it was moved, but it is not going to help us in the broader questions of how we work together for the body of Christ - clergy and laity - in the co-operative way in which we ought to be, recognising what God has called us to be.

The Chair: The Bishop of Willesden has indicated that the Steering Committee does not support the amendment so it will lapse unless there are 40 members standing in their places to indicate that they wish the debate to continue. Are there 40 members? There are 40 members so the debate continues on Item 505.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I would strongly resist this amendment for many of the reasons the Bishop of Willesden put forward. If the situation in a team ministry gets to a point where the team vicars have to meet without the team rector, they are in a very sad place, and legislating for that possibility is suggesting that nothing other than mutiny is what is happening. I am certain that with our revised Clergy Discipline Measure and the way the clergy should be moving to behave, that having a separate meeting is not going to be helpful at all. I speak from experience of having been in a dysfunctional team ministry, where the team rector seemed incapable of leading the team and conversations among the other team vicars did not help. The appropriate course of action is to work with the archdeacon and bishops and to see if you can make the team better rather than isolate the team rector, which is what would happen as a logical consequence of this piece of legislation, because people will take it into their pockets and say, "I am going to get you". It is hardly Christian, hardly charitable and does not help the team or the team rector and will not help the team vicars.

Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool): I would just like to point out that as a self-supporting minister who is an associate priest in a team ministry, as the Bishop of Willesden pointed out, there are lots of different people working within a team and not all are clergy. It occurs to me that putting a prescriptive clause into the Measure could be very unhelpful to fostering all the talents to recognising all the different gifts that are there within the team. Frankly, if as a team all of the people there, be they clergy or lay, cannot work together without some legalism being imposed upon them, then the problem is far more complex than is going to be solved by a bit of legalism. I would resist the amendment.

Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth): I have been a lay member of a parish that has a team ministry for over 30 years, and I, too, would like to resist this amendment. The Bishop of Willesden made reference to the code of practice and I would like to ask when we will see that and get a chance to discuss it, because it seems to me, with some experience of both good and less good relationships between rectors and team vicars, that the most important thing of all is the relationship. The code of practice should speak to that and should give us, I hope, some assurance, as has been mentioned earlier. I do not think that trying to legalise relationship is a good idea.

The Chair: The Bishop of Willesden wants to respond.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Just briefly to clarify on the code of practice, it is made by the Commissioners so it does not come to Synod. We recognise that there is a need to tidy up the code and this is one of the things we will make sure we

look at when we do that.

The Chair: I now put Item 505 to the vote.

The amendment was lost on a show of hands.

The Chair: I will now call upon the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 506 that Clause 5 stand part of the Measure.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

‘That clause 5 stand part of the Measure.’

The Chair: Item 506 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 506 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That clause 5 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

Clause 6

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 507.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

‘That clause 6 stand part of the Measure.’

The Chair: I see no one standing so I put Item 507 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That clause 6 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

Clause 7

The Chair: I now invite Revd Paul Benfield to move his amendment to clause 7 at Item 508.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I beg to move:

‘Clause 7, page 11, *leave out* lines 39 and 40.’

I should declare an interest in patronage. I am the Vice-President of the Society for the

Maintenance of Faith which has a patronage of some 80 livings.

My amendment seeks to remove the clause which would allow the abolition of the office of team vicar by a bishop simply by a bishop's pastoral order. At the moment if a bishop wants to abolish the office of a team vicar he must go through the full procedure of a pastoral scheme. This allows parishioners, patrons and others to make representations to the Church Commissioners and, if necessary, to attend a hearing before them. If this draft Measure is approved unamended - without my amendment - it will mean that a bishop can abolish the office of team vicar simply after consultation. The right to make representations and to appeal to the Church Commissioners will be lost. This would mean that a bishop could undertake major pastoral reorganisation without any check on his power. This Measure is part of the simplification programme. Simplification is good and should be welcomed, but it should not be done so as to remove the rights of parishioners and patrons to appeal to the Church Commissioners. When a team ministry is formed a scheme is necessary, and the same process should be followed if a team is to be altered. As we heard Mr Scowen say earlier, a team vicar is of incumbent status and so this office should not be abolished by the bishop alone without any check or balance.

I therefore urge Synod to accept my amendment and remove the power of the bishop to abolish the office of team vicar by a pastoral order.

The Chair: Thank you, Fr Benfield. I now invite the Bishop of Willesden to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Members who want to consult GS 2014A will see at the bottom of page 11 a whole series of things we are suggesting could be dealt with much more simply by pastoral order. They include a number of things such as changing the name of a parish which you would not do capriciously out of thin air. They are things where there would have been consultation. This is trying to reduce the amount of to-ing and fro-ing, making of schemes and making of orders, which takes place at the moment in the Mission and Pastoral Measure.

The particular concern that Fr Benfield has asked me to address is about a vacant post. There is no sense that anything can be dispossessed. It is the question of whether, when there is a vacancy, you could either increase or decrease it. It is both ways. Many of us have experienced a team constituted in the heady days when you had a team rector who had no particular care for any church within the benefice at all and a number of team vicars who may or may not have had a particular cure of souls in a part of the team ministry. Times change. The shape of team ministry has changed. In many cases, team rectors with overall responsibility but no church attached have decreased in number. It is quite often important to review when a particular case comes up. Fr Benfield's concern was that we could suddenly say to a team. "By the way, that post is going; you've had it". It does not work like that, does it? You have a conversation with the members of the team and with the team council, the various PCCs and others, so they are sighted on these things, but then, having got consent and an understanding together about what you are doing, this is the stage at which you make the order. It is not going to be something that is suddenly imposed upon people. It is about simplifying the process once you have consensus and consent about the shape of the team. No bishop or archdeacon will be

planning for the future of their team without having a good conversation about all that, including a conversation with patrons.

I hope you will resist this. This is about a simple way of making these things happen, not about the process by which you get there. It would only take place where there was already a vacant post and where you needed to think about the reconfiguration of the team. Please do not support the amendment.

The Chair. The Steering Committee does not support the amendment so it will lapse unless there are 40 members standing in their places. Do we have 40 such members? There are 40 such members and so the debate continues.

Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I find myself on one of those occasions in Synod of listening very hard to both of the arguments that I have heard so far and applying them to my own benefice. For a number of years now we have had a scheme which has a team rector and two team vicars, but one of those posts has not been filled for some time. Nonetheless, there are discussions going on that are helpful and fruitful which may or may not lead to a change in that. It would be extremely unhelpful therefore if we found ourselves in a situation where a diocese - any diocese - found itself in the following position. A team vicar's post comes with a house and it is dependent upon a house being there, but should the diocese become short of cash, one way in which it could fill a hole in its budget would be to abolish a spare team vicar's place, which would enable it to release the housing that was attached to it. I am not suggesting that there are out there a raft of bishops who are just looking to get their hands on our houses, but I do think that a provision which enables parishioners to object to a third party and to be heard by a third party might just be a safety valve, not least because it would decrease levels of potential suspicion were something controversial to be done.

Ven Jackie Searle (Gloucester): I would resist this amendment on the grounds that at the moment within the Church of England we are trying to seek to become a lighter, more flexible organisation that can respond to needs on the ground and of our people. So much of the simplification agenda is seeking to build collaboration, teams, conversation, and there is something very helpful about being able to have those conversations to work together with the people, but to be able to make that decision based on local consultation. Whether posts are increased or whether they are decreased that would not happen without the consultation and involvement of the archdeacon and bishops. When we think about re-imagining ministry, we want to have more scope to be able to respond in that lighter and more flexible way, so I would resist the amendment.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I too would like to resist the amendment. I wish to correct a previous speaker. Team vicars' vicarages do not belong to the clergy as a right; they belong to the diocese as a whole, and if we have to sell some vicarages so that we can redeploy the clergy, or serve the diocese better, that is a good thing. We do not have rights to our houses or have them where we want them to be. They should be where the people need them to be.

The second thing I would like to point out is that in this motion and the last one 40 people stood, and to date I have not seen very many of those 40 people speak in favour of the

motions that we are debating. Perhaps a little self-discipline needs to be exercised in this House. Thank you very much.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): It is very difficult to vote for something when you can see that there are consequences that have not yet been explored. I have looked at the wording here, and it is not about abolishing a team vicar post but having the opportunity of adding team vicars as well. I see this as a flexible way of doing things, and I would like to ask you to resist this amendment because it cuts out that flexibility to add to the ministry capability as well as perhaps close down those that are not currently in use.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): I am one of the 40 who stood and, just to be clear, one of the reasons that I was resisting the temptation to stand and speak is because I wanted to do something called listening. We have heard about that in this Synod.

I am reminded a little bit of a phrase used by AN Wilson in his book “After the Victorians” where he charts the history of Britain. He talks about the 1950s and 1960s as being Widmerpool’s Britain, a reference to the Kenneth Widmerpools of the era who were famous for their glasses and Brylcreem-ed hair, who thought that rationalisation, simplification and modernisation went hand-in-hand. The epitome of this type of figure was Dr Beeching who, to the consternation of a number of clergy, would rip apart the railway network. The gutting of Britain’s railways and cities happened because power went unchecked. I have no doubt that the Bishop of Willesden is right: no one has a Machiavellian scheme to start culling clergy. However, Synod, there is a sub-text going through the chamber at the moment that seems to suggest that legislation is some worthless ephemera from a bygone era which is getting in the way of agile organisation. Nothing could be further from the truth. Most church business is run day-to-day through human relationships and through prayer and communication with God. As the Bishop of Willesden said, we do not turn up and say, “Does Rule 6 say this?” or, “Does Item 12 say this?”

We have legislation for a very good reason. It is there to fall back on when we need it and it is there to guide a due legal process. A due legal process must involve checks and balances. I am sure the current bishops have no plan to cull clergy or willy-nilly decide to abolish posts; however it only takes one to do so.

I could give you several examples of where the Church of England has acted very badly without due checks and balances. Before the current Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich came on board - and I do not speak for the Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich - the previous regime had plans to cull numbers of clergy. I also refer you to the example of Church buildings. A few years ago in Thetford a Church building was sold for a pound to a builder, who then stripped out the contents, sold them all for a profit and sold the building for a profit. Needless to say, that did not go down too well with local people.

These are random examples of what happens if power goes unchecked. If we have a situation where a clergy team position can be abolished without any checks and balances it is wide open to abuse. As a previous speaker said, it then gives the impression that the Church is trying to centralise power without allowing any checks and balances so, far from removing suspicion, it ends up increasing it.

Synod, let us not confuse the need to have good legislation with the need to be agile as an organisation. It is possible to do both, but doing both means having a proper structure, and having a proper structure means having proper checks and balances to ensure that nothing gets abused. Yesterday we heard in the questions a lot of suspicion and anger - and I will not comment on it specifically - about the George Bell case, because there is a sense there has been no transparency. We need to have transparency in this situation. If a bishop can just turn round and say, "I am abolishing this team position post", where is that going to leave us? It is going to create a sense among the laity that it is "them and us", and that should not be the sense that we want as we move forward together and walk together. However, we need to know that we have those legal safeguards, and for that reason I am firmly supporting Fr Benfield's motion and I would urge you to do so.

Revd Eleanor Robertshaw (Sheffield): I am a team rector in the Diocese of Sheffield but I do not have a team vicar, and there has not been one in post since 1995. To put that in context, in 1995 I was still at school - just - so it is a long time since we have had one. However, I think there is somewhat of an expectation from my parishioners, although not from me, that there will be at some point a team vicar even though there is not a house and they may not have to share me as much as they do at the moment. I would resist this amendment simply because of expectations of parishioners. If that role was dissolved in my parish, nobody would expect there was going to be anything else and that expectation would go away.

The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Nigel Stock): Reference was made by the speaker before last to the previous regime of the Diocese of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich. I would like to make it very clear that from the very opening of my time at St Edmundsbury I was reluctant to reduce the numbers of clergy. There was no plan to cull without due process, and if such example is going to be used perhaps facts could be checked. Thank you.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): If we listen carefully to the Bishop of Willesden, this particular clause allows us to increase or to decrease. It is very flexible. It is not always, "You will not put in somebody". As far as I am concerned, I think we should have a much more flexible process and I welcome it. In York we have many places that have been failed exactly as in the example given by the dear, beloved sister from Sheffield. They stay on the books but the chances of filling them are slim, for two reasons. First, the diocese does not have the money. We had better have a reality check. Money will always restrain some of our ministry. As a diocese we have cut to the bone and reached the stage where we are trying to revise how we do ministry and be more flexible. For heaven's sake, let us be more realistic.

Two things are happening. In some places church attendance is declining at a very, very fast rate. Hence the Renewal and Reform programme to try and sustain that reality. In some other places, the money is not there. If that is so, why worry about a clause like this?

I want to resist this simply because when I read the Acts of the Apostles, what you actually

see going on is what I call “By the Holy Spirit, they experimented”. There is a lot of experimentation going on. Why? Because we are dealing with a God of movement. A Church that is static does not let the gates of hell stand against it because there is no need for it. For a Church on the move, not even the gates of hell can prevail against it. Jesus did not come to bring a new religion called the Church of England and its structures. He came to bring life; the life of God which all of us need to be encountering and servicing. For me, I am very grateful for this particular clause and, please, the amendment should be resisted because we should be people of the Spirit.

The gentleman who talked about the law, as somebody who trained in the legal business, yes, the law is necessary in order to curb the unruly, but where the spirit of the Lord is, there is absolute liberty. We always worry about legalism and so on and so forth because we have lost the driving force behind all this. The Holy Spirit is a direct commission. The Holy Spirit is the one who actually makes the body live. The law can stand there and help us and guide us, but if you put your trust in the law it is as if Jesus never died and rose again. My friends, I want to tell you to resist anything which suggests the better law, the better the behaviour. It does not follow. We have seen it all along in the Church. I want to say that if this clause is ever used in my diocese there will be very careful prayer, careful deliberation, people will be consulted, because again at the end of the day I am accountable to Christ and therefore cannot simply go ahead without any clear consultation. Can we get a little bit of Jesus in all of this? Thank you very much.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): I hate to disagree with my fellow lay rep from Norwich who spoke earlier, but there seems to be a concern in this debate about accountability of bishops and the idea that bishops might just go off and do whatever they want with no thought of anyone else at all. As the Archbishop of York just said, he would consult people. I notice on page 12 of GS 2014A at line 10 the bishop must “consult the mission and pastoral committee in the diocese”. I should probably declare an interest; I am on the mission and pastoral committee in our diocese, and I expect many others here are on theirs. I would say that as fellow members we therefore have a duty that if a bishop’s pastoral order is proposed and we are consulted we take it seriously, we think about it, we respond, perhaps we disagree, and there is a check and balance there which would be strengthened if we pass Clive Scowen’s amendment later - not that I am speaking to that, but perhaps we can bear it in mind when the time comes.

Dr Sam Robinson (Exeter): I support the amendment. I do so asking Synod to recall some of the debates of yesterday and to recall also that just over a fortnight ago the elites of this country took their eye off the concerns of the little people. It is for that reason that I support this motion, because there is a tendency, if the amendment is not carried, for the most important people of our churches - not the members of General Synod, not the bishops and archbishops, but the people who sit in the pews - to be overlooked and if their concerns are not taken into consideration where do we stand? These are checks and balances. The old saying “hasten slowly” is still very relevant in this day and age; you hasten slowly otherwise you go across the cliff face. I support the motion to amend.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): Point of order: motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: I think you could try me then.

Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich): Yet another speaker from Norwich! It is clear to me that things do need to change to make it easier or simpler to make changes in our staffing across all our dioceses. This is a time when there is a lot of change happening in our nation and we need that flexibility. It is not clear to me that making it possible to make these changes simply by a bishop's pastoral order is the only or right way to do that. I am getting the impression there are not sufficient checks or balances by merely having a bishop's pastoral order. Even though the present state of affairs is over-cumbersome, I would probably support this amendment unless someone can give me further reassurances about the voice of the little people in the process.

I have been part of many situations where bishops have consulted before making decisions and bishops, like all of us, are fallible. The Holy Spirit speaks through every layperson as well as through their bishop. Therefore I want to make sure that the lay people and the clergy of the individual parishes have a strong voice in the process.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): Point of order: motion for closure on this item.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Hutchinson. That has my permission, so I put the motion for closure on Item 508 to the Synod.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I put the amendment at Item 508 to the vote.

A Speaker: Point of order: can we have a count of the whole House?

The Chair: We need to see 25 people standing. There are 25 standing so we will have a count of the whole Synod.

The amendment was lost following a counted vote of the whole Synod. The voting was as follows:

<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>140</i>
<i>AGAINST</i>	<i>190</i>

11 abstentions were recorded.

The Chair: I invite Mr Clive Scowen to move his amendment to clause 7.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move:

'Clause 7, page 12, line 10, at the end *insert*—
“(aa) such persons, groups of persons or organisations as it appears to the bishop would be directly affected by the order, and”.'

As we have heard, clause 7 creates a wholly new animal, the bishop's pastoral order, giving bishops extensive powers to do things that currently can only be done by pastoral

schemes or order without going through the extensive consultation requirements and rights of appeal which attach to pastoral schemes and orders.

As originally drafted, the new sections inserted by clause 7 merely require the bishop to consult “such other persons, groups of persons or organisations as the bishop thinks fit”. The Revision Committee has helpfully inserted, as others have pointed out, a requirement to consult the mission and pastoral committee, although not, I notice, to obtain its consent. It otherwise leaves it entirely to the bishop’s discretion to decide who to consult.

My proposal on this amendment would require the bishop to consult “such persons, groups of persons or organisations as it appears to the bishop would be directly affected by the order”. The Revision Committee Report says at paragraph 65 that the general administrative law requires bishops to act reasonably and, of course, as we all know, bishops never do otherwise, and that failure to consult persons who clearly will be directly affected by a proposal would potentially be subject to challenge.

The argument is that my amendment is unnecessary because the general law already requires it. The problem is that when a statute like this Measure expressly requires consultation with some people, it can always be argued or thought that it is impliedly removing any requirement to consult anybody else. Surely it is better and simpler to set out on the face of the Measure a duty to consult any person or organisation who is directly affected so it is plain for all to see, all those bishops using the Measure, all those who are potentially affected by it. Everybody should know clearly from the legislation where they stand with regard to a right of consultation. It is much better to do that, I suggest, than rely on a general obligation to act reasonably.

If the general law does already require this then adding this requirement to the legislation could not be said to impose additional or undue burdens. My amendment can do no harm, I suggest, and it will help bishops have a clear guidance in legislation about who they are required to consult rather than having to scrape around for other areas of the general law to inform them about what they are required to do, particularly when it is as vague as an obligation to act reasonably.

Clause 7 gives bishops extensive new powers to avoid the, I acknowledge, often burdensome provisions that apply to pastoral schemes and orders. Surely the least we can do in removing that burden is to ensure that everybody who is going to be affected, whose legal rights may be affected by an order, gets an opportunity to have their say and to make known to the bishop what their view is. I cannot see that this is going to do anything to make anything more cumbersome or difficult: it will help, and I ask Synod to support it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Scowen. I invite the Bishop of Willesden to reply. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Bishop of Widmerpool? If you can lend me some Brylcreem, I will certainly oblige. I think what is going on here is quite an interesting proxy debate, which often happens in relation to this kind of legislation. It is about trust, whether our Church works well, a legal framework and whether it is fit for

purpose, about simplification and whether that goes too far. I hope that Synod has found the proxy debate has helped us in terms of thinking about what we trust bishops to do and is that “trust us” language helpful. It focuses very much on what Clive has moved in this particular amendment.

I want to say I think the 40-member procedure is very important for Synod because it gives us the chance to air issues that have been aired in Revision Committee but to which the majority of members of Synod have not been a party. Therefore I hope we will continue using the 40-member procedure as a way of ensuring we are clear about the direction of flow and what is going on.

In relation to this particular amendment, I think Clive is trying to be helpful. He and I work very closely together on our mission and pastoral committee in the diocese, so we do a lot of this stuff. But I do not think he is going to help us completely.

Let me give you a couple of examples as to why this would actually make it slightly complicated. If a parish came up with a proposal to do something, as he sets it down it is probably the case that you would have to consult the parish about the proposal they come up with because we have to consult those who would be affected by it. Similarly, it also trammels you a bit. If you have a proposal that affects a certain number of people in a locality and there are contiguous parishes you would like to talk to, under this procedure you have not got to talk to them. So the “thinks fit” combined with the general obligation laid on bishops to “act reasonably” does the job he is looking for and gives us a bit of flexibility as to who should be consulted.

On balance, I would like you to resist the amendment but to realise what we are talking about here is how we create in our Church a climate of trust and what we put into law to allow that to happen. In the end I am not going to die for this amendment if Clive wins the favour of Synod, but probably what he is proposing will make it more difficult and more constricted, and I would like the flexibility to consult all sorts of people, including the mission and pastoral committee. I would like you probably to resist the amendment on balance.

The Chair. I am taking “probably on balance” as the Steering Committee not supporting the amendment. Therefore, there need to be 40 members standing in their places to indicate that they wish debate on the amendment to continue. Are there 40 such members? There are not. There are not 40 members standing so the amendment lapses.

The Chair. We move now to Item 510.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

‘That clause 7 stand part of the Measure.’

The Chair. The debate on Item 510 is open. I see no one standing so I put Item 510 to the vote.

The motion:

'That clause 7 stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

Clauses 8-14

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 511.

The Bishop of Willesden (Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

'That clauses 8-14 stand part of the Measure.'

The Chair: Item 511 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 511 to the vote.

The motion:

'That clauses 8-14 stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

Schedule

The Chair: Bishop of Willesden, the same routine, Item 512, please.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move:

'That the Schedule stand part of the Measure.'

The Chair: Item 512 is open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 512 to the vote.

The motion:

'That the Schedule stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

Long Title

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 513.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I beg to move :

'That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.'

The Chair: Item 513 is open for debate. I see no one wishing to debate the Long Title. I therefore put Item 513 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Synod, that completes the revision stage of the draft Mission and Pastoral Etc (Amendment) Measure. The Measure now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting. That concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 11.21 am.

Legislative Business: Draft Legislative Reform Measure (GS 2027)

The Chair: Members of Synod, we now come to debate Item 501 on our agenda. You will need for this the draft Measure itself, GS 2027, and the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 2027X. Can I also draw your attention to the financial comment on this item at paragraphs 10-12 of the Sixth Notice Paper?

I now call upon the Bishop of Rochester, the Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 501. He has up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff): I beg to move:

‘That the Measure entitled “Legislative Reform Measure” be considered for revision in committee.’

I am the very new Chair of the Steering Committee having only really been appointed this week. In February this Synod agreed that there needed to be a more rapid and less complex means of amending or repealing some of the Church’s primary legislation. It did this in welcoming the proposals set out in GS 2018 entitled “A New Enabling Measure”. It then invited the Archbishops’ Council to introduce legislation to give effect to those proposals. The draft Legislative Reform Measure which you have before you has therefore been introduced by the Council. It seeks to do what the Synod asked for in February.

It may be helpful if I briefly remind members of the background to the proposals which Synod endorsed and then give a summary of how the draft Measure would implement them.

The legal framework within which the Church of England operates is complex, and our debate just ended perhaps illustrates that. In addition to common law, the Church of England remains subject to an astonishingly large volume of statute law, much of it

specific to the Church. Another aspect of the issue is that far more detail has been included on the face of primary legislation than may perhaps be necessary or desirable.

For example, the Diocesan Boards of Finance Measure 1925, which still is in place, contains detailed prescription about the proportion of a DBF's members who have to be elected, who have to be members of the diocesan synod and have to be laymen, while it says nothing at all about the directors, the people who actually do the work. Various Acts and Measures require notices, which almost no one actually reads, to be published in the *London Gazette* at some cost both of the Church's money and its officers' time. If a member of the clergy discovers that he or she has made an error in the baptismal register it can only be corrected within one month of the discovery of the error and it must be corrected in the presence of the parents or, if they are deceased, of the churchwardens. When a benefice becomes vacant the bishop is required to serve notice on his or her designated officer, the designated officer is then required to serve notice on the PCC secretary, the PCC secretary then has just four weeks in which to arrange one or more meetings of the PCC, and if there is to be a section 12 meeting it has to be at least two weeks but no more than six weeks after the debate on which it is requested. A Measure passed as recently as 1991 prescribes the purpose to which the proceeds of sale of any timber from a tree in a churchyard must be applied.

These are not just theoretical problems. This level of overprescription in Church legislation, and those are just a few examples, often imposes unreasonable burdens on the clergy and laity in the parishes who have to operate under it. In a fast-changing world we need - this was the purpose of the debate in February - without compromising our core values, to be adaptable and fleet of foot. That is much harder if the surrounding framework of law is burdensome and the processes for changing any of it are very elaborate.

As things stand, it requires a Measure to amend a Measure. The legislative process for Measures typically takes around two years, and can take considerably longer, and that is in addition to the time needed to develop policy proposals in the first place.

This draft Measure is specifically targeted at the removal or reduction of burdens resulting directly or indirectly from ecclesiastical legislation. The draft Measure enables burdens of this nature to be addressed by orders which can amend ecclesiastical legislation contained in an Act of Parliament or a Church Measure.

The draft Measure sets out the process. Before bringing forward a draft order, the Archbishops' Council would be required to consult extensively. The draft order would then be laid before the General Synod and automatically referred to a committee of the Synod. That committee would then consider and report on it to the Synod. The committee would also have the power to make amendments to the draft order. Following a report by the committee, the Synod itself would have three options: to approve the draft order, along with any amendments made by the committee; to reject the draft order; or to refer the draft order back to the committee, in which case the committee would consider it further and report back to the Synod again.

The draft order itself contains a number of important safeguards. First, before laying a draft order before the Synod, the Council will have to be satisfied that certain preconditions are met. These include a condition that the policy objective could not be satisfactorily secured by some non-legislative means. This condition should prevent legislative creep. The provisions of an order must not remove any necessary protections. They must not prevent anyone from continuing to exercise a right or freedom which he or she might reasonably expect to continue to exercise. An order must not contain provision which is of constitutional significance.

Although it is the Council who must in the first instance be satisfied that all the preconditions are met, it will be open to the committee to say whether they agree with the Council's view in their report to the Synod, and it will be open to the Synod to reject or refer back an order if it disagrees with the Council's views.

A further safeguard is the express exclusion of certain key statutes from the general scope of orders. These include the Measure which contains the constitution of the General Synod and the Measure which contains the statutory provisions relating to the worship and doctrine of the Church of England. Additionally, an order would not be possible on matters which would constitute Article 7 or Article 8 business.

In addition to approval by the Synod, orders will also have to be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Either House will have the opportunity to pass a resolution annulling the order. This recognises that orders will be changing the law of the land and that Parliament, therefore, should have a veto.

I believe that the draft Measure strikes the right balance between the need to achieve a greater degree of speed and flexibility in making certain types of changes to ecclesiastical legislation and ensuring that the legislative function of the General Synod, and indeed of Parliament, is safeguarded. However, it is recognised that members are likely to have their own views on how the various checks and balances contained in the draft Measure might be improved. I would therefore encourage Synod to support the Measure at this stage of First Consideration, thereby agreeing to its committal to a Revision Committee and, if they have ideas on how to improve it, to submit those ideas to the Clerk so that they can be carefully considered by the Revision Committee.

It is, of course, one thing to express a desire to do something, as Synod did in February; it is another thing to put it into effect. Hopefully this draft Measure provides the starting point for that and the revision process enables us then to do what revisions processes do well, namely to refine it and to get it as right as we possibly can.

The Chair. The matter is now open for debate.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Synod, I welcome the simplification process and I welcome this legislation and shall be voting for it. Bishop James's examples are clearly things that need to be addressed. However, I want to remind Synod that what the Measure calls "administrative inconvenience" and "obstacles to efficiency" are very much in the eyes of the beholder.

The Church of England has held to a long tradition of dispersed authority. This is neither convenient nor efficient in all circumstances, but it has been an important way of enabling a range of voices to be heard. I think, Synod, that the responsibility is ours not just in passing the Measure but, importantly, in the operation of it. Once it is in effect we will need to exercise care in using it so that our right and proper concerns for convenience and efficiency do not have the effect of silencing the voices of those that we need to hear.

I do support this Measure, I will vote for it, but I hope that we will continue to value the proper place of inconvenience and inefficiency when they help us to hear inconvenient and otherwise unheard voices. Thank you.

Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford): I am the current Deputy Chairman of the Legislative Committee. Madam Chairman, I have been a member of the Legislative Committee for 25 years and this particular Legislative Reform Measure was expected, as Bishop James introduced it so well, and of course he was a member of the Legislative Committee in the last Synod. I still nevertheless have some concerns. My major concern is where does the Ecclesiastical Committee fit in? Yes, clause 1 gives the power to remove or reduce burdens, okay; but, as has just been said by Dr Taylor, administrative inconveniences to some actually are a very good checking procedure to others and the checking procedure must continue. If we are in the situation where Synod itself is going to be left with this role, look at the number of members in the chamber now, and yet these are so important all Synod would have to be signed up to it. I am genuinely concerned about it.

Synod needs to have a view: a corporate view, a general view, an elected view. Yes, the Archbishops' Council will seek the view. We have been told, I believe, that they will do that, but I am not convinced yet how they will do it and I need reassurance. If it was to go across to the Ecclesiastical Committee (of which I was a member in a previous life and to which I give evidence in my current life) they are quite rightly going to need to know how we thought.

The exceptions under clause 3 are really important exceptions and one could argue that, having listed all those, is there any need for any other legislative reform through this particular Measure? Is it really necessary? They are looking at Assembly (Powers), Synodical Government Measures, Appointment of Bishops, Submission of the Clergy etc. The consultation, how will this really work? I do not believe we have been told the full story yet.

Synod's role under clause 5, laying proposals before General Synod, is really key but, Parliament, nevertheless, is supreme. Yes, we do make some legislation, we do debate on Measures, we do put it forward, but we do it in partnership with Parliament and I think that checking procedure has worked so well.

I am really concerned that the pre-consolidation amendments under clause 7 have far-reaching consequences. They make orders to amend Acts of Parliament, Measures and subordinate legislation relating to a particular area of ecclesiastical law. Then it goes on to say about having retrospective effect in certain circumstances. Retrospective law is not good law. I know very much that Conservative Governments have never passed legislation that has retrospective effect to it.

The role of the Scrutiny Committee (the Committee that will be looking carefully to see where these issues will be), can we be told how it will be made up, how they will be appointed, what levels of expertise? We have the Dean of Arches, all kinds of very helpful people advising us. Continuity, I am told it would be a Scrutiny Committee for the life of Synod. I believe. Continuity is good in one sense, but there must be opportunities to co-opt for particular issues of major concern.

Then also the terms of office. There still must, Madam Chairman, be a full checking procedure. On those 25 and a half years of being a member of the Legislative Committee I have seen the checking procedure work really well. The relationship with the Ecclesiastical Committee has never been better. I have to say they bent over backwards to help us with the Women Bishops' Measure where a special session of the Ecclesiastical Committee was called for. They accommodate us. They hold a special session. I am keen to know how individual members feel about this proposal.

In summary, I question the need as to really whether we are going to have a need for it at all. It is hardly ever going to be used in the first place. We have every year a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure which our legal team prepares for us and if there are sweep-up Measures, if there are problems, let us go with those. I urge caution, Madam Chairman.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): This may be slightly out of order but can I congratulate the Deputy Official Solicitor on her appointment as Counsel to the Speaker of the House? I support this legislation in its thrust but I think there are some things that do need to be thought through. The first of these is the reference to the Committee. When we looked at this in February there was some provision in the papers about how this Committee would be constituted. The Committee will serve an important role as one of the checks and balances. And I think it should be found in the Enabling Measure itself so that it cannot be altered through its own procedure and the Enabling Measure will be one of the listed exceptions. I also think that the Committee should be comprised of people, a majority of whom, or perhaps all of whom, who do not serve on another committee and specifically do not serve on the Archbishops' Council. You should not have someone both originating the ideas and then carrying them through without a separate and independent review.

The role of the Committee should include they confirm that it is a burden, as defined by the Measure; that they look at the nature of the administrative inconvenience; and they determine that the pre-conditions have, indeed, been met.

Finally, the role of General Synod. It is quite curious that we would go through and set up this new procedure. Our choice is, I am afraid, what I would call a Canadian biscuit choice. I once took a flight on Air Canada from Vancouver to Toronto and they said, "We have refreshments for you. We have biscuits. You can take them or you can leave them." And that is all the choice that we will get under this Measure. We can accept, reject or refer it back but, after all of this, we will not be able to amend it.

I can understand the reason for it, but I think some careful thought needs to be given as

to whether that is actually very sensible and, actually, will save time and be efficient rather than just yet another complication. There needs to be some kind of provision here which allows Synod to call in when the totality of what is being proposed causes some concern.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I made a maiden speech in February supporting the thrust of this proposed legislation. I still support it but I would like to express a number of concerns, the first of which relates to timing. This Measure is proposed on the basis that if we implement it we will be able to change legislation more quickly. I wonder in practice whether that is the case. We have been told that, usually, a Measure takes about two years to pass through the legislative process.

We have got here, first of all, the requirement for consultation with General Synod before any proposal is put forward. How is that consultation proposed to be carried out? Is it to be by email, by correspondence in advance of a session of Synod or will it have to wait for a session of Synod? That is clearly a matter that the Revision Committee needs to consider. Then, as the last speaker has just reminded us, if a proposal comes to Synod we can either accept it or vote it down. We cannot amend it. If we vote it down, then it goes back for reconsideration.

With our current regime of, in practice, apart from when we initiate a new Synod, only two sessions, one in February and one in July, it is going to be quite a protracted process, or can be, before we actually make any change under this new procedure. I would like just to make one or two other specific comments so that they can be considered by the Revision Committee if we pass the motion before us this morning. In clause 2(d) we read this, that the Archbishops' Council may include provision in an order under section 1 only if the Council considers "that the provision does not remove any necessary protection."

I did raise a point in my speech in February of what is meant by a necessary protection? What may be regarded as necessary by the person who it protects may be regarded as unnecessary by the person who is seeking to remove it. I think that is something, again, which the Revision Committee needs to look at. I did also ask in February if perhaps we could have some examples of what measures this new procedure would intend to bite on.

The Bishop of Rochester in his speech introducing the debate this morning has indicated one or two examples of what might be regarded as petty restrictions, but in his response in February Bishop Pete did say, "We will ask the lawyers to think about it. They were not sure where when we talked about it." He added, "I think we could come back with a list of the sorts of issues that might be dealt with [by this new procedure]."

I do not think we have seen that list and I would still like that to be provided so that we can see the prospective utility of this new process if we pass this legislation.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): I am, as other speakers are, in favour of the direction of this Measure and commend it to revision. I want to pick up on the provisions for consultation though. It is right that we have that wording in but there is an exclusion put in that if something has gone for consultation prior to section 4 coming into effect, then that prior consultation can have validity. We do not need to re-consult. Again, that is reasonable.

I am always concerned that consultation should be fresh. It should be near in time to when we are making decisions. I would encourage when this comes for revision that in section 4(4) that there is a time limit put on it of, say, one or two years, that the consultation should have happened within one or two years of that section coming into effect; and, similarly, that that clause should only be valid for a certain period of time.

As it stands, this Measure will not allow us to change the Measure by order, correct; but that sub-section 4 will remain in effect indefinitely and so it would be good to have some wording put in that after, say, two years of it coming into effect, that it could be automatically repealed without needing another Measure for us to tidy up the legislation.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Sorry to occupy Synod's time again but these things come back to back, do they not? I support this legislation because it will enable legislation which makes important but relatively uncontroversial provisions to be fast-tracked and I see no merit in taking a long time over legislation where it is not necessary. I recognise too that a lot has been done to build in safeguards against abuse of the procedure, but I do think there are four further matters which should be considered at the Revision Committee.

Firstly, there should be a requirement that the draft order itself states expressly how it fulfils the requirements of sections 1 and 2 rather than merely having that set out in the explanatory document. The explanatory document is a relatively ephemeral thing which Synod will see and it will then pass into history. The order itself will endure and that should be able to justify itself on its face.

Secondly, there should be a procedure whereby a proportion of members of General Synod can, at an early stage, before the order gets to the floor of the Synod require the full Measure procedure to be used. This was the point I made in an amendment in February and was told that it was premature because the legislation had not yet been drafted. Well, it has now been drafted, so I make the point again in the hope that, because it is now no longer premature, the Revision Committee will take note of it and act on it.

Thirdly, as Debrah Mclsaac said, there needs to be greater clarity about the membership of the Scrutiny Committee; whether it is to be one Committee for the lifetime of a quinquennium, or whether its membership might vary from order to order. In particular, we need to know that the Committee will be appointed primarily by Synod rather than by the Archbishops' Council or some other body. I recognise that the detailed provisions probably do need to be made by Standing Order rather than all set out on the face of the Measure.

In that context, I think it would be very helpful if the Revision Committee could perhaps, when this comes back at the revision stage, produce a draft illustrative Standing Order that we could see and see what was in view. I understand that the Standing Order cannot be made until the Measure has been passed, but we have in the past had illustrative codes of practice and other things brought to us so that we can see what is intended rather than buying a pig entirely concealed in a poke.

Fourthly, the Synod should have power to amend rather than merely saying yes, no or

sending it back. I think that would actually speed up the procedure. There are already a number of instances under our current legislation where the Archbishops' Council can bring orders to Synod for approval but Synod can amend them, and it is then for the Archbishops' Council to decide whether to make the order as amended, or decide not to proceed because it does not like the amendment or to bring a new proposal.

I think that is likely to be quicker than constantly batting it back and forth between Synod, the Scrutiny Committee and the Archbishops' Council, which could turn into quite a prolonged rally which perhaps could take longer than the current legislative procedure. Given that that works at the moment, I cannot see why it should not be done here. I would ask the Revision Committee, please, to give consideration to these four points.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): One of the great joys for me over the last two years has been to witness the growing understanding of and enthusiasm for the ambition which is contained within the Renewal and Reform agenda; an understanding that we are involved here in something which is quite radical, which is fitting a Church not just to do the things that it has done so well, but to equip it to do it more and in different ways, spreading across the community, restoring the risen Christ - as you will always hear me say it - to the centre of this country, its conscience and its culture.

What started off with only one or two work-streams now has nine and, even as we speak, we look at other things with which we need to be engaged. When the former Secretary General was retiring, William Fittall, or as he is now known, William I, William I said: "The most single thing that we could do to free up this Church to enhance its mission would be this enabling legislation", which we see now as the Legislative Reform Measure.

I can tell you, as one who spends quite a bit of time in Church House - I am no Church House groupie, however - it is interesting to witness the degree to which our senior officers are so often distracted on matters of administrative and legislative detail, distracting them from the ability to take forward the major pieces of work.

We need to be radical. I would say to Synod there are three points by which you will judge and ask the Revision Committee to form its views. Firstly, is this radical enough? Actually, there are, as has been pointed out here, many safeguards in this which could delay the process which we are trying to speed up. I thought Clive Scowen's points were particularly relevant in this regard.

Secondly, are the safeguards sufficient? Peter Bruinvels, my dear friend, told me ten minutes before he stood up that he was going to speak in favour of the Measure. If that is you speaking for, Peter, I would hate to hear you speaking against, mate. It has been altogether a quite strange 24 hours. I am still trying to recover from the revelation that the Archbishop of Canterbury does not like Brussels sprouts or garlic. I always thought there was something strange about him. Anyway, you do need the safeguards.

Thirdly, of course for me, ensuring the relevance and timeliness of all this piece. I will tonight have to present a budget which has levels of expenditure in it that I know contain much of the administrative work. I would much rather see that resource being directed

more directly to the abilities of this organisation, this wonderful group of parishes and to dioceses into the centre of the Church and forge ahead of its work. I am delighted that every speaker so far has - I think, Peter - spoken in favour of going to Revision Committee. I commend it to you. Safeguarding; relevance; radicalism.

The Chair. Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Madam Chairman, a motion for closure on Item 501.

The Chair: I see no one standing. Ah, I beg your pardon. I will take one more speech and then I would be grateful for that motion for closure, please.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): In February I made some comments about the understandability of proposed Measures, especially when we are talking about amending legislation. Again, we have had a comment this morning earlier about how difficult it can be to unpick the meaning of amending legislation. This Measure, among other things, is going to be generating amending legislation once this Measure is in place.

I would request that the Revision Committee consider as part of Standing Orders or codes of conduct which would be used in connection with this, that when in future amending legislation is presented for consideration we do present it in something which is like a Keeling schedule, even if not exactly as a Keeling schedule, so that members can clearly see what is being changed and in the context of the existing legislation can evaluate the impacts of it. It strikes me that this Measure is actually a good point for embedding in our way of practice the ability to be able to see the old and the new without confusion.

The Chair. I think I now do see no one standing and so I invite the Bishop of Rochester to reply. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff): I am very grateful to those members who have contributed to the debate. To John Spence for setting this within the big picture of the Renewal and Reform agenda and his customary challenges to us to keep those things in mind and to be radical and to be relevant. A number of those who have contributed were, in effect, making their submissions to the Revision Committee and I would encourage them to do so in writing, though, of course, the record of this debate will be available to the Revision Committee.

If I may just comment on one or two of those things. Those who spoke in that way were Debrah Mclsaac, David Lamming, Nigel Bacon, Clive Scowen and Mike Stallybrass. Some of the things you mentioned clearly will be important for the Revision Committee to consider and things like the power of Synod to amend what is in the draft Measure at the moment, that is the obvious place for that discussion to take place. How consultation might take place, whether that might be electronic and, therefore, relatively speedy, again that is a kind of assumption which is around but maybe we need to be more specific about that.

The question that was raised about the Scrutiny Committee, as it is being called, and its make-up and so forth, yes, that would be a matter for Standing Orders. Just to give

assurance that conversations will take place with the Standing Orders Committee and the idea of bringing forward some draft Standing Orders so that they can be seen alongside the further consideration of this Measure would clearly be a very sensible way of approaching that.

How that Committee is made up, whether indeed it has got the same membership the whole way through or whether it can change for each order depending upon the subject matter, those are the kinds of things which could be discussed as we go through the revision process and in partnership with the Standing Orders Committee.

Just touching on Peter Bruinvels's point about the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament: there have been some informal conversations with the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament and, clearly, there is a following wind from that direction but further discussions will need to take place. Canon Taylor encouraged Synod as a whole to take care in using such orders when we have the power to consider them.

That, obviously, is important and for Synod through this process to be aware of its own role within this, because the Synod is an important part of the picture. It is a not a bypassing of Synod in any sense this, but it is enabling Synod itself to do something which will enable us to respond to our aspirations as they are before us. However well we do this - and I hope the Revision Committee will do so, assuming you do submit this to a Revision Committee - I think I can also assure Canon Taylor that there will continue to be elements of inconvenience around.

I am sure we will not manage to abolish every example of inefficiency because we are human and these things will continue, but this is a sincere effort to go some way down that path with the appropriate safeguards and provisions which have been laid out in the draft legislation. I formally move the motion which stands in my name, that this be submitted to Revision Committee.

The Chair: We now come to vote on Item 501.

The motion:

'That the Measure entitled "Legislative Reform Measure" be considered for revision in committee.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. The Measure now stands committed to a Revision Committee. Any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment must send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod, to reach her not later than Friday 12 August 2016. That completes this item of business and we now move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 11.58 am.

Legislative Business: Draft Inspection of Churches Measure (GS 2028)

The Chair. Good morning everyone. It is still morning just. We come to the next item of legislation, Item 502 on the Agenda, which is the Draft Inspection of Churches Measure. This is for First Consideration. Members will need GS 2028 and the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 2028X. I would also like draw your attention at this point to the Financial Statement relating to this item which can be found at paragraphs 13 to 14 of the Financial Memorandum that is set out on the Sixth Notice Paper, and it is green.

I would like to say at this point, having just come from an ecumenical gathering and being aware of how members address each other at their Synods, it is my preference when I call you to use your Christian name and surname. Thank you. I call Timothy Briden, who is the Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 502. He has up to ten minutes.

Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio): I beg to move:

‘That the Measure entitled “Inspection of Churches Measure” be considered for revision in committee.’

Today Church buildings are probably in a better state of basic repair than they have been for many centuries. If so, this is largely the result of the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955, which established the system of quinquennial inspections by a qualified professional, either an architect or a surveyor. The reports produced on these inspections have enabled parishes to embark upon planned programmes of maintenance or repair, with resultant savings in time, expense and effort. Recent further streamlining has been achieved by the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015, whereby a faculty is no longer required for works of routine maintenance identified as such in a quinquennial inspection report. While the basic objective of the 1955 Measure remains sound, 60 years have passed since its enactment and some of its procedural aspects are now deficient. There are three matters of particular concern.

First, the requirement for each diocesan synod to produce its own scheme for the administration of the system has led to a duplication of effort and unnecessary inconsistencies.

Secondly, diocesan schemes struggle to match the modern tendering requirements of grant-making bodies. Thus we now have the absurdity that tendering for architectural and surveying services in connection with grant-aided projects is obligatory despite the fact that the inspecting architectural surveyor is the person best qualified to oversee the work.

Thirdly, since 1955 there have been major advances in conservation practice, in particular the introduction of specialist accreditation schemes for the professionals. It has become anachronistic for dioceses to set their own benchmarks which result in an architect or surveyor being approved in one diocese but excluded in the next.

These, amongst other shortcomings, demonstrate that the time has come for arrangements to be made at the national level. The plan is for the Cathedral and Church Buildings Division to formulate a single, overarching scheme capable of periodic adjustment. This will be done after consultation with dioceses, diocesan advisory committees, the professional bodies of architects and surveyors, together with the major providers of grant aid. The vehicle for reform is to be a set of regulations made by the Archbishops' Council subject to the approval of this Synod. A new Measure replacing the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 is therefore required so as to enable the Regulations to be made.

Turning to the draft Measure itself, clause 1(1) and clause 2 identify the buildings to which the Regulations will apply. Included are parish churches, buildings brought into the faculty jurisdiction by the Care of Places of Worship Measure 1999 - the Chapel of Lambeth Palace has not been forgotten in this context - other consecrated or licensed places of worship, with certain exceptions which are already present in the 1955 Measure, including the greatest exception of them all: Christ Church, Oxford.

Clause 1(2) sets out the matters to be covered by the Regulations and broadly reflects what already appears in the 1955 Measure. The Regulations will detail when, by whom and at whose expense the inspections are to be carried out as well as specifying the content of inspection reports and the persons who are to receive them.

Clause 1(4) again repeats the existing Measure by extending the scope of the Regulations to Church treasures and ruins and trees in churchyards. The balance of clause 1 deals with the mechanism for making the Regulations, clause 1(7) requiring them to be laid before General Synod for approval. It is not a biscuit choice this time round because General Synod will have power to amend as well as to reject the draft Regulations.

When framed, however - and unfortunately - the Regulations are likely to be technical and complex. Clause 3 therefore requires the Church Buildings Council to publish guidance about the exercise of functions under the Regulations. In practice, it is the guidance which will be the primary resource for all those involved in the inspection regime. Clauses 4 and 5 deal with repeals, commencement and other ancillary matters.

In relieving diocesan synods of the burden of oversight, and in addressing perceived anomalies, this draft Measure takes its place in the wider simplification project to which the Church is committed. I hope that Synod will support this legislation as the appropriate way to carry forward the task of caring for our Church buildings in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

The Chair: The matter is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): I want to suggest to Synod that there are two things that we should do only if presented by an extremely strong case. The first is to transfer functions from dioceses to the centre because that instinctively runs contrary to

subsidiarity. The second is to introduce Regulations where we do not currently have them, which runs contrary to simplification. What we are looking at in this item is something that will do both.

The current system, as has been said, is that dioceses have a scheme, full stop. It is as if 60 years ago our predecessors were already aware of the need for simplification and subsidiarity, and they produced something enabling and moderate. Why are we being pressed to reverse that and embark on actions where I believe there should be a strong presumption against change? I read the document, which gave me very little information as to what the case was for this, and I listened carefully to the initial speaker, but I do not see that we need to make such a major change in this area to address the concerns that underlie what is being brought before us.

We will have Regulations. I am sure we will be told that the Regulations will have a "light touch". I do not usually reckon to indulge in prophesy - I was a diocesan secretary after all - but I prophesy that the Regulations and the guidance together will give us at least another 20 pages of material impacting on our care of churches, and whoever it is who is going to have the responsibility of doing this.

We already have an example on the face of the Measure. Could I draw your attention to the Explanatory Memorandum, paragraph 9, where it says that if the person responsible for doing these inspections - whoever that is going to be - does not do it, the archdeacon can arrange it and send them the bill. Churchwardens? PCCs? I think I will bring forward an amendment if we do go forward with this suggestion that it should be the bishop who has to ensure this is all carried out and then the bishop and archdeacon can argue about the funding.

I believe that what we could do with here to enable us to address the concern is a Measure lasting precisely two lines, simply to say that the Archbishops' Council may issue guidance on the carrying out by dioceses of their functions under this Measure. That is all that we need. We do not need the panoply of regulation, accompanied by guidance. We do not need the transfer of the powers of overseeing this from dioceses to the centre. What we need, it seems to me, is that type of Measure, and, on reflection, they can do that anyway. We do not need legislation. Instead of spending two or three years on the wearisome process of taking this Measure through and writing detailed Regulations, we could use the time to write the guidance, to do it now, and I believe that will enable us to address the kind of concerns that clearly underlie what is being brought to us without us engaging in something which runs clean contrary, in my view, to most of what we are trying to achieve in this Synod under subsidiarity and simplification. We do not need this legislation and I urge the Synod not to go there.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Rt Worshipful Charles George (ex officio): Members of Synod, I had not appreciated that this Measure might be controversial. Personally I would lend support to two basic principles: first dealing with this matter at a national level with a single set of principles to be applied; and, secondly, the binary approach of having a Measure and Regulations, which comply entirely with the ideas behind the simplification proposals. It is so much

easier and speedier to amend Regulations from time to time if that is needed rather than to bring forth further legislation. I would ask you to pause and consider whether this really is, has been suggested, contrary to what we are trying to do more generally, or whether it is, as I see it, part of the simplification process.

There are simply two small matters to which I would draw attention. The first is in clause 1(4), the reference to “ruins or trees in the churchyard”. If we are concerned with simplification, I would respectfully suggest that it is enough if the inspection is confined to the churches and there is not provision made, as there is in the 1955 Measure, for ruins or trees in a churchyard. I would suggest that that is probably unnecessary and inappropriate.

The other matter I would raise is clause 5(6) which excludes the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. The only justification we are given for that is in paragraph 19 of the Explanatory Memorandum: they were not included in the 1955 Measure. Nowadays normally Synod deals with the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man as in clause 9(4) of the Legislative Reform Measure, which has just received approval of Synod, and I would suggest that was a more appropriate course, rather than a straightforward exclusion.

Lastly I note that the Church Buildings Council is to have the power to issue guidance. I welcome that and I take the opportunity to pay a particular tribute to Janet Gough, who has very recently resigned as Director of that Council after a most distinguished period of service. I feel sure that the guidance issued by that Council, with the benefit of the expert staff of that Council, will be as good as it has been in the past. I support this proposal.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): I would ask Synod to resist this. If our churches are in better shape than they have been for decades, perhaps that is because local responsibility is there and has been taken and discharged. I know however that the Church Buildings Council could be of great assistance in helping parishes in making applications for grants. It is not an expertise that is necessarily held locally and if they could provide some assistance, that would be terrific.

There are reasons why architects might well be approved in one diocese but not in the next. Some want to practise only locally. There is also some danger in setting up a central register for architects. As a group of churches we have ten buildings in six parishes and, for various reasons, we had to look at reappointment or appointment in each of those churches. They are very different and they needed different architects. We had some difficulties. There just are not that many people around who want to do this job. I am concerned that if there is some sort of necessity to register nationally that will deter them even further.

Something very important to keep in mind is that Church buildings support local mission and they go hand-in-hand. That means that the regulation and supervision of them should be local. When you talk to an archdeacon he knows the buildings, he knows what needs doing and how much it is going to cost. It has worked for the last 60 year; I think it will continue to work.

Ven Dr Tim Stratford (Leicester): I want to support this Measure, but it does feel a little

bit like choosing a sandwich without quite knowing what the filling is at present. Just reflecting a little bit on Brussels sprouts and garlic: if we landed up with such a sandwich I wonder how many people would choose it. The Measure gives us the framework in which Regulations and guidance can have some substance. I want to encourage Synod to see these Regulations and guidance as a real opportunity. As an archdeacon I find myself in a constant tension between the pressure for conservation of our buildings and the local missional intent of congregations. We are caught in quite a complex web of statutory planning guidance and policies. For us to have our own Regulations and guidance which take full account of the missional needs of the Church is absolutely vital. We have it to some extent in relation to faculties. This is also an important part of the jigsaw.

Synod, I want to encourage you to accept the framework that this Measure offers and then to take seriously the Regulations that will be coming before us in due course, and to look at them with a missional eye as a real opportunity for us to get the framework in the right shape for churches and for our missional aspirations.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I want to make a very simple point - I think it is simple - about the title of the Measure. In his introduction the Vicar-General made it very clear that this was about Church buildings, so can we please change the title to "Inspection of Church Buildings Measure" and have in clause 2, the definition clause, the meaning of "Church building". Churches, as I understand it, are groups of Christians working together in mission and following Jesus, and some of them meet in buildings.

Dr Andrew Bell (Oxford): For my maiden speech I am going to pretty well repeat what the previous speaker said. In this context we are not inspecting the body of Christ, the people who meet in these buildings, so I was going to suggest exactly the same in the title and the relevant places within the body, that we talk about "Church buildings" not "churches". Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you for your maiden speech.

Revd Peter Kay (St Albans): I am also a member of the Church Buildings Council. The people of the Church Buildings Council who have been working on this would fully understand that this is something of a sandwich without much of a filling at the moment. The filling though is to be decided by revision and consultation. In some ways what we are voting for today is a general principle of simplification and the question is whether we support simplification or not. At the moment there are 42 different quinquennial schemes. Each diocese has its own. That is not by any means a simple process. Turning those 42 different schemes into one national scheme, which is likely to include flexibility, seems to me to be a much simpler way of doing things, particularly in an age where there are such things as information systems and so on that need to be simplified as well. That is not to say that we are putting the cart before the horse but, to move in this general direction, we have to support the principle of simplification, and moving from 42 different schemes to one national scheme seems to me a good way of doing that.

Revd Eleanor Robertshaw (Sheffield): As a parish priest with five churches, four of which are listed, one being Grade I, I plead with Synod, please, to have these national

guidelines. For these past few years buildings have been the bane of my life. I am surprised I have any hair left. The DAC have been brilliant in helping our understanding but we need more guidance because I am not called to be a builder, I am not called to be an architect, but, frankly, that is what I feel like at the moment.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I want to make two comments. I am slightly cautious of this Measure. My instinct is very much with the earlier speaker who talked about the principle that things should be done at diocesan level unless they really have to be done nationally, and I have not yet heard much that convinces me of the necessity of this Measure and that it will significantly improve something that is not working. In fact, the Vicar-General made the point that this is one of the most outstandingly successful bits of legislation that we have. Therefore my first point is I have not yet heard something that convinces me that if it is not broke it needs mending.

It also seems to me that although there may be problems with inconsistency viewed from a national perspective, there is nothing particularly wrong with inconsistency between different areas of the country. The problems of Church buildings in some areas are going to be very different from the problems in others. We need a very good reason for setting a series of national guidelines rather than relying on dioceses to use their sense and their knowledge in the local area. I am not against it; I am just cautious. I would like to hear a little more justification for the need for this before the Synod commits itself to the principles that are enshrined in this First Consideration.

Secondly, we can get carried away with the Brussels sprouts and garlic point. I am just allergic to garlic; it is not my fault. Brussels sprouts was more of a metaphor and there is a grave danger in any system of hermeneutical philosophy of turning metaphors into literal statements. Also, I will get into trouble at home if I criticise the Brussels sprouts!

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I agree with Justin. I do wonder whether it is the right moment for this. If we are going with the food metaphors, it is a sandwich and you have the two bits of bread but no understanding of what is going in the filling, or if you are being asked to buy a pig in a poke, we have not seen the shape of the pig yet, we just have the poke. I slightly wonder if we should be pausing. I have not heard any archdeacons on their feet saying they want this. Perhaps there were but I did not hear them.

In terms of the amount of legislation that is going through Synod we need to be quite considered about whether this is the right time for this. I would be saying can we not come back with something that is more worked out so we can see what it is we are giving a voice to? Do we need the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure in the future? How does this relate to that? There is a whole series of things that hang on the Regulations for Church buildings which ought to be pulled together. Is this the right timing? Do we need to take synodical time on this at this moment or would it be better to say to the Church Buildings Council and others, "Please go away and give us a fully formed understanding after you have consulted about what kind of framework will help us". I am inclined to say that diocesan autonomy on these matters is preferable to national guidance. I do not think you can pray simplification in aid of this. It really is not

simplification. It feels a bit more like a kind of nationalisation. Heaven knows, it has even got a clause 4 in it.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): In view of the speeches of Justin and Pete, I wonder if I could test a motion for the adjournment of Item 502 until such time as the Business Committee would like to bring it back.

The Chair: As we have moved to the procedural motion that the debate now be adjourned under Standing Order 34, Simon has up to two minutes to give his reasons. I will then ask Tim Briden, as the mover of the main motion, to speak for not more than two minutes. When I have heard these two speakers I will decide, as is my discretion under Standing Order 34, whether to allow anybody else to speak on this procedural motion.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): The Vicar-General will have heard the speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Willesden, so my speech is I agree with them.

Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio): Thank you very much for that intervention. Plainly, the observations which have come from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Willesden will, I know, carry weight with the Synod. I ought to say, however, in answer to the point that this might not be the right time, there is also going through the process a consolidation Measure, the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure, and it was hoped that the proposed Measure would be passed and slotted into this consolidation. It may be that if the matter is now adjourned, as proposed, that the resultant wider exercise will be to an extent postponed. I hope it will not be derailed. I think perhaps Synod ought to be aware of the broader picture as well as the concerns that have been raised in recent speeches. Thank you.

The Chair: I see no one else standing. We are now going to take this to the vote. Please be aware that the effect of passing the motion will be that the debate may not be resumed, except at the direction of the Business Committee.

The motion:

‘That the debate be now adjourned.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That concludes this item of business. We will move now to the next item on the agenda, Item 503.

THE CHAIR *Ven Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 11.34 am.

Legislative Business: Draft Amending Canon No. 36 (GS 2029)

The Chair. Members of Synod, we come now to Item 503. Before I tell you what documents you will need, I thought it might be helpful if I told you a bit about the plan. As you can see, we have got about 25 minutes until lunchtime. A few people have put request to speak forms in. There is space after lunch to resume debate. Depending on how we have got on in the debate we can simply come back after lunch and complete business. There was a lot of deemed legal business on the agenda and no one has called that in, so we do not have to consider that. This is the last of the legislative business. If time opens up on the agenda we will possibly be able to come back to the leadership debate later this afternoon.

For this debate you will need the draft Amending Canon GS 2029 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 2029X. I now call upon the Bishop of St Albans, the Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 503. He has up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith): I beg to move:

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 36” be considered for revision in committee.’

In the last quinquennium Synod passed two resolutions calling for amendments to the Canons to be brought forward. Both were the result of Private Member’s Motions.

The first of those resolutions concerned Canon B 8, which prescribes the forms of vesture to be worn during services. The Synod asked for the Canon to be amended so that the forms of vesture it prescribes should become optional rather than mandatory. Because the dissolution of the Synod had intervened, and a large number of new members were elected, the House of Bishops decided to carry out a consultation of all members of the current Synod earlier this year. Seventy-eight members responded to the consultation and, of those, 59 were in favour of amending the Canon in the way proposed by the Synod’s earlier resolution. The House of Bishops considered that the proposal should be proceeded with and asked the Business Committee to introduce the necessary Amending Canon.

Paragraph 1 of the Amending Canon gives effect to the Synod’s resolution. The main amendments are considered in sub-paragraphs 3 and 4. In the case of Holy Communion, the minister will not have to wear a surplice or alb with scarf or stole if he or she considers, after consultation with the PCC, that adopting some other form of dress would benefit the mission of the Church.

In the case of Morning and Evening Prayer on Sundays the amendment is slightly different. This is because the Canon as it stands already provides some flexibility in terms of what may be worn. Currently, the minister must “normally” wear a surplice or alb with a scarf or stole at Morning and Evening Prayer on Sundays. This means that he or she already has scope for not doing so on weekdays and occasionally on Sundays.

The amendment will mean that the minister will routinely be able to adopt some form of dress at Morning or Evening Prayer on Sundays. Again, the test for doing so will be that the minister considers, after consultation with the PCC, that doing so would benefit the mission of the Church in the parish.

The amendments also deal with the occasional offices. The minister may adopt a form of dress other than one of the traditional forms of vesture if that has been agreed with the person concerned. That would involve a discussion with the parents, or the candidate in the case of a baptism, with the couple in the case of a wedding, and with the family in the case of a funeral.

The Amending Canon inserts a new paragraph 6 into Canon B 8 to ensure that where traditional forms of vesture are dispensed with, the form of dress adopted by the minister must nevertheless be suitable for a minister of the Church of England officiating at divine service.

The remaining provisions in paragraph 1 tidy up Canon B 8 so that the whole Canon will work properly following the making of the main amendments.

We now turn to paragraph 2 of the Amending Canon, which gives effect to the second of the resolutions passed during the last quinquennium. That resolution called for Canon B 38 to be amended so that the Church of England's ordinary burial service could be used in the case of a person who had committed suicide whilst of sound mind.

It might be helpful for us to recap briefly on the current position. As things stand, the minister with the cure of souls is under a duty to officiate at the burial of any of his or her deceased parishioners if the family requests the minister to do so. That includes parishioners who have committed suicide whilst of sound mind. It also includes parishioners who have not been baptised. The only difference in those two cases is concerned with the form of service that is to be used. Rather than simply using the normal burial service from the Book of Common Prayer or from Common Worship, Canon B 38 requires the minister to use a form of service which has been authorized or approved by the bishop.

In the very sensitive case of suicide, the minister cannot normally make assumptions about the deceased's state of mind at the time when he or she tragically took their own life. In many cases, the coroner's verdict, which will not usually be known by the time the funeral takes place, will be that the deceased took their own life while the balance of their mind was disturbed, not a verdict of suicide.

The advice of the Faith and Order Commission was the form of funeral service used should not amount to a judgment about the moral condition of the deceased. On that basis, they were content with the proposed change to the Canon so far as cases of suicide were concerned.

Turning to the question of baptism, as a matter of practice the clergy do not routinely ask the family of the deceased whether they were baptized. The result is they simply use the

usual forms of the funeral service without recourse to the bishop. Paragraph 2 of the Amending Canon therefore amends Canon B 38 so that there will no longer be a general exception from using the normal burial service for those who take their own life whilst of sound mind or who die unbaptized. The form of service in the Prayer Book or Common Worship could then be used in the ordinary way.

One additional provision made by paragraph 2 is a conscience clause for individual clergy. There may be cases, probably a very small number, where a minister would have a conscientious objection to using the usual form of service in the two special cases which Canon B 38 currently addresses. This could arise, for example, where it is known that the deceased was avowedly not a Christian or where he or she died as a result of assisted suicide. If the minister does have a conscientious objection, he or she will have to notify the bishop and use an alternative form of service which has been approved by the bishop.

Finally, the opportunity has been taken to remove the obsolete exception for those who die having been declared excommunicant. The legal machinery for making such declarations disappeared in 1964, so that particular amendment is long overdue.

The Chair. It is ironic that we should be considering seemly clergy vesture in York.

Revd Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn): Thank you for inviting me to address Synod on this item in what is my maiden speech. I speak in favour of this draft Amending Canon No. 36. I am keen to see it progress to the Revision Committee. I particularly support the progression of the item on clerical attire because I have personal reason for doing so.

Prior to 2003, when I became vicar of my current parish in Blackburn diocese, I served a curacy in Chelmsford diocese, and after that served as rector of the Falkland Islands. In both of those places I wore normal clerical robes, which seemed the right thing to do in those contexts.

I have been vicar of St John's Leyland for over 13 years now. When I arrived there in 2003 I discovered there a history and tradition of not wearing robes. My predecessor's predecessor stopped wearing robes some time in the 1980s. If I were to revert in my situation to wearing robes again it would remove something of the informal and family nature of our services, which in part has led to the growth of our church in recent years.

I am a compliant individual; I like to obey the law and want to obey the law. For me, and I think for a significant number of people like me, we would be delighted to lead services in the knowledge that we are fully compliant with Church Canon Law. That is the key reason that I would like to see this progress to the Revision Committee. Not wearing clerical attire in our particular demographic in a parish that ministers to a large council estate I believe does help the mission of our church in our context.

Just a couple of observations. First, I note that before any change is made to clergy attire for Sunday mornings PCCs must be consulted. It does not say they have to agree, although that may be implied. I think it would be important that if changes to clergy attire happen that it should be by the agreement of the PCC.

An observation about the term “seemly attire”. I have attended many Church services run by those who do not wear clerical robes and I have not seen anything yet which is unseemly, not a mankini in sight. However, it may be worth noting that what is seemly in one case may not be in another. For example, in the heart of our council estate we have a pioneer minister who dresses in a way which may not be seemly in a middle class suburban church, may not be seemly in our church, but which I think is quite seemly where he is. I would like to ask the question who decides what is “seemly”. Is it the minister? Is it the context? Is it the congregation or is it the bishop?

On that basis, may I support the progression of this item to the Revision Committee.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam): This discussion happens in the overall context of the Legislative Reform Measure to remove or reduce burdens of ecclesiastical legislation. Canon B 8 is not one of them. I have asked twice in public contexts whether anybody can remember a complaint being made about clergy vesture in relation to Canon B 8. So far nobody can. Why are we doing this? I feel like the Archbishop in the previous debate, that I have not heard much about the necessity for this Measure.

I am grateful to the previous speaker for drawing attention to the ambiguity in the proposed Measure of consulting the PCC and what is “seemly” dress. I can imagine a good deal of debate and dispute about that, and I do not much relish it. As a parish priest, I must have done several hundred funerals and weddings. I cannot think of one conversation in preparation for a funeral, or for that matter a wedding, where it would have been appropriate to have a conversation about what the minister might wear.

Lastly, if we are of a mind that we want to consider these two matters I would ask the Chair that we take two votes on this item which separates the Measures. When we get to lunch I am all in favour of Brussels sprouts and garlic, but they are optional.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): I am slightly terrified of being in a sandwich between the Bishop of Salisbury, with whom I have disagreed on occasion in public, and Rowan Williams, with whom I have disagreed occasionally in private about the nature of my clerical garb.

I think Synod should congratulate itself that this particular bit of simplification arises from a Private Member’s Motion from the last quinquennium and, indeed, goes back 28 years to a discussion put forward by the Revd Peter Hobson, who is here this weekend in a different capacity, to try and get this issue dealt with so that those like Alistair, who break the law, are no longer breaking the law.

There are two things I would like the Revision Committee to take seriously. One is a concern that has been expressed in this context that in relaxing the rules on clergy vesture we are somehow doing something very foolish in terms of safeguarding. The fact that somebody is leading worship or sitting up in the sanctuary in a parish church does not guarantee that that person is a “safe” person, if I may use that shorthand. Nothing can

guarantee that a person leading worship is a safe person. What we can do is not fret about whether they are robed or not, but fret about whether they have been recruited safely for the tasks they are called to do, and by that I mean DBS, references, whether they are known in the community and whether they have proper authorization. The safeguarding issue is that we must prevent those who are “not safe”, to use the shorthand, to be “upfront”, whether they are robed or not.

A detailed point for the Revision Committee is largely to do with detail. First of all, the Canon as currently expressed was drawn up before Readers were invented, and I think we need to be clear about whether this applies to Readers as well as clergy. We do not want trouble in a parish where an obstreperous Reader disagrees with the incumbent and you have some public dispute about the policy.

The second thing that concerns me, and I hope the Revision Committee will deal with, is that there is no reference to the bishop in the Canon as it stands about clergy vesture. I think it is weak that we only consult the PCC, I think we need agreement. In original discussions when Christopher Hobbs was putting this through in the last quinquennium, the idea was that the bishop would have to, as it were, rubberstamp the decision so that there could not be any aggro in the parish about a decision that had been taken because the PCC and the incumbent and the bishop were content that this policy should be adopted in a particular parish or church within a parish.

Last, the question of “seemly” is highly entertaining - the whole mankini thing is very entertaining - but we may get into trouble unless there is some way of thinking about what “seemly” actually means. It may be a helpful word, but in terms of legislation it might not be the right word. I hope the Revision Committee will take through the Canon B 8 part of this and we will deal with the 28-year old discussion for the benefit of those parishes that worship in that way and who do not wish to be breaking the law. Thank you.

Revd Dr Rowan Williams (York): I now have to disagree with Preb Lynas in public, seemly dressed for my own context among my own people because I am the chaplain to this university and they need to know that I am still here and still functioning as I do in term time.

My main point is also about safeguarding. Of course, we cannot guarantee that what you wear makes you safe. We cannot guarantee that anything makes you safe. Having been part of the Revision Committee which drew up legislation last year saying we can remove the right to vest for divine service from people who have been found guilty or investigated under safeguarding concerns, we would be taking away the force and sense of that legislation, or potentially doing so.

The other question that I have relates to that, and it is about the mission effect, particularly among the young people to whom I minister. Rather to my surprise, when I discussed this with them, they saw religious dress as a visual clue to authority. They said, “When we leave home to come to university or start a new job we are vulnerable”. Going to church in a new place makes them feel vulnerable. They are not sure who to talk to, who to trust, who will welcome them. Going into a church, identifying who is in charge is not necessarily the same as who is safe, but if there is somebody up the front wearing funny

clothes that is a reasonably good indication that the Church has found them an okay place and a locus of authority.

It is on those grounds that I want us to be very careful about how we word our concerns about vesture and safeguarding and to make sure that is an explicit part of the legislation as we go forward.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): I have two problems with this amendment to the Canon. The first one is the one I specified when I asked to speak. I am not very enthusiastic about changing the requirements on vesture, but I realise that in many churches this is completely disregarded and if it is disregarded it brings that bit of the Canon into disrepute.

I would feel much happier about it if where we refer to “seemly” dress there was some sort of specific form of what is a minimal standard of seemly dress. I say this for a pastoral reason which echoes what the speaker before said. If you go to a church and you have got all sorts of people dressed very casually and you have not got a clue who the vicar is it can be very embarrassing. I have had occasions in other contexts where not knowing who somebody was and saying something totally inappropriate to them caused me a problem. In church I want to know that the person taking a service has the authority to do that. I think there is a minimum standard of dress which shows you have that authority. I have heard about a mankini. I have never seen one. I have to say I have no wish to see one. Although it might be quite exciting, I suspect it is not seemly.

When the Revision Committee looks at this can we have a minimum standard of dress which says, “I’m a clergyperson”? I think there is a very good pastoral reason for that. It might just be wearing a clerical collar or some other badge of office. If I was in a hospital and lying in bed awaiting an injection I would want to know the person administering it was a nurse and not the ward orderly, and I think the uniform might be a clue. Often a badge of office is very helpful. It has pastoral significance not just within church but I know from clergy walking around the streets, out in the shopping areas, sometimes it is very useful to know there is a clergyperson to talk to. Can we ask that the Revision Committee says something about what constitutes “seemly”?

The other problem I have with this is that there are two very distinct elements to this, one of which I feel much more enthusiastic about than the other, and that is the permission to have the full form of burial for somebody who has committed suicide. I think it is a shame if we have to vote on both as one instead of voting on them separately.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I am wholeheartedly in support of what is proposed. It seems to me that those who are making a case against this, that we have heard on two or three occasions, are not crediting those of us who would like some more flexibility with thoughts about those same questions as they are offering about authority and how we present.

I was reminded by the Bishop of Salisbury’s speech that there have been two or three occasions when I have raised the question of my vesture at the conduct of an occasional office. They have usually been around the deaths and funerals of children or teenagers, when we have had a lot of schoolchildren in church, a lot of teenagers, who are not quite

sure. My thoughts have been how best can I help them by how I dress and is it going to help this service if I dress in a suit or in my robes? Those are issues around the appropriateness of this.

I do though have a particular issue about paragraph 5 of the Canon, which is about the occasional offices. It seems to me that there are some among those who would like to have more flexibility, not all by any means, who simply have a principled objection to wearing robes and they will not just say that and they put up with it. It seems to me that when it comes to the conduct of the occasional offices we do not want a situation where people are arguing over robes.

If robes are the normal form of dress then I believe it should be the right of the family for whom the occasional office is conducted to have the last say about what the minister should wear in a case of dispute. It does not need to go to the bishop or the PCC, it should not be a matter of argument, but on those occasions where there is a need to resolve a dispute the last word should go with the family or those who asked for the service to be conducted.

The Chair. Members of Synod, you will see that we have got to one o'clock. You will also see that there is time for legislative business after lunch, so the debate is adjourned and we will resume debate on this item at 2.30. Enjoy your lunch.

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. Please be seated. I trust you all had a nice lunch. Before we resume debate on Item 503, I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee to move a variation in the order of business.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you. Friends, I apologise for popping up yet again in front of you but I am intending to be helpful. I do not want to add to confusion, but I do want to offer a reassurance and a sense of commitment. We have this afternoon in front of us to finish the legislative business, we have two important debates that are scheduled for this afternoon and we have Item 10 which is outstanding and which has been the subject of my many conversations in all kinds of media during the course of the day.

What I am proposing to you is that we move an amendment to the order of business which simply says that we will take Item 10 on the full Agenda (that is, the DAG report) not later than 5.30 this afternoon. That means that we will be sure that we are giving it time, we are not leaving to chance what happens during the afternoon and you will know how the afternoon, we hope, will pan out. 'Not later than' means it can be taken earlier but we will not take it later than 5.30. That is my request to you, Synod, and I am asking for your consent. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you. That has my consent. Does that have the consent of Synod?

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Now we resume debate on Item 503. The speech

limit is still three minutes.

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): Thank you for calling me. I want to begin with a story of a man taken prisoner after the Somme, of which we have already heard in these days. His experience deeply scarred him, as their own experiences deeply scarred many of his generation. Half Jewish by race, his anxiety rose to such levels after Dunkirk in the Second World War that he took his own life. This action blighted the life of his widow and both of his daughters.

That man was my grandfather. His suicide was not the only one in the family. Last Friday, my eyes were full of tears as I watched the commemorations from the Somme and around the country and, on a whim, I Googled his name. The first thing that came up was a photograph of his gravestone. This is relevant because 18 years ago I took my mother on a visit to the municipal cemetery where she believed that his grave might be and we were unable to find it, and it was a Saturday so there was not anybody that we could ask. I am sorry that I can no longer show her that picture because I think it would have brought her some level of comfort and of encouragement.

Of course, attitudes to suicides in 1940 were very different to attitudes now. Things have changed and it is really good to see the Canons possibly catching up with reality. I am concerned that suicide where someone is considered of sound mind is still treated differently by providing a conscience clause. I know that the issues around that verdict are very complex. There is also experience in my own family on that venture as well. I do support the motion that is before us on the Amending Canon, but I am very concerned that matters of vesture in church and burial of suicides and others are being taken together.

While both may be seen as catching up with reality, they are nowhere near the same. Their juxtaposition in one Amending Canon seems bizarre. There may be many in this Synod who have differing views on the two parts of the Canon. I agree with other speakers today, and the speaker at the Business Report stage, it would be good were they able to be divided so that two important issues are not threatened by one another. Thank you.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): I too would be very keen to see these motions divided under your power under Standing Order 24 to do so when we come vote. That would be very good, Mr Chair. I am standing really to speak also about Canon B 38. I made my maiden speech to Synod in that debate in the last Synod and I was very keen to see this matter move forward, though I did ask some questions about whether or not it was perhaps quite as illegal as was being presented to Synod on that occasion.

I am delighted we have this proposal in front of us and I am very keen that it should go forward, but I have a couple of questions that I think are slightly more than detail about whether what we are doing here is enough in this process. The first comes from the Book of Common Prayer. As I am sure many people here know, if you open your Order for the Burial of Dead in the Book of Common Prayer, the very first thing you read in it is: "Here is to be noted, that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves."

What we are doing here, of course, in no way affects the Book of Common Prayer and the Book of Common Prayer can only be amended by a rather bigger procedure than one that we have in our own hands today. It, therefore, means that what we are going to do will not allow the BCP to be used in such circumstances, though, of course, Common Worship would be perfectly permissible, as indeed would a series 1 rite.

It does beg the question, given that BCP is, to some senses, doctrinally normative for our practice, as to whether or not we have quite done enough by just amending the Canon to put this matter fully to bed. I would like to hope we have, but I hope the Revision Committee will give full attention to that.

The second question I have comes from a line that comes just after the part that we are deleting, or the exception, where it suddenly says in the Canon: "In any other case, at the request of the relative, friend or legal representative..." I cannot think what that "any other case" might be and I wonder whether there is something lurking in the Canon that we are trying to amend that we do not know why it is there and we have not yet asked the question as to whether it should continue to be there or whether we are leaving ourselves hostage to another fortune?

I can only speak once so I want to just say something very quickly about Canon B 8, which is the proposal about vesture in the Eucharist. It leads me to ask the question: If it is going to be the case that the minister who presides at the Eucharist is not required to wear anything that signifies that minister's authorisation for presidency, is that a step in a direction of who we authorize for presidency that we do not want to take as a General Synod?

The Chair: Just before I ask Charles Read to speak, is there anyone standing who wishes to talk about B 38? Okay.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): I want to talk about vesture. My friends tell me I must declare an interest in this because they tell me I have no dress sense and should wear robes at every possible opportunity.

As an undergraduate reading theology at the University of Manchester, we found that the theology faculty was in the same building as law and geography. Theology was on the ground floor and the first floor, then law, then geography, so there were lots of jokes about, "Still being under the law." I do believe that Church law is important but I think we need to step back often and ask why is Canon law framed the way it is?

My day job is to train people for Christian ministry, lay and ordained, mainly in the area of Christian worship. I do dutifully teach people about the B Canons in particular, but then say, "You have got to ask what is the theology that drives the Canons being framed the way they are". I think we are in danger of being in a bit of tangle in talking about vesture if we do not ask some theological questions.

That takes us back to some of the speeches this morning about what is "seemly". I think we need some guidance to encourage some theological thinking about what would be

seemly and, indeed, what vesture is for and what it does theologically and what it does not do.

I think there are quite a lot of unexamined assumptions in this area or half-examined assumptions. Here is an example. In 1983 I was admitted to the office of reader in the Diocese of Manchester. At the same time the vicar and the two curates in our church decided they would stop wearing robes. Of course, they did not consult the four of us who were readers but we did not wear robes either. At the same time the rector made it quite clear to me that the clothes I wore for doing my paid day job as a secondary school teacher in East Manchester were not acceptable for leading worship and preaching, so I had to go and buy a lounge suit in the church that had just stopped wearing robes.

There are lots of unexamined assumptions that need a bit of examining and they need theological examining. In the church to which I belong, St Catherine's Mile Cross, our biggest service of the year is our Christingle service to which we can get up to 300 people. I do not normally get involved in leading that service but I go and act as a sidesperson. I put my clerical collar on to do that because you never quite know who might just want to speak to somebody, and that is a helpful badge.

I think there are lots of deeper issues behind this. I do not know whether this is at all possible, but think it would be helpful if in this process at some point somebody somewhere produced some theological guidance for discussion and just to help us think through the bigger issues here.

Ven Martin Gorick (Oxford): Thank you for calling me, Chair. Who can resist a debate on clergy vesture? Certainly, now, as a Canon of a cathedral I am always relieved to be able to throw on an alb over whatever I am wearing just before evensong and suddenly everything is beautiful, neat and tidy despite what is underneath. That is a joking start.

A bishop, when he knew this was coming up, said to me he had gone into a church where people did not wear robes. He had gone wearing his mitre and his cope and actually people laughed as he walked in. In a sense, do we want to see that happening? I think we need to ask what is the Canon, in a sense how is it operating now? I feel it does set a tone and, actually, a helpful tone.

It has not stopped churches dispensing with robes for missional reasons. Lots of people do it for very good reasons and they are not being stopped, certainly not by me, but it does establish a norm. If we removed it, removed that Canon altogether, do we open that can of worms about what is seemly and what is not? People are already getting quite irate about that. Will that be different for men and for women? Will people have different attitudes over what is seemly for one or another? What is or is not culturally appropriate? We can make all kinds of assumptions there.

I led a growing church in a UPA parish for many years where people loved robes, loved colour, loved sound and loved music as part of our worship. If it became something you had to justify, the wearing of robes, who would begin with old Roman clerical robes? In a sense, that is where we are and somehow in our old medieval buildings it works. I would go with the Bishop of Salisbury, saying why are we opening all this up? Is it really

simplifying or complicating? Keep the norm as it is. Thank you.

Canon Liz Holdsworth (Peterborough): Thank you to the Steering Committee for their work. I would like to speak to Canon B 8. May I make a plea to all those who are wishing to move forward on this, that, in the context of worship, please do not steal the laity's clothes because we need them and we need our clergy to be distinctive.

I think on the missional front life is confusing enough when people come newly to church without asking them to play 'Where's Wally?' to work out which one is the vicar. I believe more and more that people are looking for something different and other when they come to church, which is represented and embodied by clergy as they lead worship.

Secondly, if we are concerned about what is seemly, I am not convinced we actually know what is missional when it comes to dress and so I would like to challenge the assumption that alternative clothing is missional. Chinos and lounge suits are very nice, but they are not missional, they are just very middle class and sadly already dated. Therein lies the problem. Whatever style we choose, it may attract some but it will also exclude others who probably will never tell us. Clothing is never neutral.

Our vestments may be an eclectic mix of accumulated items but they speak very powerfully of a faith that is rooted in historical reality and tradition and we let go of this at our peril. This morning, John Spence encouraged us to be radical. At this point in our post-modern world changing to blend in is not radical. Being clearly distinctive is.

Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy (ex officio): I would like to speak in favour of this amendment today, as a priest with six congregations meeting in a single church located in a UPA parish. Before my arrival, my predecessor had already relaxed the clerical dress code for two of our primary Sunday congregations and so, of course, when I appeared in cassock and alb the church went aflutter. It ultimately proved to be a blessing in disguise, as I now find that I only have to robe for my one midweek BCP service.

In my church, approximately 60% of our new growth over the past few years has come from Fresh Expressions. In those instances, whether it is a café church or the kids' church or the Gospel outreach, a cassock or alb, surplice and stole can appear to be extremely overdressed when my dog collar, a nice skirt and a funky pair of heels will do. Personally, I have found that, at times, vestments can actually separate rather than unite communities, especially when empowering lay leaders and volunteers that are coming from challenging backgrounds.

I am also in a parish that has very few weddings, so I have had to be a bit creative by actually offering small chapel weddings with services of blessings held the following day in the hotel ballroom - sort of a 'twofer', offering two services for the price of one. For the small intimate chapel wedding I robe for the couple where just intimate family and friends are present. However, for those major services of blessing held in the ballroom I have frequently been asked by the couple not to robe because their friends and family are not particularly religious.

For me, the issue that is key is mission. Like the Apostle Paul, I am willing to become all

things to all men, that I may win some for Christ. I will not be a man though. I believe giving clergy more flexibility in our dress codes says something about the Church's confidence in the discernment of its priests and its PCCs about the appropriate dress for its congregation and services of worship. I pray that you will vote in favour of this amendment.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Thank you, Chair. I too want to stand in favour of this amendment but I also agree that these two different topics need to be separated. Synod, I do believe there is another proxy debate that is going on at the moment, very akin to the proxy debate we had this morning during the Mission and Pastoral Amendment Measure.

That is all to do with trust. This morning it was really about trust in those with power. I would suggest that this afternoon it is all to do with trust in those who are different, those who we disagree with and those who have a different ecclesiology to ourselves. We all know full well we have a very broad and diverse Church and there are many churches, large evangelical churches, who perhaps are not so represented in this body who do not wear vesture, even now.

Some of you will frown at that and some of you will want to control and change that, but that is the reality of the mission imperative that they feel they have. I too have been in a service where about 400 young people broke into fits of laughter when a bishop turned up in his bishop's garb, because for them it was just completely incomprehensible and it was embarrassing. That is the nature of this broad Church that we have all elected to be part of.

Can I suggest, Synod, that we have to be honest about that and recognise that. We have a postcode lottery in our dioceses at the moment. Some will get picked up for not wearing the right vesture and others will not. I think that we need to embrace a Church where we are truly honest and transparent about the differences that we have.

Instead of trying to control each other, we choose to trust each other. Instead of a fear of difference, we look to celebrate that difference because the biggest currency we have in our Church should be and is trust. If we cannot do that, in understanding the honourable reasons why people choose to do what they do, I do not see how we claim to be an honest, transparent Church that is one full of integrity and love for the other. Thank you.

Revd Charlie Skrine (London): Chair, thank you for calling me. I wonder if since lunch-time we have slightly lost our way into a debate about whether robes are bad and you can only support this if you thought robes were bad. You may be surprised to hear someone speaking from the mankini wing of the Church, perhaps saying that I love wearing robes.

Some will know my background is as an Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic altar boy from the age of seven. One of my sadnesses in my current parish is that they will not let me wear them too much and I do take the chances when they are given. I do find there are missional reasons among the under 30s group of London undergraduates particularly that I minister to for when it is seemly and when it is appropriate wearing other dress.

In particular, I find that they engage with me differently. They are more willing to ask questions. They are more willing to disagree with me. They are more willing to have a conversation about faith if I am dressed in a way they are comfortable with. I am aware that is not suitable all the time and, again, this is a permissive measure not a punitive one.

Christopher Hobbs, who first put it through, suggested I stand for London Diocese and then was not here himself to keep speaking wisely on it. I would really urge you, please can we not ask the Revision Committee to add huge definitions to it but simply to leave it much as it is. Thank you very much.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): On balance, I shall vote against the amendment in relation to vestments. The rule, I understand from what is being said, is quite often honoured only in the breach but that does not mean that the rule has no value. As Martin Gorick said, it establishes a norm and I think that is useful for us. If the motion is passed, may I ask for extreme caution around the word "seemly". Martin Gorick touched on this but I would like to emphasise it further. There could well be a risk of gender bias here and quite serious gender bias too.

Again, of late, we have been reminded of kitten heels from years ago, but I have never had my attention drawn to male heels or shoes, although occasionally on one occasion the colour of somebody's socks in a reference, would you believe? There is a risk of much more severe standards in relation to women than those as apply to men and I think that that is a serious risk that the Committee should take account of.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, good afternoon.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Good afternoon, Sir. Mr Chairman, can I tempt you with a motion for closure on this item?

The Chair: I am tempted but I am going to resist. I think I would like to hear two more speakers and then I would look forward to hearing from you again.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): In a kind of itinerant mission job, I tend to find myself wearing a whole host of things in any given month and, like Charlie Skrine, I think it was, having come from an eclectic background see the great riches in all of them. I think I would echo his point that this is a permissive motion more than anything.

I would like to make one point that has not yet quite been made. Both in the discussions about bishop's mission orders and Fresh Expressions this morning, and again this afternoon, I wonder if one of the other proxy debates that is going on is about what is properly Anglican.

There is a danger of a certain Anglican position - snobbery is too strong but heading in that direction - that sees some things as "properly" Anglican that are not fundamentally deeply doctrinal. The danger if we say to, for example, Fresh Expressions of Church or some of the more informal charismatic churches, "You are not properly Anglican in the same way that others are", the more we look at someone with those eyes, the more they look back with the same eyes. There is something important in saying that faith and

mission can be expressed in a variety of ways and that robes are not a primary matter.

Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool): Today I am not wearing my kitten heels but only because Alcuin is such a jolly long way away! I do not want to be the speaker who stands up and talks about “my deprived urban parish”, but, oops, I have done it again. I am not going to argue that all urban parishes should do the same. I can only speak of mine. Today, many times, though, we have heard of different churches having different identities and different contexts. Surely we can allow also for different types of dress and have enough respect for and confidence in each other to believe that we can each make appropriate decisions from our own wardrobes.

Some speakers have said that they have not asked when taking occasional offices. I do tend to ask - admittedly not always for funerals, but generally for weddings. Recently I have conducted two weddings of two young couples from our church, both of which attend our main 11 o'clock service at which I do not robe. One of the couples asked me to robe. They said, “We don't mind that you don't normally on a Sunday, but this is our wedding; it feels particularly special, it reminds us of our childhood.” The other couple said, “We are used to seeing you not wearing robes; can you not wear them for the wedding too?” Of course I respected both of their wishes. Do I find wearing robes uncomfortable and a little outdated? If I am honest, yes. Is that why I generally do not wear them? Of course not. Do I consider that occasionally not wearing them has major missional advantages? I do. My church is growing significantly, particularly with younger people. Is that only because of what I wear? Of course not. Am I in the best position to work out what is seemly, appropriate and missional to wear in that context? I think so. I have no wish, of course, to stop those of us for whom it will be appropriate and missional to wear robes from doing so, but I would love to feel that I was doing what I do within not just the spirit but also the letter of the law.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure.

The Chair: That would have my consent. Does it have the consent of Synod?

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I call upon the Bishop of St Alban's to reply to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith): Thank you very much for a very wide-ranging debate. We have had so many people speaking, I do not think I can mention everybody's names, but I will try to make some responses, and cluster them together.

There was a general comment to start with asking about why these two Canons are being brought together. That has been the normal practice when we have had more than one Canon because you need to have a Revision Committee and a Steering Committee and indeed, if you separate them out, you have to have different Royal Letters Patent, which cost a considerable amount of money, but is not impossible. We cannot do that today. What you can do is write to the Revision Committee to ask them to consider it. We have heard what has been said and I am sure that will be taken into account, without pre-

empting what the decision would be.

The vast majority of comments were made on robes and on vesture rather than on suicide. I will make one or two comments. We have to face the fact that we are simply catching up with the reality. If some people have not quite realised it, there are large numbers of churches where robes have not been worn in main Sunday worship for a long time. It is an absolute anomaly that we have these Canons. There is an issue here about how we are catching up with reality. Inevitably in a debate such as this we have heard people expressing their personal views as well as their views about what work best missionally. Some of those views have been quite contradictory. We need to note we have a wide range of views again - and we will note that - but this is a permissive Canon. It is not trying to force anything on anybody.

There were lots of questions about what is “seemly” and how we define that. If you have suggestions as to how that might be defined better, it would be very helpful if you would write in. We are going to have to be very cautious in trying to define anything more. It is going to be almost impossible, although we can have a look at that.

There were a number of questions about safeguarding. Robes have not been worn in some churches for years so we cannot use robes as any guarantee - not that there has ever been - of safeguarding. That needs a quite different approach.

We need to look at the issues about consulting the PCC or getting the permission of the PCC. That is a detail that can be looked at in revision. There were some theological questions about what robes are for and it might be that Charles Read wants to ask whether the Liturgical Commission or the Faith and Order Commission want to have a stab at that. I have no idea whether they would do that with great alacrity, but they may wish to.

There is a whole range of questions that we can look at. There is one technical question which Paul Hutchinson raised about why the reference in Canon B38 to “a special form of service being used in any other case at the request of the relative, friend or legal representative of the deceased” is being retained. That is because section 13 of the Burial Laws Amendment Act 1880, which you will all, of course, know provides for the making of such requests and the Canon has to comply with that Act.

There was much less said about the whole range of issues on suicide. A number of people, including Priscilla White, have expressed some concern about the conscience clause. What we are asking today is whether you will give permission for this now to be taken to its next stage. No decisions are being made at this point. If you pass this, we can then take it to the next stage and bring it back, when there will be further opportunities to look at the detail. I commend this to you.

The Chair: I now put Item 503 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 36” be considered for revision in

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Draft Amending Canon No.36 now stands committed to a Revision Committee. Any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment must send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her not later than Friday 12 August 2016. I am sorry if you were standing and were trying to speak. Send your speeches in to the Revision Committee.

That concludes Item 503 and the legislative business. In a few moments Item 12 will be taken.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 3.09 pm

A Vision and Narrative for Renewal and Reform (GS 2038)

The Chair: We come now to Item 12, a debate on a Vision and Narrative for Renewal and Reform. This Item is an opportunity for Synod to debate the overarching vision and Renewal and Reform initiative. For this item we will need GS 2038. I now call the Ven Cherry Vann to move the motion standing in her name. She may speak for up to ten minutes.

Ven Cherry Vann (Manchester): I beg to move:

'That this Synod welcome the vision and narrative for Renewal and Reform as set out in GS 2038 and commend it as a framework for the implementation of Renewal and Reform across the Church.'

Renewal and Reform represents a vast and, indeed, emerging body of work. Various elements of the Renewal and Reform programme have been coming before Synod for a number of years now for consideration and debate. This has helped shape the work and general direction of the task groups charged with taking different parts of the programme forward.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overarching and unifying narrative that encompasses all that we are seeking to do. It sets out the vision which will determine the direction and parameters of our ongoing travel; the bullet points in paragraphs 6, 8 and 12 serving as a decision-making framework for future work.

It is about being the Church God calls us to be, to do the work God calls us to do. It is about playing our part in building the Kingdom of God by being a Church that is fit for the task in today's world.

As the paper before you states, the vision and narrative for Renewal and Reform is rooted in an understanding of Luke 10:2, as relevant today as it was when Jesus spoke those words. The harvest is indeed plentiful and the potential enormous. There is a deep thirst and hunger in our world for a spirituality that gives both people and communities meaning

and purpose in an increasingly complex and often confusing world. There is a need for hope and a longing for a rock or an anchor that will hold firm in the fast and ever-changing contexts in which we live. God calls to us to respond with His love and with the hope of the Gospel so that the plentiful harvest might be reaped.

This is the vision at the heart of the Renewal and Reform programme which this paper seeks to outline. It is not about fixing the Church. Rather, it is about reaching out to a needy world with the faith and resources that God has given to us so that lives and communities might be transformed.

Part of this work will be about being transformed ourselves as we look, listen and learn in the parishes and chaplaincies where God has placed us. God is already at work around us, not just in our churches, and our task is to discern what He is doing and work with Him in making and nurturing disciples, in challenging injustice and seeking the common good.

This will require us to look in new and sometimes challenging places and be prepared to be surprised by the people God is calling and the ways in which God is already working. It will also require us to commit ourselves to becoming a more diverse Church, where everyone, not just people who are like us, can belong and feel genuinely welcome. As a Church, we will need to be humble enough to listen to the voices of those who as yet do not belong or do not feel welcome and to listen to what God is saying to us through them so that our churches might better reflect the communities they seek to serve.

This overarching narrative seeks to place the Renewal and Reform programme firmly within the hopeful future that we believe is ours in Jesus Christ. It articulates a vision that is to be worked out locally in parishes and dioceses depending on their context and need. It is not, as some fear, a one-size-fits-all programme that seeks to impose ways of being and ways of working from outside. The hope is rather to provide a framework and resourcing that releases and encourages, stimulates and supports the mission and ministry of the Church in a myriad of different ways that are appropriate for the myriad of contexts in which we serve as well as those God may be calling us into. The hopeful future has to be articulated primarily at diocesan level.

We are talking about developing a Church that is confident across the diversity of traditions and about churches working out their discipleship and faith, their social and community engagement wherever they happen to be. What will be right in one place will not always be right in another. What will work in one context will not necessarily work in another. Each church and diocese will need to be both resourceful and creative. What will matter is the local church as ever meeting people where they are and communicating something of the transforming love of God in all that it says and does. Partnerships will be crucial and this too will differ according to context. They are likely to be with other churches, local businesses, agencies and civic authorities. In order to further this hopeful future, Renewal and Reform seeks to equip and resource for the vibrant and multi-faceted body of Christ we are called to be.

The challenges are immense and the vision and narrative that this paper outlines does not fight shy of facing up to the reality of the situation in which we find ourselves. It is a

reality that does not constrain our vision; the vision of a plentiful harvest that is galvanising us and urging us on to address those things that are holding us back. They are the nettles we have to grasp if our mission is going to be based on opportunity and not defined by our diminishing resources.

Much has been said about what is sometimes perceived as an overly secular management style approach that the Church of England has adopted in the face of its current challenges. Renewal and Reform is very much about harnessing the resources that have been entrusted to us and managing them in a way that will enable us to be as effective as possible. There is nothing to fear in that. At its simplest it is about being responsible with the way in which we use the funds, the people, the experience and the wisdom we have at our disposal so that we can be ambitious for God and enable not just a sustainable, but a confident future.

Managing our resources is simply about being good stewards, which includes not only ensuring that we use our resources well, but that we exercise mutuality in terms of sharing what we have appropriately, learning from one another and holding one another to account as members of the body of Christ. The peer review process has already begun this. Whilst every context is unique, sharing good practice as well as resources is part and parcel of being good stewards so that there is an ongoing learning across the Church as we journey together.

Finally, we do want to work for a growing Church and growing in numbers is just one part of this. Indeed, we believe that growing in numbers will be the inevitable outcome of the wider elements of growth which the Renewal and Reform programme is seeking to encourage. Essentially, we are looking for growth in faith, hope and love as we, and disciples-yet-to-be, are nurtured and encouraged to live out the Gospel and make Christ known. We are looking for growth in confidence, creativity and imagination as we seek to be bold in reaching out to share with others what God has done and is doing for us. We are looking for ways of helping people to grow in their prayer and spirituality, in their understanding of God and His purposes for the world, in their giving and serving.

The vision for Renewal and Reform is to do all that we can with the resources available to us now to further that growth. It is then, and by God's grace alone, that we will see growth in the number and diversity of people in our churches and in the finances and other resources we have to further our work for God's mission in the world so that more and more people will come to grasp how wide and long and high and deep is the love of Christ.

The task groups are well into their work. Further theological reflections have been commissioned to enrich and underpin the various elements of the work and those will be put on the Renewal and Reform Facebook page. We now need to trust in the God who calls us ever onwards. We need to trust in our bishops and we need to trust one another as we continue to pray and journey together.

Members of Synod, I commend this paper to you and look forward to a rich and fruitful debate on the vision and narrative it offers.

The Chair. Before I open the debate on this Item, members of Synod, I have a point of personal explanation which is that the scurrilous rumour that the Prolocutor of the Northern Province and I co-ordinate platform outfits is completely and utterly untrue. But it will not stop me spreading it. Item 12 is now open for debate.

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester): This is a good start, but where is the mention of God's Kingdom? In the senior leadership paper it talks about "preparing leaders for wider leadership roles in the Church's ministry for the Kingdom of God in the near return and for the next generation"; but where is the vision for the Kingdom of God in this document? Yes, the Church is important, but it is the engine, not the goal.

I am a member of the Growth Fund in the Leicester Diocese and I am part of a committee that deals with the smaller grants, from £250 to £5,000. I have begun to notice that some have a growth outcome of inviting people to Church activities, which is good because it demonstrates people are beginning to gain confidence in what they can do and, as the Apostle Paul demonstrated, you have to meet people where they are. Only a few times do we have comments about wanting to share one's faith or see others' faith grow. We seem to have forgotten that we meet as a Church to share and encourage our relationship with God, that we might know God and ourselves better. People want and need to be invited to know God, not invited to know Church. It is usually expressed as there is a desire not for Church but for spirituality. As a Church we do not have a monopoly on God. God will not be limited by us no matter how hard we try.

The other week on Facebook I saw an article about the five key things to living well. It was not from a Christian organisation to my knowledge, but the fifth one included the need for forgiveness.

In the Senior Leadership paper, it mentions in the "Reflections and Learning" section that the most enlightened of so-called secular leadership practices are deeply consistent with or borne out of Christian leadership. God is not confined to Church. The world is waking up to see again the importance of kingdom values, even if it does not phrase it like that.

The vision for Renewal and Reform should be comprehensive, going way beyond the boundaries of Church because the Church is us, it is people, and we do not live in church - well, the majority of us do not.

In last month's Mothers' Union *Families First* there was an article called "On Eagle's Wings" about the Eagle initiative in Uganda. It is described as "a complete transformational community-based process that uses Bible studies to work with Church groups, encouraging them to launch economic, social and physical transformations within their communities". Mobilised Church groups act as catalysts in their communities. They use Scripture to inspire people to a realisation that heaven has already helped them by giving them the skills they need. When did we ever forget that this is what we are about? It mentioned similar initiatives in other countries.

This is surely what we have seen Jesus doing in the New Testament, so it must mean it is what we should do. This is Kingdom, not Church. Church is the engine, not the goal. The Task Groups for Lay Ministries and Lay Leadership should surely reflect this kind of

work. The brilliant leadership work going on will encourage and empower this, and I delight in its progress.

This is why I love Renewal and Reform, but why I was so disappointed that this vision report does not reflect what is really going on with at least a glimpse of what God is already doing. Some of the things I have mentioned are there but need to be picked out so they can be seen more clearly. Jesus often said, "The kingdom of God has come near", and it never went away, we just closed our eyes to it. Please let this vision document open our eyes to it again.

Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle): Thank you for this report. I was particularly encouraged to see under point 7 the commitment to ensure that the Church is present when no one else is willing to help. In times of uncertainty and challenge it is often the poorest who are forgotten, and it is very helpful that those communities are mentioned specifically as a high priority.

Between 2004 and 2015, I was a parish priest in Benwell in Newcastle's inner city. During the 11 years I was there it felt as though the community was gradually abandoned. The council-funded children's centre and the youth services stopped, the swimming pool closed and the parks fell into disrepair. It was a slow and painful process of departure. We signed petitions, we had marches, we wrote furiously to our MP, but it made no difference, the council could no longer afford much needed services. Churches closed their doors, too, unable to afford the costs of building and clergy. Of the traditional denominations, by 2015 the Anglicans alone remained. We could not afford to be there either, but we were supported by the other churches across the diocese and across the country as part of the parish system.

We know intellectually that the work of God is not restricted to the work of the Church, but when churches in deprived communities close just at the time when so much else is closing it is not surprising that people feel abandoned by God. It was very significant to that community that at a time of mass exodus by so many of the people who were helping them, we were able to stay. The church was important because of the practical things we were doing, like housing the food bank and supporting volunteer-run community projects. It was even more important that we stayed as a sign to the broken and exhausted community that God was still there in the midst of them.

It is not just that the inner cities need us; we need them too. Twenty years ago a little boy wandered into St James's Church in Benwell with his sister one Sunday morning to get out of the rain. They had no idea what was going on, the clergy were fully robed and they wondered whether they were to watch some sort of play. They sat in the front row with their sweets and stayed to see what would happen. The people were so friendly and welcoming that they went again the next week and the next week and the week after that. That boy's name is Lee Clemenson and he was ordained on Saturday. I will take your applause back to him. Lee is one of the generation of clergy who will be key to the success of the Renewal and Reform agenda.

Thank you that in Renewal and Reform maintaining a presence in communities like Benwell remains a priority, whether it is financially viable or not. Staying there is one of

the most important things we can do, both for those communities and for the Church as a whole.

The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes): I support the motion, the vision and the narrative as foundational and essential for our mission nationally. Cherry Vann spoke about working out this vision locally. In Liverpool, our vision and narrative is that we are asking God for a bigger Church to make a bigger difference and we say more people knowing Jesus, more justice in the world. Underlying that, we feel confident that we are moving with the grain of the national Church because of the Renewal and Reform vision and narrative. We do not talk about it much to our people but we are confident, as we seek to lead the diocese, that we are moving along with others.

As you read the vision and narrative, you will know that it is explicitly non-prescriptive. It says Renewal and Reform is not based on a prescription of what every church should be, nor does it represent a single Church of England strategy or describe the whole of the Church of England's work; that is our experience. But, my goodness, friends, it helps because it provides alignment. Not a brainless and infantile alignment, but a sense that we are one big Church doing one big thing in lots of small and diverse ways.

Because we are a Church that talks and then agrees and then moves, I do not believe that this narrative and vision is, or should be, optional. It is not optional. Are we not rather aligned with the direction of the Church which is enshrined in the narrative and vision set out in this paper, which we have reinforced and affirmed every time as a Synod we have said "yes" to the many aspects of Renewal and Reform?

Dialogue and conversation are hugely valuable and the theological shaping that Cherry spoke about, and that Sam Wells has begun in his piece on the Renewal and Reform website, is a great manifestation of this. What we do needs to be sharpened as we learn from one another. I regret the tendency which I sometimes see across our Church of England that critiquing other people's stuff is the most grown-up thing you can do. I would prefer a Church in which risking mistakes and making mistakes, and learning from mistakes and moving on from mistakes is the most grown-up thing you can do.

GS 2038 speaks of a whole Church which is focusing greater energy on our participation in God's mission. That is what Catherine just said. Building and developing such a Church is an ascetic matter. It is a matter of formation and prayer and contemplation and aligning ourselves with God's vision. We are in the business of offering encouragement to the people of God and hope to an increasingly anxious and fearful nation.

For these reasons, I warmly welcome and commend this vision and narrative as we are asked to do, and I hope that Synod resoundingly will do the same.

Miss Alexandra Podd (Church of England Youth Council Representatives): I love this report, it makes me really, really excited. I am 20 in a week and a half, and I do not want to be 20. I know, I am sorry. I am really excited that we have got an idea of what a Church can be when I am the average age of a Synod member. We have got 32 years, it is fine. We have got ages.

I really, really love that Luke 10 verse. The workers are indeed few and the harvest, I think, is much, much bigger than we could ever imagine. As a Church we need to pool the resources, the skills, the talents we have to make the best of the understanding and the undertaking that we have got in our world.

I am standing here today as a member of CEYC in front of you because over the last five years a stream of adults have given me, a teenager, a chance. They have said, "Go for it, give it a whack", whether that was serving on my sound team at church or preaching as a 14-year-old having absolutely no idea what I was doing. I have not killed anybody yet, so we are fine. Those opportunities have utterly shaped me.

Paragraph 3 refers to "our generation". In this case I am your generation. We are all one big generation. We hear of older generations, younger generations, how we fit in together, but we are one whole generation. There are young people up in that observers' gallery - give us a wave - who have come along today to see what you guys get up to. They are the Church of today just as much as they are the Church of tomorrow. I do not mind how you view this, whether for you this is passing on your worldly knowledge or helping shape the leaders who will be in charge of your churches in ten years' time, 15 years' time, 30 years' time. That young person you may know in your church because their weird allergy is really hard to cater for might be over there soon enough because, you know, garlic allergy, how does that work?

In my personal experience, the Church of England does and can handle individual youth calling. It tends, however, to go, "Oh, you're keen, can I ordain you?" That does not work for a 14-year-old. For some 14-year-olds it does, but they are going to be one in 1,000.

What I am really, really longing for in this Renewal and Reform is involvement for young people in this vision as leaders and as pioneers. I do not want a token, "Let's ask them what they want and then we'll see if it works", but instead go to them and say, "This is what our Church community is trying to do. Help us. Lead us. Show us where you can do that in your school communities and in your university communities".

I grant you this, young people do forget things, they are unreliable and they do get things wrong, but so do adults, so do their parents and grandparents. This time last year I made my maiden speech in Synod and tried to open in my first sentence with the word "phenomenon". I could not say it at the time and I now can say it, which is a matter of personal pride. I screwed up, but the confidence and the opportunity that I had to stand here and give it a whack and come back a year later has really shaped me. I know that the Church's confidence in me will shape my generation.

As a Church we really do need more workers. We need more young people. We acknowledge it in the report. It says we have an ageing Church congregation, but in looking for more young people, looking for Reform and Renewal, can we not ignore the young people that we have? The workers are few, but please do not whittle that down by ignoring your teenagers and children. Thank you very much.

Dr Meg Warner (London): I would like to do a little bit of reflecting on one of the resources that has been entrusted to us. Somewhere towards the centre of the Renewal and

Reform programme is something of an identity building exercise. In my work of teaching Scripture to university students I find myself reflecting often on the extent to which our Scriptures, and in particular the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which is where I work mostly, are involved so much in questions about identity formation.

I want to offer you an example of the materials that we have following the return of the Israelites from their period in exile in Babylon. When the people returned they came back from a sophisticated nation to a small outpost in Jerusalem. It was not what they expected to find. There was no king, there was no temple, the people were occupied by Palestine and they were unable on many occasions to return to their own homes and businesses because they had been taken over by others while they were away. The Israelites were few in number and they were vulnerable.

There seem to have been two principal types of responses to this situation that we can see in Scripture. The first is to say, "We are small and we are vulnerable and, therefore, we need to hold ourselves together separately and distinct and build strong boundaries in order that we are able to look after our identity and to prevent it from being diluted by other peoples". There is a second kind of response that says, "We met all sorts of interesting people in exile and we learned from them and we grew and found that we could do things that we were unable to do on our own when we worked with those other peoples. It might work best for us if we work in relationship with other peoples to achieve what we can, even though we are small and we are vulnerable". I wonder whether those two responses ring any bells for you in our post-Brexit reality.

As a Church and as Christians we have strong resources that help us understand the times we are living in. I think the extraordinary period in which we find ourselves is one of those times. It is a time that we, as a Church, have been prepared for because we have lived through and documented our own struggles in relation to identity building.

I wonder whether in the course of this experience over the last two weeks we may have gained something and lost something as a Church. Far be it from me to say that anyone should benefit from the post-Brexit chaos, but I wonder whether particularly we may have lost an identity crisis as a Church and gained a mission. I wonder whether something of the sense of why we are here and what it is we are to do may be becoming clearer to us as so many other things are becoming less clear. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke yesterday about the extent of the impact of this situation and the time and the years that we are going to spend addressing it.

I believe our resources and our heritage stand us in good stead to be people who do not walk away but who walk alongside. They stand us in good stead to be people who know what it is to live with the vision, and indeed that is something that we have been practising in recent years.

I wonder whether this new external focus that we have may help us to have an increased external focus also in our narrative for Renewal and Reform, so if we get on with our mission and our work some of the other matters might usefully be left to the Holy Spirit.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I would like to welcome this narrative, not least of all because it is so succinct and clear, and not all our documents are like that. I like it because it is straightforward and it is a narrative, a story, which is easily told. I want, however, to make a plea for an addition or two, a more open narrative, a narrative with some sub-plots.

As I am sure many of you are aware, this year is a year for great anniversaries, Shakespeare and so forth. It is also the anniversary of the death of one of the great European writers, namely Cervantes, author of the massive tome *Don Quixote*. It is a fantastic novel. It is to Spain what Shakespeare is to us. One of the great things about *Don Quixote* is the number of sub-plots, of little stories, which all make up the whole. Don Quixote, the slightly deranged knight, is accompanied by a hapless servant called Sancho Panza, and his story is very much the way into the heart of the narrative and novel.

One of the things which worries me a little is that the narrative we have is a very simple narrative and I think there are other stories, other sub-plots, which need to be part of it. We heard one from Shayne Ardron earlier, one which I have a lot of sympathy with but not all, as will become apparent. The Sancho Panza bit of it, which I hope you can bear with including, is that of the priority of the Church. We have heard critical noises about the Church and I am hoping that really applies to when institutional aspects have their hiccups, and so on and so forth. The Church is full of extremely good things, some of which are referred to in this report, and paragraph 11 in particular.

There is an approach to mission, to evangelism, to Renewal and Reform, which begins with the Church. At the risk of caricaturing, it begins with Church first and following Jesus second as if it is “come to church and then go with Jesus”. Much of our narrative here, I think, and quite properly, works with come to Jesus and then go to church. I think these are two parts that belong together. For many people, the way you come into a closer walk with Christ, the way you come to know the mystery of God, is coming into good worship, coming into church. The story of Lee Clemenson, a student at Mirfield until a little while ago, was told earlier and that is a very good example of somebody whose first encounter with Church was through worship.

I want to plead that we do not lose sight of that corporate heart. Shayne used the contrasts of “engine” and “goal”. I think that approach to our Renewal and Reform is looking towards our goal. A Council in Rome about 50 years ago began its deliberations not with exploring “How do we cope in the modern world?”, that came a little later, but with the statement - it is in the document *Sacrosanctum Concilium* - that the end of the missionary endeavour is the worship by the people of God. That is a way of Renewal and Reform and at its heart is the fact it enables people to be disciples of Christ. My example was Don Quixote, who was famous for tilting at windmills and things like that. I am not wishing to suggest that there is any comparison there between our mission and tilting at windmills.

Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester): Thank you for the work on Renewal and Reform. In any living Church, renewal and reform is an on-going process that happens all the time. It is about growing up into Christ. I offer the following thoughts as a preamble to any thorough-going theology of Renewal and Reform which the current process distinctly

lacks. This is not what we have been given today. It is not a theology. It is a narrative.

Whilst in Anglican practice, rules and regulations follow pastoral practice, (and we have been talking about that with vestments and with burying of suicides), in Anglican practice theology precedes and accompanies and responds to the on-going Renewal and Reform of growing up into Christ.

The mission imperative includes pastoral care and it is simply not present in that narrative in a clear enough way to satisfy me. I would suggest that the Four Marks of the Church of the Creed might help us here -- one, holy, catholic and apostolic - because that is truly radical, going back to our roots, which is what 'radical' means.

The oneness of the Church refers to our common baptism and participation in Holy Communion. It is not about agreeing about everything. There is not enough clarity about the sacramental theology and the sacramental life and sacramental renewal of baptism and Holy Communion in what I have read so far. Maybe it is coming. I would point out that, also, if there is not a clear direction for our Christian prayers to take us beyond our youthful chitchatting with God or even an adult sort of prayer warring, if we want to be holy (which is the next mark I want to talk about), we have to move on to contemplative prayer and a mystical theology. If you are not moving towards contemplative prayer and mystical theology, you are not moving.

Catholicity. It brings me to the rather disastrous delusion of leadership that has kind of enchanted our discussions for so long now, the nonsense of the Green Report which completely pushed out of the way the much more considered and much more important report from the Faith and Order Commission. I wonder how many of you even remember about it? Happily, in our diocese we are going to study it later this year.

Apostolicity requires that we give the past a vote but it does not get the casting vote. Apostolicity is about letting the Holy Spirit move us to new things and so I pray that this weekend we will all be moved to a new place in understanding what it means to be human, because what is completely missing from this report for my satisfaction is a lack of inclusivity. We need to include LGBTI; the poor - which we talk a lot, but do we include them? - the disabled; those who are ethnically marginalised, and that is becoming a new thing for us again, tragically. Are we an inclusive Church? If we are not, then we are not being renewed or reformed. I suggest we go back to our roots: One, holy, catholic and apostolic. Thank you.

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): My point is a simple one. As part of Renewal and Reform serving the people of this country, I would like just to be quite explicit about the role of Church schools, about the role of inspirational Christian leadership in schools and about the huge opportunities afforded to us, not religiously to manipulate children as some would like the public to believe, but to offer the love and hope of the Christian faith incarnate in Jesus Christ and offering a vision of the Kingdom to them, offering a vision of good living; so we can present and share with young people and their families the God we believe in - not the God we do not believe in, but which so many in our religiously fairly illiterate society think we believe in - so that we can demonstrate how the Christian faith sets us free to serve in this world rather than oppressing us or others.

This applies to Church schools. This also applies to Christian leadership generally.

The harvest is large. The labourers are few. That applies to Church schools as well. There clearly needs to be some investment in leadership, in attracting heads and staff to Church schools. We will hear more about that in the education debate shortly. For now, I really want to say Renewal and Reform is an embracing vision and I am sure it embraces Church schools, too.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): We are very well blessed in Bath and Wells in that we have within Wells itself the ReSource organisation, and Alison Morgan came to our church a little while ago to talk about the Word of God. She used various words to describe 'Word'. One in particular was the fact that 'Word' was not just something written on a piece of paper, but it was active and we see that quite clearly at the beginning of John's Gospel. Words are important and I think it is key that we make sure that the words in this document are absolutely right.

I welcome this report. I think it is absolutely right that we have it at this time. I suppose, with hindsight, which I ought to have, it should have come out a couple of years ago when we started looking at Renewal and Reform.

There is one word that I would like to change in this document in the two places that it occurs, in paragraph 10 and paragraph 12, where we talk about a new generation of leaders.

I would like to say that the way that the conversation went in the House of Laity only yesterday, and the way that questions were asked yesterday as well, would it not be best to have a new generation of disciples, ordained and lay, for ministry and mission in paragraph 10 and, likewise, call for more clergy and lay disciples into a wider variety of mission and ministries?

The reason for this is that not all lay people when they come to find out that they have a gift recognise it as a leadership thing. Sometimes, they look on it as something that they give to the Church rather than necessarily as a leadership thing and I think that would be a much more encouraging word to use.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Mr Chairman, after the next speaker can I tempt you with a motion for closure on this item?

The Chair: I think you might be able to tempt me, thank you.

Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby): Some of you may be wondering why I said it was my maiden speech. It is my maiden speech as a full voting member of Synod and not as a youth representative. I represent Derby, which I am very honoured to do. This motion asks whether we welcome the vision and narrative of Renewal and Reform as set out in GS 2038.

I am a little concerned with the narrative of this paper and wonder whether it actually brings all traditions with it. However, I believe there is a more pressing point to make at this stage. Renewal and Reform has been set up to do a number of really great things in the Church of England. However, I cannot help but notice that we have been here before.

Some members in this chamber will have heard many similar initiatives over the years and decades that they have served as members. Each time one of these schemes comes up there is much enthusiasm, desire and debate to take it forward; then, there is a lack of interest from those who it is aimed at, the Church still has not grown and we are back to square 1 in this chamber, debating what we can do about it.

I fully intend to be active in the Church for many years to come and I really do not want to be in this chamber witnessing another discussion about what we can do this time in 40 years' time. I believe that the reason these initiatives have not worked in the past is because very little consultation has taken place before they are implemented, if at all.

It is extremely poor business practice to not understand your market and this is why they have almost never been successful. This is particularly true of anything aimed at young people. The Church brings out a scheme aimed at young people, it flops and they wonder why, but they just try something else. Why not ask the young people currently attending church why they go? Do some market research and you will be much more successful.

I am pleased to see that there is some mention in GS 2038 that Renewal and Reform is not there to replace what dioceses and parishes already have in place that work. My parish is a liberal catholic parish with a robed choir. In the last year, that choir has seen seven young people and one adult who did not come to church previously join. The majority of them will be confirmed in the next year. It is a great point of growth for us as a church.

When Renewal and Reform is implemented in the dioceses, I implore you to have a proper consultation process and to look, listen and learn from it. You want to do something more to get young people through the door. Brilliant. Ask young people in church to help find an engaging way forward. You want to encourage more young families into church. Fantastic. Ask some that are going to church what helps them grow in their faith so they can help shape an initiative. We have got to stop telling people what they need and want and start asking what helps you grow in faith and makes you come to church every week. Only then will we be able to make this work.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Mr Chairman, a motion for closure on Item 12.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, you are always so enticing that I am tempted but, having checked where we are, we have time for just a couple more speeches and I would like to take them. After that, I would be very grateful to hear for you.

Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities & TElS): A little while ago there was a thing going around on Twitter called, *Tweet your PhD*: "Could you summarise your doctoral research

in 140 characters or fewer?" It is quite difficult to do, but I can do mine and I will tell you later.

When I read this report, I thought this is very easy to summarise in a tweet. This report says that the narrative vision for Renewal and Reform is the Church being the Church and doing what the Church does. I was delighted to hear the Archdeacon of Rochdale say precisely that in her introduction. The Church being the Church and doing what the Church does. That the overarching vision is nothing novel is, I think, a great cause of encouragement, especially for a programme that has, at times, been a little controversial.

As I continued to think about it, I thought a bit about the words 'Renewal and Reform' and wanted to add two more to them. We have been asked to think about our generation, this generation, but I looked back over the generations of the Church; to the Gregorian reform that called the Church to holiness in the 8th century; to calls for reform in head and members made at the Fifth Lateran Council in 1512; to the Reformation itself, the jubilee of which, as we were reminded yesterday, we will mark next year; to the Catholic reform of dogma and discipline, worked out by the Council of Trent. There has been renewal of religious life, renewal of charismatic tradition.

My two other words - two complementary words - were revival and restoration. Alongside the renewal and reform of the Church through the generations have been revivals: revivals evangelical and Anglo-Catholic in 19th Century England, the Great Awakening in America and the East African revival. There have been restorations: the desire of the 16th century humanists and reformers to restore the Church to her primitive simplicity and the restoration of a wealth of tradition to the heart of Anglican worship in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Renewal and Reform is not just about making things better. It is also about calling the Church back to something essential at the heart of our life, calling us back to our first love. So, yes, to the Church being the Church and doing what the Church does, but if we use words often enough they can stop being meaningful.

As we carry on debating Renewal and Reform, I want us not to lose sight of the richness and depth that those words, along with revival and restoration, have held through the generations past and the fruit that they have borne for the Church and for our generation.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Chair, thank you for calling me. I too want to support wholeheartedly this vision and narrative for Renewal and Reform and particularly want to focus for a few moments on the text from scripture which lies at the heart of it, though I do want to have a slight dialogue with this bit of scripture which I hope will be helpful: "The harvest is plentiful but the workers are few." I am not actually sure that is a particularly good description of where we are in the Church of England at the moment.

Actually, first of all, let us take the workers. We have actually got thousands and thousands and thousands of workers. I wish we had more, but we have got an awful lot. I will come back to them in a minute.

Now let us think about the harvest. I think the big missionary challenge that we face at the moment is not so much that the harvest is plentiful, but that we have missed successive harvests and we have forgotten how to do evangelism and mission well.

I think the great heart of Renewal and Reform is it challenges us to go out and find a field and plough that field and plant some seed in the belief that there can be a harvest and that is God's desire for His Church and for this nation.

Now let us return to the workers. Synod, I think I have to say that we today have not been a good example of what the workers in the vineyard are supposed to be like. I know I have used this line many times before, perhaps in Synod, but my own version of this text would be this: we have missed the harvest and the workers have locked themselves inside the barn and they are arguing over what colour to paint the combine harvester.

We had a debate earlier which was: the horse has bolted, now let us have a discussion about whether we should bolt the stable door or not. We have got to be much better at actually seeing the mission challenge that is before us, which is thousands of people growing up with little or no knowledge of the Christian Gospel, little or no contact with the Christian Church.

We need to find different ways of engaging with the many different cultures in which we serve. Reform and Renewal starts to give us a narrative which is not prescriptive but which is very permissive and we as a Church and as a Synod are going to have to move from resist and retrench to renew and reform. Amen. Let us vote for this one.

The Chair: The dulcet tones of Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Mr Chairman, a motion for closure on Item 12.

The Chair: That has my permission. I put the motion for closure on Item 12 to the Synod.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I call on the Prolocutor of the Northern Province to respond to the debate. She has up to ten minutes.

Ven Cherry Vann (Manchester): Thank you, Chair. I do not think I shall need quite ten minutes, but thank you for being generous. Thank you very much, Synod, for a really good, fruitful and exciting debate. There have been some really good contributions and some very passionate contributions that have been heartening to those of us who are working this out from the Archbishops' Council. Thank you for the broad affirmation and the affirming comments.

We do need to remember that Renewal and Reform is not everything and cannot be everything. What we are doing is providing a framework and an overarching narrative that needs to be worked out locally, in the local context, in the local church and in the dioceses. A lot of what was said today, which was absolutely right to be said, does need to be worked out where you are. For example, when we are talking about whether this is

about Church or about building the Kingdom, it is absolutely tackling injustice, about seeking the common good; about, as people have mentioned, staying there in the most difficult and most deprived context, so that we remain a sign and symbol of God's presence in the local community.

It is about maximising the opportunities that we have in each and every place, whether that be a village, an urban estate, a deprived place or a chaplaincy. Wherever you happen to be, it is working that out and maximising those chances that are before us.

In response to Dagmar's point, for instance, about the Church schools, it is for those local parishes which are blessed to have Church schools to work out what this is going to look like in those particular contexts.

Thank you particularly to those contributions from Wyn Beynon and Fr Thomas, who reminded us of the importance of contemplative prayer and good worship. Again, this is for the local context to work out. It is for the clergy, the laity and the bishops to work out what that is going to look like so that we have a diversity of expressions of Church that are going to meet the needs and to attract the people in our particular contexts.

I will briefly go through some of the other key points. The Lay Leadership Task Group is looking at whole-life discipleship and how we equip Christians to live out their faith in the world. It is absolutely about building the Kingdom of God and we all have a responsibility to do that.

Thank you to Catherine Pickford for her contribution and for her reminder of the importance of presence and to the Bishop of Liverpool for reminding us that this is not prescriptive; it is about alignment and there will be ongoing conversation and dialogue. That is partly what this debate is about. Thank you to him, too, for reminding us of the importance of taking risks and learning from mistakes. That is very important as we move forward together.

To Alexandra Podd, thank you for your energy, your excitement, your passion and enthusiasm. It is great to have somebody under 20 contributing to our debates and also really good to have people in the gallery listening in on our conversations. We need to involve young people at this stage. They are, as we were reminded very powerfully, the Church of today, not the Church of the future. Please go back and listen to what your young people are saying.

Thank you to Meg Warner for her analogy with the Israelites' return from Jerusalem. Yes, it is about working in partnership with others; it is about walking alongside others; and it is about not walking away.

Hannah Grivell, yes, again talking about the need for consultation. Implementation is a challenge for us. We have seen that with the lay ministry/lay leadership debates that we have had and papers that have been brought to this Synod for the last 30 or 40 years, with the little that has been done. We need to make implementation work and that is part of the reason why we have the peer review process in place. Those bullet points in the paper before you will also act as a framework by which we measure what we are doing

and how effective we are being, and we need to hold one another to account as the months and years go by so that we ensure that these workstreams and all the good things that they are doing are implemented, both at diocesan and local level, as well as at national level.

Thank you to Hannah Cleugh for her suggestions of including elements of revival and restoration. We have heard that and we will try to work that in. There are some really good theological resources coming onstream, and I guess that there will be more as we go forward. Please keep a lookout on the Reform and Renewal Facebook page where they will be posted over the next six months. Please look out for those.

Finally to the Bishop of Chelmsford, as ever leaving us with a rallying cry to get out there, out of our barns, putting our paintbrushes down and getting out to sow seeds for future harvests.

This has been a really positive and helpful debate, Synod. Thank you for all of your contributions. Thank you to those of you who wished to speak but were not called. Please write in with any suggestions that you have. We take them seriously. We want to listen. We are about consulting, and now it is for us to go back and begin to work this out in the places and the contexts that God has placed us. Thank you.

The Chair: I now put Item 12 to the vote.

The motion:

‘That this Synod welcome the vision and narrative for Renewal and Reform as set out in GS 2038 and commend it as a framework for the implementation of Renewal and Reform across the Church.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That concludes this item of business. Before I leave the Chair, could I thank the young people in the gallery for their interest in our business this afternoon? There is also alongside them the faithful presence of Sisters from the Order of the Holy Paraclete.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 4.16 pm

A Church of England Vision for Education: A Report from the Education Division (GS 2039)

The Chair: We now come to Item 13 on our agenda which is a take note debate on a report from the Education Division: “A Church of England Vision for Education”. For this debate you will need GS 2039. We have had a very large number of requests to speak in this debate and we have timed business at 5.30, so I am going to set a speech limit of three minutes from the outset so that we are able to hear as many voices as possible. I now invite the Bishop of Ely to move the motion. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

At the turn of this century the General Synod affirmed a motion that Church of England schools - our schools - are at the heart of our mission to the nation. Our Church schools continue to play a vital role in providing a distinctively Christian education which has spiritual development at its very heart. We offer a character and ethos which is imbued with Christian worship so our young people can experience that life-changing encounter with Jesus.

Today our educational context is changing fast. As the system has fragmented from a dual one to a very multiple-provider system, with a diminishing role for local authorities, we find ourselves the largest provider of schools and academies across the country. A large academy chain is judged to have about 40 schools; across the country the Church of England has 750 academies among our 4,600 schools.

When we were seeking to develop a vision for education to underpin all of our endeavours, and our ambition and appetite to grow the number of Church schools and extend our influence across the country, to care for even more than the million children we care for already, we wrestled with the question of whether it was our purpose primarily to be protecting the distinctive nature of Church schools or to be seeking to engage fully and with great confidence in building on our distinctive ethos to seek to develop and influence, and indeed change, the vision for education of the whole nation.

Our conclusion has been that this is a moment to be both bold and ambitious and offer more than an apologetic for Church schools: a Christian vision for education that can affect all of our children and the way that Government goes about its business. This will only have authenticity because it is rooted within the Christian character of our existing and growing number of Church schools and by strengthening the inspection framework to ensure that Church schools continue to develop their distinctive Christian character.

Only this week I have been made more aware of the opportunity before us, hearing of community school heads telling one diocese that they wanted to become part of Church school-led mass because they recognised in this vision we are articulating something deeper and richer than the often functionalist or utilitarian view of education which has become the dominant narrative. Every time I read Archbishop Temple from 1944 reminding the National Society, as it then was, that “we educate persons” and “we teach persons, not facts”, I am reminded that it is a deeply Christian vision for education for the common good, worked out authentically and explicitly as the underpinning Christian vision for Church of England schools. We know this is more and more vital as we note research from this university this year which showed that England ranked 13th out of 16 when it came to life satisfaction among children across Europe.

As the major provider of schools we must lead the way with a clear and confident message of how education should promote human flourishing. We have been inspired by outstanding schools such as Twyford Church of England Academy and what it calls its

10:10 ethos. We look to John 10:10 as a key text for us, where Jesus says that he “has come that people may have life; and life in all its fullness”. We have sought to distil our vision of education for life in all its fullness into four basic elements.

First of all, educating for wisdom, knowledge and skills. Wisdom is not theological code for coasting. “Life in all its fullness” means being exacting, rigorous, ambitious and having an appetite for all that excellence demands. We are absolutely clear that any school which accepts underperformance is failing those children.

However, knowledge is not enough. Our children need to grow in wisdom and understanding. If you think about Proverbs 3, we are led straight from the adoration of God to a fresh appreciation of justice and community. That is the kind of wisdom we want. We are educating for hope and aspiration. Good schools open up horizons of hope and aspiration and guide people into ways to fulfil them. They also cope wisely when things and people go wrong. Bad experiences and behaviour, wrong-doing and evil need not have the last word.

I was with some Year 4 children a while ago and I waved my pectoral cross and said, “Why do I wear this?” to which a girl said, “There wouldn’t be much point in you without that, would there”!

We have the resources for healing and hope much more fundamental than meaninglessness, suspicion, selfishness and despair. We are in the Year of Mercy. We want to be the people leading children through the door of hope and mercy: forgiven, with nobody left out.

Educating for community and living well together. Education needs to have at its core a base in relationships and commitments, the qualities of character that enable people to flourish together. As Archbishop Justin said to us yesterday, that is particularly important at this very moment in our society as we work out how to live well together.

We are educating for dignity and respect. Human dignity is central to good education. Schools need to be places where children learn who they are and how much they are worth. This worth is given to them by the love of God, who confers on them in His love all the dignity and inalienable human rights they have.

As important in this is that we recognise reaching out to children with any kind of struggle or disability. I am reminded of Jean Vanier of L’Arche saying that Jesus creates the Church when he offers his mother and his best friend to each other when he is at his most humiliated and disfigured.

Wisdom, hope, community and dignity. In discussing this with school leaders, they have found this to be a compelling vision of life in all its fullness. This has been welcomed warmly by the House of Bishops and by diocesan education teams. I have been trailing this at head teachers and school leaders’ conferences around the country and have met with nothing but enthusiasm and excitement about it. Visions, as I have heard recently, must be lived, not laminated.

We have developed this vision for education at this time because this is a unique opportunity that will not come again. We are hearing from senior figures in the Department of Education, in Parliament and elsewhere that this is an opportunity for the Church to engage, to be providing more of the aspirations set out in the Government's recent White Paper on education. This is an opportunity that will not come again, for us to be ambitious for opening new free schools and for doing our part in meeting the new requirements for schools in a growing child population. We need to engage with this now. We are doing this partly by starting the new Foundation for Educational Leadership, which will be a cornerstone for transforming leadership across our sector and doing the research to undergird all that we seek to do in the future. The time is here. This is an opportunity to develop new schools as well as existing schools and to offer radical new approaches to how we function as a movement for education. Standing still is not an option. We must go forward in confidence and seize the opportunity right now. This is our mission to the nation: deeply Christian, serving the common good. I commend this vision for education to Synod.

Very Revd Dr Frances Ward (Deans): In this my maiden speech I would like to begin by thanking Synod for electing me as a trustee of the National Society. It is a privilege and honour to serve that historic body, especially during the next five years of national change, challenge and opportunity in education.

This is a *kairos* time, as Bishop Stephen has said, and deeply Christian. Serving the common good rises to that challenge, giving us a vision as the Church of England to promote the flourishing of today's children; tomorrow's disciples and leaders. We face turbulent times as a nation. One of the surest signs of hope we can offer as the national Church is our continued faith in children; giving them the very best resources to face an uncertain future. The foundation years of a child's life can form them for good or ill. Good schools with excellent nurture, and an emphasis on character and self-control can turn around the worst effects of poor attachment, and material, social, emotional and intellectual poverty.

The Report offers a clear and confident vision for the long term in what is, I would argue, the best opportunity for mission that we could ask for. This is mission. This is how I believe we make the best and greatest impact upon our nation in mission, through the excellence of our Church schools and what they offer to children from all walks of life and ethnic backgrounds. Whether it is a school in Manningham in Bradford, where I used to minister, or a small rural school in the heart of Suffolk where I am now, our Church schools need to be hubs of mission, drawing greater resources in recognition of the opportunities they offer to introduce children and their parents to Christianity. The Foundation for Educational Leadership is crucial to this mission to equip teachers to communicate the Christian gospel. Imagine in ten or 20 years' time when people are heard to say, "That person must have been educated in an Anglican school. You can tell: they have such confidence and hope; they are wise beyond their years; they care about public service and what it means to live in communities that work; they know how to promote the dignity of others; they are concerned not about self-promotion but about public service, the needs of others above self. That is what it means to be a Christian".

To shape and form young people within an education ecology that is grounded in wisdom,

hope, community and dignity is the best offering the Church of England can give our nation and the world. In a mission-shaped Church, our schools are our best asset. May we heartily support this excellent vision and promote its values in all our Church schools and colleges and parishes.

Miss Emma Forward (Exeter): It may be a surprise to you that as a Christian teacher I would like to resist that we take note of this vision for education. It is on the surface hard to disagree with any of the words or the sentiment of this vision. For example, I think I like the sound of an educational ecosystem, although, in spite of having been a teacher for ten years, I have to admit I do not know what that actually means. That leads me to my main point. I cannot really tell what this document is saying. I teach pupils taking GCSE and A-level English and a great deal of my time involves helping young adults to write clearly, to make an argument and convince the reader of their point. If their written work does not communicate successfully, I send them to re-do it. There is nothing wrong with that. There is no shame in it, if you want to get something right. In fact, when teaching Year 12s and Year 13s in writing a UCAS personal statement, it is good practice to revisit it a minimum of eight times in order for the writer to express themselves in the best possible light.

The vision for education as we have it here still feels more like an apology for the Christian faith in our schools rather than an insistence on it as the absolute truth. Later on you might want to look again at the paragraph on worship on page 16. It explains why worship probably should not be omitted from school life. It feels like we are embarrassed to have to say that. Rather we should insist on worship in our schools and set standards for what that should entail. As Christian educators our schools ought to be forming young Christians to send them out to increase the faith in an increasingly secularised world. Let us send this draft back and get it reworked so that we can achieve that end. I ask that you, like me, resist this take note debate for that reason.

Mrs Gill De Berry (Salisbury): As a chair of governors of a rural primary school, I applaud this report. It reminds us of the huge asset the Church of England has in its sponsorship of so many schools; a great asset indeed for when our schools are full, our churches are often not so. It is through the schools that we can reach the next generation and embed Christian values for the future.

However, I have two questions. The first relates to the very last appendix of the report where I fear this happy state of affairs might be torpedoed or perhaps scuppered by the government policy of academisation. In preparation for this impending process, can I ask how prepared are we? Has every diocesan board of education set up its own multi-academy trust (MAT)?

Secondly, how can the diocesan boards ensure that every child in a Church primary school is guaranteed a place in a suitable secondary school? I ask that because in our area of Wiltshire there are very few choices for secondary school education and, if you do not opt for the first one that is there, I do not want to see any children be abandoned.

Revd Peter Kay (St Albans): I would like to speak largely in favour of the Report. I speak as a rural vicar with links to three village lower schools - that is reception to Year 4 - with

rolls of between 50 and 70 pupils. Two of those schools are in our benefice. One is a Church school and the other one is not. With my wonderful Reader we have great links. We take collective worship every week in those schools. I am an *ex officio* governor of the Church school and there the third school comes in because that school is federated with another non-Church school which is about ten miles away. We share a head teacher and a governing body. I am a governor of that school as well, slightly by default. If this all sounds confusing, I would like to reassure Synod that when I have a meeting or assembly, I usually turn up at the right school at the right time with the right level of preparation - usually.

I welcome the way that the Report seeks to renew a vision for Christian education although, like others, I am concerned that it seems to downplay the idea of a distinctively Christian education just at the point where there seems to be a real culture change in Church schools. I feel more work is needed there. That said, I welcome Bishop Stephen's comments about seeking to develop an overarching vision that goes beyond the Church school/non-Church school divide. I hope to provide some inspiration for this by focusing on opportunities for multi-academy trusts. I recognise that this report is speaking about Christian education in more general terms, but MATs are very much in the spotlight, and I would like to highlight some of the possibilities from our context.

I hope it might inspire others as well to think about what might work in theirs. Recent major changes in north Bedfordshire's school system, moving from a three-tier lower, middle and upper system, to a two-tier primary and secondary system, has highlighted how small village schools, both Church and non-Church, can feel very vulnerable compared with the larger schools above them. In some ways, the larger schools were seeking to dictate terms. It has highlighted to me how a MAT for those smaller schools can bring together these different schools, both Church and non-Church, to speak with a louder collective voice, to build and foster relationships that already exist.

I am concerned that we do maintain a distinctiveness in Christian education. I am certainly not suggesting a lowest common denominator approach. Nor am I suggesting that there should be a hidden agenda to manipulate non-Church schools in their ethos. Rather, I am thinking of ways that the Church as a wider body can serve the wider landscape in a way that is relevant and helpful to all. Thank you.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): Before I was leader of Church Army I was a youth worker in Chorleywood. One of the most important parts of my job was being involved in our awesome school. Whether it was doing assemblies, helping kids to read or hanging upside down on a high rope, it was a privilege to journey with these children. Last Friday, a 26-year old young woman tweeted me and asked for my email address. I vaguely recognised her name. Her marriage had broken down and it was me she wanted to pray for her. She had been in our school 12 years ago. That is the impact that our schools have on children. I warmly welcome this report. Church schools are a success story for our Church and we should be proud of the impact they have across the nation.

My favourite TV programme is *The Apprentice*, and my favourite moment is when the very scary Claude Littner puts the candidates and their CVs under the spotlight. Perhaps he would have a go at the Tory leadership contenders. In one cringing moment, as one

guy said he was a big fish in a small pond, Claude mercilessly said, “You are not a big fish; you are not even a fish”. Well, friends, we are a big fish in the educational world: 4,500 primary schools; 2,000 secondary schools; our clergy provide 1 million hours of school service every single year; 25,000 of us are school governors; 1 million attend our schools; and 15 million across this country have attended one of our schools. This is fantastic and utterly inspirational.

Every one of those schools is a community that is generous, inclusive, hopeful, loving, and, yes, deeply Christian, for each child is important and we hope they will know that God loves them and they can achieve the best that they can. When politicians remind us that the Church has no business in running schools, we remind them gently that we were running schools for 134 years before they showed up.

The Government’s recent Education White Paper calls for excellence. Well, three-quarters of our schools are excellent. They want more teaching schools, we can do that. They want more free schools, we can do that. They want more schools in poor areas, we can do that, too. They want more leaders, we can train them. This is a time for boldness, for courage, a time to be strong, and on the eve of the European football final let me say this: there is a clear open goal in front of the Church of England that the Government has set for us and I urge our team captain, the nimble and able Bishop of Ely, to lead our team forward in his kit and score that goal and the rest of us in this Synod will cheer him on.

Revd Alison Booker (Leicester): I want to welcome this report for the vision it gives the importance of the Church of England being involved in the education of our children. In time I hope there will be more details of how that will emerge here and, of course, locally. I think it is important that as a national Church we are open, clear and intentional about our commitment to education.

My own perspective is as a vicar of five east Leicestershire villages, the largest of which, Billesdon, has around 1,000 people and a thriving Church primary school. Where I am, the five village schools around us work together in a collaborative partnership. Four of these are Church of England schools. The collaboration of distinctive units is really important to them and there is a resistance to decision-making bodies which are external to that.

I want to encourage us as the Church of England not only to have confidence in our long-term experience of education, but also to draw upon our very clear ability to be the Church at an international, national and diocesan level whilst at the same time encouraging the individual unique expression of that at a very local level. In my opinion, this experience will be of great importance in our rural schools, and I am sure in others also.

We need our existing and new Church schools to be places of fullness of life rooted in their communities whilst being connected to the wider communities in which they are in the spirit of what Alexandra reminded us earlier that our young people, our children, are the Church of today.

I would like to finish with some words directly from the children of my parishes. In Billesdon School we asked a small group of 10- and 11-year olds, three-quarters of whom

have no faith experience or contact outside of school but who choose to come to a lunchtime prayer and worship club, to write an explanation, a tagline of what it means to be a Church school. It is my hope we can help create the possibility of this for many children now and in the years to come. The children of Billesdon School said this: "We are the children of God, the Holy Trinity. We learn to believe and we believe to achieve". Thank you.

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson): This report was presented with enthusiasm to the meeting of the House of Bishops in May and, while it was warmly received, I felt the need to raise a question about it. No one can object to a new Foundation for Educational Leadership and the contribution it seeks to make to education generally in our country. The urgent need for teachers is evident. The need for Christian teachers, heads and deputy heads is undeniable.

What I have found in the last two-and-a-half years in Blackburn is a family of 200 Church schools in which the Christian ethos and leadership is exemplary. The sub-title on the front page of our report reveals the loss of a significant word. This has been mentioned already. Currently it reads, "Deeply Christian and serving the common good". For many years, however, the Church of England has talked of "distinctively Christian ethos" in our Church schools. In fact, the word "distinctive" was used by the Bishop of Ely five times in his introduction. I think more times than "deeply".

It was Lord Dearing a number of years ago, when Church schools could not be seen as different from neighbouring community schools, who encouraged a change of culture towards Church schools offering a distinctively Christian perspective. That has been an important driver and contribution to where we are now. It was a healthy corrective.

The word "distinctively" has been replaced by "deeply", a far less clear and satisfactory word. When I raised this at the House of Bishops I was not persuaded that the change was justified. Yes, the foundation is not just for Church schools and so it is argued that our report cannot impose on all schools a distinctively Christian ethos, but in making that appeal for a contribution to better leadership in education generally the report loses something of what our Church schools bring to the table. This change of language will be perceived as a loss and a step back by many Christian teachers in our Church schools. They need and deserve all our support and encouragement in the unique and demanding ministry which they offer. Saying "deeply" does not convey sufficiently the gift we bring to education in our country. Wisdom, hope, community and dignity are great values, but they are values in community schools. There is nothing Christian about those. We have got to argue for "distinctively" Christian and there is a clear biblical mandate for "distinctiveness", whether it is in the Old Testament, the people of God, or Jesus' call for his people to be salt and light, not losing saltiness and putting their lamp under a bowl.

I would want to argue that, although I voted against this report in the House of Bishops coming to Synod as you see it, because of the refusal to change "deeply" to "distinctively", I am now in two minds as to how to vote. Yes, let us support the drive for development of leadership in our schools, but without weakening the distinctively Christian approach that we bring to the table. I hope we shall not agree to a contribution to educating our nation that has lost its distinctive saltiness. Thank you.

Ven Luke Miller (London): This would have been a maiden speech if I had not chipped in about BMOs earlier this morning. I declare an interest as Chair of the London Diocesan Board for Schools. Garret FitzGerald, the former Taoiseach of the Irish Republic would say, “I can see how it works in practice but not how it works in theory” and that has been our problem. We can all see that Church schools are good, that they are at once inclusive of people of all faiths and of none, and properly Christian and missional, but we cannot quite articulate why, and that is becoming urgent.

I recently met with the interim head teacher of a Church secondary school in an area of London with a majority Muslim population, who is herself Muslim, as is the lead chaplain in that school. The interim head told me that she would not wish to work anywhere than in a Church of England school: the Christian ethos embedded in the values and curriculum provides a space for her and for her students in which a true faithful life can be lived in engagement with others who differ. Why is this?

My wife, who teaches in a non-Church school in a similar kind of area, was told by a child, “I’m not gonna learn science from you, Miss, any longer because my holy book told me not to”. She called circle time. “Let’s change the language. Your belief is based on evidence”. “Yes, the evidence in my book”. “Okay, I’m a Christian, my belief is based on the evidence of my holy book, and here’s why. Now here’s some scientists and their belief is based on the evidence that they bring”. Her religious literacy allowed that child to re-engage with science because he was better to articulate his own faith in terms of articulating its evidence and engaging than in disengaging and refusing to communicate. There is no such thing as a neutral education. Church schools have their distinctive ethos.

What we are doing needs to be articulated clearly enough so that small children and grown-ups can all manage to do it. Things like Twyford School’s John 10:10 begin that, but in a moment of massive opportunity with extraordinary partnerships to make with all kinds of other schools we need more clearly to articulate it. It is clear that we are not quite yet ready with a language that works.

I commend the report to Synod. I think that we should send it forward with a strong blessing. But we need also to commit ourselves to continuing to work in this complicated field in a way that enables us clearly and succinctly to say why it is we are about what we are doing.

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek): One of the things I really enjoy is engaging with schools. Apart from the children always asking me if I have any pets, I have always had the opportunity to talk about the reason for the hope that is within me. I have always had the opportunity to say to children and to staff that I am no more valuable than they are, I am a bishop because I am responding to God’s call to fulfil my potential and to go on becoming the person I have been created to be, and I want that for every girl, boy, man and woman.

I said the same thing when I spent Holy Week in Eastwood Park Prison with the women there. Yes, I believe that this paper is as much about prisons as it is about schools. This is about educating for wisdom and skills, for hope and aspiration, for community and living

well together, for dignity and respect. This is about enabling people to fulfil their potential and to experience life in all its fullness across every part of our country.

In February, I initiated a morning in which we brought together head teachers and the clergy of our Church of England primary schools. It was run jointly with the local authority. Yes, there were some points of tension and some negotiation needed in planning it, but at no point did we water down our Christian faith; the wine was there to be tasted. We spent a morning looking at how our schools and churches could work more imaginatively together for the common good of the wider community. I was delighted that a couple of head teachers from community schools came along with their local clergy. They recognised that this was not about creating faith schools but about creating schools which are open to all and committed to the flourishing of every individual whilst the Church is not shying away from our confidence in our faith in Jesus Christ.

I was sorry to miss yesterday's debate following the EU Referendum. I had wanted to say that this debate must not be disconnected from that debate, and we need to go on doing even more joining-up. This paper is about us as followers of Jesus Christ daring to fully grasp the immense opportunity in our country to join in with God's work of transformation.

I am really excited about the vision contained in this paper and I hope we will give it our full support.

Canon Pam Bishop (Southwell & Nottingham): I too am fully supportive of the vision paper we have here covering, as it does, that commitment for our youngsters living life to its fullness, and that is very important as we move into the unknown of the 21st century.

In the fulfilling of that vision I want to pick up two quite practical specific points to raise with the education department. The first is about the curriculum. Many of us have great concerns about the narrowing of the school curriculum and the imbalance of further planning between the core subjects and areas covering not only social, moral and spiritual education, but also the creative and the performing arts.

There was a debate in Parliament just last week on the proposed and limiting Ebacc provision triggered by a public petition. That petition - some of you may have signed it - was signed by over 100,000 people and was in support of the broader curriculum: the aim of shaping our young people to be expressive and sensitive and questioning and reflective and to have the skills and experience to lead that richer life and the confidence to contribute to the public good in a changing society. Nick Gibbs, as I understand it, was not encouraging in his official response, and I think that is very worrying: it seems like a done deal.

I just want to ask the question how much involvement or influence does the C of E have in the shaping and delivery of the curriculum to ensure that the teaching of those wider values and skills does not get lost in the relentless pursuit of excellence in English and maths? What part can we play in that national debate?

My second point refers to secondary schools. We have heard quite a number of speakers talk about their primary schools and I want to talk about secondary for a moment. There are fewer of them and, to some extent, they could receive less interest. I am glad to say that in my own diocese there is a policy and financial support for Church secondary schools in the employment of a half-time chaplain - good news. Secondary schools often work in difficult circumstances. It is difficult to recruit good head teachers, let alone practising Christians. Many of them are becoming academies and therefore feeling a bit detached now from their Christian roots, perhaps. There is the challenge of working with adolescents. Wonderful as you are, you are often quite tough, particularly in terms of faith work and mission work in terms of Christ's disciples. It is very different from what can be done in the primary schools. Again, my question is how involved can we be, can the Church be, can the Education Office be in helping to support the particular opportunities offered for faith development, for mission in our secondary Church of England schools?

Revd Canon Gary Jenkins (Southwark): I welcome this report and in particular I welcome its stated goal that pupils in our schools may have the opportunity for an encounter with Jesus Christ. But it is here that I wish the report would say a little more. I am governor of a thriving multiracial inner city school in south London in the parish in which I am vicar. As I visit the school, sit in lessons and take assemblies and hear other people's assemblies being taken, I am aware of the danger of moralism. The children in our school are constantly being exhorted to work hard and to be good.

My concern is that the children in our school, and in our Church of England schools across the country, see Jesus not as a role model, as the best boy in the class that everyone should copy, but that they should come to know him as a living friend and saviour who loves them. My goal and prayer for all the children in our school in Bermondsey is that by the time they leave they should all know that Jesus loves them.

I love the reference in the report to John 10:10 and the life in all its fullness that Jesus brings, but the gateway to that life in all its fullness is to know him as your saviour. That is what you must have first. I love the focus on wisdom and that great biblical theme of wisdom, but my fear is that wisdom without the Gospel will be moralism and an exhortation to be good, and our children get that already. Can we make sure that the Gospel of Jesus' love and forgiveness is at the very heart of the offer of Church education that we make as the Church of England to our nation. Thank you.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I am very excited by this vision which seems to me to give a sophisticated and insightful picture of the interaction between Christian schools and a society in which there is a growing lobby not to have any kind of religious link to schools, and in which much of society often wishes to ignore the reality of Christ.

In this interaction we see the working of the common good, we see values and skills in the human being brought together in a way that is immensely exciting and absolutely indispensable to this moment in our history. But also we see that that interaction of values and skills, the interaction of the Christian school with an increasingly secular society, is held in a context of worship. I am reminded of Fr Thomas's words earlier of the

importance of the encounter with God that comes in worship, and that comes through very clearly indeed. The values and the vision are embedded in theology and in Scripture. We have heard that said already, and, when you look at the authors of this report, that is no surprise at all.

More than that, of course, the education that comes from the Church of England must be distinctively Christian and Bishop Stephen's words earlier made it clear that everything they are thinking of is distinctively Christian. You are distinctive because you are deep and you are deep because you are distinctive. In this context, the whole picture of what is being put forward demonstrates something that will be both deep and distinctive.

This vision is outward looking into our society, not inward concerned. It speaks of ethos: but more than ethos, through the vision of the human being, earthed in Christian faith, it opens a door to find the face of Christ and life for the children who are educated in our schools. I urge Synod to take note of this vision.

Miss Rosemary Walters (Canterbury): I would like to support this report from the point of view of someone who trains primary teachers to teach RE. I think what is so good about it is that it has a breadth of vision. When I start with my students, before we get on to how we are going to teach RE, I say to them, "Let us look at religion, let us look at education and let us see if we can put these two words together."

We begin to discuss the ideas that education is an open-ended enquiry and, also, that what justifies religious education's part in the curriculum is that it deals with an area of human experience. What is the area of human experience that it deals with? Ultimate questions. Here they are on page 5 of this report: Who am I? What do I desire? How should I live? These are to be explored within a value system which reflects the integrity of the teachers, of the pupils, bringing with them their own ideas, their own world views, so that these can encounter belief.

I think this is really exciting because it is only if you respect this integrity and it meets with belief that you are going to achieve human flourishing and you are going to get the teachers and the children to think what it means to be a person of faith. I respect this report. I respect it from a theological perspective because I think it is shot through with grace; the idea of unconditional love, love for all families, all children, all backgrounds and, I must say, all schools.

We do not have a Church school in our parish but we have a community school and it is run, I must say, in a very Christian way - you may think that is diluting but I do not think it is - and they make us very welcome. I think it is so important that we do not somehow suggest that non-Church schools do not do this because I think that they do.

I respect this report for its pedagogy. It talks about what we are doing education for. I also respect it because it is credible. I could give this report to my students. I have many students who are reluctant to teach RE because they think they are going to be got at by me and they will have to get at the children. I could give them this and say: When you are writing your professional studies assignment or your child development assignment, look at this.

My students are not reluctant to talk about love. We talk about behaviour management. Children who need love the most, often ask for it in the most unlovely ways. They will talk about love. I think if I gave them this report, I do not need to preach at them, I do not need to comment on it, that would actually set up their defences again. If I gave them this report I think they would see in it that unconditional love, that grace which is what I would want them to see in it as a true reflection of Christianity.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Synod, teaching is a vocation and we must as a Church do more to train, equip and encourage a new generation to take up the Cross and to take up teaching. There is also much to be proud of in our schools.

However, I want to focus on one issue. I feel that we need to look hard at our special educational needs provision because, in some cases, we are failing some pupils when we should be offering excellence. We need to ensure, when there is no place in other schools because they cannot manage or seem as if they do not care, that we offer a welcome.

Church schools are not just about providing education, but about showing Christ's love for all. To get a diagnosis in a statement or funding is incredibly hard and I want the Church to be there. We must not turn people away when we should be holding them tight and supporting them, working together in partnership.

Despite being a mountain of a man today, larger than life, I was an SEN pupil. I was born very prematurely and in an incubator for six months and one of only two babies to survive in the unit. I was deaf and had many years of operations and at the age of 11 I nearly died from meningitis. All of this led to serious health problems and a life spent in and out of hospital.

It was my local school, while not being a Church of England school but supported in many ways by the diocese, who helped me return and attend classes for nine hours a week. I am now on my way to getting a PhD, all because of that foundational education. Of course, a lot of that is down to mum, a single parent who fought for me, and the doctors and others who cared about me.

I know without that support my life would be different. Instead of being here, I could so easily be sitting at home - I wish! - hopeless and without any life chances. In a time when resources are limited and children are falling out of the system, I see a real need for us as a Church to step in and change the lives of many disabled children and their families.

We should be there, walking with those in need as Christ walks with us. I welcome this report and it has my full support, but I look forward to future developments in these areas I have raised. Finally, can I thank all those across our nation who make these words on the paper a reality in all of our communities. Thank you.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Madam Chairman, after the next speaker can I tempt you

with a motion for closure?

The Chair: I would like to hear from the Bishop of Coventry and Elisabeth Paver and then I would welcome such a motion. Thank you.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you, Chair, for calling me. At this stage of the debate, I would like to look ahead at the practical outworking of the vision of deeply Christian education and to touch on four areas because, as the report says and it was underlined by the Bishop of Ely, standing still is not an option.

First, as schools become academies and as, in one sense at least, the DBE is decreased so that diocesan MATs may increase, we need to ensure that this vision of deeply Christian education is embedded just as deeply into the identity and activity of our MATs as they have been in our DBEs. It is vital that the weighty responsibilities of improvement and finance do not crowd out the driving distinctiveness of Christian education that have inspired DBEs and lie at the heart of this document.

Secondly, the demographics of our population and the development of new housing across our nation is a tantalising opportunity to extend the vision of education to new schools and new communities. To grasp that expansion in school places, we may well need three strands: Diocesan will, regional co-ordination and national support.

Third, in order to rise not only to the challenge of new communities and new academies but to also realise this vision in our existing schools, the vision of deeply Christian education needs to be central to the missional strategy of every parish priest, especially those with Church schools in their parishes - a strategy embodied beautifully in Alison Booker's ministry, as we have heard, and other clergy in this debate, but in my experience by no means universal in the Church.

Fourth, this vision of Christian education that is deeply Christian in such a way that the Church school can be seen even as a form of Church and for Church of England education to be deeply Christian in such a way as to be there for all and for the good of all, to bring the life of the Kingdom of God to the whole community.

That is such a compelling vision that, as others have said and it was put powerfully by Sam Margrave a moment ago, it requires recruitment of Christian teachers and the forming of those teachers into strategic leaders of the Church; people who are inspired by the pattern of Jesus, the rabbi, and rise to that opportunity that we have for such a time as this. Thank you.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): As someone who has worked for 41 years in education, something like this, of course, has got to gladden my heart. In fact, the title did not, but that has been dealt with so ably by the Bishop of Blackburn. Thank you, your Grace, for pointing out that that word "distinctiveness" is there and will be there because it is so important.

There is another word I want us to consider which I do not think I have found. That is the

word, 'vocation'. So often now teachers in our country when they say they are teachers, well, you know, it is a very negative response. I think as the Church of England we have got to now link this work with that for lay leadership.

We have got to go out and we have got to look not only for the new priests that we all want, but for new teachers, new Christian teachers with a vocation, a vocation to have a real ministry as a lay person doing this most important job. It is very difficult to recruit head-teachers, as we know, in any schools at this time and particularly in Church schools.

As a governor of a Church school we have been through our difficulties, like many of you have. Unless we start now and actually look for and are not afraid to use that word 'vocation' - I originally trained at St Mary's Teacher Training College in Cheltenham and vocation was very much there and in our minds that God was calling us to teach. That was what He called us to, and it is biblical.

So, please, if we do anything, Synod, let us make sure that when the Church of England Foundation for Educational Leadership is there that we have lots and lots of people wanting to do the original training to be a teacher: A teacher with a Christian vocation in a Church of England school. It is so important. Thank you.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Madam Chairman, a motion for closure on Item 13.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, that has my permission and I would like to test the mind of Synod.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I now call upon the Bishop of Ely to respond to this debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Thank you very much. Could I begin at the very end and to say to Elizabeth that the focus on vocation is absolutely critical and that, certainly in the Diocese of Ely, I have been saying that our celebrating and growing Christian teachers is as important as finding new people to be ordained.

This vision will have many iterations, including for teachers, and, as you say, through the Foundation, but there will be iterations also for children. Part of this process is that we need to be, and have been, listening to children and young people. It is very great to have you here today. But also iterations for governors, for clergy, for how we approach inspection systems and so on into the future.

It is an important thing to express - I think that Bishop Rachel said this - that this is a broad vision and a broad offer for the nation, for our children and for their parents, for our families and not just for schools. This is a vision for our engagement with Further and Higher Education. Further Education is the most neglected part of our education system. We need to be engaging with that too, so a broad vision.

I would say that the fact that we are deeply Christian is no loss so long as this deeply Christian vision is rooted, as I said in my initial remarks, in the authentic and distinctive character of our schools around the country. We want that vision to be widely shared so that we take the opportunity, as Bishop Christopher among others said, there is in new communities and where we had the opportunity with primary schools and secondary schools through the free school system to extend our range and break through any stained glass ceiling in order to make sure that we are on the ground in places of need.

That would apply, too, to what Sam was talking about, his very moving speech, around special education. Hitherto, we have not been very directly involved in special education because there has not been a mechanism by which the Church could be running such schools. We now in Marylebone have our first free school which is a special school and I pray that we can extend that range over time.

I was very pleased to hear from Rosemary Walters about the vision being a basis in which when we are approaching teacher training we can see grace being the sort of gold thread through the vision which enables teachers, especially those who are going to be teaching RE who may be nervous about this, it gives them an opportunity to grow in confidence both for themselves and with the children that they are going to be teaching.

I could say more but I think that at this stage I would just like to thank Synod for this debate and to assure you that this is not the last word. There will be other iterations of this. The foundation has been set for a bold vision for education in this country that is not just about our being defensive, holding on to our Church schools, but our seeking a generous and ambitious vision that can help to change the education environment across our country for the good of our children but, even more importantly, for the transformation of our country. Thank you.

The Chair: We now come to vote on Item 13.

The motion:

'That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. I would like to thank members of Synod for this debate and I am sorry that not everyone who wished to speak could do so. I do think that we should all be deeply encouraged by the energy and commitment shown in this Synod for the care and nurture of our children and young people.

This completes this item of business and we now move on to Item 10.

THE CHAIR *Canon Linda Ali (York)* took the Chair at 5.21 pm

Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders: Report from the Development and Appointments Group of the House of Bishops (GS 2026)

The Chair. Members of Synod, we now come to the long-awaited Item 10 from Order Paper number 1, Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders. You will need GS 2026 for this debate. I now invite the Bishop of Truro to move the motion. You have up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Tim Thornton): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this report.’

Good afternoon, members of Synod. I feel the need to begin by apologising. As you may notice, I am all on my own up here. That is the only sympathy I am going to get today. I just ought to explain that the team of wonderful people who do all the work were here yesterday ready for the debate but, sadly, had to go back and so cannot be with me today. I am sorry about that. I hope you will in due course be able to say a big thank you to them for all the wonderful work that they are doing in all sorts of ways.

As I have been sitting through these last two days wondering and being told at various stages I was about to go on and then not and back again, it struck me the irony of standing here all on my own when clearly we are in no way trying to put forward the idea of the heroic single leader as a way of working of the Church today. It is also interesting to think about leadership. You have to be agile, wondering when you might be called to speak or not speak; to be adaptive - my speech was moving between 20 and two minutes as various messages were given to me – and of course you have to be fleet of foot wondering what you are going to be saying at any one moment.

Being part of a prayerful group of bishops who are actively working together to understand how they can best respond to what God is saying to us in challenging and changing circumstances is very exciting. It is hopeful and joyful to be part of a group of people - bishops in the Church of England - who are receiving high-quality, disruptive and stimulating thought and content from a range of exceptionally well-equipped people from a whole variety of disciplines and backgrounds all of whom, intriguingly, are very keen to engage with us, the Church, and see that we have a distinctive role and important part to play in the future direction and shaping of the Church.

The Development and Appointments Group (DAG), which I have the privilege of chairing, is striving to ensure that our Church has and will have into the future excellent leaders who understand their role to be those who build and, yes, lead teams of teams, noting that we are called today to be adaptive and to transform the organism that is the Church which we are charged to lead. In doing all of that, most important of all we are trying always to change the culture. We do all of this as fellow disciples of Jesus Christ.

I am not today - you will be pleased to hear - going to take you through the Report that

you have had for some time and I know that you have all read very carefully. I am going to go through some of the highlights of that Report and also talk a little about one or two of the things that have happened on the programmes that have been running; give you a glimpse of where we are going in our direction of travel; and then, most importantly, listen to what you have to say in response to this Report. Of course I hope that you will at the end of this debate take note in your normal enthusiastic way.

In thinking about what we are doing in DAG, there are four programmes that are now running. We have been doing this over the last 18 months. I am well aware of course that as we began our work, as has already been commented by various people, the initial Report that came out was not well worded in many ways. I have already publicly apologised for many of the mistakes that we made in those early days, but we are now well under way in our work and I hope some of the people who are already on the programmes in various ways, and I know are here today, will want to say something in this debate, telling you personally from their own perspective of the learning and development that is going on.

First of all, we have the programme of cathedral leadership for deans. We ran this in 2015 for 17 deans and we repeated it again just last week for a further 20 deans. Secondly, we have a development programme for bishops. Eighteen suffragans attended the programme from 2015 and over into this year and 27 diocesans, three-quarters of the House, are currently participating in a programme which is two-thirds of the way through its residential phase. In December of this year a further 30 suffragans will take part in this programme.

The cathedral programme that we are running, sometimes known as a mini MBA, is very much geared around what the deans themselves were saying they wanted. If you move from some sorts of ministry to being in charge of a cathedral, you have to understand that there are business elements of the life of that that have to be done, and the deans themselves, whom we consulted, said they wanted real work in the functional disciplines such as finance, marketing and project management. That is what that programme did in a particular, precise sort of way.

The programme that we have shaped and designed so far for bishops is very different. What we are doing there is designing an opportunity to explore thinking and the word I mentioned earlier, to “disrupt” our thinking, and to stimulate our thinking in a variety of fields. It has been extraordinarily rich to have a large number of diocesan bishops working together over a period of time residentially, where yes, of course, we have been listening to content but - surprise, surprise - some of us have already also been responding to what we have heard. For me one of the key things we are learning from this is not just individual development but also organisational development. Already I can see signs of a changing of the culture in the way that we work as bishops because of the results of what we are doing together. We aim in all this to build strategic and transformative capacity for the Church as we seek to develop disciples, grow the Church and transform community.

Thirdly of course we have created a new learning community - a five-year programme of development for those discerned by the Church as having the gifts, potential and capabilities to go on to wider leadership in the future. Fifty-five women and men are

currently participating and a further 62 begin the programme this coming Thursday. Those who are participating have spoken of their joy at being part of this more transparent process and they have shown great spirituality, humility and passion in their determination to use this opportunity to serve the Church. I might also say that in talking to many of the people who have been teaching them, they have come away very enthused and amazed by the joy, enthusiasm and real engagement of these people.

Our fourth area of work has been targeted development for those groups in the Church where some specific interventions might be helpful. In particular, I point to positive action that we have taken to provide BAME clergy with development around the senior appointments process.

Clearly part of what I am doing here today is, to some extent, being part of accountability, trying to say how these programmes are going to add value in some way. I was very heartened by the debate we had earlier on the Renewal and Reform programme, and I believe that much of the work we are doing is helping in that overarching way of thinking and being at the moment. I have a responsibility to try to share with you what I think we are learning from all of this. It is still early days. We have put in place various mechanisms to try to evaluate and assess what is going on. I would single out for you the contribution the programmes have made to fostering collegiality and fellowship across the Church. As I said just now, I see already that there are signs of ways in which the bishops are beginning to think again about how their meetings work, about how they take responsibility together, the question perhaps being: are we a group of leaders or are we a leadership group?

In terms of what has been valuable coming out of all this, a very close second for me would be the stimulation provided as we listen to those people who have been teaching us and walking with us. Yes, we have used excellent, high-quality teachers from various disciplines and, as we have sat there, those of us who ourselves are steeped in some understanding of theology and the Christian life, it has been very interesting to respond to what we have been hearing and to understand and think about that language and interpret it into the way we work ourselves.

All of these things are really important and I believe show real strength in various ways. What I would say to you is clearly the learning community is great, it has been set up, but I would hope that we can find ways to encourage other dioceses now to invest in their own CMD work to carry on building up other communities that can learn as well. I am in close dialogue with the Rt Revd Tim Thornton, the chair of the CMD panel, to try to see ways in which we can try to help dioceses and the Church more generally to pick that up.

Looking to the future I would stress importantly, as I come to the end of this presentation, that the way we see our work going into the future is to give resources to bishops, to work with their teams, and to make them more effective so that they can build on the strategy they are designing in their dioceses. For us to think more carefully what it means to lead the Church of God at this time is surely important, and I think all that we are doing is distinctively Anglican as we think about the Incarnate being at the heart of all we do. All of this assumes that we are equipping ourselves to become those whom God is calling to be the guardians of the deposit of the faith so that, as in the preface which is read every

time a priest is licensed in the Church of England, we may proclaim afresh the gospel in this generation. I look forward to your comments and your questions in this debate.

The Chair. Item 10 is now open for debate. There are a number of speakers who have put in requests.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury): I want to thank Bishop Tim for bringing this important Report to Synod. Nurturing and discerning the Church's leaders is a responsibility of the whole Synod, not just the House of Bishops, and it is good that we have the opportunity to scrutinise these arrangements. Could it be confirmed, please, that nurturing and discerning senior leaders is now fully integrated into the Renewal and Reform programme so that it falls squarely within the remit of Synod from now on? This will not surprise you much, but I am never going to be the biggest fan of the present leadership programme. To me it is a bit too much in thrall to secular thinking. In particular the talent pool approach to releasing gifts sits uneasily with a theology of discipleship and vocation. I am not convinced that it will deliver on its own terms. It has struggled to be diverse, for instance, one of the stated aims. More seriously, I wonder how far we are preparing people for distinctly Christian leadership.

That said, there has been some helpful dialogue over the last 12 months and a real attempt to understand why the original proposals caused such dismay. We welcome the softening of language and broadening of approach. I would like to thank Lisa Adams, who heads the programme, for engaging with people in my kind of role, with directors of ministry and diocesan CMD officers, who are the main deliverers of continuing ministerial development, including leadership training, across the Church. We continue to want to work with DAG in a joined-up way.

The main point that I would like to make relates to the wider CMD picture. Renewal and Reform has generated workstreams around discipleship, vocations, ministerial education, lay ecclesiastical ministries and a number of other areas including leadership.

The single omission and main area where there is no fresh initiative, no new group or proposed extra funding is the CMD, continuing ministerial development, of around 19,000 lay and ordained ministers. Originally CMD was tucked in with RME in the RME Report but was dropped from the final proposals and not replaced with anything.

The senior leadership development programme, which serves a very small number of people, is not intended to plug that gap. Over the next ten years it is those currently in mid-ministry in roles of primary responsibility such as team rectors and incumbents of large multi-parish benefices and rural deans who will bear the heat of the day while numbers retiring continue to rise, until the impact of increasing vocations begins - God willing - to kick in. These are the key front-line leaders we have now, strategically crucial to the Church's ongoing mission and ministry, but at national level we are not yet resourcing them in any structured way, although a few dioceses are doing good things.

If we want to improve the overall resilience and competence of Church leadership then

this may be an even more important group to focus resource on than potential candidates for preferment. As Bishop Tim referred to, he is the chair of the National CMD panel as well as the chair of DAG so is ideally placed to help us think this through and perhaps frame some recommendations and bring them back to us.

Synod, I hope that you might wish to give Bishop Tim your encouragement to consider how that might best be taken forward.

Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield): I will never forget the day when my very able-bodied cleaner cried as she told me the words that she had heard Archbishop Justin say on BBC Radio 2's Jeremy Vine's "Being Human" series. He said, "To be human is to be limited". She was so moved and freed and, frankly, relieved that she no longer had to be all things to all people. She also began her faith journey that day and her own anxieties and mental health struggles stopped being that burden that she had to hide. What does it look like to take those words seriously - "to be human is to be limited" - in the context of our challenging reality in leading and shaping the Church of England? The missed opportunities of this important and necessary project to nurture and develop the vocations of tangibly limited, so-called disabled people is disabling our Church.

Whilst I wholeheartedly welcome the creativity that is expressed in this Report and the desire to do things differently and better, I wish to express immense frustration that the Church, Christ's Bride, will continue to look so very, very different to her Groom. The one who rode into Jerusalem on that ridiculous baby donkey yet eclipsed those Roman horses and chariots and their victory parades. The essential characteristic of our Church must be of unlikely people living unlikely lives and serving and leading in countercultural ways, where the weakest are not tolerated, pitied or accommodated but prized, cherished, and even followed. This needs to be deliberate and visible for all to see, and maybe even mock, as they probably did "that fool" we follow on the donkey. This project's express desire for diversity expressed in paragraph 7 is a great start, but it is not particular to Church. Diversity is an aspiration of all administrative layers of our society and, dare I say, very often a token.

What this Report demonstrates resoundingly therefore is that disabled people are assumed to play no part in the important work of encouraging and nurturing vocations and leading our churches. What they are able to do is often left hidden under the label of disability. One in ten people in this country are considered to have some kind of impairment or disability, although I agree with Archbishop Justin that that figure is ten in ten.

Who are they in the Body of Christ - if indeed they can even get in the building, but that is not for this debate? This is not about campaigning for equal access because it is the right thing to do. It is much deeper than that and if the Church is to be truly herself, we have to look at this and take seriously the words of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians: "God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong". Strategic leadership development? Yes. Skilled, professional, capable and vision-creating leadership? Yes. Prophetic witness to the king on the donkey? Nowhere near. It is not about giving people a go; it is about a truly courageous Church that is willing and committed to looking like that fool on the donkey

whilst everyone else is still polishing their chariots in a display of strength and power: an explicit and determined call to those that the world might call fools, to fulfil their vocation in the Church, is really, really important.

I urge those involved in this project to think again and to be braver. The great news is that we do not have to reinvent the wheel. My own experience of training and that of other disabled clergy is, yes, our colleges were unprepared but then we were welcomed and affirmed and the changes have begun. We do not have to lay new tracks for this stuff and it does not have to wait until the main business is done in two or three years' time, as paragraph 39 implies. It can start now and it needs to start now if our Church is to be truly whole and healthy.

The Chair. After Canon Cotton I will be reducing the speech limit to three minutes.

Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford): This is being called the “Eton of the Church of England”; a phrase that perhaps expresses something of the admiration, aspiration and enthusiasm that the Bishop of Truro has already mentioned. There is plenty of good stuff in the Report. Both the learning and the camaraderie are much that we can take great pleasure in. However I believe the nature of this sort of debate is also to point out some of the things that may need to be corrected or indeed some of the things that are absent on these pages; what is not in the Report. I turn especially to paragraph 26. I value the emphasis on the intentionality of the discernment of clergy going into the learning community. That speaks of determination and commitment. That is good. What is not said in that paragraph needs to be heard as well. What about those people who cannot pass the rather avid gatekeepers who determine who goes into the learning community who are asking themselves, “What could I do to be considered?” It is not named here because this Report is naming the good things, but it is a question that needs some careful consideration.

What about the question that is asked by someone who says, “I have been considered and found to be below the line; found to be someone who is not worth investing in”? All I am doing there is drawing a consequence from a phrase in paragraph 5 which speaks again about the intentionality of investing in some people and not others. £2.3 million is a lot money. What about those others?

It was in asking those questions that I started to recognise that some of the language of this Report, although good at the moment, still needs further modification. The language starts to split into two groups. The rather invisible group are those who are led; those who are seen to be done to and from whom is not expected any contribution. What this Report does name is the other group; those for whom strategic change seems not only to be their duty but their property. I am afraid to say that is not a pattern I recognise in the Church of England. That is not the pattern that Jane Charman was referring to, where strategic change so often happens at the local level. A phrase that is used is “thought leaders”. As I read that, I compiled my own short list of thought leaders, those who have contributed to the major part of my learning over the last ten to 15 years about not only what the pattern of ministry can be like now but in the future: Nicola Slee, Dave Tomlinson, Francis Spufford, Pete Gregg, Linda Woodhead, Diarmaid MacCulloch, none of whom would be in the learning community and I wonder if they contribute to it as well.

Part of what I am wanting to endorse is again what Jane Charman was saying, to encourage the Bishop of Truro to hold his two roles together. There is a lot of good stuff in this Report, but £2.3 million should buy a lot of good stuff. I noted the underspend of about £100,000.

If I can refer finally to paragraph 34, it is noticeable that in specifically targeting women for episcopal ministry, this Report draws on the work of Transformations and the Leading Women programme which, as far as I understand, has not been allocated any money at all.

So, long may the Church's Eton flourish, but I wonder what needs to be done to recognise and enhance the value and contribution of the rest.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): I want to warmly welcome this Report, which takes huge strides forward, it seems to me, in terms of transparency, forward planning and theologically grounded, practically useful training for those leaders who are in place now and for those who are coming onstream later, and an expression of a desire to increase minority ethnic involvement. As we look around this chamber, it will be painfully obvious that we are not representative of our churches or our nation, as Alexandra Podd from the Youth Council alluded to earlier.

However, I want to respectfully disagree with Alexandra. She said we have 32 years. I want to say that 32 years is way too long. I have been involved, in my adult life at least, in the Church of England for 20 years and I have only experienced warmth and welcome, for which I am very grateful. When you keep hearing that there is a desire for change and when you can begin to count your involvement in the Church of England in terms of decades, and you look around and there does not seem to be any change, you begin to ask, "Is there the will?" because the Church of England, when it wants to push things through, can.

The words of Martin Luther King come to my mind: "I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that our biggest obstacle are those who constantly advise minorities to wait until a more convenient season. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection." I want to thank you for this Report and for your desire to make a change.

I have one suggestion - forgive me if this has been suggested before; I am new to Synod - I notice that the governance panel on the SLDP includes elected female representatives of the House of Bishops, and their presence signals a desire to say let us find a way to have representation at every level. My question is: might something similar be done for minority ethnic groups? Thirty-two years is too long for us to wait for a time when the Bridegroom is surrounded by every tribe, tongue and nation and that picture represents our leadership in the Church of England. I welcome this Report and urge you to keep pushing forward. Thank you very much.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very grateful for this report, but also I will bring some challenge to it. Do not panic, Tim, it is okay. I want to focus particularly on the bottom of page 6 at item 28. I was one of 11 so-called lay lay assessors for each of the 25 panels that met to, as it were, discern with others, usually a bishop as the Chair, another senior clergyperson and a lay person, who was not a lay lay person but a lay person employed, as it were, by the national system. I was with the wonderful Brad Cook and Lisa Adams and give thanks also for the wonderful work of Ashton Greene in the background, all within Caroline Boddington's team.

It was a privilege, and also noting in this second year of this process, that laity were invited to be fully participatory and had a very big say - one of my chairs is sitting there: I hope he agrees? - in what we were doing in meeting a range of people, over 80 people in total in those 25 panels and over 60 coming on into this learning community. I felt it was very professional, very well-organised. I think the people who met us felt listened to and valued, certainly the 8 people that I saw. Just to pick up a point from Robert: certainly the person that perhaps was not necessarily going to go forward in this package of ideas was going somewhere else to be supported in that. I did sense a real desire to feed back, support and develop the future.

As I say, the interviews also had in the background some psychometric testing, which I thought was very helpful both for us and for the participants who gave a presentation and probably had a very sensible structured interview for over an hour in total. Each of us from the laity, and I have spoken to some of them, some Synod members, some diocesan lay chairs and others, are very experienced people in the world of education, of business and management, of human resources. Perhaps I did not, but they certainly knew what they were doing. I think I can reassure lay people and clergy that this was taken very seriously and done well.

So what are my challenges? It was quite a formal process. Perhaps in the future - because this is a learning community - those interview processes could be more interactive, more organic, more collaborative, as we discern words from Jan Allen Smith, a layperson from Carlisle diocese.

We have heard a little bit helpfully from both Zoe and Robert about the need to perhaps open up who we are pushing forward into this process. At the moment it sits with the bishops, maybe it could be a little more opened up. I sense from what Tim is doing, and Ashton, and others, it is a learning environment, that we are learning, too, how to do this. I am grateful to see that next year I and others have been invited to consider being on these panels. This is going to be an ongoing process. We do need to hear those wise voices who are saying, "What about this group? What about this way in?" so we do not get stuck, as it were, in a rather traditional model of interview of the same sorts of people. I am very pleased to challenge the bishop but also to say well done, Tim.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): There is much to welcome in this report, but I wish to focus particularly on paragraph 39 of the report which draws attention to the fact that disabled people have not yet found fair representation within the leadership of the Church of England. I must confess, though, that I do baulk at the use of the term "issue" when

speaking of disability, the “issue” of disability. I hope that as someone who is disabled I am not an “issue” within the Church, which could conjure up ideas of being difficult or an inconvenience - perish the thought! Language matters and I take issue with the word “issue” in this context.

I also agree with Zoe that there is a danger that looking at disability representation within senior leadership may never rise above simple tokenism unless we seek a holistic integrated approach regarding disability from all the powers that be within the Church, which culminates in a vision for the whole Church where all aspects of our Church, including our senior leadership roles, our churches and buildings are fully accessible. It goes much deeper than just physical access. This process must be rooted theologically.

Soon after my ordination as priest, I was told to my face by another ordained priest that I actually should not have been ordained in the first place because of what the Bible states in Leviticus 21:21. There is much work that needs to be done and much that has been done under the theology of disability, a resource readily available to us. We need a lead from our present leadership, one which embraces a positive call for accessibility and inclusion so that there is a future time when the disabled priest can apply for jobs, including those of senior leadership, within the Church of England on a level playing field.

I believe that with a practical, theological and integrated approach we will achieve real transformational change, for together we are one body, each of us made in the image and likeness of God revealed in the body of the risen Christ, which is a body where the scars of the crucifixion are not healed, a body where all our abilities and disabilities find their rest. Thank you.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): When we hear a speech like that we need to pause. Synod has got to have the ability to pause and not just keep talking. I am sorry, I know the rules do not allow us but I am going to burst into song. Have I got your permission, Madam Chair?

The Chair: You have.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): As one of the most unusual training experiences of my life, I was consecrated Bishop of Aston at St Paul’s Cathedral on the Tuesday and I attended a 24-hour training for new bishops at Launde Abbey on the Thursday. To the question, “What has been the biggest challenge of your episcopal life so far”? I had only 48 hours’ experience to go on. It really was quite surreal. That was my initial ministerial education as a bishop.

To become a deacon and priest, the Church had generously paid for me to train for a full three years at theological college, throwing in a university degree for good measure. They had housed me, fed me, educated me, kept me largely out of mischief, and that was just the start. There was then a three-and-a-half year curacy and then, in those days, another three-and-a-half-year curacy, and only then was I let loose on a poor unsuspecting church as their incumbent. What did I have on becoming a bishop? A 24-hour session focusing on the challenges I had experienced over the last 48 hours.

Being a bishop is perhaps not more difficult than being a vicar or a chaplain, it is certainly not more important, but it is very different. At times, you can seem to have considerable authority in the life of the diocese; at times, you can seem to have very little. Managing the workloads and expectations - not least the cruellest expectations of all, the ones that you place on yourself - gets more complex the more dispersed your leadership becomes. Taking opportunities to speak truth to power, managing multimillion pound budgets, setting diocesan strategy and direction, developing new spiritual disciplines and support networks, reading the signs of the time, all of these come with their own joys and their own real challenges.

It is not just bishops either, it is cathedral deans, leaders of our theological institutions, vicars in some of our larger or more complex churches, those younger clergy who are already showing a capability and deepness of faith that needs some nurturing for their own good and the good of the Church as a whole.

There was some clumsiness in the way the Green Report was introduced, of course, and the whole outworking of the report has been expensive, of course, but has it all been worthwhile so far? Talk to the bishops, the deans and younger leaders about their experiences before you make up your mind. For myself, I feel both better equipped for the episcopal role and far closer to and better supported by my episcopal colleagues. Three midweek residential have not quite replicated my ten years' training as a deacon and priest, but have really helped.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: after this speaker can I tempt you to a motion for closure?

The Chair: I would like to hear two more speakers and then I would like to come back to you, Mr Freeman.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): I am encouraged to see this report. It is wonderful to see the positive feedback in the comments from those who have participated so far. As with previous speakers, I would like to focus on the section on targeted development on pages 7 and 8. We have not yet spoken about paragraph 38, so I would like to mention that briefly.

We are talking here about under-represented groups and there is a sub-heading "Development for traditional catholic clergy" and the report talks about a programme which has been developed to focus on that group. Smuggled in under this heading it also talks about conservative evangelical clergy who are under-represented at senior levels and continue to be under-represented. The report says: "There may be scope to develop a similar programme for conservative evangelical clergy if required and this will be explored in 2017".

I would just like to ask the Bishop of Truro how this is going to be explored and who is going to decide? If under-representation is not enough to demand a programme, what other criteria would there be? Do there need to be other people writing in and saying to you that we want this? If it is decided that a programme, such as is being developed for

Traditional Catholic clergy, is not going to be helpful, in the interests of mutual flourishing what other steps might be taken to address this particular under-represented group?

Revd Bill Braviner (Durham): As a newly elected member of this Synod as of three days ago this is my maiden speech. I declare an interest as a co-founder of Disability and Jesus, a survivor of mental health issues, and a good friend of Jarvis the guide dog.

I want to welcome this report, but I want to draw attention to an issue that has already been raised, namely disability. Persons with disabilities often experience what we might call a charity approach in Church. People are categorised into “helpers” and “helpees” - if that is good English - those who minister and those who are ministered to. Persons with disabilities are often automatically placed in the “helpee” category as people who must be ministered to. Admittedly, that is a generalisation but in many cases describes reality.

It is a one-way model. It categorises people as either independent or dependent, an independent agent who acts upon a dependent object, and independence becomes the ideal. biblically, Kingdom aspirations are for interdependence, a way of relating, of being, in which all minister and are ministered to, all serve and are served, all flourish through enabling all to flourish. Indeed, the very title of this body reminds us that we are together on the way. A commitment to interdependence demands that the voice and the experience and wisdom of persons with disabilities, alongside others, needs to be at the heart of our common life, otherwise we will not be properly engaging with either the central aspects of personhood and relationship which are at the heart of a Christian understanding of our identity in God or with the call to human flourishing which flows from them.

As Tim said, we are all made in the image of God. God saw all that he had made and he said that it was very good; he did not look at anybody and say, “Whoops, I messed up that time”. None of us is perfection. It is ten out of ten. All of us are on spectra for everything, but we are all called to community together, and that is fundamental to human flourishing. We cannot flourish independently, only communally, only interdependently. I cannot flourish properly unless you do.

Paragraph 7 of the report expresses a desire for diversity in senior leadership and we must ensure that persons with disabilities are allowed and enabled to fully participate in the life of the Church in ministry at all levels. The voice of people with disabilities needs to be present and it needs to be heard in the senior leadership of the Church.

In paragraph 39 we get two sentences on this “issue”, suggesting a piece of work over the next few years, but can I ask that we, as a Synod, press for the same positive action to be taken on the preferment of persons with disabilities, whether physical, sensory, mental or whatever, as we have happily seen in the progress with appointments of other hitherto under-represented groups in the recent past? Thank you.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on Item 10.

The Chair: That has my approval, thank you. I will now seek the approval of the Synod.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I will now ask the Bishop of Truro to respond to the debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Tim Thornton): Thank you very much for the debate and thank you to all those who have spoken. Sorry that those who wanted to speak have not been able to. Please do write in if you have specific questions or requests or points that you want to make.

I will not try and respond to every single person, but there were some themes very clearly coming through. I would say loud and clear that I apologise for the bad use of language in the report. I hear the point that is being made about disability and people with disabilities of various sorts. We certainly will take some action under that heading.

I would, however, want to make a point both about that and the BAME issue, and slightly relating to the CMD issue, which I will come back to in a moment. One of the things that we have learned through our programmes is to try and have those hard conversations you need to have with people, and I think a hard conversation I need to have with Synod in a way. We have heard several times today through the debates about proxy debates and I would want to point out that you cannot expect DAG to solve all the problems of the Church and you cannot expect DAG, which is looking at senior leadership through a particular lens, to expect it will solve all the problems of diversity if the whole Church is not taking diversity seriously. Absolutely we will take our responsibility. I was particularly grateful for the Archbishop of York's intervention at that moment, but I do hope that the whole of Synod hears what is being said today and we all take our responsibility in certain ways.

On the CMD issue, which Jane Charman quite rightly raised, and I did in my presentation say I have this weird dual role, again what I would say is the House of Bishops received a report less than a year ago, a review from the CMD panel in which they asked the House of Bishops, and they agreed, that they would take a step change in CMD. The responsibility for CMD is in the dioceses. You diocesan bishops have it in your hands to change the resources that you give in your dioceses to CMD. At the moment there is no national fund for CMD. I suspect Canon Spence in some of the things he will be saying tonight would not want yet another demand on the national budget. If Synod wants it they would have to change the rules. At the moment, it is simply not possible for us to think in those ways.

Thanks to Robert Cotton for what he said. I simply did not recognise some of the language he was using. You might expect me to say that. I would like to tell you that Linda Woodhead has been and contributed to the learning community. They had a fascinating engagement with each other. I would simply say that, yes, we are doing what we are doing.

I was very grateful for what Jamie said. We take particular care in dealing with those people who are not welcomed into the learning community, in that sense, and in working

with them we spend a lot of time giving feedback and talking to bishops. What I hope might happen is that other dioceses will build their own versions of learning communities so we can talk to each one of us about what our particular vocation is in various different ways.

I am grateful to everybody who has spoken. Again, as I said at the beginning, I hope Synod will want to pay their own thanks to Caroline Boddington and Lisa Adams and their team for the vast amount of hard work that goes into this. I am well aware that we have not yet got it right, it is work in progress, but I do believe that the journey we are on is a very proper, important and exciting one.

We have learned lots of things in our programmes so far. One of the very helpful things that we were told as diocesan bishops, when looking at leaders of organisations, was the trouble with the leader of the organisation is that nobody tells them the truth. I am sure that is right and we therefore have to work even harder in thinking, listening and working out how we can work together.

I do hope that Synod will take note of this report. I can assure you I have listened carefully to all that has been said and we will go on working together to try and find even better ways to do this very important work.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. I now put Item 10 to the vote.

The motion:

'That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That brings us to the end of Item 10 and the business for this afternoon.

Revd Sean Doherty led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *Canon Linda Ali (York)* took the Chair at 8.30 pm.

The Chair: Good evening, Synod. Please be seated.

Archbishops' Council's Annual Report (GS 2040)

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 14 on Order Paper III, the Archbishops' Council's Annual Report. You will need GS 2040 for this item. I would like to introduce Mrs Mary Chapman and Mr Philip Fletcher who will make the presentation. They will speak for up to 20 minutes. I would like to point out that the Business Committee has decided under Standing Order 107(3) that this presentation should not include an opportunity for asking questions.

Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio): Thank you, Chair. Good evening, Synod. I am hoping

that Philip and I might be something of the aperitif or appetiser to the main meal of this evening's business, which is, of course, the consideration of the Council's budget for 2017. We would like to give you a backdrop based on the Annual Report for last year.

This is the first Annual Report of the Archbishops' Council during this quinquennium, so our presentation aims to give newer Synod members a flavour of the composition, purpose and work of the Council. I hope that those of you (and I know there are some) whose Synod membership and service predates the formation of the Council will please bear with me during that. We also want to create a bridge between the work reflected in the Annual Report for 2015 and what will come in the budget.

First of all, who are we? Chaired by our Presidents, the two Archbishops, the Council is a unique Church institution in terms of its very strong representation from General Synod through the elected officers of Synod, who sit *ex officio*, and six further members directly elected from and by the three Houses. The presence of the First Estates Church Commissioner is a reflection of the Council's vital relationship with the Church Commissioners in bringing together consideration of policy and resources.

Completing the team are the six appointed members, selected, as Archbishop Sentamu said yesterday, to bring the greatest possible diversity of experience, skills and perspectives. While we are all trustees for the Council and, therefore, not representatives, there is no doubt that we hear the voice of the Church of England through the Synod members.

The Council was born following a major report on the theme of working as one body, and from that came the statutory object expressed in the National Institutions Measure, which established the Council. I have always rather liked the emphasis in this phrase, this object, on serving the furtherance of the Church's mission. Since the beginning of the last quinquennium we have set our priorities and organised our work to align with the three priorities agreed by General Synod.

The Council's on-going responsibilities are broad-ranging and the priorities have given a valuable way of focusing our efforts. We have committed too to doing those things which can only or can best be done at national level in support of dioceses and the wider Church of England. It is in homes and schools and workplaces, in parishes and on the streets that the mission is carried out. Our role is to support those closest to the frontline. The 2015 Annual Report sets out how we fulfilled that commitment last year.

Before I go to specifics, I would like to express the appreciation and thanks of the Council, and I hope of Synod too, for the faithful, intelligent, diligent and creative work of the staff team. We are truly blessed.

As I said, the Council's responsibilities are broad-ranging. Renewal and Reform has been the leitmotif for important programmes of work based on the three priorities of the quinquennium.

Last year might be described as one of co-ordination, consultation and communication. The linkages between the various task groups were made more evident. Members of

Council and staff attended meetings of diocesan synods, bishop's councils, theological educational institutions and finance forums to consult widely across the Church and to listen to ideas which have helped to reshape the programmes.

Synod has debated and agreed new programmes, new funding arrangements and legislative changes. As we now move towards implementation, the need for a shared vision and narrative to guide further work was imperative and Synod has debated that today. Increasingly, the Council asks itself the question: How will this piece of work contribute to Renewal and Reform? Or, put in another way: How will this contribute to building God's Kingdom?

Interwoven with the desire for renewal is the searching question of how we can best develop a culture and practice that promotes the safety and well-being of all the Church communities. During 2015 the National Safeguarding Team was established to work closely with dioceses to establish a whole Church approach to safeguarding. The pilot stage of the quality assurance process was completed and is being rolled out during this year. At the same time, the team has started important and onerous preparatory work for the Goddard Inquiry into sexual abuse.

Towards the end of last year, the Council started to review its relationships with a range of organisations where it has governance responsibilities or to which it grants funds. As we pick up momentum with Renewal and Reform, we must waste no opportunity to build partnerships with those where there is a strong alignment of goals. Before Philip highlights some of the key projects and programmes of 2015, it may be helpful to give a brief financial overview.

In terms of funding, you can see here that the two main income streams are the funds made available by the Church Commissioners which are distributed to dioceses and the funds that come through the diocesan apportionment, about which John Spence will speak in much more detail. From time to time, there are also significant funds from other sources; last year, from the Government in honour of the First World War Centenary.

Of the total funds that the Council has at its disposal, almost two-thirds was spent on selecting and resourcing for public ministry. The largest proportion, £35 million, of that was distributed to the 25 dioceses having below average resources and a further £13 million in training for ministry grants.

Synod has been closely involved in the review of the methods by which the money made available by the Church Commissioners is distributed, agreeing the new system that will direct half of the available funds more accurately to the poorest communities and make half available as development funding with a focus for the poor.

The examples of projects that have already started under the existing and much smaller fund demonstrate how the new arrangements open up great opportunities for new ventures and exciting and more intensive work to support growth. We need to move faster. The Council is now preparing for the full implementation of these arrangements from 2017. Peer reviewers have been selected and are being trained and considerable thought is being given to the criteria and evidence that will enable us to demonstrate the

impact of the funding.

At this point, I would particularly like to express the gratitude of the Archbishops' Council to the Church Commissioners for their partnership and co-operation in making these changes possible. The discussions between the Council and the Board of the Commissioners have been full and detailed and the process has enabled significant improvements to be made in how the money is spent and how we assess its effectiveness.

The Commissioners are rightly and properly concerned that the income they generate on behalf of the Church is spent to best effect and the Council will want to work with dioceses to assure ourselves and the Commissioners on this. The Commissioners have made it possible to move straight to the new arrangements next year by providing an additional sum of up to £72 million over ten years to ease the transition for those dioceses which will experience the greatest change. This is excellent news and we are very grateful to them for making this sum available. Now I would like to pass the baton to Philip.

Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio): Good evening, Synod. Those of you who have sunk as low as me and actually enjoy *Monty Python's Life of Brian* will remember the joke where the People's Liberation Front start asking the question, "What have the Romans ever done for us?" And after they had ticked off the aqueducts, the roads, the legal system etc., they begin to run out of steam.

My endeavour, very briefly, is to set in front of you a few examples of what the Archbishops' Council does for us collectively, for the Church and people of England. I stress already, as Mary has already done, almost all of this is in partnership with others. The first example (you will find more on all of these in the Annual Report) is the First World War Centenary Cathedrals Repair Fund, £40 million over a four year period, thanks here to partnerships with the Government itself which has provided the resource; to the Church Buildings Council; the Cathedrals Fabric Commission, which ensures that it is all properly allocated and properly spent; and the individual cathedral; and if we extended this to the Church Roof Fund, parish authorities that make sure that we are actually gaining advantage and putting our heritage in good condition.

Next set of examples, two on this one, both related to the common good. On the left-hand side, the pilgrimage to Paris initiated by the Environmental Working Group which we, the General Synod, established; working with others, and you will see Christian Aid's flag for good reason in the background to that photograph taken on the steps of St Martin-in-the-Fields in Trafalgar Square; the setting off of the pilgrimage to Paris, a faith pilgrimage, not just the C of E with Roman Catholics and others, to emphasise to governments gathering in Paris just how vital that climate change agreement was. I have heard many people say it is the faith element that really brought home to governments how important this was.

The right-hand side, and we all know that this is the initiative of Archbishop Justin and his Task Group on Responsible Credit and Savings. One of the outcomes of that initiative, the Churches Mutual Credit Union, started last year with the Methodist Church. Today, the URC came in. In the autumn the Roman Catholics will be in. That is very much an

ecumenical initiative to ensure that we all take management of money seriously. I could add the Church's Credit Champion Network and savings club programmes in schools - learn to manage money when you are still at primary school, that is when it really gets through.

Next one, the Occasional Offices. Hallowed by tradition that title, hardly sets the blood racing. The Church through the Occasional Offices has half-a-million contacts a week with the people of England. It is one of our big links with the 18 to 45 age group. I do not really need to say this to vicars present, but we have used one-off legacy money to help those vicars and other ministers in the vital role of providing first class services to the people of England with minimal administrative hassle.

If in doubt, three new websites: Weddings, funerals, christenings - which is the word that everybody except us tends to use for baptisms or what they think of as baptisms. Production of really good materials. Some of that is available for anyone who wants it. Also, some sound research showing what really hits the button with the people we are talking to when it comes to those Occasional Offices.

Communications, new media, the development of our website. The huge Lord's Prayer initiative in November last year, five million hits. It was a very good little video but it really got those hits because the cinema chain declined to show it when we were willing to pay them money. The *Just Pray* website backed by the AllChurches Trust; the blogs; the podcasts; the 50 new videos that have appeared; the new website to come. There is a lot still to come around this.

Ministry and vocation, at the heart of the Archbishops Council's work. I will not spoil it because that will be a big feature of the budget debate to come, but I want to give a couple of examples of what we are trying to develop. The C of E Ministerial Experience Scheme to give 18 to 29 year olds a real experience of what it is like to be a priest in the Church of England when they are thinking around vocation: No commitment. It is not just ordination, though I thought I would include that lovely photograph from Newcastle.

The work on lay leadership and ministry which we heard about at the House of Laity yesterday is all part of this. Getting what might be called the nuts and bolts right - see GS Misc 1138, which gives you information about the giving state of the Church of England, how we can be more efficient. There is also the Parish Buying scheme, £4 million savings in 2015. The latest research suggests that a third of our parishes have used it, 40% are thinking about it, 20% have not heard of it yet. Well, if you want good products at a really competitive price that deploys our commercial muscle, please find out, if you have not already done so.

There is the Parish Giving Scheme and I will not delay us on that one. Every treasurer knows how important Gift Aid is. Many of us know how tedious it is sometimes to get the Gift Aid right to make sure we have got the trail for the revenue. Well, we can help from the centre with that, if it is a bore.

My final point, just to underline again, this is not, of course, the Archbishops' Council working on its own: it is all of us working together with a host of partners, some of whom

I have named in that slide. Just because of space, I have not mentioned there, as I should, the Pensions Board, the National Society, deanery synods. You can go on naming at them, and I am very aware, as the Council is, and grateful to them. A catalyst is what we hope the Archbishops' Council can continue to be for Christian service by and for the Church of England. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Chapman and Mr Fletcher. That brings us to the end of this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart)* took the Chair at 8.50 pm.

The Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for Apportionment for 2017 (GS 2041)

The Chair: We are moving on to Items 15 to 22. You will find them on Order Paper III, if you picked that up on your way in. Also, you will have had in your papers GS 2041. This series of items is to ask the Synod to approve the Archbishops' Council budget for 2017; approve the proposals for the apportionment of the sums needed amongst the dioceses, and approve the proposals for pooling adjustment in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands.

I am going to ask, in a moment, Canon John Spence, the Chair of the Council's Finance Committee, to speak to Item 15. I am going to use the Chair's discretion to increase his speech limit to 15 minutes because he will speak to all the items on the Agenda, but will propose Item 15 to start with and then, at the end, without further speaking, propose the remaining items. So, please, Canon Spence, could you introduce the item at number 15?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I beg to move:

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report.’

Mary rather modestly, I thought, described herself and Philip as the mere aperitif before the main course. Far be it from me to accuse them of being lardy but you will realise they are much more substantial than an aperitif. There will be those of you who when you return to your dioceses on Tuesday and your parish will reflect on the Shared Conversations or on the EU debate. There may be those of who you reflect on metaphorical Brussels sprouts, allergies to garlic, or even certain individuals within the Synod's passion for or aversion to the mankini.

I would like to think that some of you will say: we were there. We were there when they spelt out the significance, even the enormity, of the new financial arrangements which will come into play from 1 January 2017 when two new funding streams will begin across this Church, in the first year each dispensing £24 million; across a four-year period approximately £100 million; across a decade a quarter of a billion pounds to further the work of the Church. Much of the emphasis has been on the strategic growth element, one of those funding streams.

For me, just as important is the second, where for the first time funds are being distributed to dioceses entirely on the basis of the levels of deprivation therein for work in and use therein in evangelizing the most deprived communities of this country; places like the Hartlepoons that we heard about yesterday and others we heard about today.

This is an enormous opportunity and a huge obligation on every one of us. Firstly, to ensure that the funds are appropriately applied for. We need that flow of quality applications to come through so that there are the uses to which the funds can be put. Secondly, to ensure that the peer review system works so well that there is the active working with dioceses to ensure that the targets and impacts are clearly defined and, thereafter, monitored.

Whereas these budget sessions have for many years been about how we might spend £30 million or £40 million and work out how we raise the funds for it, in future from next year they will include the annual report on progress in the dispensing of those funds and the impact that those funds are achieving.

It does not stop there, because if you look at it in terms of the strategic funding the expectation is that most applications will include elements of matching and, if we reckoned on a 50% matching piece, then on the strategic element alone and without the Archbishop of Canterbury saying, "Doing a Gordon Brown", we could be talking about half-a-billion pounds of investment over ten years. I hope Synod feels proud of its role in this process.

You firstly agreed that we should say goodbye to the Darlow Formula, which, if not with us since the mythical days of the unicorn, had certainly served us well over two decades. I have, by the way, just won a bet for including "lardy" and "unicorn" in this address. That will teach the Diocese of Leicester to take me on!

Then, you mandated us by a vote of every House in February 2015 to approach the Church Commissioners to ask them to break their obligations of inter-generational equity. That enabled us to enter into the dialogue that Mary has described to you, a dialogue that has been deep and meaningful, frank and, at times, to be quite clear with you, very thorough and searching. Out of it, as Mary has said, has come a very clear and improved methodology.

If Mary has offered thanks, I have no hesitation in repeating my thanks to the Church Commissioners for taking this quite enormous and unique step. By freeing £72.7 million of transitional funding they have recognised the urgency that we have described and enabled us to begin this funding flow in its full extent - £24 million for each of these two purposes from 1 January next year.

Well, besides that, looking at the expenditure budget feels a bit like 'plain Jane', although to be honest I am rather embarrassed to put before you a budget of £37.3 million of expenditure which is a whopping 9.4% or £3.3 million higher than the year before. Let me share with you why you should not feel so worried about that. £1.4 million of it relates to Vote 1, the training and recruitment of clergy, of ordinands and so on, and will only be

spent if we manage in September 2017 to recruit the extra 10% of ordinands which is at the core of the RME workstream.

Other elements of this stream include the funds for the inflationary increases that TEIs will face and the context based mutual support scheme across dioceses which accounts for about £350,000 and which has been the subject of a Synod vote. £1.7 million comes in Vote 2, the general Church work through the Archbishops' Council. Again, £800,000 of that relates to the formalisation of the safeguarding funding which was the subject of an additional budget requirement during 2016.

I would like to tell you that this is the end of the story and that we can be confident now that we have enough revenue budgets in place to deal with the safeguarding issue. I cannot do so. Increasingly, it becomes clear that the historic work called for by Goddard and other inquiries and by our own need to root out issues of the past is taking a huge amount of time of the team and we will need to consider whether that is leaving enough oxygen for work on the safeguarding issues of today and tomorrow.

That is £800,000. A near £700,000 as the first element of the three-year funding of the digital evangelism workstream, for which again we are grateful to the Church Commissioners for their help and which we are now beginning to mobilise so that that money is properly spent. We must not reinvent wheels. We must take advantage of learning in places like Lichfield, so that we learn from them and work with them rather than invent something which is already in place.

A further £100,000 is to do with the Occasional Offices projects, which Philip Fletcher alluded to earlier. That is that £1.7 million and a further £0.2 million comes from the agreed 5% increase in the funding for retired clergy housing in Vote 5. So you see, if I add those three elements together I get to the £3.3 million and you will realise that all other elements of the budget remain flat. That may not be sufficient.

We will, once this process is complete, immediately start the thinking for 2018 and beyond as we consider what further economies can be achieved, always with the focus on cost-effectiveness rather than cost-cutting for the sake of it. For the last two years I have stood before you and referred to sticking plaster budgets and I promised you that when I came this year I would give you a budget that I viewed as being more strategic. I was alluding to the fact that we have been constrained by a budget which is tied almost entirely to the total of the apportionment raised from the dioceses through Votes 1 to 5.

While we should always operate mainly through the funding from dioceses, we should not be restrained by it. We need to utilise all the resources available to the Church of England, to maximise and optimise the work that we do on your behalf.

This year we have unlocked and separated the two issues. While the expenditure budget is £37.3 million, the amount that will be raised through apportionment comes to just under £31 million. I could not stand before you and recommend that we had an increase in the apportionment of such a level that would restrain you from doing the very work that we say is so urgent, and I believe that an increase in apportionment of 3.5%, which has been arrived at after huge consultation through the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum and

elsewhere, represents a fair compromise. The remaining £6.3 million will come: £1.6 million from the Church Commissioners in the areas I have described; £1.4 million from the use of designated and restricted funds; £600,000 from the rent rebate we are again receiving from the Corporation of the Church House; and a further £2.7 million from various sources of income and trading activities - income-generating activities - such as rentals and publishing.

That leaves a gap of £400,000. The Corporation of the Church House has agreed in principle they will give us further support equivalent to the sum of our service charge, they themselves sitting on very large reserves but very restricted in the ways that they can apply them. They are still thinking that piece through and therefore we are at this stage reluctantly, and as a loan, taking that money from the capital within the Church and Communities Fund.

There is an expenditure budget of £37.3 million, with the increases all exactly explained to you and other elements of the budget remaining flat. There is an apportionment increase of 3.5% to yield just under £31 million, and the elements of the gap constrained are filled by taking advantage of other Church resources which are rightly available.

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider honestly that this is a basis on which we can go forward. We will keep the focus on cost-effectiveness. We will search out economies wherever we can. Above all, we will consider how we maximise the impact of this wonderful initiative, this wonderful agenda of change on which we are embarked so that we can - and you know I will always say this - return the risen Christ to the centre of this country, its conscience and its culture where He so rightly belongs.

Chair, I beg the approval of the Report under Item 15. I move the expenditure budgets in Items 16 to 20, the apportionment increase in Item 21 and the pooling arrangements under Item 22 all in my name. Thank you very much.

The Chair: We now have the opportunity to take note of the Report and then we will formally move them item-by-item in due course.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Five years ago, before my first visit here to York as a member of the General Synod, I remember being delighted when the budget document landed with a plop on my doormat. I explained that delight to Synod at that time. Five years on, I am afraid I have requested paper documents so the budget still arrives with a plop on my doormat, and I am glad to say that it still fills me with delight. I love the clarity, I love the numbers, but I also love the words which explain how the money is used and where it comes from.

I am a parish treasurer - I have told some of you this before - and I like to see money being used for the work of our Lord Jesus Christ. There can be no better use of it. I am also pleased to have learned how the finances of the Church of England work overall. Although I find it completely fascinating - I love to talk about share schemes - I also find this knowledge very useful. Part of what I do in my parish, but also sometimes further afield in my deanery - I am a deanery treasurer too - is stewardship. Although Oxford is a rich diocese, much of it being close to London and standards of living being generally

good, it seems that we are very poor givers. I am rather hopeful that our new and long-awaited Bishop of Oxford may bring tips from his previous role in Sheffield where giving is proportionately much better. We certainly need to do something about it.

When doing stewardship I find it works best to tell people how the money is used. If they see the vision they are much more likely to put hard cash behind that vision to support it. To be honest, the Church of England does not make this easy. Local churches quite often pay large amounts in parish share into diocesan pots and then the diocesan pots pay into the national pot. It makes it all rather opaque and confusing and distant from the person in the pew. It is vital that we here in Synod understand these budgets - and we are all members of our own diocesan synods and we need to come to terms with those budgets as well - and we communicate them clearly to anyone who wants to hear, and to those who need to hear. I know many people will not find the budget as fascinating as I do - and that is truly sad - however, every member of Synod has a role in making sure that they are understood enough to be able to explain it and, if necessary, defend it to the people who need ultimately to fund it. The budget is funding the furtherance of the Kingdom of God in our nation. Spread the word!

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): As a new member of Synod in this quinquennium, I am really speaking from two contexts this evening, firstly as a vice chairman of my own diocesan board of finance but also as one of your elected representatives on the Finance Committee, so, not surprisingly, I support the finance motions. Many of the speakers today, as we have gone through the different debates, have expressed great excitement about Renewal and Reform, education and, clearly as an accountant, I express that same level of satisfaction and excitement when it comes to budgets and accounts.

I would like to make just one or two observations relating to the budget and the budget process. First of all, again as someone new to this, I have been incredibly impressed by the diligence and thoroughness of the budget preparation by the Archbishops' Council staff and particularly David White and his team. I think the quality of that preparation should be recognised by Synod.

Secondly, it is a team that has been able to answer almost any possible question you could ask about any aspect of the financial analysis within the document. I also feel that, as we have gone through the process, there has been a very substantial amount of review and challenge of the budget both within the management of the Council and within the Finance Committee.

Most important for me, and very much picking up on the comment that John made, this budget strikes me as being realistic. The underlying cost levels remain steady but there is recognition of the need to budget more for safeguarding and to support the Renewal and Reform programme, particularly in the areas of training for ministry and digital evangelism; basically the recognition that we need to resource growth.

There is a further level of realism that needs to be taken into account, which is that if we are successful in realising the targets for growth that have been established under Renewal and Reform, particularly in terms of training for the ministry, then this budget will inevitably have to continue to grow in future years, but that growth, in my view, would

The Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for Apportionment for 2017 Saturday 9 July
actually be a sign of success.

Finally, John talked a little about cost effectiveness. One of the points that was certainly discussed at the Finance Committee - and I know the Secretary General was very focused on - is ensuring that there is value for money from all the money that is being spent by the Council. I think any period of excising excess cost or fat from the Council's operations has been well-completed. We now need to be realistic about investing for the future well-being of the Church, but in a managed and cost-effective manner. I for one support the financial motions.

Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich): Thank you so much to Canon John Spence for another characteristically courageous, clear and forward-looking statement. I am so delighted that what was described as "not broke but broken" last year seems to be being fixed with such a purpose. I for one am delighted to be here to hear this good news and I have even got my anorak with me. I think these financial issues are key. I am so glad we are not storing up treasures for future generations; future generations that are not going to be there unless we start doing something now, so this is excellent.

I expect that you have spotted I am quite a fan of the general idea of Renewal and Reform, and so I hope it is going to be helpful for future dialogue with dioceses to inform the finance team who have done such wonderful work.

However, I encounter clear signs in a diocese known to me of fear that Renewal and Reform is urban in focus, and offers little to those in rural multi-parish benefices. I should say I discovered this by reading other candidates' election addresses for General Synod and discovered it more firmly when I did not get on. I then saw that the *Guardian* was indeed saying, "The Church of England says it will shift funds away from rural parishes to urban churches". I had not heard it put that bluntly before. I was not sure that the reporter was quite putting it as the Church of England would like it to be put, but I can see why there might be a problem.

The challenges of ageing clergy and congregations and the challenges of buildings are acute for the whole Church of England, but they are particularly serious in the rural setting, where clergy and congregations tend to be older - that is certainly true in Norwich - and the buildings can be older and more numerous as well. The ratio of the population to clergy in rural settings is not so good in terms of the impact. The clergy are spread with a smaller population to minister to. I discovered that there was great fear that this strategic development funding was going to leave dioceses known to me less well off.

I want to encourage the finance team and all those engaged in dialogue to support and try to win hearts and minds of those who are feeling threatened. I suggested that the peer review of grants - made with the help of course of the Commissioners' money as well and thank you to them - should include rural perspectives because it is the situation that might seem to be threatened. In fact, Norwich is not going to be that badly off as a result of these changes because of the levels of deprivation in the diocese.

I want to ask if there will be some way of following up the funding that is for deprived areas to check that it does not go not on "subsidising decline", as it has been put, but

goes on helping the poorest in our dioceses. In schools there is a pupil premium for those pupils with special needs or on free school meals and things such as that, and you have to show you are spending that premium to help those most needy pupils. I wonder whether there could be some similar system of assessing the impact here. I think that is something that would be worth looking at, if it is not already part of the excellent plans.

Then moving on, the recent Ministry Division figures that were published in June showed 25% of stipendiary clergy were over 60 at the end of 2015. This emphasises the need for recruitment that this wonderful budget is beginning to fund. The budget is meant to fund a 10% increase in ordinands each year, as I understand it, to 2020. Can we be given any update on the rise in ordinands that is sought? It seems that the Church Commissioners' funds will not be released unless there is hard evidence, and that raises the question of the reserves that the Council talks about. It sounds like those reserves are having to be dipped into and are in deficit, and that is why other funds are being drawn. Is there any funding for any dioceses that are in special financial problems, realising that seems to be in the news as well?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Thank you, first, to Mrs Dziegiel. I am delighted you are so fascinated with the numbers. I quite enjoy them myself. We know we have to get better still at explaining them. I am increasingly of the view that we need to use social media such as YouTube the better to give simple explanations. It is worth remembering that the total of apportionment is equivalent to 9% of the total raised by dioceses in the parish share. However, that does not remove from us the obligation of simple explanation in words that people can understand, as I hope I have tried to do with my explanations tonight.

I do not mean to sound head masterly, but I am very pleased that young Carl Hughes realises that as a newly elected member of the Finance Committee he is supposed to support his Chairman on financial motions. This is much more likely to earn you a glass of wine at the end of meetings, Carl. Of course you do make serious points there. We need to recognise the pressures that lie ahead, which Dr Richmond also referred to, in the pattern of ordinand growth. We are not yet seeing that increase in numbers, but we are seeing a change in the age profile, with more younger ordinands coming through. We are investing an initial £200,000 with the help of the AllChurches Trust and a significant expansion of the Church of England Ministerial Experience Scheme (CEMES), and that is helping us triple, if not quadruple the numbers going in that scheme, and is very much seen as a pilot for a still wider expansion, recognising that those who have been on that scheme to date show a high conversion rate into ordination. There will come a pressure period as we go forward, if and when those numbers of ordinands increase.

It is not the case, Dr Richmond, that the Commissioners will only release the funds; I will only ask them when I have evidence. I cannot expect the Church Commissioners, whose role is to maximise the funds of the Church of England for the use of future generations, to release investments on some hope and prayer that those numbers change. When the numbers start growing, as they will, let us be in no doubt, at that time, we will engage in a dialogue with the Church Commissioners that we have had over the last 12 months. If it is the case that there is in the short term some strain then we will say to dioceses, "This is surely your prime responsibility to invest in the future. Work with us so that we can

make this manageable”, and if there are dioceses which are struggling to cope, yes, of course Dr Richmond, we will address that.

I do need to blow the myth of the urbanisation impact of the changes in financing. If you look at what is happening with the demise of Darlow, the two most affected dioceses, which between them account for something like 12% of the total distribution, are Manchester and the largely urbanised Chelmsford, my own diocese. The model of deprivation that we have used on the advice of Sir Andrew Dilnot, from the Statistical Authority, links the two issues of the levels of deprivation in dioceses with the proportion of deprivation within that diocese. Rural deprivation, as we all know, is as prevalent as urban deprivation. And, yes, the peer reviewers will be looking to see how those dioceses use those funds in those deprived communities. I hope it will not be for the continuation of models of the past. I hope it will be for proactive, imaginative and creative thinking about how we can revitalise the power of our ministry in some of those parts of the world, what are sometimes called the “end-of-line towns”. In your diocese it might be people around the east coast, Dr Richmond, where priests have been loath to go and where there is much discretion available to bishops and their teams about how to enhance the package. Yes, we will be keeping a close watch.

Within the strategic funding streams already granted, there are at least three initiatives I can think of that are dealing particularly with the challenges of multi-benefice rural ministries. I for one feel comfortable that we are not urbanising. If the Bishop of London were speaking, he would point out they probably have more areas of deprivation than other in the country but they will receive no funding because the proportion of that deprivation against the total is small. We will continue to work to make sure that these measures have the maximum impact.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): I wish to thank Canon John Spence for his exposition. I had a conversation with the Bishop of Manchester earlier this weekend. I wanted to buy him a T-shirt because I had seen one several times which said, “I’m a mathematician; of course I’ve got problems”. I have some problems not with the actual numbers, the numbers are probably fine, but the way they are distributed. I have had previous conversations with the Bishop of Winchester in his former life over Vote 4, as we used to call it, because at that time - and this is a history lesson for those who have not been on Synod for very long - when we voted for the Mission Agencies pension contributions to be added to our budget, we did it without a finance statement.

The first issue I would like to raise is when we have green papers that give us a financial exposition of what the issue might be, if we should vote in a particular way, it would be a good idea, when we have our budget for the following year, to expose the amounts that have emerged as a result of those decisions. I would like to see the budget for 2018 and beyond at least to have an additional column which says, “And these are the additional amounts that you voted for last year as a result of this, that or whatever vote”.

The other issue that I have with the paper that we have had today is that, although you may not have noticed, we are still going to vote for five different amounts, but nowhere throughout the paperwork have I seen Votes 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 mentioned. There is a subtle change. We are apparently going into three separate Votes, probably in due course,

which look like training, general and clergy housing. With that change, there will be an aggregation of three amounts which were previously exposed as separate. We must make sure as a Synod that we definitely look at those figures much more closely because the more they are aggregated the less likely we are to see the difficulties that might lie from individual increases. Perhaps we could take some of that on board.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I want to give every encouragement to the developments in this budget. Thank you for changing the titles. It makes it much easier to explain to those in the parishes what we are spending the money on. The word "vote" is becoming not the most popular word.

Just to highlight for you one particular thing that has been happening as regards digital media and to promote this in this arena for everyone to hear: we have in our Lichfield Diocese an online pastor. We are the first diocese to have one. I just thought you might like to hear how successful that has been. It is testimony to the expense that we are putting into this budget and encouragement to everyone else to engage.

Dr Ros Clarke is our online pastor. She has 350 Twitter followers in her one year in post and 220 Facebook followers, 70 Instagram followers and 900 YouTube hits. She is engaging in conversations each week with 50 to 100 people. One of the things which has happened as a consequence of her work is that there is now something called "TGI Monday", which is a group of mostly young clergy who are answering questions that come in from the public. I am pleased to tell you that so far "TGI Monday" has had 35,000 views. Not quite as many as the Archbishop for his Bible study. However, at least one person has come to faith through this. There is a new group starting for young people. I think this is an area of work where we will need in the future to target more finance. Certainly from our point of view as a diocese it has been extremely worthwhile.

You will see on page 26 of this paper that digital evangelism is being promoted here. This is the way we will engage young people in the future. Anyone here who has nearly run over a young person crossing the road with a phone in their hand will understand that. We are going to have to use more money than we have in the bundle so may I encourage the Finance Committee to look at future resourcing for that.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): Could I please ask Canon Spence two questions, brief ones I trust. First, I think this is an admirable budget which I will gladly support. Is there any plan to have a longer financial planning horizon and at least have some three-year indicative forward plans? I recognise we may need one or two different scenarios around ordinand numbers. I think it is very important that we try to have a longer planning horizon than just one year. Is there work in hand to try to roll that forward in that way?

That might produce an answer to my second question. If you look at the inside of the front cover, you will see the budget overview which shows, as Canon Spence pointed out, that there is an assumption of some £7 million coming as income over and above what is charged to the dioceses and apportioned. My anxiety there, or my question is how sustainable are those funding sources? How sustainable is that income? More particularly, is there any danger that we will find ourselves with open-ended expenditure commitments being funded by limited-period income? I would be grateful for some

comment on that which is obviously an issue that a forward financial plan would bring out as well.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Mr Tim Hind, how lovely to hear from my fellow Ugly Sister from Cinderella in last year's end-of-Synod review. I take your point about presentation and we will look at what we can do. If you look at the wording within the budget statements, we have said we are keen to understand from Synod your preference, or not, for rolling votes 3, 4 and 5 together into a single budget. Our aim is to simplify. If that does not work for you, it will not happen.

Penny Allen from Lichfield talks to the example I referred to earlier of the wonderful work that Ros is doing in Lichfield in the digital evangelism space, and I hope you can pass on from Synod our congratulations to her for the stunning figures she is achieving. It will be critical that we work with people such as Ros rather than against her. We must not have our resources in any way used in competition. We need to learn from the best practice both inside and outside of the Church. We are assembling an expert reference group to help us draw on some of the best brains in the business so that we make sure we spend this money wisely. If it proves that even the £2 million that has been committed to us over the next three years is insufficient, because we are having such success and seeing so many good ways in which to spend the money, then already the Church Commissioners and ourselves are clear that that is something that will need to be addressed as and when.

In a way, Keith from Liverpool, that tells you the challenge I have. I would love to give you a three-year budget, but there are too many spinning wheels. That is why we have given you indicative figures that if all other things remain the same and we were to gain the 10% growth in ordinands, that would drive the increases in budget of 4.6 and 6.4% to which I refer. They are only indicative numbers. We will continue to work on the long-term piece. We need to continue to understand how we gain the economies to which I have referred. How digital are we in Church House? Not your head office, but your chief support office, to be there to support you. If you face financial challenges, we cannot be immune from them. We will continue to try to work on three-year horizons.

I can certainly reassure you about the funding streams. I think I would make a point that there is a piece here where the next three to four years represents a particular piece of funding pressure. If we start getting the higher flows of ordinands through, ultimately there will come a point where they are priests and we would be hoping they would be working with the unlocked laity of this Church after the lay leadership and discipleship work to create a massive impetus that we simply do not understand today. That will take time, but over the next three, five, seven years that will be a pressure.

Our commitment to the Pension Board to increase Vote 5 by 5% per annum is a commitment which lasts until 2020, and after that - we have had dialogue with the Pension Board - we believe that will no longer be required and that will remove that particular pressure on increase. In the meantime, all the funding flows that we are using to bridge that gap, Keith, we have reassurance on for the next three years. They tend to come from organisations who have very strong reserves. When you referred to our reserves falling below the levels, I can assure you I will not let the reserves fall below the prudent level, which is why we are using other resources of the Church. Of course, if events

happen and things change and things get turned off, that can always happen and we will deal with it.

Revd Sarah Schofield (Lichfield): I stood in the recent elections to Archbishops' Council and was heartened, and I have to say surprised, by the number of members who engaged with me in the voting period on a range of issues to ask where I hope the Church might be in five years' time. No one, however, picked the issue that was closest to my heart when I decided to stand: where will our poorest communities be - I mean economically poorest, because often not deprived in other ways - at the end of this quinquennium and, more importantly, where will they be headed?

In my parish, we are currently being helped with our share on a case-by-case basis by Lichfield DBF. Not because we need to keep our church open for the sake of one more Victorian Black Country Church building. Not because we are urban, but because we have an expanding outreach to sex workers unique in our city and diocese. Not because we are urban, but because we are poor. More of this can happen in the future because of this budget. At a time when politics appears to have demonstrated how forgotten many of our poorest communities feel, we in the Church of England are remembering them, not least because we are of and in those communities.

Could we perhaps encourage the communication team, especially at this moment when I suggest the media may be looking to other issues in this Synod, to try and tempt them with this good news story that one major national institution has not forgotten nor overlooked our economically poor communities.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Synod, on many previous occasions I have challenged the Church Commissioners and Archbishops' Council to do more in respect of a bias to the poor. My real passion and reason I stood for Synod is because I care about mission, ministry and evangelism. I used to work as a community development worker for the diocese in a UPA parish and have experienced lots of the issues and lots of the successes.

I wanted to stand today - I had not planned to - to celebrate and praise the hard work of both Canon Spence, the Church Commissioners and, indeed, Archbishops' Council and their staff. They have done some excellent and hard work and on many occasions they have taken the time to speak to me about their plans and I am grateful for that. I wanted to also say that it might sound a bit boring, number crunching and finance, and I am not that excited when the accounts drop at my door, to be honest, but this is very exciting. We are here today to look forward to a brilliant future.

If I just leave you on one note that I wanted to share. On Sunday we had a priesting in my parish and there was a young priest ordained, who is a curate in the parish that I worked in. On the Monday he had his first mass. There were a number of young deacons and priests who had also been ordained at the same time. It was an exciting, wonderful thing to behold, this energetic youth there at the front of our church leading, both lay and ordained. I hope that work continues and that together we can celebrate and be excited for the future, because we have got something really, really exciting to come. I just want to thank you for your hard work and I will be supporting this.

Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby): I am really pleased that Canon Spence made reference to the Church of England Ministry Experience Schemes that are now running in many dioceses across the country and that there is funding for these. In our diocese, to set it up they consulted with every ordained minister under 30, and it did not take them very long.

As a young woman discerning my calling to ordained ministry, these schemes are extremely exciting. However, I am a young woman discerning her calling who also happens to be married. It is extremely difficult for a young adult who is married to get full benefit of this scheme as living in community is an extremely important part of being on such a scheme. This is just not possible for a married couple. Many schemes will give an option for young married people to be involved, but they are rarely truly a viable option. The one I was offered was less than half my salary, and I am currently the main breadwinner for myself, my husband and our two cats.

I am so pleased to see that these schemes are funded in this budget, but I ask you to rethink how we can help and fund young married people's vocation as it is not at all uncommon for young Christians to be married. Thank you.

The Chair: Before Canon Spence responds I would be quite interested in a motion for closure of the debate if anyone feels able to do that.

A Speaker: Point of order: motion for closure.

The Chair: That is of interest to me.

This motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Canon Spence, would you like to respond to the remaining speakers?

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Thank you. To Sarah Schofield, if any of you have had the chance to sit down with Sarah and hear about the work she is doing in her community, particularly with the sex workers, it is an inspiring story, and of course it is right that we should give you every support we can.

One of the challenges we have is how we help our excellent communications team, who are so often dealing with the necessary fire fighting of the media of the day to have the space to do far more of the good news stories of this Church, and there are legion numbers. We need to work with them, and indeed there will be a meeting within the next two or three weeks where we think through the triple issues, first, of ensuring that we are an effective mouthpiece for the Church in turbulent times, second, that we can do enough of the good news pieces to which Sarah referred, and, third, that we can unlock this enormous digital evangelism space. We will work with Arun and his excellent team on that piece.

To Hannah Grivell, yours is a new issue for me. I am delighted you are so confident about CEMES. I had not been aware of an issue around married people and I would like to take

that away, please, and ask William Nye to refer it to the appropriate quarter and we will see what, if anything, can be done.

Sam. I am worried about you, Sam. You usually give me such a prickly question I am leaning back to David to try and get an answer, and now you are being awfully nice, which is very kind. Can I just thank you for your contribution in the debate earlier this afternoon. You and I and other people with disabilities do understand sometimes that people unintentionally place barriers in the way of people with disabilities. Often it is indeed parents who coddle their children so well and convince them of all the things they cannot do, and people unassumingly take to the point: "You can't do that because you can't see, can you?" Tell that to anybody who sees me on my K13000 BMW motorbike on a Saturday morning.

Sam gave me the opportunity to say some very sincere words of thanks: William the second, William Nye, took office just after the General Synod in November. For William to have got around the Church as he has done, to go on a tour of assimilation and understanding while also coping with the highly complex work streams that he has to cope with, with very demanding Archbishops - quite why Justin felt the need to be twice as demanding because York was on sabbatical I am not quite sure - and on top of that learn and manage to pull together the team within Church House in the way that he is doing is nothing short of phenomenal.

The entire Finance Division give me great support (because I have been known to be a little bit demanding myself) and David White is now in my mind gaining biblical status because of his enduring patience. He never stops, as anybody sitting in this hall today saw by the number of times David had to come to get me off to do things. I do not think you quite needed to lock me in a room with you, David, at one point where we had to appeal to the Church Commissioners to get us out. That was a real test of the state of the relationship. David is phenomenal in all that he does to support.

I could not begin to tell you how grateful I am to them. I will keep battering them, they know that. I will keep the cosh, because ultimately I represent the funds that you and your parishioners provide, and I hope you will understand that I would never want to see misspent one penny of that widow's mite that goes into the collecting bag. I thank all of them. I thank you.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order: I wonder if we are quorate in the House of Bishops.

The Chair: I am very pleased to check that. Could 11 bishops please stand? If you are numerate then we are quorate. No other quorums required?

The seven areas of points on your Order Paper are as follows. I shall read them out and ask you to vote on them as we go through. They have all been moved. If you would like to do that one-by-one so that we know clearly which is which.

First, Item 15, will you take note of this Report?

The motion:

'That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Item 16.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2017, as shown in its budget, of £14,749,011 in respect of Training for Ministry.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Item 17.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2017, as shown in its budget, of £16,376,263 in respect of National Church Responsibilities.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Item 18.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2017, as shown in its budget, of £1,220,587 in respect of Grants.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Item 19.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2017, as shown in its budget, of £794,254 in respect of Mission agency pension contributions.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Item 20.

The motion:

The Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for Apportionment for 2017 Saturday 9 July

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2017, as shown in its budget, of £4,577,129 in respect of Clergy retirement housing grant.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. Item 21.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2041) for the apportionment amongst the dioceses of the net sum to be provided by them to enable the Council to meet the expected expenditure shown in its budget for the year 2017.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. Item 22.

The motion:

'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2041) for the pooling adjustment for 2017 in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. That concludes this item. In addition to the thanks, I would like to express our thanks to our Chair of Finance, Canon John Spence. Thank you, John.

Before I ask the Archbishop of York to prorogue the Synod, one or two notices. If you have yet to pick up your note indicating which group you are in for the next few days, please visit the information desk and collect it on your way out. Secondly, please leave your voting card with staff on your way out.

Tomorrow, morning service at York Minster starts at ten o'clock. Buses are available outside if you have booked that. I am assured that Synod members know what they are doing tomorrow morning, but that is just a little clue as to the timetable. Later on this evening at 10.15 there is night prayer in the Berrick Saul building across from here.

Archbishop, please would you prorogue the Synod?

Prorogation

The Archbishop of York prorogued the Synod.

INDEX

- academies:
 - Church of England 160
 - multi-academy trusts 163–4, 172
- AllChurches Trust 191, 198
- Anglican Communion:
 - and effects of EU Referendum 10
 - recruitment of clergy from 88
 - and women priests 31–2
- Anglican Consultative Council (ACC),
Lusaka meeting (2016) 31–4
- apportionment, diocesan 189–90, 192–
9, 206
- Archbishop of York, Pilgrimage of
Prayer 26–31
- Archbishops' Council:
 - Annual Report 36, 187–92
 - appointments to 42–3
 - and the BBC 66–7
 - budget 2017 36, 192–206
 - and Church Commissioners 188,
189–90, 193–5, 198
 - and compensation for dispossession
93
 - and Draft Legislative Reform
Measure 113–15, 117, 119
 - finances 189–90
 - questions to 64–7
- Archbishops' Missioner 87
- Archbishops' Secretary for
Appointments 56
- archdeacons:
 - and inspection of church buildings
124, 125–6, 127
 - and Mission and Pastoral Measure 94
- Article 7 business 114
- Article 8 business 114
- attendance figures 83–4, 106
- authority, and vesture 133–4, 137
- 'A BBC for the future' (White Paper)
66–7
- benefices, multi-parish 197, 199
- Bishop Bell allegations 39, 58–9, 71–3,
74, 75, 106
- bishops:
 - appointment 38, 54–7
 - and clerical vesture 133
 - development programme 176, 183–4
 - as focus of unity 55
 - in House of Lords 10, 53
 - and team ministries 103–10
- Bishops' Advisory Panels 86
- Bishop's Mission Orders 141
- and role of visitors 94
- and synodical representation 94–6
- Bishop's Pastoral Orders 94, 103, 106–
10
- Black and Minority Ethnic Anglicans:
 - and senior leadership 177, 181, 186
 - and vocations 19
- Book of Common Prayer* 69, 130–1,
136–7
- Brexit *see* EU Referendum
- budget 2017 36, 192–206
- Burial Laws Amendment Act (1880)
143
- Business Committee:
 - and agenda 5, 135
 - and contingency business 37
 - report 35–41
- Canons:
 - A 5 70
 - B 8 129–30, 132–3, 137, 139, 142
 - B 18.2 64–5
 - B 38 130–1, 136, 142–3
 - C 4 86
 - E 7 66
 - E 8 66
- capability procedure 77
- carbon emissions 46–7, 61–2
- Care of Places of Worship Measure
1999 123
- Cathedral and Church Buildings
Division 123
- Cathedrals Fabric Commission 190
- Cathedrals Repair Fund, First World
War Centenary 190
- centralization of services 83–4, 123–4
- Channel Islands 125
- Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 55
- Chilcot Inquiry 20

child abuse:
 and funeral directors 73
 and Goddard Inquiry 189, 194
 historic 39, 58–9, 71–3, 75
 child poverty 7, 46, 47
 children:
 admission to Holy Communion 75–6
 see also young people
 Church Army 96
 church attendance 83–4, 106
 church buildings, inspection 122–8
 Church Buildings Council 123, 125–6, 190
 Church Commissioners:
 annual report 36, 44–7
 and Archbishops’ Council 188, 189–90, 193–5, 198
 Assets Committee 53
 and central provision of services 83
 and Mission and Pastoral Measure 92, 103
 questions to 53, 58–61
 Church and Communities Fund 195
 Church Credit Champion Network 191
 Church of England Ministerial Experience Scheme 191, 198, 203–4
A Church of England Vision for Education 159–74
 Church House Publishing 42
 Church Roof Fund 190
 church schools 84–5
 and mission 160, 162–3, 169, 172
 and multi-academy trusts 163–4, 172
 and Renewal and Reform 153–4, 158
 secondary 163, 165, 169
 and special educational needs 171, 174
 and vision for education 159–74
 Church and State, and EU Referendum 10–11, 25
 Churches Mutual Credit Union 47, 190
 Churches Together in England 85–6
 clergy:
 ageing 197–8
 and child abuse 39, 58–9, 71–3, 74–5, 189
 conservative evangelical 184–5
 and pastoral care 77
 retirement age 88
 retirement housing 89–90, 93, 194, 206
 stipendiary, numbers 88–9
 and top-up pensions 63–4
 traditional catholic 184–5
 vesture 129–44
 working with dementia patients 86–7
 Clergy Appointments Adviser 77
 Clergy Discipline Measure 101
 clericalism 65–6
 climate change 190
 and investment 46–7, 61–2
 Common Awards 87
 common good:
 and EU Referendum 6, 7
 and faith schools 85, 160, 162, 168, 169
 and Renewal and Reform 145, 158
 Common Worship, funeral services 130–1, 137
 communications 191, 202, 203
 compensation, and dispossession 93
 Conference of European Churches 51
 confidentiality, and child abuse allegations 71–3
 Continuing Ministerial Development 87, 177, 178–9, 186
 continuous praying presence 1, 36, 90
 Corporation of the Church House 195
 Council for Christian Unity 57
 question to 85–6
 credit unions 46, 47, 190
 Crown Nominations Commission:
 questions to 54–7
 report 38, 40
 curriculum, school 168

 DAG *see* Development and Appointments Group
 Darlow Formula 193, 199
 DBS checks 74
 deans, development programme 176, 184
 Declarations of Interest 36, 67, 80
 dementia, training to work with 86–7
 Development and Appointments Group (DAG) 77, 91, 135, 175–8, 186
 diocesan boards of education, and Multi Academy Trusts 163, 172
 diocesan boards of finance 83
 Diocesan Boards of Finance Measure

- 1925 113
- Diocesan Synod Motions, welcoming transgender people (Blackburn) 37
- diocesan synods:
- and inspection of buildings 122, 123–4, 127
 - and Mission and Pastoral Measure 94–5, 97
- Diocese in Europe, and EU Referendum 6, 8, 24, 51–3
- dioceses:
- and apportionment 189–90, 192–9, 206
 - and church buildings inspection 127
 - and deployment of clergy 88–9
 - deprived 199
 - and Free Schools 84–5
 - mission and pastoral committees 94, 97, 107, 109–10
 - and mutual support 194
 - and safeguarding 74–5
 - and Strategic Development Funding 192–3, 197, 199
- disability 204
- and senior leadership 179–80, 182–3, 185–6
- discipleship:
- developing 66, 145, 158
 - intentional 33
- dispossession, and compensation 93
- diversity:
- and the BBC 67
 - and mission 145, 146, 157
 - and senior appointments 76–7, 177, 178–9, 185–6
- divorce, and marriage in church 78–9
- Draft Amending Canon No. 36 37–8, 40, 129–44
- Draft Inspection of Churches Measure 122–8
- and Regulations 123–6
- Draft Legislative Reform Measure 112–21, 132
- Draft Mission and Pastoral etc. (Amendment) Measure 91–112, 140
- Code of Practice 97, 100, 101–2
 - and deanery plans 92
 - and role of visitors 96
 - and synodical representation 94–5
 - and team ministries 99–101, 103–10
- Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament 98, 115–16, 121
- Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 127–8
- Ecumenical Relations Measure (1988) 86
- ecumenism:
- and credit unions 190–1
 - and doctrine of justification 57
 - ecumenical representatives 2
 - in Europe 52
 - and independent congregations 85–6
 - and mission 3–4
- education:
- fresh vision 7, 12, 36, 159–74
 - special educational needs 171, 174
- employers, faith-friendly 54
- Enabling Measure, proposed *see* Draft Legislative Reform Measure
- Environmental Working Group 190
- episcopacy, and mission 48–9
- Episcopal Church (TEC), and Anglican Communion 34
- equity, intergenerational 193, 198
- estates, church presence in 131–2
- EU Referendum:
- debate 5–26
 - economic effects 3, 6–7, 9–10, 18–19, 44–6, 53
 - and expatriates 6, 8–9, 24–5, 52–3
 - and integration 6–8
 - international effects 3–4, 9
 - and marginalisation 10, 13, 15, 17–18, 21, 25
 - and mission 151
 - questions on 48–53
 - and racism 6–7, 10, 15, 18–19, 22, 50–1
 - and reconciliation 8, 16–17, 22–3, 25, 50, 52
 - and vulnerable communities 10, 13, 18, 51
 - and xenophobia 6–7, 10, 19, 22, 50
 - and young people 9, 22, 25
- Europe, and role of Christianity 3–4, 8, 25–6, 48–9, 52
- Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD) 2–4
- evangelism:

digital 194, 196, 201, 203
 and interfaith dialogue 76
 and theological education 87
 and young people 155, 200
 Evangelism Task Group 75, 87
 report 38
 Evening Prayer, and clergy vesture
 129–30f
Everyday People 19

Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 122
 Faith and Order Commission:
 ‘Communion and Disagreement’
 report 80
 and funerals of suicides 130
 question to 57
 Finance Committee 196–7, 198, 200
 Five Guiding Principles 83, 86
 Five Marks of Mission 87
 food banks 148
 Foundation for Educational Leadership
 162, 166, 173
 Four Marks of the Church 153
 Free Schools 84–5, 165, 174
 Freemasonry, and Christianity 79–80
 Fresh Expressions 96, 139, 141
 funeral directors 73
 funerals:
 of suicides 130–1, 134, 136, 143
 of unbaptized persons 130–1, 136
 and unlicensed clergy 73
 Further Education 173

General Synod:
 Agenda 5, 135
 constitution 114
 continuous praying presence 1, 36,
 90
 ecumenical guests 2–4
 emergency debate 5–26, 35, 39, 41
 new members 1, 129
 presentations to 26–31, 31–4, 187–92
 Youth Council Representatives 149–
 50, 181
 glebe land, and Mission and Pastoral
 Measure 93
 goals, quinquennial 188
 Goddard Inquiry 189, 194
 Good Disagreement 20–1, 39, 68
 Green Report (2014) 153, 184

growth, intentional 146

Holy Communion:
 admission of children 75–6
 and clergy vesture 129–44
 homophobia 55–6
 homosexuality 54–6, 71
 House of Bishops:
 and admission of children to Holy
 Communion 75–6
 and Bishop Bell case 71–3, 74, 75
 and clergy vesture 129
 Declaration 81
 Development and Appointments
 Group 77, 91, 135, 175–8, 186
 and diversity in senior leadership 76–
 7
 and EU Referendum 48–53
 and Freemasonry 79–80
 and human sexuality 55, 68
 and marriage in church after divorce
 78–9
 and pastoral care of clergy 78
 questions to 67–83
 and safeguarding 74–5
 and same-sex marriage 82–3
 and Shared Conversations 67–71,
 80–1
 and transgender people 37
 House of Clergy, Standing Committee
 75
 House of Lords:
 and the BBC 67
 and international affairs 10
 and Syria 53
 housing:
 clergy 58, 89–90, 93, 194, 206
 social 46, 47
 human sexuality:
 and House of Bishops 54–6, 68
 and Shared Conversations 68–9

iconography and ethnicity 19
 identity:
 national 6
 and Renewal and Reform 151
 inequality 7, 10
 Inspection of Churches Measure 1955
 122, 123, 125
 inspections, quinquennial 122

integration, social 6–8, 10, 14–16, 50
 Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum 194–5
 investment, and climate change 46–7, 61–2
 Isle of Man 125
Issues in Human Sexuality 55

Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification 57
 Just Pray website 191

 laity:
 lay leadership 37, 66, 147–8, 158, 191
 lay ministries 37, 64–5, 96, 147–8, 154, 191
 Lambeth Conference 1998 33
 Resolution 1:10 69, 71
 Lay Leadership Report 37
 Lay Leadership Task Group 37, 66, 147–8, 158
 Lay Ministries Task Group 37, 65–6, 147–8
 leadership, in schools 153–4, 162, 166, 172–3
 learning community 77, 87, 176–7, 180–1, 182, 186–7
 legislation *see* Draft Legislative Reform Measure
 Legislative Business 36, 91–144
 Legislative Committee 115
 Legislative Reform Scrutiny Committee 116, 118–19, 120–1
 Listed Places of Worship Roof Repair Fund 190
 Lord’s Prayer 27–30
 Lord’s Prayer initiative 191

 marginalisation 10, 13, 15, 17–18, 21, 25, 153
 marriage:
 after divorce 78–9, 86
 same-sex 69, 82–3
 Meissen Agreement 2–3, 4
 Methodist Church:
 and doctrine of justification 57
 and homophobia 55
 and marriage in church after divorce 79
 migrants, and EU Referendum 6, 10, 14–15, 17, 50–2
 Ministerial Experience Scheme 191, 198, 203–4
 ministry:
 and continual professional development 87, 177, 178–9, 186
 lay, and preaching 64–5
 rural 199
 statistics for ministry 88
 Ministry Council, questions to 86–9
 mission:
 and church buildings 125, 126
 and church schools 160, 162–4, 169, 172
 and clergy vesture 129–31, 133–4, 138–43
 and episcopacy 48–9
 and EU Referendum 151
 and Renewal and Reform 145–6, 148–9, 156–7
 see also Bishop’s Mission Orders
 Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 92, 99–100
 Mission and Public Affairs Council, questions to 53–4
 Mission and Public Affairs Division, and EU Referendum 50
 Morning Prayer, and clergy vesture 129–30
 mutual flourishing 81
 mutuality 146, 194

 National Church Institutions:
 and central provision of services 83–4, 123–4
 and EU Referendum 53
 National Institutions Measure (1998) 188
 National Investing Bodies, and Transition Pathway Initiative 61–3
 National ME Vocation Advisory Group 19
 National Safeguarding Team 189
 National Society 162
 National Society Council, questions to 84–5
 Near Neighbours project 10–11, 16
Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders 36, 91, 147, 175–87

occasional offices, and clergy vesture
130, 134–5, 142

occasional offices projects 191, 194

ordination training:
and Common Awards 87
financing 196–7
for leadership roles 87
maintenance grants 192, 206
and marital status 86
numbers in training 198, 201

Paris Conference (2015) 61–2, 190

Parish Buying Scheme 191

Parish Giving Scheme 191

parish share 196, 198, 202

Parliament:
and Draft Legislative Reform
Measure 114
Ecclesiastical Committee 98, 115–
16, 121

parochial church councils, and clerical
vesture 129–30, 131–2, 133, 140, 143

parsonages, and Green Guide 58

patronage:
and bishops 103–7
and team ministries 92, 103–8

Patronage (Benefices) Measure (1986)
94

patrons, and clergy appointments 92

peacemakers, training 16–17

peer review system 146, 168, 197, 199
and Resourcing the Future 189–90,
193

Pensions Board 201
questions to 61–4, 89–90

Pilling Report 71

political parties, rejection 18

politics, and EU Referendum 18–19,
21

Porvoo Agreement 57

poverty, urban 148–9, 202

presentations 26–31 ,31-4, 187–92

Primates’ Meeting, and Episcopal
Church 34

Private Member’s Motions 38
on clergy vesture 129, 132

Provincial Episcopal Visitors (PEVs)
81–2

Questions 47–90

racism, and EU Referendum 6–7, 10,
15, 18–19, 22, 50–1

Readers, vesture 133

reconciliation, and EU Referendum 8,
16–17, 22–3, 25, 50, 52

Reformation, 500th anniversary 4, 57,
156

Remuneration and Conditions of
Service Committee, question to 89–
90

Renewal and Reform programme 36,
106, 188–9, 196–7
and diversity 145, 146, 157
and proposed Enabling Measure 119,
120
and senior leadership 178
Vision and Narrative 65–6, 144–59
and young people 155, 158
see also Lay Leadership Task Group;
Lay Ministries Task Group;
Resourcing Ministerial Education

Resourcing Ministerial Education 38,
89, 194

safeguarding 189
budget for 194, 196
and clergy vesture 132–4, 143
and DBS checks 74
training 74

St Michael’s House Protocols 67–70

schools *see* Church schools; Free
Schools

Scrutiny Committee 116, 118–19, 120–
1

Secretary General, questions to 83–4

Shared Conversations on scripture,
mission and human sexuality 35–8,
80–1
funding for 60–1
and St Michael’s House Protocols
67–70

simplification 103–4, 114–15, 123–8,
132

Simplification Task Group 66, 86, 92

spirituality, search for 144–7

Stamp Duty Land Tax surcharge 89–90

Standing Orders:
and Draft Legislative Reform
Measure 118, 120–1

SO 4(3) 5
 SO 24 136
 SO 34 128
 SO 57 (6) 94
 SO 58 (1) 97
 SO 58 (4) 98
 SO 59 (6) 98
 SO 107 (3) 187
 SO 136 (3) 56
 SO 141 56
 Standing Orders Committee 121
 stewardship 195–6
 Strategic Development Funding 192–3,
 197, 199
 Strategic Leadership Development
 Programme 77
 subsidiarity 83, 124, 127
 suicides, burial 130–1, 134 136, 143
 Syria, and ethnic cleansing 53–4

 Task Group on Responsible Credit and
 Savings 190–1
 team ministries 99–101
 and patronage 92, 103–10
 team vicars 99–101, 103–8
 Teams and Group Ministries Measure
 100
 TEIs *see* Theological Education
 Institutions
 Theological Education Institutions:
 and Resourcing Ministerial
 Education 194
 and training to work with dementia
 patients 86–7
 theology:
 and clergy vesture 137–8, 143
 of disability 183
 and Renewal and Reform 146, 149,
 152–3, 159
Thinking Afresh About Welfare 10
 transgender issues 37
 Transition Pathway Initiative 46–7,
 61–3
 transparency, and sexual abuse

 allegations 71–3, 106
 vesture, clerical 129–44
 vocations:
 of disabled people 179–80, 204
 growing 88–9
 minority ethnic 19
 to teach 172–3
 young 150, 191, 198, 202
 Vote 1 193–4, 199
 Vote 2 194, 199
 Vote 3 199, 201
 Vote 4 199, 201
 Vote 5 194, 199, 201
 voting:
 counted 25, 108
 by show of hands 26, 41, 112, 121,
 128, 144, 159, 174, 187, 205–6
 vulnerability 10, 13, 18, 51

 welfare reform 10
 witness 8
 Women Bishops Measure 116
 women in the episcopate 181
 Five Guiding Principles 83, 86
 women priests, in Anglican
 Communion 31–2

 xenophobia, and EU Referendum 6–7,
 10, 19, 22, 50

 young people:
 and clergy vesture 133–4, 140–2
 and EU Referendum 9, 22, 25
 and evangelism 200
 and Renewal and Reform 155, 158
 Youth Council Representatives 149–
 50, 181

Index created by Meg Davies