

Report of Proceedings 2012

General Synod November Group of Sessions

Volume 43 No. 3

Officers of the General Synod

Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

Canterbury

Ven. Christine Hardman

York

Revd Canon Glyn Webster

The House of Laity

Chair

Dr Philip Giddings

Vice-Chair

Mr Tim Hind

Secretary General

Mr William Fittall

Clerk to the Synod

Dr Colin Podmore

Chief Legal Adviser and Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Administrative Secretary to the House of Bishops

Mr Ross Gillson

Standing Counsel

Sir Anthony Hammond KCB QC

Secretary to the House of Clergy

Mr Jonathan Neil-Smith

Deputy Legal Adviser

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

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of York

Ven. Alan Wolstencroft

Registrar

Mr Lionel Lennox

Contents

Full Synod: First Day Monday 19 November 2012

| | |
|---|----|
| Introductions | 1 |
| Progress of Measures and Statutory Instruments | 1 |
| Report by the Business Committee | 2 |
| Anglican Consultative Council Meeting | 8 |
| Draft Act of Synod Adopting the Anglican Communion Covenant | 18 |
| Questions | 33 |

Second Day Tuesday 20 November 2012

| | |
|---|----|
| Legislative Business: Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration of Women) Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 30 | 81 |
|---|----|

Third Day Wednesday 21 November 2012

| | |
|---|-----|
| Presidential Statement | 157 |
| Diocesan Synod Motion: Amendment to Canon B12 and Regulations | 160 |
| Private Member's Motion: Living Wage | 177 |
| Dates of Groups of Sessions in 2013 | 194 |
| Farewells | 200 |
| Youth Unemployment | 205 |
| Farewell to the Archbishop of Canterbury | 227 |
| Index | 239 |

Full Synod: First Day Monday 19 November 2012

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams)* took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

Revd Canon Glyn Webster (York) led the Synod in prayer, remembering those who had died since the July group of sessions, namely Sir Charles Frossard KBE who had represented Guernsey for over 20 years, initially in the Church Assembly and subsequently on the General Synod; Mr Roger Godin, who had represented the Southwark diocese on Synod for a total of 23 years between 1970 and 2005; Mr Patrick Locke, who had been on the staff of the Church Commissioners for 41 years (1957–98) and who had served as the Secretary to the Commissioners from 1992 until his retirement in 1998; and Sir Stuart Bell, who had been the longest-serving Second Church Estates Commissioner since the creation of the role in the 1850s, serving from 1997 to 2010.

Introduction of New Members

The Chairman: I introduce and warmly welcome the Rt Revd John Goddard (Bishop of Burnley); Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford); Revd Rupert Shelley (Southwark); Revd Canon Dr Gary Wilton (Europe); and Mr Ian Yemm (Bristol). (*Applause*)

There is one other matter which Synod may like to note on this occasion. Not exactly a new member of Synod but someone who is shortly to be a member of Synod in a new capacity. I will ask Bishop Justin to stand, to be greeted by Synod in great appreciation. (*Applause*)

While we are on the subject of good news, many of you will know of the long-standing legal battle that the diocese of Harare has had over its property in the face of the depredations of Dr Nolbert Kunonga, former Bishop. I am very happy to tell you that this morning we received the news that the Supreme Court of Zimbabwe has ruled in favour of the diocese of Harare and Bishop Chad sends this message: ‘Just to inform you all, dear friends, we won! Praise be God!’ (*Applause*)

I hope the Synod will be happy if I send on behalf of Synod our assurances that we share in the joy and thanksgiving of the diocese of Harare and continue to uphold them in our prayers. Will that be acceptable to you? (*Agreed*)

Progress of Measures and Statutory Instruments

The Chairman: I am required to report to the Synod as follows: that the Church of England Marriage (Amendment) Measure has been approved by the House of Commons and is due to be considered by the House of Lords this evening. If the Measure is approved by the House of Lords, it is hoped that it will receive Royal Assent on a date in December.

I report also that the Diocese in Europe Measure and the Clergy Discipline (Amendment) Measure have been submitted by the Legislative Committee to the

Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. Also, that the Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2012 and the Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2012 have been laid before Parliament and will come into force on 1 July 2013. For the convenience of members, these matters of report will be set out in a notice paper.

THE CHAIR *Canon Ann Turner (Europe)* took the Chair at 2.35 p.m.

Report by the Business Committee (GS 1880)

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford): I beg to move:

That the Synod do take note of this Report.'

We welcome one another to this group of sessions. It comes as a result of a decision that Synod took in July, which then prompted the Presidents to call a November Synod. Being a third meeting in the year, we are all truly grateful to those who have had to take further holiday time in order to be present. Their willingness to do so is much appreciated and should not go unrecognised.

Also much appreciated was the package of paper we received for this Synod. It was the lightest it has been for a very long while, prompting the question 'Can this be all there is? There must be more. Will there be another one tomorrow?' However, let us be assured that there is no relation between the light weight of the package and the very significant business outlined in it.

The applause a moment ago expresses our relief that we meet after an announcement has at last been made of the name of the next Archbishop of Canterbury. We all assure Bishop Justin of our support and prayers as he prepares for the future that he has been called to embrace. That is the positive way of expressing it! Maybe Synod should at some time consider whether the practice of a blindfolded boy pulling out a name from a box in the context of worship would be a good way for the Church of England to discover the will of God in important appointments.

It is around that theme of decision-making that I want to set the scene for the agenda this week. How do we decide how to vote when we are confronted by many opposing voices? How do we discern the will of God for his Church at a particular time? How do we discover the mind of Christ? How grateful we should be for those around the country who have made a commitment to pray for us during this week. I am sure that we are aware of all kinds of groups offering earnest prayer for certain outcomes from tomorrow, but I would not want to be sorting out the heavenly in-box, with all those conflicting requests.

Whatever our longing, we need to come to the place where we pray that most difficult of prayers, as it was when it was first uttered, 'Not my will but yours be done.' Surely, over and above all our personal convictions and preferences, we need to align ourselves with that will of the Lord of our Church.

Whatever our view of the Measure that outlines the legislation for women as bishops, we find ourselves at this Synod close to a decision. We reach a decision tomorrow after years of debate, and it is right that we come to this moment. Not everyone will

be able to speak during the debates of the Synod – at least, I hope that, as we come towards the end of the day tomorrow, some who had hoped to speak will feel there is nothing that can usefully be added – but all of us as members of Synod can pray, can listen and can vote. That is the prime responsibility of members of Synod. Inevitably, there is an atmosphere of tension as we allow the process of voting to decide the way forward. Whichever way the debate and the voting goes, there will be anxiety and emotion; but let us handle that moment with grace to one another and in the faith that the Lord is fulfilling his promise to build his Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The decisions of the Business Committee regarding the agenda were quite limited this time because, according to our Standing Orders, certain items of business just had to be taken. We did have a choice as to the order of the agenda but, with all of tomorrow required for the legislation, even that was somewhat limited.

The item on the referral of the Covenant to the dioceses and the report from the Anglican Consultative Council are a natural pair and healthy way to begin this group of sessions, as we reflect on the relationships within the Communion and the response of the Church of England to the proposal of a Covenant.

The following motions, passed by a number of diocesan synods, will be taken at a future group of sessions – for three reasons. First, to allow more time on our agenda than is possible this November for such an important debate. Second, to allow the House of Bishops more time to consider their response. Third, to allow the new Archbishop to be in office when we discuss our future engagement with the Communion.

The agenda allows for one Diocesan Synod Motion from Southwell and Nottingham on those eligible to assist with the administration of Holy Communion and one Private Members' Motion on the living wage, its appropriateness as a Christian value and as an aspiration for the Church of England institutions. Both, I am sure, will engender lively debate.

The agenda also provides for a debate, sponsored by the Mission and Public Affairs Council and preceded by a short presentation, on the problems many young people face in trying to enter the working world of employment. The personal and social consequences of being unemployed and becoming dependent on a benefit culture are having a serious impact on the younger generation and it is timely for a view to be expressed by this Synod.

On Wednesday morning we shall debate the dates for our sessions next year, with the recommendation from the Business Committee that, for the reasons set out in GS 1880, Synod should meet in July and November next year and not in February. I will say more on that on Wednesday.

There will then be a farewell to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was postponed from July but is actually more appropriate now in terms of timing, a few weeks rather than a number of months before he leaves office. It feels more comfortable to do that when we know who will step into the empty shoes.

One other recent decision that will have an impact on us all, but in particular the Business Committee and the staff in Church House, is the appointment of the Clerk of the Synod to a new role, for which he will leave at the end of March next year. He has served us extremely well and we shall miss his wisdom and humour. Depending on the outcome of Wednesday's decision about a February Synod, we may have to bid him farewell at the end of this group of sessions.

Our report also contains responses to a number of suggestions that have been received from Synod members. We welcome suggestions and all members of the Committee see the correspondence. I will not add now to what is said in the report but we will reflect on any comments that are made.

To sum up, in these three days we face a number of significant decisions, one obviously with more far-reaching consequences than the others but all, I trust, prompted by the desire that our mission as a Church might be more effective in bringing the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the people of this nation.

The Chairman: This item is now open for debate. I remind members that their comments should be confined strictly to the shape and content of the agenda or to matters addressed in the report. It is not in order to get into the substance of the subject.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): Reading the report of the Business Committee, I was left wondering how far its remit runs. When we get to the debate on the Southwell and Nottingham motion on Wednesday, we will touch on some quite tricky matters of theology and practice in Christian initiation, but it seems that some of those theological elements have already been decided in the Business Committee report.

I do not want to get into the debate for Wednesday but, as an example of where I think the report oversteps the mark, in section 28 at the bottom of page 4 it refers rather tendentiously to the idea that confirmation completes the sacrament of Christian initiation. As Synod members will be aware, this is a huge issue in the Church of England's theological and liturgical life and I wonder why the Business Committee thought that it had solved the problem.

Likewise, in the supporting papers for Wednesday's debate it seems to me that the Secretary General's paper leans in one particular way; not least that the booklet which came out recently, *The Journey of Christian Initiation*, seems to be taken as Church of England policy, when it clearly is not.

My plea, therefore, is that in the Business Committee report and in the accompanying papers for debate we try to have a bit more balance and less trying to decide some of the debates in advance. Unless, of course, the Business Committee has quietly staged a palace revolution and has solved all the Church of England's theological and liturgical problems, in which case that would be nice to know!

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I am a member of the Business Committee but I am speaking in an entirely personal capacity in this debate.

Some people are destined to be remembered for certain things in this Synod. As we have heard before, Christina Rees and Fr Houlding will always be remembered for their contributions to the debate on women bishops. I fear that my legacy, when it comes, will be to do with churchyard fees.

At the end of the Business Committee report, in the 'Forecast of Future Business', I note that the Fees Order is due for attention in July. Because of my past interest in this matter, I am beginning to receive comments and suggestions from churches around the country about the non-working of the new Fees Measure, in particular the financial pressure it is putting on those churches with open churchyards; for example, one parish in the diocese of Birmingham where churchyard maintenance costs £5,000 an acre. They actually spent £20,000 but, across the survey carried out of a sample group of parishes in the diocese of Birmingham, £5,000 an acre is a large amount of money.

I raise this now for a number of reasons. First, to make the Synod aware of this on-going issue and because I would personally be interested in hearing from others if there is a widespread concern about this matter.

Second, because I know that when we meet as the Business Committee we will look at the things that have been said in this debate and some of the concerns that arise. As we think about and plan the agenda, we can work with other bodies and agencies within Church House to shape the agenda; that can be important in terms of how we talk about the Fees Order in July.

Third, it is so that we make sure the Fees Measure as it now works and its associated orders do what we expect it to do, and that there are not so many parishes around the country that are faced, as this parish in Birmingham is, with potential insolvency within two years unless something is done urgently to resolve this matter.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister): I want to raise a matter of principle arising from the Business Committee's discussion of Diocesan Synod Motions, particularly in section 13.

The lawyers have advised that, because debate on a specific matter may be prejudiced by debate on the general principle, the general principle debate should be delayed. This seems to me to be the wrong way round. Notwithstanding legal advice, it is sometimes right and proper to discuss the general principle, in particular the broad theological principle, before addressing particular detail. I would love to hear the Business Committee's reflection on that.

The Archdeacon of Colchester (Ven. Annette Cooper) (Chelmsford): I welcome the Business Committee's report, in particular the fact that it is reviewing the circulation of papers, and I thank the Committee for its attentiveness to detail.

Could I press the Committee a little further and refer them to the circulation of A(12)3? I would ask the Business Committee members to remember that some years ago Synod carried a motion to ensure that our language was inclusive. Being a

member of the Appointments Committee, I greatly welcome the appointments to the panel of chairs; however, I am a little concerned that on this paper we have made appointments to the 'Panel of Chairmen'. I wonder if we could watch the detail in our circulated papers.

Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs (Chester): I would like to raise a subject, whose absence from our agenda I believe is in danger of hindering the successful conclusion of our debate tomorrow about the ordination of women to the episcopate, and which will also be relevant to other debates that will certainly follow in the years ahead. That subject is how we can and should learn to live with diversity in the life of the Church.

In this regard, there are a number of issues we need to explore more fully. The first is the polarity that currently exists between, on the one hand, the view that the majority should prevail and, on the other, the point at which separate provision becomes schismatic. The second is how we define 'legitimate' versus 'illegitimate' diversity within the life of the Church.

The weakness of our debates about women bishops thus far is that they have attempted to address the substantive issues without adequately considering what it really means for us to live with differences in the life of the Church.

We need to make the time and space to discuss this broader issue much more fully, moving beyond debate as essentially a negotiation between different power blocks, perhaps to develop some kind of theology of kenosis, to use the language of St Paul from Philippians, based on a willingness to forego our 'rights' for the sake of the other and of the Body as a whole.

Whatever happens tomorrow, I hope that the Business Committee will consider how to build in such a discussion as a follow-up to tomorrow's debate and as a vital part of preparing us for our common future.

Mr Chris Pye (Liverpool): I speak to paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 of the report. Here I must declare an interest, coming as I do from the red rose side of the Pennines and having no wish to intrude on private grief on the Yorkshire side! However, we do need a national debate on this issue.

A letter in the *Church Times* this week illustrates the problems in London, and no doubt members can think of other places. We need to do this nationally and quickly. Forty-odd offices in England is not good stewardship; it is excessive.

I will enjoy saying this next phrase. Let us park Yorkshire and have a national strategy debate. It takes a lot for me to agree with somewhere like Wakefield without a special dispensation and visa, but we do need to take these things on board at a national level and not hide behind a legal smokescreen.

I hope that the Business Committee take notice of this and act, because what we are doing at the moment is costing an awful lot of brass.

Revd Stephen France (Chichester): It is with some sadness that this will be my last General Synod, as I have just moved from the Chichester diocese to the London diocese. I have enjoyed having the big white envelopes come through my letterbox in

Sussex, and a slightly smaller one in Brondesbury, but I am a little confused with regard to paragraphs 25 and 26 of the Business Committee report in relation to the legislative business of women in the episcopate.

In the Secretary General's very helpful 'Future process' document GS 1012 in January 2012, paragraph 39, he says, 'The Final Approval of the Amending Canon requires no special majority' and yet, when he writes to us in October 2012, in GS Misc 1034, paragraph 2, he says, 'The Final Approval of the Amending Canon requires the same majority'. I wonder which it is.

The Bishop of Bradford (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): I want to support paragraph 13. We would not have a debate on a national strategy had the Dioceses Commission not done its investigation into West Yorkshire. This is classic distraction stuff. You can kick something into the long grass that demands decision and action by saying, 'We need more time. We need a broader strategy.'

I agree that we need to look at the way the whole of the Church of England is organised but not by delaying an immediate matter that is on our table, which we need to grapple with and make a decision on.

The Chairman: I see no one standing and therefore call upon the chair of the Business Committee to reply to the debate.

The Archdeacon of Dorking, in reply: I thank all those who have contributed. I am delighted that so many members give such a careful reading to the Business Committee report. That is evident from the issues raised. It is not the remit of the Business Committee to decide a number of issues; we simply try to forge an agenda that is appropriate for Synod.

On the issue of the Committee's remit and the question of whether there was any bias in the report in section 28, I note that the bullet points begin with the word 'whether'. It is not actually making a claim, therefore; it is asking a question. I do apologize if there is something of a bias there. The role of the Business Committee is not to sort out the theological convictions of the Church of England.

With regard to the Fees Order referred to in future business for July, I am told that refers to the Legal Officers and Ecclesiastical Judges (Fees) Order and not to the Parochial Fees Order; so I think that deals with the particular concern, but no doubt DRACSC will have heard the concerns raised by Simon Butler.

The question as to whether Diocesan Synod Motions should or can rightly be parked while other business is being conducted on the floor of Synod is one on which the Legal Officer has given advice to the Committee. It is important that other business is not prejudiced by taking those Diocesan Synod Motions in advance. I think the Bishop of Bradford has answered that question in his final remarks.

As to the circulation of papers from the Business Committee to members of Synod, yes we try to watch over the detail. They are read a number of times before they are sent out. The Business Committee does not alter the wording of the reports that it receives. We will watch carefully with regard to wording referring to 'Chairs'.

Regarding the question of whether there is the need for a debate on the diversity of the Church of England, living with difference, the Business Committee does not itself initiate business for the General Synod but I am sure that concern has been heard and that there will be some discussion as to whether there could be room for that kind of debate at some stage in the future.

On the question of the special majority, referred to in the General Secretary's earlier report, legal advice tells me the need for that two-thirds majority was overlooked in the General Secretary's earlier report, and that is apologized for.

That is my response to the comments members have made. I am grateful for members' support and also for the work, support and encouragement of my colleagues on the Business Committee. I trust that, as we go through our agenda for the rest of today, tomorrow and on Wednesday, we will conduct our business in a way that is worthy of our calling.

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *The Dean of Leicester (Very Revd Vivienne Faull)* took the Chair at 3 p.m.

Anglican Consultative Council Meeting

Presentation under Standing Order 97

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): It is my great pleasure, as the current Vice-Chair of the Anglican Consultative Council, to introduce this presentation of the work of ACC-15, hosted by the Church of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia in Auckland very recently.

My brief, agreed by the Church of England representatives sitting behind me, comprised just two questions: what is the Anglican Consultative Council, and how does it work? – and to say something of the four Instruments of the Anglican Communion in not more than five minutes. It is a challenge.

There will be some pictures that will be rolling during our presentation. However, I want to make it quite clear that we were not at all of these venues; we were working. There were some spouses accompanying us, who had a wonderful spouses' programme and, if members look very carefully, they may see a certain Archbishop's wife paddling!

I begin by bringing greetings from the ACC chair, Bishop Tenganenga of southern Malawi, who assures us that all members of the General Synod will be in his thoughts and prayers during this session. As he said in his sermon at the ACC closing Eucharist, '...so that we can see the face of Christ in each other and pray for one another as we seek to further his mission in the world'.

In attempting to answer the questions I was set, I must assume that some members have a working knowledge of the Anglican Consultative Council and some have a far greater understanding of its work in specific parts of the Anglican Communion. I hope that Synod will forgive me if I appear to be teaching my grandparents to suck eggs.

The Anglican Consultative Council meets every three years. The venue is by invitation of a province or church. My involvement has spanned four ACCs – 12, 13, 14 and 15 – held in Hong Kong, Nottingham in England, Jamaica and New Zealand. Each of the 38 provinces or churches are invited to send three members, according to the size of their church, and it is hoped that the laity, clergy and bishops will all be represented; but when a church has only one or two member places they are encouraged to ensure that the lay voice is represented.

Members serve for three ACCs. Seventy-nine members attended ACC-15, plus five Primates elected by the Primates' Standing Committee who serve on the ACC Standing Committee. There are five ecumenical participants, who joined in all parts of the meeting but have no voting rights. The business is conducted in the context of a daily Eucharist, Bible study and evening prayer organised by the hosting church, which tries to include ACC members from all continents.

Elections are held at each ACC for the Standing Committee – seven members who are joined by the five Primates. The chair and vice-chair are elected to serve for two ACCs. As Bishop James and I had been elected at ACC-14, we will remain in post until the end of ACC-16. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury is the President and always joins the Standing Committee for two days at their annual meetings, which are held in the Anglican Communion Office at St Andrew's House, London.

The Standing Committee elects five of its members to serve as a Finance Committee. The Secretary General Canon Kenneth Kieron and his staff at St Andrew's House do a magnificent job of supporting the whole of the Anglican Communion's work, networks and other initiatives, on a very tight budget, which is made up of contributions requested from all provinces and churches and a large annual contribution from the Compass Rose Society.

The agenda of an ACC includes Bible study groups, reflection groups, presentations and reports from all areas of work, commissioned by the previous ACC, a finance and budget-setting session and an annual report from the Secretary General. Resolutions are proposed and voted upon in the business session.

The Standing Committee, through the Finance Committee, has to find funding for each ACC and lays aside funds for a Lambeth Conference, should the Archbishop of Canterbury call one. This has not proved an easy task, especially in the recent recession. A resolution at ACC-15 approved the setting-up of a campaign to try to attract other funding.

ACC-15 was conducted in an atmosphere of care and respect and, despite obvious differences of opinion on some issues, there was an openness to listening and to working together, which was remarked upon by many members. I would like to pay tribute to our members, all of whom contributed fully to the work and helped others who were struggling with some of the more formal processes.

The Anglican Consultative Council is only one of the four Instruments of Unity in the Anglican Communion. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Primates' Meeting and the Lambeth Conference all share this responsibility. The staff of the Anglican Communion Office and Lambeth Palace work most co-operatively and

enthusiastically to serve each of these Instruments and the whole Communion is indebted to them.

Modern lines of communication have made it easier for Anglicans across the world to keep in touch, but I know that many regretted the loss of *Anglican World*. I am therefore delighted to tell Synod that it was re-launched at ACC-15 and is again a very good read. I would urge members to get their parishes, dioceses and individual members to subscribe – see the Anglican Communion Office website. Future issues depend upon members' support.

Inclusion and unity have been at the heart of His Grace's work with the Consultative Council and support for Anglicans in all parts of the Communion has been readily given. May I take this opportunity to thank him sincerely on behalf of all whose privilege it has been to serve with him in this task. I thank Synod for listening.

Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin: Madam Chair, Archbishop, Synod members, I now share with you something of the context in which we met. *Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou, katoa* – greetings to you, to you all. *Koiora tatou* – be alive, have life, all of us. I have just used the Maori words of greeting.

We met in the Province of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. Historically, in 1814 the Church Missionary Society met the Maori people and by 1857 had made great inroads in sharing the gospel with them. A large majority of the Anglicans in Aotearoa, New Zealand, at that time were therefore Maori, estimated to be between 70 and 80 per cent. On 13 June that year, an Anglican Constitution was signed in Parnell, the area where the ACC was hosted. Not one single Maori was present at the ceremony and neither were they invited to be signatories. The settler Church arrived some 27 years later, in 1841. Bishop George Augustus Selwyn came for the settlers, who were then mainly from England. In 1989 they produced the first New Zealand Prayer Book; in 1990 they passed their revised Anglican Constitution of 1857. It was then that this revision acknowledged and included all three parts of the province. They became equal partners and this came into effect in 1992, after their General Synod.

Their Prayer Book reflects the three parts of the Church and, at major services in the province, all three archbishops are present and share presidency or leadership. The Church has repented its past and continues to embrace its future. The three strands of the Church in that province are Tikanga Maori, Tikanga Pakeha and Tikanga Polynesia or Pacifika.

I had the privilege of preaching in the Polynesian Church on the second weekend, when we all attended different cities and towns. There I experienced the rich liturgy in words of different languages, as well as music and movement. Imagine having the gospel danced from the altar down to the aisle and danced back up again. It was absolutely wonderful.

While there, I was deeply moved by the commitment of the structures and the leadership to the diversity in its midst. It is something that I believe we as a province and as a Church could certainly learn from. Is there resistance in some parts of the Church to its all-embracing and inclusive efforts? Of course. Most definitely. But the

young people whom I met are living that diversity, enjoying that diversity, and are wondering what the problem is.

Koiora tatou – be alive, have life, all of us.

Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool): I will talk about some of the work that we did, in particular the networks, and will highlight some of the resolutions that were passed.

The ACC has a number of self-funded networks, which seek to profile particular areas of interest within the Communion as a whole. They include the Anglican Communion Environmental Network, a Peace and Justice Network, a Network for Inter-Faith Concerns, a Family Network, Women's Network, Indigenous Network, Refugee and Migrant Network, Youth Network, and a Safe Church Network. There are others but those are the ones from which I will be highlighting some resolutions. The Safe Church Network was recognised as an official network at this particular ACC meeting.

Our sessions began with a marketplace-style time, during which members of the ACC were able to engage with the networks informally, in preparation for more in-depth discussions in smaller groups, with two networks of their choice. Those discussions were an opportunity for members to learn more about the work of the networks and to influence their future direction of work, through the sharing of experiences and challenges at provincial level. A number of resolutions that came to the ACC for adoption were developed through this process.

There were also resolutions presented to the meeting that had their origins in the Anglican ecumenical dialogues with the Lutherans, Old Catholics and the Reformed traditions. There were resolutions that arose from work undertaken through the Anglican Communion Office, for example in the areas of continuing indaba, which Bishop Stephen will talk about, communications, and the Bible in the life of the Church. A number of resolutions were proposed by members.

I would like in particular to draw Synod's attention to a few of the resolutions. The first is birth registration. Here, we take for granted that all children will be registered at birth, but this is not the case across the Communion. Registration of birth is an important act that opens up access to education and the establishment of identity. It is something we take for granted but which is vital for the development and the fostering of the talents of many born within our Communion.

There was a Safe Church resolution and a resolution on gender-based violence and domestic violence. Those were passed following discussion in the networks and an evening presentation from a project working in these areas. The resolutions reaffirmed the call for the elimination of abuse and violence, and the commitment of the Communion to high standards of care for the young and the vulnerable. This is an issue that touches every province within the Communion.

There was a resolution concerning the environment, which included the promotion of sustainability. This too was the subject of an evening presentation but was also very powerfully presented in dance form and music at the Polynesian dinner, and members will see some pictures of that presentation. For their community this is not a matter of

theory, which regrettably it can often feel to be for us. It is the reality of the sea advancing on and taking the islands to which they belong. As we left that dinner, one of the Polynesian community grasped the hand of one of our company and pleaded for our help. 'Help us', he said. I, for one, am taking that challenge seriously.

We passed a resolution around the trafficking of persons. Again, it is something that probably does not touch most of us on a day-to-day basis but is a matter on which a number of networks are working together. The resolution concerned the promotion of awareness and action, both in the 'sending' province and those receiving trafficked persons. It is much more common than we would all like to believe. Indeed, on returning home I received an e-mail from one of the ACC members in Africa who had been sitting with us on our first flight. We parted company at Dubai and she took another flight to Accra, where she sat next to a young woman who was returning home, having been trafficked by her brother. She was going to land in Accra without the financial means to get back to her home. Fortunately for that young woman, Philippa was able to give her help. This is a live issue, very much brought home by encounters like that.

We had a resolution on Israel-Palestine and there was a major discussion. There is a document, *Land of Promise*, commissioned by the Network for Inter-faith Concerns, which explores Christian attitudes to the Holy Land. The report is a resource available for study and I commend it to Synod.

One issue which took many of us by surprise and was also the subject of a resolution was the difficulty many from developing nations had in obtaining a transit visa to sit in an airport lounge air-side for two hours in Australia. Some totally failed and had to be re-routed. The Australians were frankly ashamed by the conduct of their authorities. However, theirs are not the only authorities who are exercising inequality in the application of immigration procedures, demanding higher levels of information from some than from others, depending on the country of origin. It is a basic justice issue and something that we should also explore here.

In total, the meeting passed 41 resolutions, all of which are available on the Anglican Communion Office website.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): As Synod will have seen from the pictures on the screen and heard from fellow members of the ACC, we were made extraordinarily welcome in New Zealand.

At the opening event, having been well and truly '*haka*'d' in, having rubbed noses and exchanged breath and eaten copious amounts of oysters – which in my opinion is always good for the kingdom of God – we then proceeded to have a question-and-answer session with three archbishops: one was an Archbishop on my right, Archbishop Thabo from Southern Africa, and Archbishop Katharine Jefferts-Schori.

It was one of those question-and-answer sessions with children that we bishops do quite a lot of, so we can usually predict the sort of questions that will come up; such as 'How much do you earn?'; 'What made you want to be a bishop?' – a question that usually takes a bit of unpacking – and so on. In this question-and-answer session, however, there was one wonderful question from a child, which I think took us all by

surprise. She asked, 'If God wore shoes, what kind of shoes would God wear?' It is a really good question and I spent most of the ACC reflecting on it.

I will not say who gave which answer; I will leave that to Synod's imagination. However, one of the answers was – and I am not looking anywhere in particular – 'I think God would wear the kind of shoes that it is easy to slip on and off.' I think the Archbishop was trying not to use the word 'sandals' at this point in the conversation! The reason given was that God would want to feel his feet upon the solid earth; also, God would want to be able to give the shoes away.

Another archbishop said they thought that God would wear dancing shoes. I thought that was a brilliant answer and it stayed with me throughout all that happened in the ACC meeting. I think that it must also have stayed with Archbishop David Moxon because, at the final dinner, he also spoke about dancing. He gave us a quick lesson in how to dance, explaining that when you dance sometimes both feet are on the ground and sometimes both feet are off the ground, but most of the time one foot is on the ground and one foot is off the ground; therefore, when you are dancing there is stability and continuity but also a certain precariousness.

That seemed to me to be a good image for what we were about in the main business of ACC-15, which was to think not just about our Instruments of Communion but also where we are in this Covenant process. Bear in mind that the synods in most of our provinces meet only once in four or five years, so it will take a long time for all of this to work through. However, we also discussed the process of continuing indaba. It seems to me that what we are learning about with continuing indaba is that which is stable and continuous, and that which is precarious and provisional, and we are beginning to work out how we can negotiate that between us. It was a rich and beautiful experience.

I went to ACC-15 with some trepidation, wondering if I would find myself cast into the centre of the most difficult and intractable politics of the Anglican Communion, and it was not like that. Because (perhaps I can do this image to death and then leave it behind) over the course of two weeks we did learn to dance together. We had some very rich and beautiful conversations, where we faced up to some of the disagreements and differences that we face in our Communion.

I was left with some questions. First, what is the significance of context in our theological debate and discussion and what is unchanging and counter-context as well as counter-value? I have to say that there were times in my discussions when I thought, 'If anybody else starts their contribution by saying "In my context..."', I will shout out "I do not give a monkey's about your context. Jesus is Lord."

That was the debate we had. Sometimes it was a very hard debate about what is stable, what is continuous, and what must be fresh and what is precarious. A particular thing that I think we need to take note of is the process of continuing indaba. It is perhaps something on which we need further discussion in the Church of England. Indaba is a process of honest conversation that seeks to build community, energize mission, and provide a context in which conflicts can be resolved. There are inspiring examples of continuing indaba going on across our Anglican Communion and we need to participate in that much more.

There was also a very encouraging debate on the project, 'Bible in the Life of the Church', again affirming the centrality of Scripture in the life of the Anglican Communion but also daring to look at those issues of how we handle Scripture differently and what we must learn from each other.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): I want to echo very strongly what has already been said about the warmth of the welcome we received from the Province of Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, but there are a couple of features of the meeting that I would like to underline which have not yet been drawn out and which I think were of great importance for us.

The first is to respond to what some people have said: that the structure and pattern of ACC meetings is designed to push to the margin some of the more difficult and contentious matters in the Communion; to focus our minds on process and to take our minds away from the arguments we are not prepared to have. I do not think this is true. I think that the crucial point is not whether or not we have those arguments; it is where we have them.

In the small groups, the Bible study groups, and some of the other smaller groups that functioned during the ACC meeting, I can guarantee from first-hand experience that very demanding exchanges on the state of the Communion and the large issues that divide us did go on, and were in a very proper sense contained within the life of those prayerful, biblically focused groups.

Going back to issues that were raised earlier this afternoon, if we ask the question of how we manage our diversity as a Church, part of the answer has to be 'In what context are we trying to do it?' – sorry, Stephen! A context of administrative, public, bureaucratic decision-making, or primarily a context where we are trying to read the Bible together and understand one another as disciples?

I do not think that we were evading the difficult issues, therefore. I think that perhaps, as at Lambeth 2008, we were trying to create the conditions in which it was possible to have a fruitful discussion of them.

I want also to underline the very warm response that the ACC gave to the development of the Anglican Alliance, which is the new international network looking at issues of relief and development across the Anglican world, coordinating and prioritizing some of the work already done on the ground by countless Anglican agencies. This has developed very rapidly and very fruitfully. I think the Communion, overall, has recognised it as a very important tool for addressing the needs of our world and for enabling us to talk more honestly and more usefully together. That, in turn, poses a question of very wide range, a question about the Instruments of Communion and about the kind of international life we have as a Communion.

We are still in that post-Second World War era to some extent, where if you had a problem you would throw a committee at it. The main thing you would want to ask would be whether the committee was representative, whether it was functioning in a certain kind of accepted way. The fact of the matter is that we have moved on culturally, internationally, from that in quite a lot of ways.

The networks of the Anglican Communion now represent some of the most creative, most universally supported work that we do as a Communion. Those networks, in looking at particular, focused questions on mission, education, relief, issues around the family, issues around gender, indigenous people, the environment and so forth, draw people from the entire spectrum – and I do mean the entire spectrum – of Anglican identity. Help them to listen to one another, identify the priorities on which they want to focus, and work together effectively. I am deeply grateful that these have developed in such a rich way, especially in the last five years or so.

Perhaps the larger question we are up against is how we hold together the burgeoning life of networks, alliances, less formal associations across the Communion with the unavoidable need for decision-making and managing bodies. I do not think we have a formula for that, but it is the kind of challenge that this ACC has put before us more vividly perhaps than ever before.

I would like to add one final word about all of this. As members heard, on one of the weekends during the ACC meeting we were able to leave the meeting itself and go out into the parishes to see something of the life of the local Church at the grassroots. I had the inestimable privilege to spend a weekend in Christchurch, in the South Island, visiting the site of the earthquakes of 2010 and 2011. I was able to meet some of the people who had been most directly involved in relief work in the wake of the earthquakes and to get some sense of how Church and city were pulling together in Christchurch in the aftermath of these devastating events.

One hundred and eighty-five people were killed in the earthquakes. The city centre of Christchurch was almost entirely destroyed, and the cathedral there was largely destroyed as well. I found myself in the middle of a deeply praying, deeply hoping community. I spent a wonderful afternoon, a really wonderful afternoon, with a group of a couple of hundred young adults from the diocese of Christchurch who wanted to explore not only the issues of their situation but their own questions about vocation and faith. I was aware that, in that very pressured and stressed environment in and around Christchurch, the Anglican diocese was doing truly extraordinary things in bringing the questions of faith alive for a younger generation and mobilizing the energy and vision of that younger generation in and out of the Church.

Perhaps the thing I will carry away most vividly from those two weeks in New Zealand is that sense of the Church mobilizing the prayer and the intelligence and the energy of a younger generation in the aftermath of traumatic suffering. It is one part; it is not the whole of the story of the Anglican Church in that province, but it is a very important part.

Put together with the focus that was emerging in networks, informal connections around and between the Churches, I had quite a strong sense of a Church being born in another style, of another mode of Church life coming to birth in that particular environment, which has a great deal to say to the rest of us.

I believe that, for all the unresolved problems and unfinished business that any international Anglican meeting leaves in its wake, this particular meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council gave us an immense amount to be grateful for and to

work for in our understanding of our Anglican identity in the Christian spectrum and in response to God's challenges and God's call in the world today.

The Chairman: We now have about ten minutes for questions. That is an opportunity for anyone who would like to ask questions of those who have addressed us. I have asked Elizabeth Paver to feed the questions across the team, acting as team captain. If members would stand if they have a question, I will ask for questions in groups of three, so that Elizabeth has a moment or two to respond.

Revd Canon Martin Wood (Chelmsford): I would like to ask a question about the project 'Bible in the Life of the Church' which Bishop Stephen alluded to. I gather that there is a report out called *Deep Engagement and Fresh Discovery*, and I wonder whether those who were involved in that debate and know something about it would consider that that would be something it would be worthwhile for this Synod to engage with.

Revd Christopher Hobbs (London): I have a number of questions. Is it the case that there are overlapping geographical episcopal jurisdictions within the Church in New Zealand?

Did the Appointments Committee appoint the members? Do the members last there for nine years? Is it every three years and for three sessions? It was not quite clear to me.

What progress has there been with the Anglican Church in North America in relation to the fallout, including, as has been seen recently in the diocese of South Carolina, bringing on the Anglicans who are not currently represented?

The Bishop of Chelmsford: The resolutions from ACC are not known for their brevity and so I did not read out the whole resolution on 'Bible in the Life of the Church', but part of it does indeed commend its discussion and study to the provinces. I believe that it would be well worth considering. Whether that would need a debate here at Synod or whether it would go to the dioceses, I do not know, but I certainly would want to support it.

Canon Elizabeth Paver: In Questions later this afternoon, there is one regarding the appointment of people to be members of ACC. When members have heard that response, if they wish to hear more they can ask us privately.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: In relation to the Anglican Church in North America, that grouping has been invited more than once in the past to make a submission or a statement of its position to the Anglican Consultative Council and the Standing Committee. We have not received anything from them and so it has not come on to the agenda from their side. We await developments.

Canon Margaret Swinson: Regarding the jurisdictions, there are three streams to the Church in New Zealand, which have their own bishops. Although there is not a segregation of congregations, the reality is that most congregations depend very much on the physical area in which they are situated. The Polynesian part of the Church is much smaller, even though the largest group of Polynesians in the world live in

Auckland. In the cathedral in Auckland there are three cathedrae: one for the Maori bishop, one for the Pakeha bishop and one for the Pacifika bishop. That is how it works.

Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin: I would like to add that all three archbishops are in communion with each other and there is mutual respect.

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd John Pritchard): I am encouraged by and interested in what the Archbishop said about the development of networks over the last five years in particular. I wonder how those are supported, encouraged and facilitated, or are they just individual entrepreneurial activities? I have some connection with the Anglican Health Network, which is really struggling at the moment, and I wonder why that is so in that case but not in others. How are they supported, encouraged and enabled?

Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester): The Anglican Consultative Council report on the Holy Land is quite an interesting read. How was the Committee drawn together? What support and staffing does it have? What authority would that report carry?

Canon Elizabeth Paver: With regard to the networks – and I absolutely concur with what the Archbishop said about how they have flourished more recently – we did find the funding to appoint a network coordinator, the Revd Terrie Robinson, and she has worked tirelessly in the Anglican Communion Office to enable much of this communication across the Communion to happen. It is reliant on people from each of the provinces and churches finding someone who is prepared to be involved and lead in each of those areas.

The Women's Network does go to the Commission on the Status of Women at the UN in New York on an annual basis. All of these networks have to be funded from extra funding. They do not get funding other than the administrative support from the centre. They are very active in trying to find this. I myself was lobbied by the Women's Network, asking, 'Isn't there anywhere where we can find some extra funding from, so that we can do more of our project work which is so valuable on the ground?'

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Three years ago, at the last Anglican Consultative Council, in response to concerns and requests coming from various provinces, the Council asked for some work to be done on issues raised by Christian Zionism. That work was remitted to the Network for Inter Faith Concerns (NIFCON), which duly produced the report that was discussed at this ACC meeting.

It was written with a large amount of input from the staff of the Anglican Communion Office, drawing in a wide range of other voices. It is a study document, commended as such by the ACC. It is not in itself a teaching document. The ACC does not issue teaching documents. It is a study document produced, as I have described, by one of the networks and commended for use, study and further discussion.

Mr Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): This is a question relating to *Anglican World*, the magazine, to which I used to subscribe. The International

Anglican Family Network produces its magazine two or maybe three times a year. How will that relate to *Anglican World* in future?

Revd Prebendary Philippa Boardman (London): Archbishop Rowan spoke very warmly of the life of the diocese of Christchurch, which is led by Bishop Victoria Matthews. Given the interest in this Synod in the practical outworking of women bishops, could the Archbishop comment on how the ministry of a bishop who is a woman has included those who may have been uncertain about her ministry at the outset?

Canon Elizabeth Paver: *Anglican World* has been very much part of the communication of what is going on in so many of the provinces. Things like the Family Network will continue to produce their own bulletins, so they will still have their work, but this will be in addition to the networks' own publications.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Victoria Matthews is one of the best bishops I know. She is a person of sacrificial ministerial habit, currently living in one room, as a result of having lost her home and her possessions during the earthquake, and ministering out of that context. She is someone who gives immense priority to the spiritual formation of her clergy. In a traditionally quite Protestant diocese in New Zealand – and they are not all like that – she has won a very, very high degree of corporate confidence. She has also suffered considerably from public vitriol over the controversies concerning the rebuilding of the cathedral in Christchurch, which she manages with great courage.

The Chairman: We have come to the end of our time allocation for questions. We now move on to the next business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 3.45 p.m.

Legislative Business

Draft Act of Synod Adopting the Anglican Communion Covenant: Report on the Reference to the Dioceses

Article 7 and Article 8 Business

Report by the Business Committee on the Article 8 Reference (GS 1878)

The Chairman: This is a report of the Business Committee on the formal reference to dioceses under Article 8 of the Synod's Constitution. The form of the debate is straightforward, being a 'take note' debate on the report. I remind members that they should confine their comments to matters addressed in the report under debate. I shall be ready to call them to order if they do not do so.

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford): I beg to move:

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

It is entirely appropriate that we continue on the theme of the Anglican Communion. The Business Committee Report GS 1878 outlines the results of the Article 8 reference to the dioceses on the adoption of the Anglican Communion Covenant, something as an exercise required by SO 91. A debate on that report has to happen

within two groups of sessions at the end of that reference exercise, hence today – though it does feel a very long time ago that this matter was debated around the dioceses in the country.

I am very aware of the considerable amount of work that this exercise has entailed. The Business Committee is very grateful to all who have made the process happen; to staff in diocesan offices; to those who oversaw the circulation of relevant material; to those who planned Synod timetables and agendas; and to those who contributed to debates in diocesan and deanery synods. This kind of exercise does not happen without considerable preparation and care, and we are extremely grateful.

We are also thankful to the staff here at Church House for the work they have put in, not only in circulating the information but then collecting and collating the data from all around the country. We owe them a debt of gratitude and appreciation for this piece of work, which they completed alongside all the other work they have to do to enable Synod to function well and efficiently. What is more, it followed quite quickly after another piece of Article 8 reference work.

Statistics and figures are always somewhat dangerous and open to various kinds of misinterpretation. I am sure members will know the definition: statistics is the science of producing unreliable facts from reliable figures. My selection of certain facts now could easily create a measure of spin in the telling of the story. I am keen to avoid that accusation.

It is important in this debate, as it was in writing the report, that we are honest in how we speak of the ways in which the dioceses have responded to the request to consider and vote on the motion ‘That this Synod approve the draft Act of Synod adopting the Anglican Communion Covenant’.

The clear outcome is that 18 dioceses voted in favour of the motion and 26 voted against. The draft Act of Synod was not approved by a majority of the dioceses, so it cannot be presented to General Synod for final approval.

Looking at the individual votes more closely it is clear that, while in some cases the majorities were substantial, in others, the voting in the House of Laity or the House of Clergy or both of the Houses was very close indeed. That margin is expressed most clearly in paragraph 10 of GS 1878, where we are told that if just 17 individuals in five particular dioceses had voted to support the Covenant rather than oppose it, a bare majority of dioceses would have approved the Covenant. By contrast, if a total of just ten individuals across five other dioceses had voted against instead of in favour, the majority of synods voting against would have been much greater: 31:13.

The diagrammatic summary in paragraph 11 makes it clear that the membership of the Church of England was pretty evenly divided in its views, with the percentage variation between support and opposition being extremely small. A majority of dioceses voted against, but a majority of the diocesan synod members who voted, voted in favour.

In the American presidential elections it is the majority in the electoral college that counts, not the popular vote. Even in our own parliamentary democracy one party

might gain a majority in the House of Commons while another gets the most votes overall and, usually, neither of them enjoys an actual majority of the popular vote. It is the outcome that counts. In this case the outcome is clear, but the underlying voting is not without significance.

It is important to note that nine dioceses that voted against the Act of Synod passed the same following motion affirming support for the Communion, claiming that a vote against the Covenant was not a vote against the Communion. Two other dioceses passed similar motions but with a variation in the wording. Three dioceses considered a following motion but did not pass it. The texts of those motions are found in Annex B of our report.

As I said in the Business Committee Report earlier, let me assure Synod that it is the intention of the Business Committee to allow considerable time in the not-too-distant future to take those following motions and to have a substantial debate on our relationships within the Communion. Our debate today is a much narrower one about the report on the Article 8 reference to the dioceses.

The deanery synods' statistics have not been included in the report, not because their opinion is unimportant or those debates at deanery level did not really matter but because there were so many variables in what was done and voted on that it would be very easy to paint a distorted picture from the raw data. Having said that, it was good that some deaneries had the opportunity to hear about and engage with the issues.

There is an important sensitivity to observe as we conduct this debate, as it will no doubt be reported to other parts of the Communion. We need to remember that it is not so much what we say here but what is heard elsewhere that is significant. There will be a fuller debate in due course but, meanwhile, the message that needs to be heard is that the Church of England, while it acknowledges the differences around the Communion, is still deeply committed to finding ways of maintaining and deepening relationships within the worldwide Anglican family. I say that with confidence, not least in the light of the Diocesan Synod Motions that have been passed.

I commend the report on the reference to the dioceses.

The Chairman: This matter is now open for debate.

Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Wakefield): The diocese of Wakefield values its links with the Anglican Communion. It has a long-standing link with Mara, Rorya and Tarime in Tanzania and more recent links with Faisalabad in Pakistan and Adelaide in Australia. Many people have made and learned much from exchange visits. Members might think, therefore, that the diocesan synod would have been happy to accept the Anglican Communion Covenant rather than being the first diocese to reject it.

I want to share with Synod members some of the arguments that I think led the diocesan synod to reject it. First, it had no problems with the first three sections of the Covenant – in fact, on the contrary – but section 4 was the issue. That provides for relational consequences if one member Church refuses to desist from an action that another member church finds controversial. As we are aware, the actions that some member Churches would find controversial are the ordination of partner gay bishops and priests, the ordination of women as bishops, and all those things that we have

discussed ourselves. As we looked around the room, we realized that in that very room there were people who sincerely held opposing views on this matter – and the same thing, of course, would apply to the chamber here.

Whichever way the Standing Committee of the Anglican Communion decided, they would be excluding part of the diocese of Wakefield, and part of the Church of England, if they excluded someone on that basis. These divisions do not neatly fall between national Churches and yet we all consider ourselves as sisters and brothers in one Church. To stop talking to people who disagree with you or to exclude them in some way seems to go against the nature of Anglicanism. We have heard about dancing together and about the indaba process, both of which seem much more appropriate.

It was put to us that it is one thing for people to decide they are out of communion with the Archbishop of Canterbury but quite another thing for him to decide that he is out of communion with them. It is always open to any Church to decide that they do not want to be part of the Communion. That would be regrettable, but it seems better than the Communion excluding a Church.

Anglicanism has always included a wide range of views, a situation that has caused unbearable tension at times, but these divisions are as much within national Churches as between them. It seems far better to be open and honest about our differences and to talk to one another about them than to suppress them while excluding another Church that may have a similar mix of views. It seems to me that it is when we are open and honest with one another that we are open to the work of the Holy Spirit.

Rev Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford): The Anglican Communion is a wonderful, global, Christian fellowship of Churches that are multicultural, multiracial and which embrace people both in richer and poorer economies. Most of its members are black, female, under 30 and live on two dollars a day or less. It is a huge privilege for members of this Church to belong to such a global community, an extraordinary global community, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

It has been my privilege to be a guest of Anglicans in India, South Africa, Pakistan, Nigeria in the last three months and it will be a my privilege to visit Uganda at the installation of their new Archbishop in a few weeks' time. There is a very special role still for the Church of England in the global Anglican Communion, and we should do everything we can to support it.

The Anglican Church began to experience problems of global governance as it expanded in various ways throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, often through the expansion of British influence throughout the globe and largely to do with matters arising from the abolition of the slave trade. How could national and independent Churches work together, though, without being a global universal Church?

The 1930 Lambeth Conference gave responsibility for deciding how churches might work together in harmony to the Primates of each province, not to a centralized body. Centralization, with the Instruments of Communion, only really began to take place in the 1970s and following. That process of centralization has now hit some very bumpy weather. There are no agreed fora for the Communion to move forward.

The question is are those in national Anglican Churches able to collaborate together in one global fellowship with an agreed process of global governance? What form should such governance take? The Covenant process adopted a fellowship model to address the governance issue and it has not been approved by the Church of England dioceses.

If there is no symmetry between national Church provinces and the global Communion, such that the global Communion cannot direct the provinces, the hard question to explore – but explore it we must – is whether there is an acceptable degree of symmetry that would give enough common ground for accountability.

It is the governance question that must now be addressed. We take courage from Our Lord's words, 'I will build my Church and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.' I hope we can take forward the growth and the development in our links with the Anglican Communion in the next months and years.

Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford): 'So be it', I believe, is a reasonable translation of the word 'Amen'. We have before us today a rather dry report on voting figures. So be it. It includes a few 'what ifs'. If someone in authority is using those to flag up, 'We're not done with this yet', I am not so sure but, if it is interesting enough, idle speculation, so be it.

We hear there is an indication of yet more delay for the following motions. We were asked once to wait for ACC. Now, there is a change of Archbishop. Then there will be the bedding-in period. With a little sigh, so be it.

When challenged by those people in the parishes and dioceses who are rightly given, through Article 8 process, the chance to express their views, when challenged by 'Why are you not listening to us?' – because a report of voting is not the same as listening – what they are asking for is 'Why aren't you listening to us, taking into account what we are saying and acting upon it?' I find it very difficult to respond.

Processes can be managed to muffle voices that have not only a right but a longing to be heard. If that is happening, I am not going to say, 'So be it', for I believe that people in England, in the Church of England, in many different places, are wanting to say a bold and enthusiastic and excited Yes to the Anglican Communion. That is what we are waiting for, an opportunity to hear that, and to be able to say – what are those words at the end of the parable? – 'Here are my two denarii. Take care, and if you want more I will provide it.'

Ironically, we have heard in the report on ACC that there is now an increasing recognition of two ways – two ways of authority, two ways of meeting the legislation: management and committees – and there is the authority of action, of the Anglican Alliance, of continuing indaba. These are the threads that make the bonds that hold us together, which we willingly want to adopt.

It has always been that which the following motions have wanted to affirm loudly and willingly. Let us finish off this process, take notice of this report. So be it. However, that is not the end. The people of the Church of England want publicly, loudly and

willingly to say that the Anglican Communion belongs together and we want to say at the end of that, 'Hallelujah, Amen'.

Miss Joy Gilliver (Chichester): When we discussed the Anglican Communion Covenant my sense was that it went to the very heart of the nature of the Church. If Jesus lies at the heart of the Church, then the Church must be able to embody that communion of love, relationship and unity that is of the essence of the Trinity. For me, that means that bonds of communion are not optional; they have to be part of our internal DNA. A mere federation of independent Churches simply will not do.

When I read the Covenant document, as the Bishop of Sodor and Man and the Archbishop of York referred to in the report, I do not see the language that speaks of centralization, division or exclusion. What I see is the language of invitation: invitation to dialogue, invitation to consider the impact of certain actions. We have: 'in communion with autonomy and accountability'; acting with 'diligence, care and caution' where an action may threaten the Communion's unity of mission; having in mind that the 'bonds of affection and the love of Christ compel us always to uphold the highest degree of communion possible'.

We have the language of 'mediated conversations', of 'agreed parameters and a willingness to see such process through'. Even when an action is eventually declared to be 'incompatible with the Covenant', the Standing Committee makes recommendations about the relational consequences and each Church or each Instrument decides whether or not to accept such a recommendation. Furthermore, the Covenant is not written in stone because it says that: 'Any covenanting Church or Instrument of Communion may submit a proposal to amend.'

It seems to me that, in the Church of England taking a decision to say No, we have effectively put ourselves outside the capacity to influence the Covenant's development and it would be better if we were on the inside.

It is staggering to look at how different the votes were in the dioceses compared with our own voting here. When we voted here, only 57 people voted against, there were 20 abstentions and 39 out of 39 bishops voted for. I cannot help wondering what happened then when this went out to the dioceses. It is almost as though they were considering a different document – although, of course, that was not the case. The Archbishop said here, I believe, that the Covenant allows for mature adult ways of addressing conflict. The alternative is not no division, but potentially fractious and chaotic division. That can only be a poor witness to the unity for which Christ prayed.

I wonder what message we give to the wider Church when the Church of England, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury, the common link in the bonds of communion, is the head, cannot itself agree to the Covenant. I wonder what we are going to do about it.

I am delighted that the following motions will be discussed in detail, but I hope that that does not become an alternative to serious engagement with the Covenant itself. I would hope that the new Archbishop of Canterbury will want to ensure that we address the matter urgently.

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): Appendix A to the Report by the Business Committee on the Reference to the Dioceses, GS 1878, pages 5 to 7, contains my recorded opinion as the diocesan bishop of York. This was given to the diocesan synod after it had voted overwhelmingly to approve the draft Act of Synod adopting the Anglican Communion Covenant. I simply draw it to the attention of members, and I will not repeat what I said then.

I still believe the Covenant offered the Communion a better way, so I hope that we will be able to take note of this report by the Business Committee. What can I do in these few minutes? Let me approach the same subject by offering a reflection.

In 1949, the year of my birth, Michael Ramsey wrote a superb book called *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, a gospel that both transcends the world and speaks to the immediate here and now. He updated it in 1967, when he was then Archbishop of Canterbury.

This book enriches the whole understanding of the whole gospel, not as a panacea of progress or as an otherworldly solution unrelated to history but as a gospel of transfiguration. Such a gospel both transcends the world and speaks to the immediate here and now. The word ‘glory’ might perhaps inspire, call us back to ourselves, to our ‘bonds of affection’ in the Anglican Communion. It is about glory. As Archbishop Ramsey shows, the single word ‘glory’ gathered together all that Israel had learned of God’s oneness and his nearness, his activity in the created world and his transcendent sovereignty. In the epistles we find the same word taken up to express the state of the risen Christ, both as the Lord to whom worship is due and as the Lord who comes to be in His Church.

Between these two uses of the same word lies the enigmatic story of the transfiguration. Archbishop Ramsey’s study shows this as a disclosure, before the passion, of the glory that was in store for Christ and the disciples. The whole meaning of ‘glory’ is that brought in to fill out the significance of the transfiguration in the gospel story. The transfiguration explains the transformed glory of the New Testament epistles.

‘The word expresses in a remarkable way the unity of the doctrine of creation, the incarnation, the cross, the Spirit, the Church and the world-to-come.’ (p.5)

‘Glory is a word and a theme closely linked with the ecumenical quest of Christian unity. The word recurs in our Lord’s prayer for unity in chapter 17 of St John’s Gospel, where the unity of the disciples is inseparable from the glory which Christ gives to them.’ (p.7)

As members of the Anglican Communion, our unity as disciples of Jesus Christ is inseparable from the glory which Christ gives to us. In a real sense disunity is a disfiguring of the glory which Christ has given us. The desire for an Anglican Covenant can only bear fruit if we take seriously the givenness of the glory and unity that Christ gives to us. It is this glory and unity that we are called to live in, and we pass on to the world God’s goodness or his glory. The Covenant was supposed to help us as a Communion to see ourselves, to whom Christ has given his glory and his unity. Consequently, our holy conversation in the Church of England, within the

Communion, is based for us on that trust deed of the Church of England in the Preface to the Declaration of Assent. We all in the Anglican Communion are in need of each other. May Christ's glory and unity, which he has given to us, lead us graciously to embrace one another in a covenant of mutual dependence.

Our Lord says, 'Father, the glory that you give me I have given to them so that they may be one as we are one. I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may know that you have sent me and have loved me as I have loved you.' The Covenant was supposed to be helping us to come to terms that we have already been given Christ's glory and we have already been given his unity, and it is that we want to show to the world.

I hope we will take note of this report and maybe some day return to the Covenant.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I remember discovering with astonishment and some dismay, after the Covenant had been so overwhelmingly supported in this Synod, that it was beginning to be voted down by some dioceses. It was at that point that I set up the 'Yes to the Covenant' website with my friend Revd David Harris, who is Canadian by origin and who cared very deeply about this from that point of view.

I suppose my greatest regret in this whole matter is that I did not do something sooner, that I did not create that campaign sooner in the process. I do not know whether it would have made any difference, but I do know that there was a great deal of ignorance around.

When I went to my deanery synod it was clear that most people there did not even know what the Anglican Covenant was. Somebody came up to me in the tea break and said, 'So what's this all about then? Is it something to do with women bishops?' I would like to think the people in our diocesan synods were better informed, but I think it is the case that this came at a time when people were preoccupied with other matters, particularly the women bishops debate in diocesan synods, which had been voted on soon beforehand, and there just was not a lot of awareness around this.

I am not going to argue with the outcome of the process – there is no point in being a bad loser – but looking at the figures and looking at the process it seems as though it almost went down by accident in the dioceses. I am sure that many of those who voted and who felt strongly against it would not say so, but it did seem quite arbitrary. Nevertheless, the process was followed.

I do feel that many of those who put forward following motions saying, 'We don't want the Covenant but we do love the Anglican Communion', were living in cloud cuckoo land. The Anglican Covenant, as it came before us, is the process of much heart-searching. The Covenant Design Group was the outcome of a long process of compromise and discussion to try to thrash out something that would start to bring us together. To think that one can just say, 'Oh, we'll just affirm that we love the Anglican Communion really, even though we vote down the Covenant', I think is regrettable.

I can only hope that we will find a way of working together. I look forward to the debates that are to come on our relationship with the Anglican Communion, and I

hope that we can find a positive way of moving forward, but I do think we have made the wrong decision on this.

Revd Canon Maggie McLean (Wakefield): First, I want to disagree with Prudence Dailey. I think we had quite an informed debate at our diocesan synod, and I am sad that other places do not seem to have the same kind of level of input or debate.

For us in Wakefield – and I will not repeat what my colleague said in her contribution – the main thing to come out of our diocesan synod and the conversations that were around at that time was the need to move beyond the intended benefits of the Covenant and to consider the longer impact and the unintended consequences of, particularly, section 4.

It was felt that, however nicely phrased the Covenant is presented, it does create a new disciplinary body for Anglicanism. It will have the powers to exclude provinces from representation at international meetings. It will have the power to create a first and second division of Anglicanism. The presence of this new central power will affect the decision-making processes of all the provinces by introducing a new consideration that has not previously existed; that is, whether the decision agreed locally will lead to potential exclusion internationally.

Isolated and compelling cases do not make for good general rules. Anglican bishops in the House of Lords oppose the Assisted Dying Bill not because there are not certain situations where such a law might be humane but because of its unintended consequences, the way in which it would change the fabric and relationships of society. It is our thought that the Anglican Covenant will do the same for the Churches of the Anglican Communion. It will stifle change in the name of unity and formalize division in the Communion for decades to come.

I urge the members of this Synod to vote in favour of noting the report, in order to affirm the outcome of the diocesan voting.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): I would like to make three brief points about this. First of all, I suspect that some of the dioceses did not register entirely in their discussions which provinces in the Communion had thus far adopted the Communion and why. I am struck by the fact that among those who adopted it most readily were some of the smaller provinces of the Communion, for whom the international bonds and links matter enormously, not just, as has been said, as a matter of warm fellow feeling but as a matter of having some sense that other larger and distant bodies do recognise a degree of responsibility with and to them. I think we ought at least to ponder in this Synod on the experience of those smaller provinces as we reflect on the whole experience of the Covenant vote.

We certainly do not want to re-open the whole question at this juncture but to identify what the unfinished business is. Part of the unfinished business is whether there is any role for an agreed process of conflict resolution within the Communion. I think that is still on the table. I think it still needs to be addressed. I do think, if it is not to be section 4 of the Covenant, it is incumbent on us to do a little bit of work on what it might be. I hope that Synod in its further consideration of this will be looking at that question.

It is not a matter of setting up a curia or a central magisterium or whatever. It is a matter of finding vehicles that we can trust to do some of that conflict resolution, some of that working out of where the boundaries of our shared identity are, and, quite simply, what the results are, not in punitive terms but in terms of conflicts that we cannot resolve in the way we would like to.

The third point, and the second area of unfinished business, is, if not the Covenant, what exactly is it that as Anglican communities across the world we promise to one another? Covenants are about promise. I, like other supporters of the Covenant, believe that this was a way of promising a certain level of serious attention to our Anglican colleagues across the world. Granted that the Covenant in the form we discussed it did not win the trust of the majority of the Church of England dioceses, but the question remains. What do we promise to one another as Anglicans? What degree of attention and what degree of willingness to step back and listen – once again, across the globe – are we promising to one another?

I think we have the potential for a very rich discussion here. In the light of the ACC meeting, it is quite clear that the Covenant is being received across the Communion in different ways, at a different pace, at a different rate. There is plenty of scope for further discussion, but I would like to suggest that for the Church of England those two questions remain very firmly on the table. What kind of conflict resolution do we think is realistic? What is it that we promise to one another as part of the fellowship of Anglicans globally? Answering those questions is not an academic issue for some of the most vulnerable parts of our Anglican family.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells): I have a few reflections. First of all, I think that we all suffered last year from a clash of two Article 8 businesses and the energy levels within the dioceses were very much lower in pursuit of the Covenant than they were in terms of women bishops.

I dispute the idea of cloud cuckoo land put forward by Prudence Dailey. Being one of those whom she must pigeonhole as being in cloud cuckoo land, I do not think that we are in cloud cuckoo land if we object to something that we think is designed inappropriately. I think that maybe the Anglican Communion was in cloud cuckoo land in thinking that this particular design would work.

I was very moved by the Bishop of Peterborough's suggestion earlier that we ought to look at first principles before we do some things. It struck me that when you design something, you need to have an idea of the outcome. Quite a lot of architects use a principle called urban architecture, where they build the buildings first and wait until they have seen who walks from one building to another before they put in the pathways. It might be that model that we need to look at.

Most people, I suspect, would have been able to be comfortable with clauses 1 to 3. There is an unbalanced nature to it by the introduction of clause 4 in the way it is versed. If this is to come back, I would suggest that we might consider looking at clauses 1 to 3, seeing how we do live up to that Covenant that we think we might have with each other, before we start talking about relational consequences.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I was very glad that the dioceses had the opportunity to debate the Covenant. In my diocese in Southwark the debate included a ringing endorsement of our international links. We have very close links with the Church in Zimbabwe, which is, of course, one of the poorest and most marginal provinces in the Communion. We had a positive and thoughtful and well-informed debate about the Anglican Covenant and the Communion, which ended in a decision not to approve it.

I am a little concerned about the Business Committee report. On some level it might be taken to imply that the Covenant was not rejected, it was just a result of procedure. But we followed the procedure that we had been given, and that procedure resulted in a clear decision against adopting the Covenant. An American President is the American President, however close the popular vote.

Second, I have read somewhere that the decision was the result of a highly organised and well-funded No campaign. That was not in fact the case. It was a few of us with emails and we were working in response to two things: first, a perception that the resources that were made available to discuss the Covenant by the ACO did not give much space to those who were opposed, and, second, the strangely incremental and curiously pressurized way in which the Covenant wording found its way through Synod over a number of years.

What happened in the dioceses, as is shown by the following motions, was a ringing endorsement of our relations with the Anglican Communion. Those are not at risk. I am surprised that there seems to be some feeling that, as we did not pass the Covenant, those relationships are at risk. They are clearly strong. We have just heard how strong they are in the reports of the ACC. I look forward to them developing.

There was also a real concern that the Covenant would reduce the Church of England's ability to engage with the people of England, and that is why the dioceses chose not to support it. I look forward to strengthening friendships and I also look forward to a creative and constructive discussion of the following motions.

Mr John Ward (London): If we were to change the way in which we were a Church and covenant with joy, we might have hoped for a large majority. Whichever way one looks at the figures, the dioceses did not say that.

In response to Prudence Dailey and, if I may, the Archbishop, I am afraid I do not have any easy solutions or answers for how to create a safe space for dialogue but here are some personal reflections.

Since joining General Synod I have learned that you cannot entice people into conversation even if there is a curia legal structure in place, like standing orders or ecclesiastical law. Creating a safe space for me is not about formal process and procedures on a grand scale.

Since joining General Synod I have been trying to make friends with the people with whom I disagree, but I know that I have not had enough discussions with those people about the tricky issues of the day. Sometimes I have avoided them – if I am honest,

the people and the issues – because I just have not had the energy. Does anyone feel the same?

Sometimes we have avoided them – that is the tricky issues – because we are not convinced that tackling them head on will help. Sometimes the discussions have been woefully short because of the pressures of Synod, or just life.

I have been trying quite recently to encourage one conservative Evangelical into discussion by email – so far, without success (but come on, Chris, you know you really want to). I feel that another person never lets me get a word in edgeways, but I am sure that masses of people feel the same thing about me.

Perhaps all I have learned is that we are no more and no less than sinners standing together at the foot of the cross hoping for His resurrection. It feels to me very inadequate, small scale and very one-to-one. It does not feel much like a real Church, but I am trying to keep the door open and I know that some others are trying to do the same. Is that indaba? Perhaps that is all we can do as a Communion, as we try and walk together without fear.

In that context, I was looking last night at the Anglican Mainstream website and read something there with which I wholeheartedly agree. I was quite surprised. It is the need for people to reject labels. Absolutely! Labels are for jam jars and not people. People are messy, unreconstructed, confused and struggling, and looking for God. What a surprise that we are able to agree!

Then I googled this. I would thoroughly recommend this website to members: 'Label Jars, Not People'. On that it says, 'The idea started with a late-night conversation. Two kids, nothing better to do with their summer night than spend it on Facebook talking about high school and life. Then the question arose....wouldn't you like to know how people truly see you? It's something that's always on the back of your mind, so we set out to see if our friends and classmates would be brave enough to share those thoughts.'

It is visually as well as intellectually stimulating. The friends thought 'doormat'; the person thought 'generous'. The friends thought 'chilled'; the person thought 'used'. The friends thought 'shy', the person thought 'afraid to be judged'. Lastly, the person thought – although it is a baby, so I expect someone put the notice on them – 'innocent' and the friends thought 'bound to grown up some day'.

I hope that I am doing some growing up in General Synod and I hope that I continue to do so in God's name with all those with whom I disagree.

Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester): My congregation has many members who come originally from other provinces in the Anglican Communion. The truth is that the backbone of many other parishes in the city of Manchester and other English cities is drawn from other provinces. The Anglican Communion is not just over there; it is over here and it is a significant part of the Church of England.

In today's global village, the rest of the world is just a tweet away. We simply cannot afford a 'little England' mentality, isolated from the rest of the world. We need a

sense of international accountability and coherence, so I regret the failure of the Covenant to be approved by the majority of diocesan synods. This could effectively mean that the mother Church of the Communion has killed off the Covenant, though it would be interesting if most of the rest of the Communion adopt it, leaving us looking in from the outside.

This is surely unfinished business, which the House of Bishops and the new Archbishop of Canterbury will need to address urgently. We need a sense of international accountability. The Church of England and the Anglican Communion profess to be part of the one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Catholic belief is that the Church is essentially international, as is the gospel we proclaim. It simply will not do for every province to do what is right in its own eyes.

In Catholic understanding, the discernment of Christian truth is a corporate matter for the whole Church across the world. As St Vincent of Lérins put it, the Catholic faith is what has always been believed everywhere, by all. St Vincent saw that Christian doctrine would grow and develop, but he also saw the need to assess development as to whether it was a right development or not. Crucially, he saw that Catholic international discernment and consent was an essential ingredient of such assessment.

St Vincent's teaching here was itself a development of the Lord's promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Church, to guide her into all truth. The Spirit was not promised to individual disciples or nations but to all the disciples together, to the whole Church. To refuse to be accountable to one another internationally is to impair seriously our ability to discern the truth. That is an extraordinary position for a Church to put itself into.

While we all accept the canon of Scripture, there is much debate about the correct interpretation of Scripture on a variety of subjects. Again, the promise of the Holy Spirit to guide us applies. The promise is to the whole Church. Again, we need international accountability to be able to discern the correct interpretation of Scripture.

For these reasons, I urge the House of Bishops and the new Archbishop of Canterbury to consider as a matter of urgency how we may become mutually accountable at an international level within the Anglican Communion.

Dr Angus Goudie (Durham): I was interested in a comment a few minutes ago, I think from Joy Gilliver, that it seemed as if the diocese was discussing a different document from the one that had been debated here and supported much more strongly. I feel that might almost be the truth. The last section in it certainly does not spell many things out. Perhaps there ought to have been a code of practice to go with it.

We debated it in Durham, along with the women bishops debate. We had a full day with many stirring speeches on both topics. There was a feeling amongst some of those against it that it did not have sufficient teeth and would not be able to take action. Others felt that it was too weak, that there were things that the Church ought to be able to say. The majority, I believe, did not vote on it as something that would be an excluding, punitive section 4. I think there was a sense that the final section in

there was something much more open than that and that any punitive aspect, if there at all, was several stages down the line. Teeth can be used to chew something over and frame our words, not only to digest and destroy the inherent nature of the other.

The main argument in favour was that the context of section 4 was the affirmation of so much that we share and which was there in sections 1 to 3. These were things that we could all say a hearty 'Hallelujah' to and 'Amen'. The outcome at the end of the debate was nearly 2:1 among the clergy and nearly 3:1 among the laity. There is a sense that we really felt that dialogue was the first stage, and that exclusion was more hinted at and read into it by others.

While I accept that many do not yet see the Covenant as a safe place for that sort of dialogue, I still believe that we should be seeking to make it one. I read about an example recently of a safe relationship, and it seemed to be what happened in the diocese of Liverpool, with the link there between themselves and two provinces, one in North America and one in Nigeria. They discussed things on which they had very different approaches, to do with sexuality.

We hear in other areas how the indaba process of listening has worked out really well and people have been able to communicate with each other. Can we send out a message from our debate today and from the following-on debates that our aspiration should be to work this out and to produce a safe process, even if at the moment we are outside the covenanting provinces?

I would hope that the Church of England might be able to give a robust external critique of the Covenant as it develops, along with others who feel that now they could not support it.

Mr Jack Shelley (Exeter): I voted that it should go to the dioceses because I felt it was of great importance that we knew what their feelings were. But at the diocese I spoke against it and I voted against it because I felt that clause 4 had only one outcome, which is schism, separation. I think there needs to be something else.

Earlier on we heard people talking about having a theology of living together in diversity. I greatly believe we should be promising to look after one another, to listen to one another, to be aware of the consequences in other provinces of actions we take in our province, particularly in the vulnerable provinces. If we do feel that our evolving theology means that we need to take a form of action which will wound people and provinces in other parts of the world, I do not think we should only have one solution to that wounding, that the wounding should lead to separation and schism.

I believe that we need to learn how to live together even while we wound each other, as we implement our diverse and sometimes incompatible theologies, and I would be grateful if in the summer we could have some sort of guidance about the theology of living together even while we wound one another.

The Chairman: I call upon the Archdeacon of Dorking to respond to the debate.

The Archdeacon of Dorking, in reply: I think our debate reveals that we have been through a somewhat difficult experience as a General Synod and as a Church of England, and not least a difficult experience for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

I think our debate also reveals a very positive and welcome support for and warmth towards Anglican friends all around the globe, and not just to those in the Anglican family but to all other international links with which we share resources, bonds of affection and all the rest of it. That has been strongly affirmed here this afternoon, and that is good.

The reference to the dioceses and our speeches here this evening expose that it is possible to read one document and come to very different conclusions, some seeing suspicion and concern in it, others finding the opposite: welcome and approval.

I sense that our debate has raised a number of important and big questions. Questions of governance: how do we hold together as a fellowship? What is the need for accountability to one another across the globe as an Anglican family? Questions about diversity of the Anglican Communion: how different can we be? Does there have to be a section 4? If there does, how strong do the teeth need to be?

It is not just across the Anglican Communion that that is relevant. It is also, as has been made clear in one of the speeches, in our own dioceses, and here at General Synod there is great diversity of view and opinion.

The question of urgency in all of this has been raised. How long can it be waited for until there is a clear statement by the Church of England, supportive and affirmative of the Anglican Communion? Do we need to wait until those following motions hit the agenda? Yes, the answer to that is we do, but there is a real sense in which it will come.

There is a question of understanding of the process we have been through. Were people mostly unaware and uninformed, which led to the huge dissonance between the vote here at Synod and the response from the dioceses? What can we do that will inform those from whom we seek a view?

Then there is the question that has been raised by several people of what is next. What else is there? If this will not do it, what else will do it? How are we going to find a way of providing a means of dealing with conflict resolution within the Anglican Communion? Then there is the question of the promise that we have made to others in the Anglican family and, not least, the smaller provinces who value that sense of belonging to something much bigger.

There have been questions about our process. Was the Covenant reference defeated because there was too much asked of our diocesan synods all at one go? Was it overload locally? Are we doing it the right way? Ought we to be looking more to one-to-one engagement rather than some big, overarching Covenant?

A whole host of questions raised here this afternoon reveal that there is a lot of ongoing work needed, which is important in the building of relationships and trying to finish the business that we have started, so that we can find our way, whether we are

in or out of cloud cuckoo land, and find a way to be a Church family which reflects the glory of Christ. If we are able to do that, I trust all the people of God will be able to say ‘Amen. So be it.’

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Michael Perham)* took the Chair at 4.50 p.m.

Questions

Questions asked in accordance with Standing Orders 105–109 were answered as follows, those for written answer being marked with an asterisk.

Church Commissioners

1. *Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: Have the Church Commissioners yet considered, should the draft Bishops and Priests (Ordination and Consecration of Women) Measure become law, whether to fund the legal expenses of a female bishop should a PCC seek redress through judicial review for action contrary to the proposed code of practice and whether, were funding to be provided, it would be subject to any financial limit?

The First Church Estates Commissioner (Mr Andreas Whittam Smith, ex officio): The Commissioners have given no specific consideration to this. We would treat any requests for help with bishops’ legal costs arising from disputes linked to this legislation in the same way as we treat requests in relation to any other litigation involving bishops.

Our powers are discretionary, we treat each request on its merits and we take account of bishops’ own conduct, including whether they have acted in accordance with legal advice.

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): Given, as now proposed, not only that the doctrine of the Church of England will be changed but that the judicial review following a breach of the proposed code of practice will be the only course of action open to a PCC seeking redress, short of leaving the Church of England, will any provision be made (1) to fund the legal expenses of the PCC or (2) to enable the congregation to leave the Church of England with sufficient access to parish and benefice property to continue its life and mission?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: I am afraid that our powers are circumscribed by the Acts under which we were founded. We have discretion to pay the legal costs of bishops, but only bishops, and I do not think we would have the power to go further than that.

2. *Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester)* asked the Church Commissioners: What costs have been incurred by the Church Commissioners in the use of the Lambeth Palace website to run the ‘Enough Waiting’ campaign in support of the draft legislation on women bishops?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: The Church Commissioners provide an annual sum of money to cover the cost of staffing and support services at Lambeth Palace. The job of the Lambeth team is to support the Archbishop across the full range of his ministry, including with any campaigns he chooses to launch as part of his ministry. The Commissioners were asked for no additional funding in relation to this campaign.

3. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: Has more up-to-date guidance on the implementation of the Repair of Benefice Buildings Measure 1972 been issued since the notes issued by the Commissioners in January 1972, which state that ‘occupants should carry out by their own initiative and at their own expense such minor tenants’ duties as re-washing of taps, replacement of blown fuses, repair of the odd broken window and so on’, and does such guidance give any indication as to the maximum cost expected to be borne in connection with such ‘minor tenants’ duties’ in any one year?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: The current guidance is in the Code of Practice to the Measure, which was last updated in 2012.

The Measure requires the occupant to use the parsonage ‘in a tenant-like manner’ and the Code states that ‘it is reasonable to expect that incumbents will arrange minor works of maintenance on their own initiative’ and that clergy are not expected or advised to undertake ‘more onerous maintenance items’ themselves.

There is no reference to the maximum cost expected to be borne in connection with minor tenants’ duties in any one year.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): On what date in 2012 was this new updated Code of Practice issued, and how was the information contained in it disseminated to diocesan parsonage boards and indeed to clergy occupying parsonages?

The First Church Estates Commissioner: I am afraid I cannot tell you how it was publicized and on what basis it was updated. I am answering for the Third Commissioner, of whom we do not have one at the moment.

Archbishops’ Council

4. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: Can an assessment be made of the savings that would be generated if all clergy (including bishops) received a stipend, and all employees of the National Church Institutions and the dioceses received a salary, of an amount equal to the national minimum stipend?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops’ Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: The information for making such a complex calculation is not readily available and in any event would not involve comparing like with like because clergy generally receive housing and expenses whereas staff receive salaries. In assessing any financial savings or indeed additional costs, because there would be additional costs, it would also be necessary to take into account the loss to the Church if it were

no longer able to employ professionally qualified staff such as lawyers, accountants and property specialists at a level that took at least some account of the wider market.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): I thank Mr Britton for his answer. I have two very short questions. First –

The Chairman: You are allowed only one, so you must ask it in a form that comes out as one question.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): For me professional people obviously are both clergy and laity working in the diocese in full-time ministry, and I would have thought that professional people would –

The Chairman: This is a speech, not a question. Let us have the question.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): If I gave you a figure that included a stipend level and the cost of housing and expenses as a kind of medium for the nation, could you tell me by how much extra those members of staff serving for the glory of God are being paid compared with parish ministry and the cost of clergy in dioceses?

Mr Andrew Britton: As I said, it would remain a complex calculation, because the cost of housing varies enormously from one part of the country to another. I come from the south east and clergy, because they have housing provided, actually enjoy a higher standard of living than some other professional people, so I do not think the question can be readily answered on the basis of any average for the country as a whole.

5. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: With the Government proposing a change to Gift Aid from 2013, allowing up to £5,000 of giving on the plate to count for Gift Aid (a reclaim of up to £1,250), how much will the Church of England and our parishes benefit from this if every parish takes it up?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: We estimate that the Small Donations Gift Aid Scheme will enable parishes to benefit by around £15 million each year. Guidance on the scheme will be shared with dioceses and parishes in early 2013 when the Bill has received Royal Assent and HRMC have published their operating guidance.

6. *Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the statement in the report of the Archbishops' Council as Central Stipends Authority in November 2011 that 'effectively the gain in the value of stipends when dioceses achieved *Generosity and Sacrifice* Aspiration 2 in 2006 had all been lost' and that 'The CSA will engage with dioceses and the Church Commissioners as to how to address the ground that has been lost' (GS Misc 1006 page 1), what progress is being made towards addressing the lost ground?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: The Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee considers matters relating to stipends before they go to the Council for final decision. Whenever

the RACSC considers the level of stipends it includes in its discussion consideration of the adequacy of stipends and its impact on the general level of clergy morale. However, it also has to take into account the question of affordability and this has been influenced by the difficult economic situation and pressure on the general level of earnings. In some dioceses there is real concern about whether parishes will be able to meet the requested parish share contributions in the current economic situation. Accordingly, RACSC tries to recommend stipend levels which are both fair to clergy and affordable by parishioners.

The RACSC hopes to recommend levels that address recouping the lost ground when better economic times come.

Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford): When and how does the Council plan to do what it said it would do in GS Misc 1006, namely to engage with dioceses and the Church Commissioners as to how, not whether, to address the ground that has been lost in the value of stipends?

Mr Andrew Britton: The main way in which negotiations take place and we obtain information from the dioceses is through the IDFF, and we keep well abreast of the way in which dioceses think about stipend levels. It is not decided unilaterally by the Archbishops' Council on the advice of the RACSC. It is very much the result of a process of consultation. With regard to when we will be able to move towards fulfilling the objective of returning stipends to the level at which they were some years ago, I have to stand by what I said; it will be when better economic times come, and if you ask me when that will be I shall have to say that I do not know.

Mr Chris Pye (Liverpool): Since 2006 many lay pensioners and workers in commerce and industry have had no pay rises or rises in income, other than very small statutory ones. In how many years have the clergy had no increase in stipend since 2006?

Mr Andrew Britton: I know that in some dioceses clergy have had no increase of stipend, but it has never been true of the country as a whole.

7. *Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the statement in the report of the Archbishops' Council as Central Stipends Authority in November 2011 that 'effectively the gain in the value of stipends when dioceses achieved *Generosity and Sacrifice* Aspiration 2 in 2006 had all been lost' and the increasing insistence of the Church that clergy are responsible for providing their own housing in retirement, has the Council consulted the Pensions Board about:

- (a) ensuring that stipend levels become adequate to allow for saving towards retirement, particularly for those without other means, inheritance or savings from previous careers; and
- (b) helping clergy to get into the housing market earlier during their ministry, and to making progress towards the other recommendations of GS Misc 1010?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: The Council decides the framework for stipends and pension policy on the recommendation of its Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee. For

matters relating to pensions policy, this is after consultation with the Pensions Board and other responsible bodies including dioceses.

Part (a) has been addressed in my answer to Question 6. The main focus of such consultation will be with those responsible for funding stipends.

Turning to part (b), RACSC and the Council will give further consideration to taking forward the issues raised in GS Misc 1010 in due course.

Revd Paul Ayers (Bradford): Since GS Misc 1010 recognises that the issue of retirement housing causes the greatest anxiety, especially for clergy who have not inherited property or gained access to the property ladder through resources from within the family, what degree of priority is being given to this issue, and in determining the adequacy of stipends how does the Council take into account the increasing insistence on the need to save and invest in property with a view to retirement?

Mr Andrew Britton: Work is in hand, reporting to RACSC on issues of housing provision, and we know that many dioceses have already implemented flexible housing solutions, for example by using houses as strategic property for curates or pioneers. RACSC has now provided advice on various housing matters in regard to taxation and benefits in kind. I hope that provides a partial answer to how RACSC is responding to the concerns set out in GS Misc 1010. More generally, I have to recognise that where those solutions result in considerable expenditure from dioceses it is very difficult to press forward with them at a time when many dioceses have financial difficulties to confront.

8. *Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Have any of the staff for whom the Archbishops' Council is the managing employer been involved in running the 'Enough Waiting' campaign in support of the draft legislation on women in the episcopate?

Mr Andrew Britton (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: This was the Archbishop of Canterbury's initiative, run from Lambeth by the Archbishop's press and media staff. Some technical support was provided from Church House as part of the normal co-operation arrangements between Lambeth and the Communications Office.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I hope that answer means that I can ask my question of the Archbishops' Council rather than more personally to the Archbishop. In view of the potential No voters in tomorrow's debate, which the 'Enough Waiting' campaign is aimed towards, a potential No vote would be a vote out of conviction or conscience. Is the Council aware of how disrespectful was the suggestion that No voters should consider abstaining to allow the majority will to go through?

Mr Andrew Britton: The Question related to staff for whom the Archbishops' Council is the managing employer. The managing employer for the staff of Church House, Lambeth and elsewhere is run by the Joint Employment and Common Services Board, which I chair. It therefore seemed right to answer the Question in terms of the staff

involved. It is true that the members of staff who work for the Archbishops are employed on common terms with those who work for the Archbishops' Council, but the Archbishops' Council itself is not in any sense a managing employer for them. I hope that answers the supplementary question.

9. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Having regard to (i) the objectives of the Weddings Project and (ii) the recent repeal of the statutory requirement that marriages must take place between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., has consideration been given, or if not will it now be given, to bringing forward a draft Amending Canon to remove or relax that requirement in respect of marriages conducted according to the rites of the Church of England?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: The canonical requirement was considered most recently by the Marriage Law Working Group, which decided in 2006 not to recommend any change on the ground that the requirement did not give rise to major problems in practice. In 2007 the Revision Committee for the draft Church of England Marriage Measure also rejected a proposal to change the position. Nothing that has subsequently emerged from the Weddings Project has suggested that the current restriction, which takes account of the public nature of marriage and the interests of clergy and lay participants, is unreasonable. Given that an Amending Canon would be needed to alter the current requirement, the Council would therefore need to be persuaded that the cost of the legislation was worth the gain.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Will Mr Fletcher agree that a key objective of the Weddings Project is to encourage those who would otherwise settle for secular weddings in secular venues instead to marry in church, and that the recent removal of the time restriction for secular venues is a new development that once again threatens to make church a less attractive option for those who, for whatever reason, might wish to have an evening wedding?

Mr Philip Fletcher: The Synod and the Church of England at large are not bound to follow the lead of the Government or indeed of Parliament at a particular moment, but it is fair to ask whether we should be thinking about the current restriction to hold weddings between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. However, the Weddings Project really did not come up with a good reason for altering that frame, and there are arguments in its favour: it is daytime, the time of the clergy has to be considered, and if the issue were raised again many other things would need to be looked at before it was concluded that this was the right thing to do. It has been looked at fairly recently and no proposal has yet been made to alter those hours in terms of the Canons.

Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester): Could consideration be given to this matter in the light of the fact that for example recently in Manchester the diocesan registrar issued advice to all clergy that proceedings would be taken against them under the Clergy Discipline Measure if they conducted weddings outside the canonical hours, and there seems to be a rather strange disparity between canonical and statutory requirements?

Mr Philip Fletcher: The Canons amount to a statutory requirement, and except where a special licence permits otherwise 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. is the rule. If members feel that a change should be made, they are well aware of the processes to set that in train.

The Chairman: I remind members that when asking supplementary questions they should not ask simply about matters of opinion. Secondly, even if members have been called by name, they should give their names and dioceses before asking supplementary questions.

10. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In view of the proven link between Christian community action and church growth and its clear witness to the unconditional love of God in action, particularly for those who have little or no other contact with the Christian faith, will the Archbishops' Council raise the profile of our substantial contribution to community service within any promotional and public relations activity planned over the next year, making reference where possible to the Church of England's website www.churchofengland.org/how2help?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: The pursuit of the common good is, of course, one of our three major goals for the present quinquennium and is being pursued on many fronts, as members will see in successive annual reports of the Archbishops' Council. The extent of our parishes' involvement in local community service and their impact on well being and church growth is quite literally incalculable, and the 'how2help' website, set up by Mission and Public Affairs and the Church Urban Fund, is an important resource for putting local churches in touch with expertise and imagination around the country and helping to build confidence for local initiatives. I am very happy to commend the site now, and we shall go on doing so whenever we can. We are very grateful to the benefactors who made this work possible.

11. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Bearing in mind that the *Turning up the Volume* task group on ethnic diversity in senior appointments has now started its work, what progress has the Archbishops' Council made with the request in the Synod's resolution of July 2011 that, in order to provide a baseline against which to measure the progress to be reported in 2014, the Archbishops' Council collects and publishes for each diocese the current number of black, Asian and other minority ethnic (i) clergy and (ii) laity in specified significant roles, including suffragan bishops, deans, archdeacons, residentiary canons, directors of ordinands, examining chaplains and bishops' advisers for selection conferences and other diocesan officers?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents: For the first time this year the Archbishops' Council has published a table showing stipendiary clergy by ethnicity and diocese. This table showed the percentage white, black, Asian and other minority ethnics, and the percentage data coverage. The Research and Statistics team of the Archbishops' Council is working with the *Turning up the Volume* task group to provide baseline data where possible by role, at least at national level, and will be seeking the group's support in making the data complete to give an accurate position from which to measure progress. Moving

forward, it is hoped that the new 'people and pay' human resources system will provide a means for ensuring complete data gathering.

Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss: What role do diocesan bishops play in ensuring that data on ethnicity in leadership roles are collected efficiently?

Mr Philip Fletcher: I am afraid I do not have the information to enable me to identify particular Diocesans and what they do. All I can note is that ethnicity data are held for 81 per cent of stipendiary clergy, but it varies across dioceses from 63 per cent to 94 per cent. Perhaps – and here I speculate – encouragement from the dioceses is an important part of ensuring that the data is made as complete as possible, and I would certainly encourage that.

12. *Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the CMEAC *Unfinished Business* report of July 2011 (GS 1844), can the Archbishops' Council give any information on the intentional steps being taken to increase the potentiality of black, Asian and minority ethnic clergy taking up senior leadership positions in our national, diocesan and local church structures?

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied on behalf of the Presidents: Dr Mallett is a member of the task group set up by the Archbishops following discussion in the House of Bishops, which I chaired, to take forward the recommendations of the report *Turning up the Volume*. Under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Rochester this group has held one meeting and has agreed that the first step is to look at establishing the baseline statistical position, and a request has been sent to dioceses. Other suggestions made in the original report, which the group will wish to review, include the importance of coaching and mentoring, effective monitoring and clarity of the appointments process and practice. The next meeting of the group will be in December and I understand that three meetings are in place for next year. We look forward to the suggestions that emerge from this.

Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): I asked the Question to ensure that a report on action in this area was brought to Synod. I would like to know whether there will be a process to provide regular reports to Synod of the progress of the *Turning up the Volume* task group and the other strategic working party on BME vocations that has been established by the Council to focus on the issue of increasing vocations from black, Asian and minority ethnic people and ensuring that there will be some progression through the structures of the Church of England for such people. Will there be some form of regular reporting?

The Bishop of Sheffield: I am unaware whether that process has been set up. I know that the *Turning up the Volume* working party recommended regular processes of reporting, but I think it is for the new group to establish that in dialogue with the Archbishops' Council. The working party on vocations reports regularly to the Ministry Council and I would certainly welcome questions on that regularly at Synod so that we can have an opportunity to report.

Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford): Is the Bishop aware that the Archbishops' Council reports regularly to this Synod on all the business that takes place under its auspices

and that those reports provide an ideal opportunity for conveying this flow of information to members of the Synod?

The Bishop of Sheffield: The Bishop is so aware, and should perhaps have remembered that in his answer to the Question!

13. *Revd Eva McIntyre (Worcester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What steps are being taken to provide pastoral and liturgical resources on mental health matters for parishes, chaplaincies and dioceses?

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied on behalf of the Presidents: As part of the work of the Committee for Ministry of and Among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP), a website is currently being launched that contains resources to support pastoral work among those living with mental illness and to encourage mental well-being. It provides material for use in pastoral situations, and liturgical resources which may be used for occasions of worship and prayer. It is hoped that this will be used widely across the Church and that it will help to encourage better awareness and understanding of mental health and of the significance of mental illness as a major issue both in society and the Church. Those who have been involved in developing these resources are to be congratulated, including the member of Synod who has asked this Question and who had a leading role in setting up the website.

Revd Eva McIntyre (Worcester): I thank the Bishop for that endorsement and ask whether he feels able to encourage diocesan members here to ask that the link to that web resource be placed on all diocesan websites.

The Bishop of Sheffield: I do indeed feel able to encourage that, and I presume that a reference to Revd McIntyre would provide the information.

14. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What progress has been made with preparing new strategies for re-imagining ministry and turning the rhetoric of lay involvement into reality since the previous group of sessions, and when can General Synod expect to receive some definite proposals in that connection?

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied on behalf of the Presidents: Since July 2012 the College of Bishops has considered a vision document prepared by the Ministry Council bishops, which dealt in detail with lay participation, lay ministry and collaboration between lay and ordained ministers. In the light of that discussion further work is now being done to define more clearly the areas of work that need to be developed in relation to the wide and diverse range of lay ministries across the dioceses and ways of developing lay discipleship and service. A report will be given to the Archbishops' Council in early 2013.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): Thank you for that reply as far as it goes. My Question was when General Synod could expect to be able to debate these matters, and my supplementary is whether it is reasonable to hope that we will discuss them next summer, in July 2013.

The Bishop of Sheffield: I would go so far as to say that it is not unreasonable. However experience to date of helping to pilot this process forward suggests that sometimes these matters take longer than we anticipate.

House of Bishops

15. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: When can the Synod expect to receive reports of the outcome of (a) the review by the House of its pastoral statement on civil partnerships and (b) the work of the group established by the House to advise it on human sexuality?

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu), replied as Chairman of the House of Bishops' Standing Committee: In July 2011 the House said that it would complete its review of the pastoral statement by the end of this year. The House will discuss the matter further in December. The wider group on human sexuality is chaired by Sir Joseph Pilling and has been asked to let the House have a report for consideration in December next year.

Revd Christopher Hobbs (London): Your Grace, is that an undertaking to bring the reports to the next Synod following the discussion in the House of Bishops?

The Archbishop of York: The House will make that decision when it has seen the report in December. The House will determine what kind of report will be produced. There is no need for us to keep it quiet or to not let it be known.

16. *Miss Rachel Beck (Lincoln)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Can assurances be given to Synod, given the concern expressed at the last meeting of Synod that the full diversity of beliefs on the issue of same-sex marriage that exist within the Church were not fully represented in the response submitted to HM Government's consultation on the issue of same-sex marriage, that the members of the group established to advise the House on human sexuality will be encouraged to look at the subject in all its fullness, a fullness which includes debating the possibility of blessing same-sex marriage?

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu), replied as Chairman of the House of Bishops' Standing Committee: The submission to the Government on same-sex marriage reflects the teaching of the Church of England as embodied in its Canons and endorsed by previous statements from the House of Bishops. When the House established the Pilling review in July 2011 the Government had not announced its intention to introduce same-sex marriage. Therefore, it is not surprising that the subject was not mentioned in the group's terms of reference. However they are very broad, and the group is unlikely to be able to offer the House advice on the Church of England's approach to human sexuality without taking account of this new development.

17. *Revd Clare Herbert (London)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Does the group advising the House of Bishops on issues in human sexuality chaired by Sir Joseph Pilling, given the subject matter under review, include any members at all who are openly lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender?

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu), replied as Chairman of the House of Bishops' Standing Committee: The group established by the House under an independent chair consists of four bishops who were selected for the range of views they brought to the subject, not their sexuality or marital status. Similarly the advisers were selected for their expertise and breadth of understanding and were not asked questions about their sexuality. I understand that in recent months the group has spent a good deal of time consulting widely, including with many LGBT representative groupings and individuals.

Revd Clare Herbert (London): I thank the Archbishop for his reply. However, given the attempt to make the group inclusive in terms of gender, which has already taken place, is it possible that it will also consider a membership that would reflect the subject under discussion in its own experience of life and faith?

The Archbishop of York: As I have said, the group consists first of those four bishops, and secondly of advisers because of their expertise. I hope that in its wide consultation the group will be able to draw on the different gender experiences of many people. The group is just doing its work, and I am quite sure that Pilling will not chair a report that does not take account of what you have suggested – otherwise we would not be taking the listening process at all seriously.

18. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Is it the case that the Faith and Order Commission has been invited by the House of Bishops to undertake work in relation to the Church's teaching on marriage and, if so, who will be conducting that work on the Commission's behalf?

19. *Miss Rachel Beck (Lincoln)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Given the concern expressed at the last group of sessions that the full diversity of beliefs on the issue of same-sex marriage that exist within the Church were not fully represented in the response submitted to HM Government's consultation on the issue of same-sex marriage, can the House ensure that in any request for work in this area to the Faith and Order Commission it would be encouraged to look at the subject in all its fullness, a fullness which includes debating the possibility of blessing same-sex marriage?

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu), replied as Chairman of the House of Bishops' Standing Committee: With permission, Chair, I will answer these Questions together.

At a meeting of the House of Bishops Standing Committee earlier this year the Bishop of Coventry, as chair of the Faith and Order Commission, asked whether the Committee wished the Commission to undertake any further work on the Church of England's teaching on marriage. The Committee saw no need for a review of the teaching document issued by the House in 1999. It did, however, ask the Commission to produce a short document summarizing the Church's doctrine of marriage and taking account of further theological work that has appeared since. The work is now well advanced.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): At best, this sounds like a missed opportunity, given the amount of recent work on these matters, which deserves more serious –

The Chairman: You are making a speech, not asking a question.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I am coming to the question – which deserves more serious consideration than is possible in a short document. Who is advising the Commission and when will the report be published?

The Archbishop of York: That document has been asked for by the Standing Committee of the House. It will then go to the House of Bishops to decide how, when, where and what will be published after consultation with the House. That is the process.

20. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Has the House considered the report of the independent panel, chaired by the Bishop of Liverpool, which has examined afresh the events surrounding the Hillsborough Stadium tragedy of 15 April 1989 and, if it has, does it share the bereaved families' hope that a just outcome may now be realized?

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu), replied as Chairman of the House of Bishops' Standing Committee: The Hillsborough report was released during the College of Bishops' meeting in September and the House has not met since, so there has been no opportunity to consider it collectively. I am sure Synod will join me in expressing admiration and thanks to the Bishop of Liverpool for his painstaking and compassionate chairing of the independent panel that investigated the tragedy of 15 April 1989 and did so much to uncover the truth.

Our Lord says that the truth sets us free. It is a very fine thing that the Church, through the Bishop of Liverpool, should have shared in this work of truth-seeking and truth-telling. Unfortunately, the Bishop of Liverpool cannot be present to hear what I am saying. However, if members are happy to do so, I think that we should take this opportunity to congratulate him and then I shall finish my answer. (*Applause*) Much remains to be done to ensure that justice follows truth, but we all pray that the families bereaved at Hillsborough are finding freedom from the oppression of half-truths and, now that the truth has been told, can trust that justice will follow.

Mr Colin Slater (Southwell and Nottingham): I warmly thank the Archbishop for everything that he has just said. When the House of Bishops has an opportunity to consider the Hillsborough report will it bear in mind that this General Synod would, as I believe to be the case, value an opportunity to debate it and what it teaches us as a nation about the way in which we handle emergencies and their consequences?

The Archbishop of York: Your question has been heard and will be taken into account by the members of the Standing Committee responsible for determining the agenda of the House of Bishops.

Revd Canon Peter Spiers (Liverpool): I thank the Archbishop for his answer and draw the House's attention to the fact that there is pressure on the Attorney General to

announce a date on which some inquests will be held. Will the House support the e-petition to bring forward the inquest into Kevin Williams's death, because his mother, Anne, who has been an indefatigable fighter for justice, has terminal cancer?

The Archbishop of York: That is an opinion question, which I shall not answer. However for me, when truth is proclaimed in public justice is done. The challenge now is to ensure that anyone who has broken the law and demeaned his or her office should face the consequences of their actions and understand the profound grief and anger that they have caused. The law must do its work of justice, and the Church continues to have a pastoral calling to support the bereaved families and those who again have been traduced, demeaned and misrepresented and to help all concerned to understand the nature of penitence, penance and forgiveness.

21. *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: In the light of the recommendations made in the interim report of the commissaries appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to the visitation in the diocese of Chichester, is consideration being given to the action that might be taken if a priest declines to undergo a risk assessment in relation to safeguarding?

22. *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Has consideration been given to whether further amendment of the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 might be appropriate as a result of the interim report of the commissaries appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to a visitation in the diocese of Chichester and, if so, what amendments are being considered and by whom?

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chairman of the Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group: With permission, Mr Chairman, I shall answer these Questions together.

The interim report of the commissaries made a number of recommendations in relation to the national Church. They, along with those made specifically to Chichester diocese that have national implications, are being considered in the first instance by the Clergy Discipline Commission and the Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group. If they conclude that changes to the Clergy Discipline Measure are in fact necessary, proposals to that end will be put to the Archbishops' Council for approval with a view to draft legislation being introduced to the Synod. At this stage it is not possible to say whether changes either to the Measure or to current guidance will be proposed, since so far both the Commission and the group have only been able to give the commissaries' recommendations preliminary consideration.

The matters that the Commission and the group are considering as part of this process include the situation, to which the commissaries draw attention, of a member of the clergy refusing to participate in a safeguarding risk assessment. As the law stands, it is unclear whether a cleric can be required to participate in such an assessment or be the subject of disciplinary proceedings for failing to do so. Accordingly the Commission and the group will consider whether legislation might be brought forward to clarify that position. In addition, before the publication of the report the group had concluded that our risk assessment processes need reviewing, and the report has only strengthened that conviction.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Given the need for some urgent clarification of these issues, will the Bishop give a timescale for when the Clergy Discipline Commission, the Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group and the Archbishops' Council will consider these important matters?

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham: I and the national safeguarding officer and others will attend the next meeting of the Clergy Discipline Commission in January to look at this quite specifically.

23. *Canon Christine McMullen (Derby)* asked the Chairman of the House of Bishops: Bishop Martin Warner has said on the Chichester diocesan website, 'We need to ask whether our provision and national structures are sufficient to deliver the standards of action that our statutory and voluntary partners rightly expect of us in the area of safeguarding.' What action is being taken nationally to ensure that these issues of national structures and provision are adequate and that accountability within dioceses is fit for purpose?

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied as Chairman of the Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group: The Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group is very actively considering the recommendations contained in the commissaries' report, including a consideration of the adequacy of the current structures and whether they are fit for purpose.

The Chichester diocese is not alone in needing to address these questions. On Wednesday the group will host a lunchtime meeting to discuss all these matters. In addition, at the national safeguarding conference in January, to which all diocesan safeguarding advisers are invited, there will be a session specifically focused on the report. This will enable all dioceses to contribute to this analysis, since the responsibility for ensuring that safeguarding provision and actions are fit for purpose rests with all of us, at both national and diocesan level. It is envisaged that a report will then be presented to the House of Bishops for consideration.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Martin Warner): What can be done to foster the expectation that national and diocesan structures will involve survivors' groups and statutory agencies in the review of their adequacy and provision?

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham: We are committed to ensuring that the voices of survivors are both listened to and included in all discussions, and we are actively engaged in seeking to ensure that that happens.

Secretary General

24. *Revd Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Secretary General: What plans are there to review the process for nominating an Archbishop of Canterbury once the present process has been concluded?

25. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Secretary General: In view of the public perception of confusion over the appointment of the next Archbishop of Canterbury, will consideration be given to a review of the CNC process with a view to introducing greater clarity and transparency?

The Secretary General (Mr William Fittall): With permission, Mr Chairman, I shall answer these Questions together.

The framework within which all CNCs operate is set out in the Synod's Standing Orders. It was thoroughly reviewed by the Perry and Clarke groups just over a decade ago. Since then there have been further changes in the way the CNC operates. There are now six diocesan representatives, interviewing has been introduced and the CNC's first choice is the name forwarded by the Prime Minister to The Queen.

The Prime Minister's and Archbishops' Secretaries for Appointments intend to discuss with the chair of the Canterbury CNC whether there are any lessons from the latest process which, without breaching confidentiality – an important safeguard – could be shared with the Archbishops' Council so that it can consider whether it might wish to propose changes to the Standing Orders.

There is a case for seeing what emerges from that rather than rushing to launch a wider review now, not least to avoid signalling any impression of dissatisfaction with the appointment just made.

Revd Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I note the perspective of the answer implying that the reviews of 10 years ago were somehow recent. Would the Secretary General agree that as the rules are indeed laid down in Standing Orders, it would be perfectly proper for Synod to undertake a review of this thankfully rare process as a matter of routine?

The Secretary General: It is quite important to remember that the Standing Order covers all diocesan bishop appointments as well as the process for the two Archbishops. The exercise conducted by the Perry group, which the Clarke group followed up, considered the CNC process in general. Obviously it is open to the Synod to re-open that after 10 years, if it wants to, whether in relation to Canterbury in particular or the CNC process in general. Clearly there is an issue in relation to Canterbury.

Last year the Archbishops' Council looked at the question of the representation of the Canterbury diocese, because there is a question whether, now that there is a more elaborate process for the selection of the Bishop of Dover and the component of the Archbishop's job in relation to the diocese is quite small, the Canterbury diocese should have the same number of representatives as elsewhere; it decided that it was not the right time to look at that. That could be looked at specifically in relation to Canterbury, but some of the wider issues that people have raised are really about how CNCs work more generally.

Whether members want a review is up to them, but in the Church of England we have a great tendency to conduct reviews without being quite sure where we want them to get to. So let us have a review only if there is a considerable groundswell of thinking that we need to look at this again. Actually 10 years is not a very long time and there have been a number of further incremental changes since then.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): There have been some very excellent senior appointments recently, but there is increasing concern that the leadership development process across the Church is not fit for purpose. Apart from contracting

out our leadership development to the oil industry, what consideration has been given to setting up a clear, transparent process of leadership and management development across the clergy's time in ministry based on the talents and skills that the Church needs for the 21st century?

The Secretary General: That goes rather wider than the question of how the CNC itself operates. The bishops have a training and development officer based at Lambeth, Karen West, who does a lot of training and development for new and serving bishops. Additionally, there is a bishops group that looks at both senior appointments and training and development issues, but often it is not possible to get these matters completely right, and there is obviously a lot of continuing work to be done on them.

Revd Charles Razzall (Chester): Given the Coptic Church's recent ability to produce before the blindfolded boy two candidates who were not currently serving bishops and the success of the Roman Catholic Communion in presenting the late Cardinal Hume as Archbishop of Westminster, would the Secretary General comment on the possibility of this process for nominating the Archbishop of Canterbury including not only current and future members of the House of Bishops but also ordinary parish clergy, so that we might have not only a Justin Martyr but a Becket or a Theodore of Tarsus?

The Secretary General: I will deal with the point about the Coptic Church when I answer the following Question from Mr Harding.

There are two different questions. The first is: who should do the selecting? Of course, the CNC panel is made up of laity, clergy and bishops. Secondly, obviously the field from which the selection is made has changed over the years. I think that Ambrose was called to be a bishop before he had even been baptized, but whether we are quite in a state for that now I am less sure.

26. *Mr Nick Harding (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Secretary General: Could consideration be given to the possibility of involving children and young people in the selection and appointment process for new diocesan bishops, as is becoming the practice for appointments of clergy in some parishes?

The Secretary General: I understand that the Secretaries for Appointments routinely ask dioceses to provide an opportunity for engagement with children and young people during consultation. What happens varies from case to case. For example in relation to the vacancy in the See of Canterbury the Secretaries met representatives of the Church of England Youth Council.

Any proposal to involve additional people within the CNC itself would require the Synod to amend SO 122; and any suggestion of adopting the approach of the Coptic Church, whereby a young person would draw one of the shortlisted names from a sacred vessel, might need some prior theological input from the Faith and Order Commission!

27. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Secretary General: With regard to the Church of England's representatives on the Anglican Consultative Council:

- (i) how are they appointed;
- (ii) has consideration been given to enhancing their democratic legitimacy by their being elected by General Synod;
- (iii) if so, why was that option rejected; and
- (iv) if that possibility has not been considered, why not?

The Secretary General: The ACC's Constitution provides for the Church of England to have three representatives. In addition, the Archbishop of Canterbury is present and currently Mrs Elizabeth Paver also attends as an elected member of the Standing Committee of the Communion.

The three representatives are appointed in rotation by the Appointments Committee after consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury. They serve for six years or three plenary sessions, whichever is the longer period. As vacancies arise the Appointments Committee has an eye to the spread of Church tradition among all those due to attend from the Church of England.

Representatives have been appointed, rather than elected, since the creation of the ACC, and it is not obvious that introducing STV elections would achieve a better outcome, given that vacancies usually arise one at a time. However, it would be open to the Synod to do so if that was what the majority wished.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Will Mr Fittall agree that direct election by the governing body of the Church of England, which for this purpose must be this Synod, would be the best way of ensuring confidence that its representatives truly represent the Church of England and its breadth, and that it would be perfectly possible to change the appointments cycle so that all three representatives are elected at the same time by STV?

The Secretary General: The right way to select people for particular roles is an interesting and tricky question. Clearly for some roles election is absolutely right, and indeed recently the Synod went for that system in relation to the Business Committee. If you want my view – and I am not sure that I am meant to express one – I think that one has to be a little careful about assuming that election is the answer to all problems. Sometimes you may want to select people with the right skills and experience, and with the ACC mechanism there is some advantage in not having a completely new panel each time, which is why quite often one person is selected and does his three turns and so it turns round. I do not think it is clear cut, but at the end of the day it is for the Synod to decide.

28. *Revd Stephen France (Chichester)* asked the Secretary General: In what ways has the Clerk to the Synod been directly involved in the process of producing papers and recording meeting votes in relation to the draft legislation on women in the episcopate over the past two years?

29. *Revd Stephen France (Chichester)* asked the Secretary General: In what ways will the Clerk to the Synod be directly involved in the process of producing papers and recording meeting votes in relation to the draft code of practice accompanying the women in the episcopate legislation to the end of March 2013?

The Secretary General: With permission, Mr Chairman, I shall answer these Questions together.

The lead staff responsibility in connection with this legislation in the Synod, the House of Bishops, the Steering Committee, the Revision Committee and the Code of Practice group has been mine. I have been greatly helped throughout by an outstanding contribution from the Legal Adviser and his colleagues.

Since becoming Clerk to the Synod Colin Podmore has held the lead role in supporting the Business Committee in the handling of the legislation. He has carried it out with the professionalism and impartiality that he has manifested as a servant of the whole Church for nearly a quarter of a century. (*Applause*) As I informed the Synod on 13 October, Colin will continue his full range of duties until 31 March, when he leaves to become Director of Forward in Faith, save that he has requested, and I have agreed, that he will not now play a role in relation to the legislation on women bishops.

Revd Stephen France (Chichester): Clearly the impartiality of officers of the Church is vital to good governance. If the Clerk of the Synod is able to operate in an impartial way, why is he limiting his role in relation to the legislation on women bishops? And, if he is not, why is he being paid until the end of March 2013, when others will clearly have to cover this role?

The Secretary General: As I tried to explain in my answer, actually his role has been fairly limited, because those who have served on the Revision Committee, the Steering Committee and all the other forums will know that I have led the work myself, supported by the Legal Office. Essentially Colin's role has been in relation to the business of the Synod, and he concluded that for the final approval debate tomorrow he would rather not sit to support the Chair; I shall do that. However, he will carry out his other duties until the end of March, and I can assure the member that he will not receive money for light duties.

I would like to say something slightly bold at this point. All of us who work for the Church come from somewhere, and I slightly resent the suggestion – (*Applause*). Perhaps I should stop there! Let me add, however, that for 27 years I served ministers in Whitehall without any of them having any notion of my political conviction. When you come to work for the Church of England you can worship at the most middle-stump parish church, but in terms of Church politics and the issues to be discussed tomorrow, that is actually a position. Therefore, all members of staff who are Anglicans – many staff posts do not have to be filled by Anglicans – are worshippers and will have their private views, and what Synod expects from us is to distinguish between them and how we serve them, and we try to do that to the best of our ability.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Christopher Hill): Would the Secretary General confirm that the Clerk to the Synod will also continue his duties as Director of Ecumenical Relations for the Council of Christian Unity until he moves to his other post?

The Secretary General: It is a heavy responsibility, as I have already indicated. Indeed that is so.

Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans): May I be as bold as the Secretary General in asking whether there is any precedent for a Clerk to this Synod to be formally associated with one of the pressure groups within the Church and the Synod?

The Secretary General: I can think of another example of a member of staff, who shall remain nameless, who on joining decided to step down from active involvement in a group, and I am entirely satisfied that throughout his time here Colin has not been actively involved, but he has been head-hunted and appointed to this job. He is required to give six months' notice and he has gone about it entirely properly. The group from which the other person stood down was Affirming Catholicism – just to show how even-handed we are. It is obviously right that members of staff should not be actively involved with campaigning groups, and that is the case; and it is for that reason, of course, that in accepting the appointment Colin said that he would say nothing more about his new role until he takes it up at the beginning of April.

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): Will you accept another supplementary, Mr Chairman?

The Chairman: As it is from you, I had better!

The Archbishop of York: Will the Secretary General agree with me that when I heard that Colin was to work for Forward in Faith I told him that I was very surprised, because in the 25 years that I have worked with him I have never known his theological leanings to be in any direction other than as a Christian in Christ? Will the Secretary General confirm that?

The Secretary General: I can confirm that that is what the Archbishop said, and Colin was hugely appreciative of what he said.

30. *Mrs Mary Johnston (London)* asked the Secretary General: Given that the present Clerk to the Synod currently fills several quite distinctive roles, how is the task of replacing him to be processed?

The Secretary General: Essentially the process will be the same as on the last occasion, namely that there will be an advertisement and an open competition. At least three members of the Synod, including the chair of the Business Committee, will join me on the selection panel. The appointment of Clerk to the Synod will be made by the Business Committee and submitted to the Synod for approval. The intention is to start the process in the next few weeks.

31. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Secretary General: Has the Charity Commission been asked to explain why it takes the view, as recently quoted in a letter to the Plymouth Brethren, according to the *Daily Telegraph* of 4 November, that it makes no presumption that religion within the Church of England is for the public benefit, given that the charitable object of each PCC is 'Promoting in the ecclesiastical parish the whole mission of the Church', and that numerous passages of Scripture highlight the importance of followers of Jesus having a positive impact on their neighbours?

The Secretary General: There is nothing controversial about the Charity Commission's statement of the law that religious bodies, like any other body seeking to register as a charity, must be able to demonstrate public benefit.

What is at issue in the current case concerning the Exclusive Brethren is whether the Commission was correct in concluding that the limited engagement by the members of a particular gospel hall with the public, and the limited arrangements for public access to acts of worship there, meant that the public benefit test was not met. The Legal Office is closely monitoring the case, which is now going to appeal. Its present view, however, is that the specific grounds on which the Commission reached its decision do not have implications for the Church of England or indeed for churches in general that hold public worship and are socially engaged in their communities.

32. *Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans)* asked the Secretary General: What representations have been made to the Public Administration Select Committee in connection with its current investigation into the Regulation of the Charitable Sector and the Charities Act 2006 in relation to the question of the public benefit requirement?

The Secretary General: The Churches' Legislation Advisory Service made a wide-ranging submission to the Select Committee on behalf of all its members, including the Church of England. In addition, last month I wrote on behalf of the Church of England to the Minister for the Cabinet Office about the separate review of the 2006 Act conducted recently for the Government by Lord Hodgson. Our current main concern is about Lord Hodgson's proposal greatly to increase the number of PCCs that would have to register. While we continue to keep a weather eye on the Charity Commission's application of the public benefit requirement, we are not aware of any evidence that it is proving problematic for Church of England bodies.

Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans): With regard to Lord Hodgson's proposal to require more PPCs to register, is there any danger that some such PCCs might be granted charitable status and others not?

The Secretary General: Our concerns about this proposal are essentially for that reason. We have had no difficulty at all in relation to that. I think 1,700 or more PCCs with an income of more than £100,000 per year have had to register. We have worked with the Charity Commission on the public benefit issue and all those that have applied to register have succeeded without any difficulty. Our concern is more about the sheer bureaucracy that this will involve and the burden that it will create for volunteers in parishes, and at a time when the Charity Commission itself is suffering severe cuts it seems slightly strange that it should have to take on further regulatory work of this kind, which I suspect will not add very much to the sum of human happiness.

33. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Secretary General: Given the apparent uncertainty over whether the Food Standards Agency and the Churches' Legislation Advisory Service are correct in interpreting EU law as banning the sale of jam in re-used jam jars by voluntary organisations and the need for such rules to be based on robust evidence, is it known whether there have been any instances where

the sale of jam in a re-used jam jar at church fêtes associated with any of the Church of England's 16,000 churches has ever caused anyone to become unwell?

The Secretary General: Now concerning jam jars! The disputed issue relates to what constitutes a food business for the purpose of European law. I understand that the initial advice given by the Food Standards Agency to the Churches' Legislation Advisory Service was quite unequivocal, namely that individuals might re-use jam jars purely for private use but not for material to be sold or given away other than as private gifts. Subsequently, however, ministers and the Food Standards Agency have been somewhat in retreat over whether selling jam at church fêtes would constitute a food business. The Bishop of Exeter has now written to the Food Standards Agency for further clarification. We eagerly await hearing whether that will enable the Advisory Service, and indeed the Women's Institute with which it has been working closely, to issue further advice. The specific answer to the Question is: none whatsoever.

Clerk to the Synod

34. *Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: On what basis and by whom are members of the public invited to sit on the platform during General Synod debates, and is there a protocol for introducing them and their interests in the matter to be debated?

The Clerk to the Synod (Dr Colin Podmore): I have arranged for a list of those who are generally entitled to sit on the platform to be placed on the notice board. Additionally, those moving motions may invite Synod members, staff and others whose names are notified to me in advance to sit at the members-in-charge table and advise them during debates.

There is no protocol requiring movers to announce the names of those advising them or to explain why they consider that their advice would be helpful to them. Such persons have neither speaking nor voting rights.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The following are generally entitled to sit on the platform during groups of sessions:

- those listed on pages 1–3 of the List of Members;
- members of the Panel of Chairmen;
- the Secretary of the Corporation;
- the NCIs' Chief Executives;
- the Directors of the Archbishops' Council;
- the Finance Director;
- the Canterbury Provincial Registrar;
- the Appointments Secretaries;
- a member of staff supporting each Archbishop.

C J PODMORE
Clerk to the Synod

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): Will the Clerk to the Synod consider introducing such a protocol so that members may know who is seated on the platform at the beginning of a debate rather than at the end, as in the Manifestation of Faith in Public Life debate?

The Clerk to the Synod: I will ask the Business Committee to reflect on that and comment on it in its next report.

Board of Education

35. *Canon Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education: In the light of the decision of the Department for Education to withdraw top-up funding for small schools in the near future, can the Board of Education confirm its continued active support for small, rural, voluntary-aided schools and report what representations have been made to the DfE to that end concerning the effect that the withdrawal of top-up funding is likely to have?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd John Pritchard), in reply: The new revenue funding arrangements are intended to simplify school funding. All schools will receive a lump sum up to a maximum of £200,000. However, local authorities are applying the funding arrangements in very different ways, many of them allocating much smaller lump sums (one setting this at £42,000), which will have a significant impact on all small schools.

The Government has given the assurance of a minimum funding guarantee for 2013–14, which means that no school should suffer a reduction of more than 1.5 per cent of its per pupil funding.

We continue to make representations at national level on this matter but detailed funding decisions are made locally, so there is a greater need for local political lobbying and for individual dioceses to continue to work with their local authorities to negotiate the best deal for all their schools in these very difficult circumstances.

36. *Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education: With reference to the answer given by the Chief Education Officer in July 2012 during a discussion of *The Church School of the Future* concerning the question in the NCI application form about membership of organisations that are incompatible with the Church of England's commitment to promoting race equality, will that question be added to application forms for posts in Church schools?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd John Pritchard), in reply: Neither the Board of Education or the National Society provides application forms for posts in Church schools, as neither is the employer. However, we are confident that candidates are judged on their suitability against the school's Christian foundation and values, including a commitment to the absolute value of every child as a child of God.

Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark): As this confidence is not shared by all due to statistics that reveal an increase in racist bullying in schools, will these bodies now consider how best they can influence employers to ensure that the question of support for organisations that do not advocate race equality is considered during recruitment?

The Bishop of Oxford: There are two possible ways in which that might happen: first, that every local authority could be contacted by the National Society to establish whether they would ensure that the right questions were on their particular application forms, but that would be a huge effort and I believe that there are other ways of doing it; second, that the National Society or the Board would provide its own application form, and if there was sufficient demand from schools we could do that. At the moment we are working through the good judgement of each school where we believe that these issues are very important and are taken seriously.

Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester): Would the Board give consideration to drawing up a model application form, which could then be provided to employers as an example to follow?

The Bishop of Oxford: That would be a way of meeting both of my possible answers and I thank Canon Killwick for the suggestion.

37. *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education: How does the Education Division intend to respond to the recommendations contained in the recent Stonewall report concerning the experiences of gay young people in Britain's schools in 2012, in which it is reported that more than half of lesbian, gay and bisexual young people in Britain's schools, many of whom attend faith schools, experience homophobic bullying?

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd John Pritchard), in reply: The Board of Education is quite clear that no form of bullying, for whatever reason, is acceptable in Church of England schools and that it would expect all staff and governors to be vigilant and decisive. Diocesan boards of education work closely with their schools developing their Christian ethos and will be equally determined to put the absolute value of all children and young people at the heart of the Christian ethos of their schools.

Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham): Will the Education Division ensure that every school, at both primary and secondary level, has in place an LGBT anti-bullying policy and will provide training for all staff members on these matters?

The Bishop of Oxford: The Education Division itself cannot do that, but it can advise diocesan boards to do it and we will certainly consider that possibility.

Ministry Division

38. **Mr Gerald O'Brien (Rochester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What steps are taken to ensure that the lifestyles of those seeking ordination are within the parameters of the General Synod resolution of 1987 on human sexuality and the House of Bishops' guidelines contained in *Issues in Human Sexuality*?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James), in reply: Under the policy followed by the Ministry Division, DDOs are required to discuss the bishops' guidelines in *Issues in Human Sexuality* with all candidates before they attend a bishops' advisory panel. Each candidate is then required to give an undertaking that their lifestyle will be in accordance with the bishops' guidelines should they be recommended for training. The DDOs are further required to state in the sponsoring papers that the

candidate is aware of the bishops' guidelines and ready to live within them. A candidate would not be recommended for training unless this commitment was clearly in place.

39. **Revd Ferial Etherington (Carlisle)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What is the current policy for the approval of new proposals for training pathways for ordination?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James), in reply: In May 2010 the House of Bishops approved a policy whereby new proposals for training pathways should be scrutinised by the Ministry Division and approved if they meet a set of criteria. The criteria, which are included in the policy paper attached to this answer, concentrate on quality in education and formation, which includes meeting a minimum cohort standard so that all ordinands on such schemes are trained in groups that are both formationally and financially viable.

The aim of this policy is to enable dioceses to shape the training sector through their sponsorship of ordinands to training institutions. Consequently, the Ministry Division consults widely with dioceses, colleges and courses about the new training proposals, but it asks sponsoring dioceses directly for an estimate of the number of candidates they intend to sponsor to the new pathways and will give approval only if the cohort standard is likely to be met. More broadly, the policy also clarifies that while the House of Bishops and the Ministry Division are responsible for the setting of standards in ordination training, for checking that these standards are met and for funding on an equitable basis individual colleges and courses are responsible for their own management and viability.

Ministry Division

October 2010

Proposals for new training provision

In May 2010 the House of Bishops endorsed a policy whereby proposals for new training provision should be evaluated by the Ministry Division against a set of criteria. This page sets out the process for approval and the criteria.

THE APPROVAL PROCESS

Those proposing new training provision are strongly encouraged to make contact with the Ministry Division at an early stage of their thinking to discuss their proposals and the procedure for application.

The approval procedure is in three stages:

- (a) **in principle agreement:** an outline proposal should be submitted to the Ministry Council setting out the proposal with reference to the criteria. The consultation will inform the in-principle agreement stage.
- (b) **approval:** to include detailed scrutiny of curriculum, governance and finance proposals. The documentation required is a full curriculum approval document, a business plan and (for new institutions) an explanation of the governance arrangements.

(c) **review after three years:** approval will normally be given for a three-year initial period. At that stage the provision will be reviewed and will either be confirmed or approval withdrawn.

THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

With regard to consultation the Ministry Division will be contacting the affected dioceses, training institutions and RTPs. In addition, it will put up a page on its website to give access to a summary of any current proposals.

In practical terms this will mean a period of consultation will need to be built in to the process for considering new proposals. In the normal working periods of the year, this will mean a two-month period for comment and some time to evaluate those comments. The results of the consultation will then be fed into the decision making process of the Ministry Council.

For planning, approval and recruitment purposes, applications will normally need to be with the Ministry Division in September of one year if students are to be admitted to new provision in the following September.

CRITERIA

1 Contribution to the development of training and ministry

- added value above existing provision of training
- contribution to new patterns of ministry

2 Education

In relation to 3 below:

- broad-based theological and ministerial programme which will enable the candidate to achieve the learning outcomes
- structured programme which enables candidate to complete level 5 (DipHE or Foundation degree) or above by the time of ordination
- viable cohort size (normally a minimum of 8–10) to enable a good exchange of views, perspectives and knowledge
- an approach to learning and formation which will instil good habits of continuing learning and development

3 Formation

In addition to 2 above:

- a pattern of life and worship (communal and individual) which will deepen Christian discipleship and prepare candidates for the beginning of a representative ordained ministry
- appropriate use of residence or gathered time to enable these aims
- viable cohort size (as above)
- continuity of group life, and focus on formation of group life or other forms of corporate life, to enable candidate to experience and interact with a range of views and of expressions of church

- a variety of contextual and placement experience to enable candidate to be equipped for a ministry within the wider church

4 Sustainability

- realistic staffing and costing of the proposal
- outline of risks and how they might be mitigated

5 Cost to the national Church

- costs to be in line with comparable provision according to focus of ministry (potential incumbent, assistant minister, pioneer minister, locally deployed)
- cost to be affordable within the limits of the Vote 1 budget

6 Consultative process

- In considering new proposals the Ministry Council should seek the views of stakeholders in a way which informs but does not necessarily determine the outcome.

40. **Revd Ferial Etherington (Carlisle)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What proposals are in place to ensure that the approval of new proposals for training pathways for ordination addresses the requirements of the wider traditions of the Church in all theological education providers?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James), in reply: The Ministry Division's approval process for proposed new ordination training pathways clearly requires that candidates are prepared for a wide-ranging, representative ministry. It stipulates that the pattern of training and worship, the use of residential time and the variety of placement experience must equip candidates for a ministry within the wider Church. The cohort standard and the staffing required to meet the educational and formational requirements have the same aim. The full criteria are available as part of the written answer to Question 39.

41. **Revd Dr Timothy Bull (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: Regarding the Ministry Division's work of inspecting ministerial training institutions, in order to ensure that such inspections are consistent:

- what objective standards are applied when inspecting each institution;
- how are such standards set, monitored and maintained; and
- what training is given to inspectors to ensure that such standards are understood and equitably applied?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James) in reply: Inspections of ministerial training institutions are carried out under the authority of the House of Bishops. While the reports take a broad view of the institution, the Church's concerns for corporate worship and community life as the context of training, theological learning as applied to ministry and the development of ministers are addressed by reference to detailed criteria. All inspections are carried out against the same set of criteria to ensure that the same standards are applied in all places.

The criteria, which are appended below, are reviewed on an annual basis by the Ministry Division's Quality in Formation Panel, seeking feedback from senior inspectors as well as in the light of feedback from inspected institutions. There was a significant streamlining of the criteria in May 2012 to ensure that inspectors focus on the most important matters.

All inspectors are given induction training before they undertake an inspection and all teams are given further training as a team shortly before they carry out an inspection.

All draft reports are scrutinized in detail by the secretariat and an external reader unconnected to that inspection to ensure that the standards are equitably applied.

Inspection criteria (May 2012)

Underlying principles

- 6.1 Inspections aim to be constructive in recognising an institution's strengths and helping it to address weaknesses. They are carried out in the light of the criteria below. Inspectors may also address any other relevant issue which causes concern. Institutions are asked to co-operate fully with the inspection team.
- 6.2 The criteria are these:

Section One: Aims, Self-Evaluation and Working Relationships

A Aims and objectives

Inspectors will consider whether the institution's aims are appropriate, clearly articulated and understood. Specifically:

- A.i Its aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring church(es).
- A.ii They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring church(es).
- A.iii The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to:
 - previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports;
 - other external bodies' evaluation; and
 - self-evaluations.

B. Relationships with other institutions

Inspectors will look at how well the institution engages with partners:

- B.i There should be evidence of the institution's commitment to partnership with the other providers of theological education in the region.
- B.ii The institution should draw fully on the resources of universities in teaching quality assessment, staff development and the promotion of research.

- B.iii It should engage effectively with local churches, other faith communities and secular organisations so as to enhance formation for public ministry.

Section Two: Curriculum for Formation and Education

As section 7 sets out, new training provision or pathways need separate approval when proposed. The same enquiry format applies where curriculum approval is part of a full inspection, but the findings will be built into the inspectors' report.

C Curriculum for formation and education

Inspectors will consider the curriculum's design and content. In particular:

- C.i There should be a theological, formational and educational rationale for the institution's approach to mission and to formation for ministry and discipleship.
- C.ii The institution should offer, and periodically review, a set of programmes that will enable candidates to be prepared for their ministries and/or meet their learning needs.
- C.iii The academic and formational assessment methods should enable the institution to advise church leaders on the suitability of candidates for their ministry.

Section Three: Ministerial Development

D Community and corporate life

Inspectors will consider the institution's quality of common life. Is it a good place in which to live, work and study? In particular:

- D.i The institution should offer a clear statement of how it understands corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry and the working relationships between members.
- D.ii There should be a clear statement of its understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice; its training, governance and community life should reflect this (see also I.v and J.ii).

E Worship and training in public worship

Inspectors will look at whether the arrangements for common worship and the policies underlying them are satisfactory. In particular:

- E.i The institution's policy and practice in corporate worship should reflect the tradition of the wider church and the liturgical inheritance of faith.
- E.ii There should be a policy on, and provision for, a balance of worship, including authorised and innovative forms, which recognises and

equips candidates to work within the variety of practice within the sponsoring church.¹

E.iii Ministerial candidates should be effectively trained to plan, prepare and conduct public worship and they should receive critical and constructive comment from staff and peers.

E.iv The liturgical space should be adequate for its purpose.

F Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation

Inspectors will consider how well the institution helps learners in their ministerial, personal and spiritual formation and self-awareness. In particular:

F.i The institution should enable candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own church and to gain an empathetic understanding of church and faith traditions other than their own.

F.ii It should offer corporate and individual guidance for learners, including encouragement to seek confidential spiritual counsel and to maintain a regular private prayer life.

F.iii Its common life and the guidance offered should enable students to grow in Christian discipleship with a view to exercising a public role in ministry and engaging with the world.

F.iv The teaching and ministerial staff should model an appropriate pattern of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.

Section Four: Education and Training

G Teaching and learning: content, method and resources

Inspectors will consider the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning activities, methods and resources. In particular:

G.i The units of teaching and learning should be well structured, with clear and appropriate aims.

G.ii There should be a proper balance between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training.

G.iii Learning programmes should be varied in format and method, with use of student experience, courses, seminars, tutorials, one-to-one, groups, placements and private study.

G.iv There should be an appropriate learning environment, with adequate resources including library and information and communications technology.

G.v Staff should provide students with constructive formal and informal feedback assessment, against published assessment criteria, both in terms of academic progress and in terms of preparation for beginning public ministry.

¹ For Church of England institutions this should include specific comment on the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod 1993 should be introduced to students and be respected.

H Practical and pastoral theology

- H.i The institution's learning structures and formational activity should integrate theory and practice and enable students to grow as theologically reflective practitioners in the context of the developing and diverse society in which they will minister.

Section Five: Staff and Students

Inspectors will consider the recruitment, expertise, resourcing, appraisal and development of staff. In particular:

I Teaching staff

- I.i The gender, lay/ordained and denominational balance of ministerial and teaching staff should model appropriate patterns of learning and of ministry and comply with denominational guidelines.²

J All staff

- J.i Staff recruitment and selection procedures should be transparent, fair and consonant with the policies of the relevant partner bodies.
- J.ii Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed at regular intervals.
- J.iii There should be an effective programme for the continuing professional development of staff, including annual appraisals for all staff.
- J.iv Staff should be sufficient in number and expertise, and resourced to fulfil their role adequately for the institution's and students' needs.

K Students

Inspectors will examine procedures for student admission, welfare and support, appraisal and discipline. In particular:

- K.i Policies on students' admission,³ welfare, complaints, discipline, assessment, reporting to sponsoring churches and arrangements for first appointments should be publicly available; and there should be evidence that they are applied.
- K.ii The institution' decision-making structure should enable students to take an appropriate part in its governance, provided that students take responsibility for their participation.

Section Six: Governance, Management and Finance*L Organisation and governance*

² Church of England policy is that any residential college recognised for the training of women should have at least one full-time female member of staff, who should be either an experienced minister in Orders or an accredited lay minister, with some parish experience and able to exercise a ministerial role within the institution. Failing that, a female member of staff with the necessary experience should be appointed part-time. Courses and Schemes should include a woman meeting these criteria as a full or associate staff member. In all cases they should be fully integrated into the policy-making, teaching and tutorial work and life of the college.

³ Church of England policy is that colleges recognised for the training of women should allocate at least 15% of their places to women.

Inspectors will examine the effectiveness of the institution's governance structures and processes. In particular:

- L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.
- L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.
- L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.
- L .iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members – teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals – so that they play an effective role in decision-making.
- L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.

M Business planning and risk management

Inspectors will look at evidence for the existence and implementation of the institution's strategic policies. In particular:

- M.i There should be a regularly updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3–5 years which identifies short- and medium-term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.
- M.ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.
- M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.

N Financial policies

Inspectors will consider the effectiveness of day-to-day operating processes:

- N.i The institution should have policies to control and manage investments, expenditure and borrowing, and the annual report and accounts should contain an appropriate reserves policy.
- N.ii Management accounts showing performance against budget should be produced at least quarterly and reviewed regularly by the trustees.
- N.iii The institution should consider its sources of income and have strategies to identify and raise the funds it needs.
- N.iv The institution should have adequate financial controls aimed at minimising waste and loss, and should be appropriately advised on tax-efficiency.

- O* *Statutory and operating policies*
- O.i* Proper books of account should be kept, with computerised data regularly backed up and stored offsite.
- O.ii* Bank mandates should be up to date, with appropriate authority levels.
- P* *Accommodation*
- P.i* The i) public, ii) teaching and iii) provided private living accommodation should be fit for purpose and suited to students' needs.
- P.ii* There should be adequate provision for the needs of disabled students.

42. *Revd Eva McIntyre (Worcester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: With reference to paragraph 33 of GS Misc 1025, what progress has been made with the pilot on black and minority ethnic vocations in Southwark diocese and when will the further work with other dioceses start?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James), in reply: I am pleased to report that the Ministry Division and CMEAC have been working closely with the diocese of Southwark to make progress on this project. A successful diocesan day consultation on encouraging minority ethnic vocations was held in June. This is to be followed by a vocations weekend in February 2013. A broadly based strategy group has been established to oversee the project and to extend it during 2013 to other dioceses. A key element of that strategy is to appoint and train vocations champions for minority ethnic vocations, who will advocate and lead and encourage this work in their dioceses.

Revd Eva McIntyre (Worcester): Does the Bishop yet know which dioceses will take on this work after the pilot project?

The Bishop of Norwich: Not precisely, although we hope that in due course the vocations champions might be found in every diocese.

43. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What progress has been made with the common awards process since the last group of sessions?

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied as Chairman of the Common Awards Working Group: Since July 2012 the Ministry Division has been working on the contract with Durham University for the consideration of the Archbishops' Council. It has also gathered the information from consultations to articulate the pedagogical and theological culture within which the common awards will be developed and to propose a structural framework for them. A residential conference attended by 100 theological educators met in September to respond to these documents and to agree next steps.

Approximately 150 educators have volunteered to take part in working groups that will begin the detailed writing of the awards in January. Consultation with IME 4–7 and Reader training officers continues to consider how the awards can serve these constituencies. Draft programmes will be completed by summer 2013, giving institutions an opportunity to further shape the awards in line with their distinctive

traditions before the programmes are approved by Durham in the autumn of 2013 and launched in autumn 2014.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): Without making rash promises, can the Bishop confirm that there will be a seamless move to make these programmes available in the autumn of 2014?

The Bishop of Sheffield: I can confirm that at present everything is on target for that, and I see no reason why it should not happen.

44. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What specific provisions are so far in place or planned for theological colleges and courses to apply for training pathways to be treated as exceptions to the suite of common awards validated by Durham University?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Graham James), in reply: In early October all ordination training institutions were informed about the process for considering pathways to be treated as exceptions to the suite of common awards validated by Durham University. A detailed timetable, process and set of criteria for exceptions was set out and the application forms will be available in January for a process that will run through to June 2013. The Ministry Council's aim in this has been to be transparent about the process and to encourage all theological educators to be involved in the collaborative work of creating the common awards, while enabling colleges and courses to apply for exceptions where they are likely to meet the criteria. All the relevant documentation is available to Synod members on the notice board [as for Question 39].

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): What provisions will there be for a possible appeal against a Ministry Council decision?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Ministry Council will establish a small working group to look at exemptions applications and the right of appeal from that working group's recommendation will be to the Ministry Council. The appeal process is set out in the information that has already been released.

45. *Dr Peter Capon (Manchester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What progress has been made in making it possible for all suitably qualified independent students at Church of England training institutions to register for University of Durham awards?

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied as Chairman of the Common Awards Working Group: The Ministry Division has been working with Durham University to ensure that a wide range of students will be able to benefit from the academic awards that are currently being created. The range includes ordinands, Reader students, curates in the post-ordination phase of their training and independent students. These matters are presently subject to contractual negotiations with Durham and therefore cannot be set out in more detail, but the aim remains that independent students will be able to study alongside ministry students.

Dr Peter Capon (Manchester): In view of the crucial importance of this issue for some institutions, when are such negotiations likely to be concluded, and in the meantime what advice can the Ministry Division give to the institutions planning for 2014?

The Bishop of Sheffield: Institutions should apply to the Ministry Division for detailed advice where there are points of question. As far as possible, all the public documents relating to the development of the common awards are on the common awards website and can be consulted by the institutions, members of the Synod and indeed anyone else who wants to explore them.

With regard to the timetable for the negotiation of the contract, our present estimate is that a contract will be prepared for the Archbishops' Council in the spring of next year, at which point those negotiations will be concluded, but institutions with particular questions are asked to contact the Ministry Division directly.

46. *Professor Anthony Berry (Chester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: In the light of the considerable cost of theological journal subscriptions and the need to manage costs, could the Ministry Division consider arranging a national, neutral-cost scheme for access to electronic journals for all clergy, licensed ministers, candidates in training and staff of courses and colleges?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James), in reply: The remit of the Ministry Division does not extend to providing electronic resources for learning for all clergy and licensed ministers in addition to staff and students of colleges and courses. However, the Division is in negotiation with Durham University to provide such access to theological journals for those who in future will be taking Durham awards, including ordinands, Readers in training, curates in post-ordination training and registered independent students.

Professor Anthony Berry (Chester): Encouraged as I was by a visit to the excellent library in Norwich Cathedral, I regret that the bishop does not consider the continuing education needs of clergy and ministers in his answer, which itself is very encouraging.

The Bishop of Norwich: Thank you.

47. *Revd Alastair Cutting (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: Given the value to the Church of that most valuable asset, who holds a national list of those curates who remain without a new post on completing IME, and what are the numbers of those who have found themselves in that position in the past two years?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James): Initial ministerial education is divided into two parts separated by ordination. I will therefore first describe what happens at the end of IME 1–3, on completion of which the placement of stipendiary deacons is the responsibility of the sponsoring bishop supported by Ministry Division. That placement process begins in October and runs until May. Dioceses usually circulate vacant title parishes for unplaced deacons to the colleges and courses via the

Ministry Division. A webpage on the Church of England website advertises vacant title parishes.

Candidates still unplaced late in the process are invited to provide personal profiles, which are then circulated to all diocesan and sponsoring bishops and DDOs in order to assist in finding suitable curacies. In 2011 eight candidates were unplaced and subsequently found posts; in 2012 one remains unplaced. The Ministry Division retains a list of unplaced individuals and follows up their progress. There are many reasons why someone remains unplaced and it is rarely due to the availability of posts.

The Ministry Division does not hold figures for curates completing IME 4–7 satisfactorily and then not finding posts. There is anecdotal evidence that a very small number find it difficult to obtain a post, and often it seems to be a consequence of an unwillingness to be deployed anywhere in the Church of England. The Holy Spirit has a pull to the south!

48. *Revd Alastair Cutting (Chichester)* asked the Chairman of the Ministry Division: What pastoral support structures and subsequent training opportunities are there locally and nationally for curates who, having had so much invested in their training, remain without an appointment on completing IME?

The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James): On completion of IME 1–3, the pastoral support structures and opportunities for further training in place for an ordinand without a post are the responsibility of the candidate's sponsoring bishop, the director of ordinands and the principal of the relevant theological course or college.

There are many reasons why an ordinand is not placed and it is rare that there is no post for that person. Individuals often remain unplaced owing to personal and pastoral reasons whilst some decide to fund further training at their college or course.

Pastoral support and further training for IME 4–7 is provided by the diocesan bishop, the training incumbent and appropriate diocesan staff. Under common tenure a curate will be assessed regularly throughout the curacy to highlight any training needs and in order to prepare him or her for a future incumbency post.

As I said in answer to the previous Question, a willingness to be deployed is a key feature of finding a post.

Revd Alastair Cutting (Chichester): In most dioceses IME is considered incomplete until 4–7. Taking account of a post-first curacy appointment, will the Ministry Division continue to investigate this area, with the assistance of diocesan IME officers, to ascertain the extent of the issue for those who have finished their first curacy in relation to what to do after their continued training?

The Bishop of Norwich: Yes, indeed we will. It will be rather easier to follow up as a result of the assessment-of-curates procedure when it is known that someone has been registered as having satisfactorily completed his or her IME 4–7, which of course has not been the case in the same way in the past.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Can the Bishop help those of us who have so carelessly forgotten what the distinction is between IME 1–3 and IME 4–7?

The Bishop of Norwich: I thought I had made that clear at the beginning. IME 1–3 is what you do in your college or course; IME 4–7 is what you complete after ordination or licensing as a lay minister.

The Chairman: Three supplementary questions are allowed at my discretion.

Revd Canon Deborah Flach (Europe): Does the Ministry Division offer help to curates who seek posts but have trouble with their visas?

The Bishop of Norwich: The Ministry Division does not have that sort of responsibility after ordination; that would be with the diocese. However, there is no reason why the Ministry Division should not support the diocese and the priest concerned.

Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee

49. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Recommendation (xiv) in the report on the second phase of the work of the Review of Clergy Terms of Service (GS 1564) was to the effect that those appointed to interim posts pending pastoral reorganisation should be appointed as rector or vicar on common tenure, with the prospect of reorganisation mentioned in the instrument of an appointment, and that, if displaced, such clergy should be entitled to compensation of the kind proposed in the report for priests in charge displaced by pastoral reorganisation. Has this recommendation been implemented and, if not, what reasons have been given for not doing so?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): This regulation has been implemented. Regulation 30 of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations 2009 provides for this as an alternative to suspending the presentation and appointing a priest in charge if, at the time the appointment is made, the mission and pastoral committee of the diocese has invited the views of interested parties before submitting proposals to the diocesan bishop for inclusion in a pastoral scheme. Under Regulation 30(3), if a pastoral scheme affecting the office is not made within five years, the office ceases to be designated as subject to pastoral reorganisation, with the result that any compensation payable to the officeholder for loss of office is no longer limited to a maximum of one year.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): Does the Bishop have any sense of the proportion of instances in which that alternative is taken up?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: No, I do not. I am grateful for the Question in order to encourage people actually to think about this as a possible way of progressing in circumstances such as those that Miss Dailey and I have outlined.

50. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Does the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee consider it part of its role to offer guidance to clergy and dioceses on the

liability of clergy in relation to minor repairs to the houses they occupy by virtue of their post? If so, when was any such guidance last issued?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): RACSC's terms of reference include the item 'To produce, in partnership with dioceses, a framework of national policy for stipends and other related matters and to advise dioceses on such matters'. The provision of housing is regarded as coming under 'other related matters', and stipend levels are set on the basis that housing is provided.

The Church Commissioners issue guidance to parsonage boards about the duties of incumbents in relation to provided housing, currently in the Code of Practice to the Repair of Benefice Buildings Measure, about which we have already heard in this set of Questions. However, it is for dioceses to set their own policies and issue written guidance about what that they require clergy to be responsible for. The Code recommends that diocesan policies are reviewed and disseminated to clergy on a regular basis.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): Has RACSC any plans to issue guidance to dioceses on the maximum amount that an occupant of a parsonage is expected to spend on minor repairs in any one year, and has it assisted in disseminating the very recently updated Code of Practice to which we have already referred?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds: The update was indeed issued in July 2012 and it is on the Church of England website. We would not want to create a specific amount. The terminology used is the rather curious phrase 'a tenant-like manner', but actually it expresses the obligation that clergy should have and do have in relation to minor repairs.

51. **Revd Jeffrey Stokoe (Sheffield)* asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Giving figures on a diocesan basis, how many diocesan and suffragan bishops and parochial clergy who were in post when it was introduced now hold office on common tenure?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds replied (Rt Revd John Packer): During 2011 two archbishops and 11 bishops (three diocesan and eight suffragan) transferred to common tenure. We are not able to provide figures for bishops on a diocesan basis, as this would run the risk of individuals being identified.

The table below indicates by diocese how many stipendiary parochial clergy (incumbents, team vicars, priests in charge and assistant curates) are on Common Tenure. This includes clergy who:

- were transferred automatically on to Common Tenure when the legislation took effect on 31 January 2011;
- were appointed on Common Tenure after 31 January 2011;
- opted voluntarily to be transferred to Common Tenure.

These figures may be understated, as not all dioceses have been able to provide complete information about the number of clergy on common tenure.

A number of other clergy, including deans, residentiary canons and archdeacons, have either been appointed on, or opted to be transferred on to, common tenure. If these clergy and bishops are included, at 31 December 2011 just over half the stipendiary clergy were on common tenure. Of 8,185 full-time and part-time stipendiary clergy, 4,424 (54 per cent) were on common tenure and 3,761 (46 per cent) were on historic freehold.

Incumbents, team vicars and assistant curates on Common Tenure at 31.12.11

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| Diocese | |
| Bath & Wells | 125 |
| Birmingham | 64 |
| Blackburn | 98 |
| Bradford | 57 |
| Bristol | 78 |
| Canterbury | 82 |
| Carlisle | 85 |
| Chelmsford | 193 |
| Chester | 118 |
| Chichester | 133 |
| Coventry | 67 |
| Derby | 93 |
| Durham | 101 |
| Ely | 72 |
| Exeter | 153 |
| Gloucester | 97 |
| Guildford | 73 |
| Hereford | 41 |
| Leicester | 82 |
| Lichfield | 163 |
| Lincoln | 84 |
| Liverpool | 123 |
| London | 233 |
| Manchester | 146 |
| Newcastle | 60 |
| Norwich | 85 |
| Oxford | 195 |
| Peterborough | 74 |
| Portsmouth | 52 |
| Ripon & Leeds | 79 |
| Rochester | 84 |
| St.Albans | 145 |
| St.Eds. & Ipswich | 83 |
| Salisbury | 117 |
| Sheffield | 62 |
| Southwark | 150 |
| Southwell & Nott | 100 |
| Truro | 69 |
| Wakefield | 72 |
| Winchester | 102 |
| Worcester | 68 |
| York | 105 |

52. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) asked the Chairman of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Nationally, how many bishops who held the freehold before the introduction of common tenure have voluntarily exchanged their freehold for common tenure and what percentage of bishops now hold office under common tenure?

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): The Archbishops of Canterbury and York agreed to be transferred on to common tenure automatically by the legislation. During 2011, the latest date for which we have figures available, 11 bishops moved over voluntarily on to common tenure. By the end of 2011 23 per cent of bishops were on common tenure, including those appointed on common tenure after 31 January 2011. Further figures will be available for the position at the end of 2012.

Council for Christian Unity

53. Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford) asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity: Has consideration been given to whether the Church of England is in full and unimpaired communion with Bishop Mark Lawrence and the Episcopal Diocese of South Carolina?

54. Mrs Lorna Ashworth (Chichester) asked the Chairman of the Council for Christian Unity: Following the recent issue of a Certificate of Abandonment of the Episcopal Church in relation to Rt Revd Mark J Lawrence, Bishop of South Carolina, and recognising that Bishop Lawrence has been one of the declining number of theologically conservative bishops who has sought to remain and to keep his people within TEC, in the light of paragraph 6 in the statement offered to the Synod in GS Misc 1011 in 2011 by the Archbishops, are there any plans to consider proposing to the Synod fuller recognition of the Anglican Church of North America than has been considered appropriate up to this point?

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Christopher Hill): With permission, Mr Chairman, I shall answer these Questions together.

The withdrawal from the Episcopal Church of most of the clergy and people of several dioceses, led by their bishops, after diocesan convention decisions, is a development novel in kind as well as in scale. Our North American sisters and brothers have often been involved in a litigious and sometimes acrimonious debate. We should try to remain on good terms with all parties and avoid inflaming matters further. Our response should be deliberate and not hasty.

As the Archbishops noted in GS Misc 1011, the creation of the Anglican Church in North America raises questions of recognition of orders (ministry), as well as a relationship of communion. The former question is in some respects simpler, because the considerations are more objective, and it is also the more pressing by reason of requests for transfer. Nevertheless there are some matters that require clarification before any decisions can be taken.

Clergy ordained in several churches with which we are not, or not yet, in communion are seeking permission to minister in the Church of England. The Council for

Christian Unity has therefore established a small group to offer advice to the Archbishops through the Faith and Order Commission on the relevant issues. The question about the Anglican Church in North America's orders – whether it is a church and whether its orders are such that we can recognise – will be addressed in that context. This will necessarily involve direct 'engagement with the Anglican Church in North America', which was envisaged in the Archbishops' GS Misc 1011 to which I have referred, and that will be the context for subsequent exploration of relationships between our Churches.

On Saturday a special diocesan convention endorsed the South Carolina withdrawal from the Episcopal Church. The bishop has stated that their position would be to remain within the Anglican Communion as an extra-provincial diocese. The Episcopal Church on the other hand maintains that General Convention consent is necessary for any withdrawal. So the legal, and indeed theological and ecclesiological, position is extremely complicated and absolutely not certain. It has therefore not been possible to consider the consequences for our relationships at this immediate stage, and in my view any statement just at this point would be premature.

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): I thank the bishop for his very detailed answer. What are the moral consequences?

The Bishop of Guildford: I think Question time is for factual rather than ethical advice.

The Chairman: The Question is probably not a proper one.

Church Buildings Council

55. *Revd Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Chairman of the Church Buildings Council: Does the Church Buildings Council monitor the variations between dioceses in the operation of the faculty system, and would it be willing to undertake work to promote best practice nationally in the light of the Synod business relating to the process forecast for next July?

Mr Tim Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich) replied on behalf of the Chairman of the Church Buildings Council: A report on the streamlining of the faculty system, commissioned by the Archbishops' Council, will be discussed by the Council on 27 November. I understand that its recommendations fall into three categories: improvements that can be made by promoting best practice; changes to the rules; and amendments to the Measure. If the report is endorsed by the Archbishops Council, its authors hope that without encroaching too far on the autonomy of the dioceses variations in practice can be minimised to produce a fairer and faster system for parishes.

Revd Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Will the report address in particular the need for simplified procedures for comparatively minor matters, the issue of double jeopardy where churches have to satisfy secular planning authorities as well as the faculty jurisdiction, especially in relation to works in churchyards and outbuildings, and the issue of unnecessary procedures being required for unlisted churches where there would be no equivalent need for secular planning control?

Mr Tim Allen: I very much hope that the reforms will deal with the first problem to which Revd Cawdell refers. However, the other two are problems that arise from secular law as well as from the law of the Church and would be more difficult to deal with.

Revd Mark Steadman (Southwark): Does the Church Buildings Council consult with the Ecclesiastical Judges Association in these matters as well?

Mr Tim Allen: The Church Buildings Council has excellent relations with the ecclesiastical judges and consults with them almost on a daily basis.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Does the Council, or moving forward will it, obtain figures for the relative time that it takes for faculties to be processed from submission to grant where faculties are uncontested, so that we can see the variation, if any, across the Church of England in the delivery of legal services to the parishes?

Mr Tim Allen: Because of limitations in its powers and resources, the Church Buildings Council does not have the detailed figures to which you refer.

Mission and Public Affairs Council

56. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In his speech during the debate in July 2012 on Israel and Palestine, the Bishop of Manchester warned of the serious impairment of Jewish/Christian relations should the motion pass unamended. Given that the motion passed in an unamended form, have there been any concrete signs of such impairment and, if so, what response has the Church of England made?

57. *Mr Robert Hurley (Oxford)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Given the recent cancellation of the visit by the Bishop of Newcastle to an EAPPI-sponsored Holy Land conference in Gateshead, what work is being done to improve relations with the Jewish community after their disappointment with the result of the EAPPI motion passed by the General Synod in July?

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Michael Hill) replied as Vice-Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: With permission, Mr Chairman, I shall answer these Questions together.

Relations with many parts of the Jewish community were strained as a result of the vote, and hurt and anger was expressed in the Jewish press and elsewhere at some of the language used in the debate. Some formal contacts were put on hold by the Jewish community while the impact of the debate and vote was considered. Representatives of the Church of England, the Council of Christians and Jews and the Board of Deputies of British Jews have since met and will continue to meet to address the issues raised.

Whilst noting the strain in relations that the debate caused, it is also important to recognise that the topic of Israel/Palestine does not of itself define Christian/Jewish relations. Formal dialogue continues between the Church of England and different organisations within the Jewish community, through the Council of Christians and

Jews at local and national levels, and internationally through the ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Dr John Dinnen (Hereford): Has the contact with other Jewish groups included Jews for Justice for Palestinians and the Israeli Committee against House Demolitions, which are entirely supportive of EAPPI; and, as the Bishop has answered two Questions together, may I ask a second?

The Chairman: Not unless you can turn it into one very quickly.

Dr John Dinnen (Hereford): – and also, are you aware that 5 per cent of EAPPI volunteers are Jewish, which is a higher instance than the number of Jews in England?

The Chairman: We want only one answer.

Mr Tim Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): At this time I cannot give Dr Dinnen a very accurate answer to the first part of his joint question, but I will take soundings and respond accurately. On the second part, yes, we are aware of the organisations to which he referred and the fact that certain participants in the process are themselves Jewish.

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): In the light of the present critical and tragic situation in the Holy Land even today, what work has been done by the Church of England to further the aims of the Alexandria Declaration to promote peace between Jewish, Muslim and Christian communities in the Holy Land?

Mr Tim Allen: In response to the first part of that, I think that every member of Synod would share Canon Sugden's anxiety about what is happening at the moment. We remembered it in our prayers this morning and will continue to do so. As I was briefed only for the specific Question, I cannot give a full answer to the substance of the question, but I will look into it and respond in due course.

58. *Mr Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What is the current position regarding the Climate Justice Fund launched in September 2009 in conjunction with Tearfund, as its webpage relates to events in 2010 and e-mails to its dedicated address are returned? Is this an initiative that failed despite the ongoing 'Shrinking the Footprint' campaign?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio), in reply: The Climate Justice Fund is part of the 'Shrinking the Footprint' initiative. Supporting the Fund is one of the seven simple steps recommended to churches as part of the overall 'Shrinking the Footprint' campaign. Parishes and individuals can still contribute to the Fund, but a decision was taken in early 2011 that the Climate Justice Fund was not a suitable campaign tool and that campaigning on climate justice issues was probably best done via other Christian development and environment agencies. The campaign section of the website therefore remains dormant, although the Fund remains very much open. Steps have been taken to resolve the e-mail malfunction.

Canon Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): If the campaign section of the website remains dormant, how can ordinary people be aware that the Fund is still open? I have seen nothing to encourage contributions.

Mr Philip Fletcher: There are various ways of making contributions to fight for climate justice, and given the importance of the subject I would encourage participation in all those options. Since it is not seen as suitable as a campaigning front, I do not think that it would be right to press vehemently for additional funding, but I should pay tribute to the dioceses, including St Albans, that have made very substantial contributions towards enabling the 'Shrinking the Footprint' campaign and the Climate Justice Fund to continue to operate.

59. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What representations have been made by the Mission and Public Affairs Council to Her Majesty's Government concerning the so-called Liverpool Care Pathway and its use in the treatment of patients nearing the end of their lives?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio), in reply: The Mission and Public Affairs Council have not yet made any specific representation to Her Majesty's Government with regard to the Liverpool Care Pathway. The Council is however in the process of preparing a response to the consultation on the review of the NHS Constitution. This review contains matters directly pertinent to the Liverpool Care Pathway as well as to other aspects of end-of-life care and is an appropriate vehicle for making known the Council's opinions on the LCP. The consultation process concludes on 28 January next year.

60. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Chairman of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: How many full-time stipendiary Anglican chaplains are employed at airports in England?

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops' Council, ex officio), in reply: The figures are not held centrally. The majority of airport chaplaincy is delivered by part-time and volunteer chaplains and Anglican chaplains work alongside those of other churches and faiths. We are aware of full-time Anglican stipendiary chaplains at Gatwick and Manchester airports and that the Church of England, through the local diocese, is a major funder for ecumenical chaplaincy at some other airports where currently the holder of the post is not an Anglican. Overall, there is much important ministry going on at airports through ecumenical and multi-faith chaplaincy teams made up of full-time, part-time and volunteer chaplains.

Mrs Susan Cooper (London): What steps have been taken to ensure funding to provide full-time chaplains and a career pathway for those who work in this important area of ministry and to enable it to meet the needs of ever increasing numbers of travellers and workers in airports?

Mr Philip Fletcher: It is difficult to give a single answer on the funding issue, which is a matter for dioceses as much as anything. However, perhaps I can draw Ms Cooper's attention to the work that the Mission and Public Affairs Council, in partnership with the Education and Ministry Divisions, is sponsoring to research some

of the issues on the scope, roles and theological foundations of chaplaincy within the Church's ecology of mission and ministry. It is not confined to airports but the question of airports is likely to be a focus of the research being carried out by the Cardiff Centre for Chaplaincy Studies and the Oxford Centre for Ecclesiology and Practical Theology.

Revd Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Is it Mr Fletcher's desire to see their careers take off?

Mr Philip Fletcher: Mr Chairman, I cannot follow that.

The Chairman: I am feeling very indulgent. We will take another supplementary.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Dr Geoffrey Rowell): Is Mr Fletcher aware that there are also Anglican airport chaplains at Vienna, and at Schiphol in conjunction with the Old Catholics?

Mr Philip Fletcher: I am very grateful to the bishop for enlightening me!

The Chairman: It was worth coming back for that, wasn't it?

Business Committee

61. *Mr Nick Harding (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: What steps would need to be taken to make it possible for the three Youth Council representatives on General Synod, who are elected from the Church of England Youth Council, to have full voting rights instead of the limited speaking rights that they currently enjoy?

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford), in reply: To achieve this, both SO 113(a) and the Church Representation Rules, which govern the composition of the House of Laity, would need to be amended. Amending the Standing Orders would require only a simple majority, but an instrument amending the Church Representation Rules would require a two-thirds majority in order to be approved.

62. *Mrs Pamela Bishop (Southwell and Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: In the light of the recognised widening socio-economic divide between the north and south of England resulting from the impact of the financial and economic crisis, has the Elections Review Group in its recent work paid attention to the need for adequate representation of lay people from the northern province so that views and perspective from across the nation may be heard?

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford), in reply: The Elections Review Group considered carefully all the representations that it received and has reported on them to the Business Committee. It was mindful of the position of the northern province. Where there is a clear-cut choice to be made between a proposal for change and continuance of the status quo and it is clear that there is at least some support for change, the Business Committee sees its role as enabling the Synod itself to decide which option it prefers.

Mrs Pamela Bishop (Southwell and Nottingham): In preparation for a well informed debate in July, are there any plans to offer resources that might explain the impact of socio-economic factors on the north/south divide, which might therefore prompt the debate to move beyond just a counting of heads?

The Archdeacon of Dorking: Some time was devoted to this at the meeting of the Business Committee prior to this group of sessions, but because the agenda needed to be sorted out we did not complete that discussion. We shall meet in December. If Synod decides that there should be a February group of sessions we may not have time to sort it out in December, but we will ensure that good, careful material is prepared to enable proper debate to take place when the matter eventually finds its way back here.

63. *Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: In view of the importance of the Anglican Communion, has consideration been given to inviting Primates of the Communion to address the General Synod on a regular basis, for instance once a year?

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford), in reply: Invitations to address the Synod are a matter for the Presidents, but the Business Committee can make suggestions to the Presidents, as indeed can any member. I will invite the Committee to consider whether it wishes to make any such recommendations to the Presidents in this regard.

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): Could consideration be given in particular to inviting a Primate from Africa during the 2013 calendar?

The Archdeacon of Dorking: I am sure that your suggestion has been heard.

64. *Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: To encourage Chairs, where possible, to call a wider pool of members to speak, will the Business Committee consider producing a cumulative report, updated after each sitting of Synod listing (1) by Chair, the members called to speak and (2) by member, the number of times a member has been called to speak?

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford), in reply: Those chairing Synod debates have in front of them alphabetical lists showing the names of members who have spoken previously during the group of sessions and the number of times they have done so. The lists are indeed updated after each sitting.

However, the number of times that a member has spoken is only one of the relevant considerations in the calling of speakers. For example if only one member stands or has indicated a wish to speak against a motion, that member is very likely to be called, however many times he or she has already spoken. Publishing such lists could therefore be highly misleading.

Any concerns about the calling of speakers on a particular item of business should be notified to the Clerk to the Synod, who will pass them to the Chair concerned.

Dioceses Commission

65. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chairman of the Dioceses Commission: How many dioceses now share administrative functions?

The Archdeacon of Nottingham (Ven. Peter Hill) (Southwell and Nottingham) replied as Vice-Chairman of the Dioceses Commission: When the Commission undertook a survey of joint administrative working in 2009 it indicated a varied pattern of such arrangements across at least 19 dioceses. The areas that were most commonly shared were IT (four schemes across nine dioceses) and education (four arrangements of various kinds across 12 dioceses).

Revd Christopher Hobbs (London): Is it the remit of the Dioceses Commission to foster more such relationships or of any other person or body in the Church of England?

The Archdeacon of Nottingham: It is part of the remit of the Dioceses Commission to foster such administrative cross-boundary arrangements. In fact the Commission participated in a workshop in such a way at the diocesan secretaries' conference in 2010, when such considerations were encouraged.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Will the Dioceses Commission provide and publicise a clear analysis contrasting the administrative costs of dioceses substantially sharing functions with those that do not, so that the benefits are clear to the diocesan and deanery synod members of those that do not?

The Archdeacon of Nottingham: I will take that question back to the Commission.

Liturgical Commission

66. **Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission: Has consideration been given by the Liturgical Commission to the publication for use in the Church of England of the forms of worship by those grieving for the loss of a beloved animal, produced earlier this year by the Episcopal Church of the United States?

The Bishop of Wakefield (Rt Revd Stephen Platten), in reply: The Liturgical Commission has not considered this as long as I have been its chairman. The Commission drafts forms of service at the request of the House of Bishops and we have received no such request.

Ethical Investment Advisory Group

67. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chairman of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group: What outcomes can the Ethical Investment Advisory Group report from its conversations with Veolia regarding the company's ongoing involvement, through its divisions and subsidiaries, in providing transport, refuse and other services to illegal Israeli settlements in the Occupied West Bank?

Mrs Jenny Humphreys (Bath and Wells), in reply: The Ethical Investment Advisory Group has been in dialogue with Veolia since 2009 about business activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territories involving the provision of services to settlements. During the period of our engagement the company has sold its settlement-related landfill business, declined to re-tender for a suite of bus services serving settlements and identified a firm to whom it intends to sell its interests in the Jerusalem Light Rail Transit. We have asked for information about two further bus routes about which concerns have been raised and are being kept up to date by the company on its operation of, and exit from, the Jerusalem Light Rail Transit.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): I would like to invite the Ethical Investment Advisory Group to advise Synod whether through any investments at all we are profiting from any current conflicts between Israelis and Palestinians.

Mrs Jenny Humphreys: Could you be a little more specific?

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): If I am allowed, Mr Chairman, I am happy to do so.

The Chairman: Briefly, and specifically.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): I am aware that our change of policy, so that we now invest in –

The Chairman: This is a speech, not a question.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): I just wanted to give more detail. We invest in weapons that are non-discriminatory, but a weapon that is non-discriminatory is a missile, so are we profiting from any investments that might relate to the conflicts that I have mentioned? Are we making any money out of it and are we investing in it? If so, we should not be.

Mrs Jenny Humphreys: The wider question of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group's overall investment in armaments is not specific to this Question. I would not like to give an answer that might be wrong and I will therefore take it back to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group to check.

The Chairman: That brings Questions to an end.

After the closing act of worship, the Session was adjourned at 6.49 p.m.

Second Day

Tuesday 20 November 2012

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 10.25 a.m.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Synod sang the first verse of the National Anthem to mark the 60th wedding anniversary of Her Majesty The Queen and His Royal Highness Prince Philip Duke of Edinburgh.

Legislative Business

Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure (GS 1708D)

Draft Amending Canon No. 30 (GS 1709C)

Draft Measure and Draft Amending Canon for Final Approval

(Final Drafting at the February 2012 group of sessions)

Final Approval debate on the draft Measure adjourned at the July 2012 group of sessions)

Article 7 and Article 8 Business

(Resumed debate)

The Chairman: Members of Synod, gracious magnanimity and attentive listening are watchwords throughout this day and I trust that we will be able to achieve that. It will no doubt be helpful to the Synod if I explain briefly how I plan to shape our deliberations today.

As members know, in order to be carried Item 501 needs a two-thirds majority of those present and voting in each House. Therefore, when the question is put there will need to be a division by Houses. We need to try to reach that point between 5.30 and 6 p.m. to allow enough time for any debate on the Final Approval of the Amending Canon and Petition to Her Majesty the Queen. Whether we vote on the Final Approval of the Measure at about that time will, of course, depend on individual members of the Synod, because in a final approval debate it is not possible to move the Closure, speech limit or Next Business. However, under SO 21(c) I retain a discretion to alter the usual speech limit of five minutes.

That presents a challenge, because we have already received more than 172 requests to speak, and members who have made requests to speak should note that I will not automatically call their names if they do not stand to speak. This means that self-discipline will be necessary on the part of everyone throughout the debate. We shall rely on the good sense of speakers to be brief and not repeat points that have already been made. We shall all need to be sensitive to the mood of the Synod as the afternoon wears on and sense when we have actually had enough.

The main tool that I have at this stage is that I can impose shorter speech limits, which will need to be applied strictly irrespective of who is speaking at the time. SO 17 also requires me to call a member to order for tedious repetition of his or her own

arguments or of arguments already well rehearsed by other members; that is why attentive listening is necessary today. If necessary, I may direct that member to stop speaking. I hope that it will not come to that. Rather I hope that, especially as we near the end of the debate, members will not take up time by repeating what has already been said.

If Item 501 is carried, we will move to vote on Item 502, the motion for final approval of the Amending Canon. That also requires a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. Both the Measure and Amending Canon address the principle of the ordination of women to the episcopate, but I hope that those who wish to speak to the principle will do so during the debate on the Measure. That will mean that the debate on the Amending Canon will need to cover only the details of its provisions.

If the Amending Canon is approved, we shall vote on Item 503, the petition for Royal Assent and Licence, which requires only a simple majority.

I hope that gives members an overview of how I envisage the debate proceeding.

As required by SO 92, I declare on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity that the requirements of Articles 7 and 8 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect of the Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure.

Given that four months have passed since the debate was adjourned, I believe that it would greatly assist the Synod if the Bishop of Manchester, as chair of the Steering Committee, were to address the Synod again on Item 501. Under SO 20(b) I give my permission for that to take place. Does it have the general consent of the Synod?
(Agreed)

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd Nigel McCulloch): Your Grace, members of Synod, as I was saying ...! (Laughter) Following the adjournment of the debate in July and Synod's invitation to the House of Bishops to think again about one of the two amendments that it made in May, today I believe that we are in a different and better place, and in a moment I shall speak about the amendment to Clause 5(1)(c) that the House of Bishops made in September.

I hope that today's debate will do what debates at a Final Approval stage should do, namely look at the legislation in its entirety, with a view to answering one key question: will God's mission and ministry entrusted to the Church of England be better advanced if this legislation is approved or if it is rejected?

To help members of Synod reflect on that fundamental question I will refer first to what has happened since we last met in July; secondly, I will summarize the Measure to which the Synod is being invited to give final approval; and, thirdly, I will explain why I believe the question about final approval should today be given an emphatic Yes.

With regard to clause 5(1)(c), the decision taken by the House of Bishops on 12 September took account of a short but intensive period of consultation. It was clear to the House that some members of Synod simply wanted clause 5(1)(c) deleted while

others thought that it should be retained unaltered. The House however accepted the view of the Steering Committee that both approaches were problematic. By contrast, it seemed to the House, as to the Steering Committee, that the approach suggested by the Revd Janet Appleby had much to commend it.

By adopting the amendment that she devised the House has retained on the face of the Measure an explicit acknowledgement that the selection of male bishops and priests is something on which guidance will have to be given in the code of practice. In addition, as the legal advice to the House makes clear – see the annex to GS 1708-09ZZZ! – the guidance will have to be directed to a particular end, namely that the selection is in a manner that respects the grounds on which the Letter of Request was issued. It therefore will not be simply a case of ‘any man will do’. There will need to be discussion between the diocesan bishop and the parish about the nature of the theological conviction on which the Letter of Request was based and issued, and in the light of that the bishop will need to seek to accommodate the parish’s concerns – clergy and laity – which must be of theological conviction that relate to the consecration or ordination of women and not any other matter.

Next, I give a brief summary of the Measure before Synod for Final Approval. It will mean that all three orders of ministry will be open equally to men and women. Subject to transitional provisions, it will repeal the 1993 Measure and pave the way for rescinding the Act of Synod. Resolutions A and B will therefore disappear in time, as will the Petitions under the Act of Synod. Parishes will have a statutory right to issue Letters of Request and bishops will have a statutory duty to make diocesan schemes under which parishes will be able to receive pastoral ministry and sacramental care from male bishops. Bishops and others will also need to give effect to Letters of Request from parishes seeking a male incumbent or priest in charge. The requirement for diocesan schemes under which bishops will delegate to male bishops will apply to all dioceses and all diocesan bishops irrespective of their gender or convictions and practice in relation to the ordination of women.

Everyone will have to have regard to a statutory code of practice. The Synod will have the ability to propose amendments to the code of practice made by the House of Bishops, and therefore in its final form it will require the agreement of both the House and the Synod.

The legislation contains no sunset clause. It will remain in force until and unless our successors in years to come decide to change it. Without the two changes to clauses 5 and 8 subsequently made by the House of Bishops, this is the legislation that received support in 42 of 44 dioceses.

Thirdly, I urge the Synod to approve this legislation by the necessary two-thirds majorities in each House.

I believe that here we have a Measure which, whatever its imperfections – and all legislation has imperfections – can be made to work. I believe that it will enable the Church of England to flourish and enable women to exercise the leadership that the great majority of us recognise as God’s gift to this Church; and, despite all the understandable concerns from those with theological difficulties about the ordination of women, I truly believe that it will enable them to continue to have an honoured

place within the Church of England and make their own distinctive and valuable contributions to its mission.

I know that the legislation is not what they would have sought, nor frankly is it wholly what I personally have been seeking, but nor is it the legislation that would have emerged had the Church of England decided that it wanted to abandon the mixed economy approach chosen 20 years ago. Had Synod wanted to insist that there was now only one acceptable view on this matter in the Church of England, the legislation before it for approval today would have been shorter and simpler; and that of course is what some here would have preferred, so in this debate let us not underestimate the degree of compromise and accommodation that they have made.

When I cast my vote in favour I will do so because I really do believe that it is the right thing to do. Others will conclude that they must cast their votes against the Measure because they believe that that is the right course, and some may record an abstention because they are simply not sure what the right course is. In the last analysis we must all do what our consciences dictate and then respect the decisions of our brothers and sisters in Christ.

It would be wrong of me to finish without referring to the situation in which we would find ourselves if today's legislation were to be rejected. Had the Women Priests Measure not passed 20 years ago, there would have been much sorrow over the opportunity lost. However, up to the last minute – and I was in the House of Bishops then – we all knew that the outcome would be extremely close, and few of us would have been surprised if the Measure had been lost. By contrast, if today's legislation goes down after all the work and hopes of the past few years, it would be a shock to a large number of people across the Church of England. It would be a devastating blow to the morale of many, not least our female clergy, and a major deterrent to continuing to attract into the ordained ministry able women and many able men. In my view, it would also do real harm to the credibility and mission of the Church of England under God to the people of this nation; they simply would not understand.

We have spent much of the past decade debating this issue and I simply cannot believe that it is in the interests of the Church of England for that debate to go on for a further decade, especially when the overwhelming majority of our dioceses has spoken so clearly. As I have said, I shall vote in favour of this legislation, and for the sake of God's mission through the Church of England I urge the members of all three Houses to do the same today.

Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester): Our main function as a Synod is to be a legislative body and this debate is a legislative debate, so our job is to scrutinize the draft legislation before us and to decide whether it is fit for purpose. This is not a debate about whether we are in favour of women bishops in principle; it is about whether this is the right legislation to introduce women bishops. It would be perfectly possible to be in favour of women bishops in principle, but still believe that this is the wrong legislation by which to introduce women bishops.

I do not believe that this draft legislation would be good for the Church of England. We are all desperate to move on from the sad conflicts of the past few years, but this legislation does not provide a clear way forward; it relies on a code of practice that is

yet to be drawn up and agreed. The danger is that the formation of the code of practice itself would become a new battleground. Both WATCH and GRAS have stated that they would resist any further provision being made in the code of practice that is not already in the Measure. Attempts by the House of Bishops to improve the provision for traditionalists in the code of practice will meet with resistance. The furore in the summer over the bishops' original and modest clause 5(1)(c) gives a clear idea of what we could face. Once established, the code would be open to change, so there could be an ongoing political struggle over the contents of the code for years to come. This legislation would not bring closure, because it does not provide a clear and lasting way forward.

The legislation would not be good for the Church of England, because it relies on a vague concept of respect, translated as 'seeking to accommodate the parish's concerns' in a note from the Legal Office. The note says that it would be open to the House of Bishops to include more detailed guidance in the code as to what respect would involve, but that could be given as rough a ride as the previous clause 5(1)(c) in the lead-up to the July group of sessions.

The problem is that vagueness makes disputes over interpretation and application more likely, and then the really big problem is that such disputes can only be resolved in the secular courts by means of judicial review. We really do not want to resort to the secular courts to resolve Church matters. The expense involved in judicial review would be out of reach for many parishes and potentially a serious drain on the resources that the Church Commissioners make available to diocesan bishops. If we had clear, unambiguous legislation that provided fairly for everyone, there would be little or no need for these kinds of costly legal dispute.

This draft legislation would not be good for traditional Anglo-Catholics, conservative evangelicals and other more central Church of England members who remain to be convinced that women bishops would be an appropriate development in the Christian tradition. According to a recent survey by Christian Research, we number 31 per cent of the Church of England – roughly one third – a very significant minority. We would be forced by this legislation to be under the oversight or jurisdiction of women bishops. Delegation to male bishops would be limited largely to the taking of services. Functions of episcopal oversight such as clergy appointments or licensing would be shared rather than delegated. The code of practice would be an insecure method of provision. Bishops and others would only need to have regard to its guidance; they would not be under a legal obligation to follow it. The existing legal entitlements under the 1992 Measure to pass Resolutions A and B would be repealed, as would the 1993 Act of Synod. There would be no replacement of Resolution A, and Resolution B would become a request. The Act of Synod would be replaced by a code of practice, with no PEVs or other mechanism to guarantee the appointment of any bishops for traditionalists in the future.

The removal of these provisions without proper replacement would be a serious matter, as solemn assurances were given to both Church and Parliament that they would endure as long as they were wanted and needed. Not only would the provision be insecure; it would be unfair. Bishops provided for traditionalists would almost always be acting as suffragan bishops. They would not have oversight in their own

right but would have it delegated to them. They would be second-class bishops, making us second-class Anglicans.

It does not have to be this way. On two occasions in the past few years we have come tantalisingly close to a lasting settlement: first, in the Revision Committee when a majority voted for provision to be made by statutory transfer, which was all the more surprising as the Revision Committee comprised a strong majority in favour of women bishops; and, secondly, when a majority of the whole Synod voted for the amendment proposed jointly by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for co-ordinate jurisdiction. Another option that would merit further exploration is that of provision by a society, an idea that captured imaginations right across the Synod.

There has been much hype about missional disaster if this legislation is not approved today. The survey by Christian Research earlier this year found that 75 per cent of practising members of the Church of England surveyed wanted provision to enable traditionalists to remain; they want us to get this right. A BBC poll among a group drawn from the general population found that 80 per cent would not think less of the Church of England if there were not women bishops. We can therefore take time to get this right. The Church in Wales has been this way before us. In 2008 it rejected unsatisfactory legislation and is now engaged in a new process. We need to take the time to get this right.

This draft legislation is not fit for purpose. It will not deliver the clear and lasting settlement that will enable us to move on together. We should vote against it and make it clear that proper provision for traditionalists has to be an essential ingredient of a new Measure. We could then begin discussions to lead us towards a new Measure that would make fair provision for all, a Measure capable of commanding consensus, bringing peace and unity of purpose. The Catholic group would do everything that it could to enable the development of such a fair Measure and to facilitate its safe passage through the Synod.

We have already played a full part in all the debates and discussions over the formation of legislation for women bishops – in the Synod, in the legislative drafting group and in the Revision Committee. We have responded positively to every invitation to take part in informal discussions outside the synodical process. We have put forward and supported several different methods of provision for traditionalists in a genuine and concerted effort to reach a compromise: a third province, additional dioceses, a society, statutory transfer and co-ordinate jurisdiction. At least three of those have attracted widespread support and interest in the past. We can and must do better than the present legislation, which is no compromise at all, because it has united against it the whole spectrum of traditionalists for whom provision is needed.

I urge Synod to vote against this legislation so that we can do better and move forward together.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): Synod, today we have an opportunity to further the mission of the Church, no less, by supporting this Measure and saying a joyful and heartfelt Yes to it.

Today Synod will hear, and has already heard, speeches from distinguished and learned theologians and will enjoy and gain from them, but the Church of England does not consist only of distinguished theologians. The thousands of people in the parishes, so warmly commended by Bishop Justin in his recent press conference, going about their day-to-day business of loving God and their neighbours, working with their priests and ministers, are the Church of England, and their views have been expressed very clearly; they support this legislation.

When I was first elected to Synod 13 years ago I committed myself to serving with the interests of parishioners in mind. Therefore, although I do not speak with the authority of an ordained person, I speak with the authority of my own lived experience of representing two very different dioceses, and I have become aware that the overwhelming view is that it is timely for the Church of England to have women bishops. 'We must make it work' was the phrase I heard repeated most often in discussions with those of different views, that is we must make this legislation work and not send it into the long grass and spend more years debating, listening, discussing and coming to broadly the same position. This is the compromise so long laboured over.

At last year's July group of sessions we heard an inspirational address from Archbishop Anastasios. He talked about individual orthodox communities being united and said, 'A forest is not more beautiful if it has only one kind of tree. What is needed is that all should be free to grow as their potential permits.' As a laywoman I truly believe that the public ministry of ordained women has been accompanied by an affirmation of the gifts of all and consequently has contributed, alongside male colleagues, to the gradual empowerment of the laity, which in turn is reflected in a more collaborative ministry, and it is through collaborative ministry that the Gospel message is proclaimed in contemporary society.

This Synod warmly endorsed the three themes identified by the Archbishops' Council – going for growth, the common good and re-imagining ministry – and the various Divisions of the Council are working towards those ends. If this Measure is not supported, what on earth are we going to say about re-imagining ministry to the men and women in the 42 dioceses who have made their views clear, to the 3,400 ordained women in the Church of England, to the nearly 50 per cent of ordinands who are women, to senior women clergy, to women archdeacons and deans, and to the 36 – now 37 including the Bishop of Swaziland – women bishops in the Anglican Communion? Do we say, 'Well, in re-imagining ministry we did not mean to re-imagine it to the extent of enabling gifted and talented ordained women to be fully included in all three orders – we do not have that much imagination'? Of course we do not say that. Of course we have imagination. We have it in bucket-loads when we see what is going on in the dioceses, but we have more than imagination; we are blessed with gifted, God-called women ready and waiting, so now is the right time to do the right thing and complete the process begun in 1992 and initiated long before then.

I hope and pray that those who are hesitant will trust our bishops to implement generously the scheme of arrangements for parishes that wish or need to have a male priest or bishop. Legislation is no substitute for pastoral care, and a code of practice is no substitute for trust. Supporting this Measure will enable us as a Church to offer a

model of living with our differences in confidence and love, and not legislating for them in anxiety or fear. In the Exeter diocese we have a range of traditions, and ways of working have been developed that enable those of different traditions to receive and experience priestly ministry. That has not been without some heartache, but nevertheless it has been held together not through legislation but through the wise leadership of our bishop underpinned by relationships, relationships of courtesy, kindness, tolerance and respect. This Measure may be debated, supported and enacted nationally, but it will be lived out and implemented locally through local relationships.

Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield): Pete, Matt, Paul, Dave, Andy, Martin, Chris, Nolan: a list of names, yes, but real people, all former ministry trainees in one local parish church who have gone on to theological college in the past 10 years – an example of how seriously the local church takes the priorities that this Synod has articulated, facilitating Church growth, and contributing to the common good.

As a local church we wholeheartedly agree. Our vision is about growing the parish, planting churches and training leaders. We consider ourselves loyal Anglicans who continue to uphold the historic orthodox faith as written in the Scriptures and expressed in the 39 Articles and Creeds. But – and it is a big but – the legislation that we are debating today as it is now framed tells us that despite past assurances our theological convictions about the consecration of women to the episcopate are not legitimate. Are we legitimate Anglicans? We believe that as God's chosen people, wholly and dearly loved, the ordering of relationships in His Church and in our families should be distinctive, counter-cultural in the 21st century, and should reflect the equality, complementarity and servant-hearted loving submission of Father, Son and Spirit.

Let us be clear. If this legislation is given final approval today, it will promote the loss of conservative evangelical and traditional Catholic ministry in the Church of England. Indeed that process has already started. Remember my list of the men who have so far completed their theological training? Only one has been ordained in the Church of England. Given the statistics about future clergy numbers, I suggest to Synod that the Church cannot afford this loss. Despite assurances, we expect that trend to continue, so the future is already here, at least as far as the crisis in ordained ministry is concerned. If we are serious about sharing the Gospel with the nation, England cannot afford this loss. As a local church we have the potential to be part of the solution. We want to be part of the solution, but will Synod let us be?

Today, as the Apostle Paul said, let us clothe ourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience. Let us bear with each other, forgiving whatever grievances we may have with one another. Forgiving as the Lord forgave us, let us put on love, which binds us all together in perfect unity. I dare to challenge members not to bow to cultural pressure but to pull us back from the brink of disunity and to vote No to this legislation.

The Archdeacon of Hackney (Ven. Rachel Treweek) (London): Much of England smiled this summer as we celebrated the Olympics and Paralympics. Amidst all that was not quite right, amidst various controversies, we can still say 'That was good'. However in the preceding months that was not the song being sung in parts of east

London. There were endless meetings and missives about potential disaster, transport nightmares, local people facing crises, so we made plans to support local people, we updated major incident plans, and at times it felt as though the default position was fear and resentment. The joyous reality was very different from the perceived prediction. I know that this is a poor comparison with what faces us today, but it reflects something of where we are now as a Church and where we can be once we live the experience of men and women as bishops.

In July I urged us not to do competitive pain. Now I also urge us not to compete for places of honour. In this kingdom season we rejoice in our communion together as saints in Christ by grace alone. Honour is something that we give to each other. I am married to a vicar who faithfully serves two parishes with Resolutions A and B. As an archdeacon I relate to both traditional Catholic parishes with resolutions in place and those who hold fast to male headship. All of us are loyal Anglicans and we indeed need to honour one another, not to seek protection from one another.

Recently I heard a speaker telling a story of passing Buckingham Palace with her children. They were looking at all the high fences and huge walls, which made one of the children ask who lived there and was told, 'The Queen.' The child looked again at the high fences and said, 'Mummy, if she gets out what will she do to us?' The way we perceive this Measure is important. Is it truly about protection? Fences can be about protection; they keep people out or in, but sometimes they are not there primarily to do either. Sometimes they mark boundaries, which provide clarity and allow people to live better together.

We now have a Measure that has created appropriate boundaries to offer space and respect to all, so that people can hold their integrity, their identity, keep good conscience and live in communion with each other as we seek to be Christ's good news to the world. The words of the Measure do not now diminish anyone, respect for theological conviction has weight, and there will be diocesan schemes. I believe that adequate provision has been made for those who cannot accept women bishops – and 'adequate' is a key word. It is not perfect for any of us; it is compromise for all, as it should be.

I believe that those who say we can do better are unable to accept the reality of the impossibility of the perfect squaring of the circle. We need to have the courage to say that we have worked at this and that there is no solution that will give everyone what they most want; and anyway surely the focus should not be on whether this gives me or you what we need? This is about the Kingdom of God and us seeking faithfully to be Christ's Church, and in that we are of course called to look out for each other's needs.

I believe that we now have a bridge that is strong enough for us to walk over, and let us not reject God's call to be prophetic in our world – a call to demonstrate how it is possible as Christians to live together in places of immense difference, not to flee or fight but to stay connected. When Jesus' followers went to the tomb on the first Easter morning and found the stone rolled back, anxiety levels must have surged – fear and confusion. Fortunately, they did not linger on the edges for too long, and those who took the risk of entering discovered a place of resurrection and a new way ahead. May

we not linger on the edges any more. I urge us to have the courage to say Yes to this Measure and to live the kingdom season.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner): I am very grateful to my friend Rachel for making many of the points that I too want to make, but I have to be clear that I come to a different conclusion about the way I shall vote today.

There is a general impression that Christians are quick to tell you what they are not in favour of but slow to tell you what they think is really good, and I want to stick with the second of those options. Although I shall vote against this legislation, I want to say something about the serious and positive reasons for doing so and our intent in doing so for the discipleship and good of our Church.

Among the messages and videos that appeared on the Lambeth website, underlined by the Bishop of Manchester today, I noted the recognition of theological principle as a reason why some might vote against this Measure. I welcome that recognition as an affirmation that in this and any debate we are committed to hearing all the voices of theological conscience, including those, like mine, that come from a minority. So, first, my voice and vote are grounded in our recognition of the freedom of theological conscience, a freedom for which I want to say we are enormously grateful that we belong to this Church and are part of this Synod, and for that character.

Secondly, the vote has the effect of registering a constituency. A ‘traditionalist constituency’ is not a precise term since there are a number of people holding quite different views who nonetheless find themselves together within it. Traditionalists voting against the Measure are registering an expression of something provided for within the boundaries of Anglican tradition. Their votes are not simply statements of private judgement but expressions of a recognised and accepted theological view about the principle of the admission of women to the presbyterate and the episcopate – a view that seeks adequate structural expression.

However, there is an obligation to be clear about the scope and limitations of holding that principle. The principle for traditionalist Anglo-Catholics has been well rehearsed. It arises from the lack of consensus on this development in the universal Church, which includes, as well as ourselves, the Roman Catholic Church and the churches of the east, with whom we share the threefold shape of ordination, a sharing that Anglicans have always honoured in a way that gives shape to our understanding as traditionalist Anglo-Catholics; and it is also an important element at the heart of our continuing ecumenical discussions.

It is a matter of profound disquiet and pain that there should ever be any occasion when Christians of the same communion do not express that bond in the sharing of the one bread and the common cup of the Eucharist. The grounds for that refusal can only be of the utmost seriousness. For some of us the ecclesial character of which gender is the greater part of the minister of the Sacrament opens up such grounds, but it is precisely the gravity of this action that lays upon our refusal the utterly serious requirement to honour in all other respects the women who are ordained as deacons and priests, and perhaps soon as bishops, and those who receive their ministry as a joyful, lawful, legitimate and fruitful expression of the working of God’s sacramental grace – the majority view, let it be noted, within our Church.

I therefore resist any assumption that a vote against this Measure implies necessarily that those who do so vote believe that women are inferior to men or must be subject to men or that they do not have the skills and capacity for the exercise of ministry as priest or bishop. What is crucially important here is the unresolved question among us of what theological significance, if any, we are to attach to gender differentiation that affirms the dignity and equality of women and men together. What did God intend in the creation of male and female?

Serious concerns remain about the scope and reliability of the provision for traditionalists within this Measure; we have already heard of that. If the Measure is passed I will continue to do all I can to make it work in ways that honour women and men together in the exercise of their ordained ministry within the bounds of our diverse theological convictions. St Anselm spoke of Christianity as faith seeking understanding. Building on that, I wish to speak of faith seeking communion, seeking how to be able to live with difference and integrity in the dynamics of the search for what ultimately unites us. The cast of my vote is in the direction of the need for further travel and fuller consensus.

The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd James Jones): Is the future of the Church of England at stake? If so, it is the future of England that is at stake also. With one-third of all clergy being women, the parish network so vital to our national mission would now collapse without their ministry in leadership. In thousands of parishes the mission of God through the Church of England already depends on the leadership of women. Yet I understand why those who take seriously the authority of Scripture believe that a woman should not exercise such leadership or headship, why she should not be a priest or a team rector or a bishop, why she should not even be a member of the General Synod exercising authority over the Church; I understand that theological position.

I understand it for I held a similar theological understanding of 1 Corinthians 11. In that chapter Paul writes: 'I want you to understand that the husband is the head of the wife and God is the head of Christ.' Yet I came to see that to believe that God is the head of Christ cannot mean that Christ is subordinate to God or that Christ has less authority than God, otherwise we would be denying the full divinity of Jesus. Therefore, headship in this verse cannot mean that a woman is subordinate to a man or has less authority than a man in the family and in the Church.

This different understanding of headship helped me when I was ordained and swore the oath of allegiance to the Crown. With that oath all priests, all presbyters, in the Church of England acknowledge the authority of a female minister, namely the Queen, the Supreme Governor of the Church of England. When she gives Royal Assent to promulge our Canons we recognise her authority over us. The Book of Common Prayer shows that the ministry of a bishop is to feed the Body of Christ, and the Scriptures tell us that it was a woman who first physically fed the Body of Christ. If a woman can feed the Body of Christ in the flesh, she can surely feed the Body of Christ in the Spirit.

For centuries women have been doing this on the mission field. I was so aware of this when I was on the staff of the Scripture Union, that worldwide evangelical movement, and recognised the extraordinary leadership of women on the mission field. Indeed

without the leadership of women the worldwide church would be smaller, and in Liverpool under the leadership of women clergy, men and women are taking the Gospel into some of the toughest urban areas. The truth is that without women in leadership we are no longer able to serve the people and parishes of England. Women serve as leaders in Scripture, on the mission field, as Supreme Governor and in this General Synod.

As a bishop who throughout his ministry has sought to honour the place of traditional Catholics and conservative evangelicals, I now believe that for the mission of God to the people of England it is right for women to take their place in this House of Bishops seated before us now.

Revd Prebendary David Houlding (London): Last week I met a lady who said to me somewhat passionately, 'I don't know what to pray for.' Her words have haunted me ever since, and I find myself facing the same dilemma. How might we pray today? For all of us it is a difficult question. There are no winners today. There are not two sides in this debate. As St Paul reminds us, we are all for Christ and we love his Church, his bride.

We all know that there will be pain, distress, anger and tears whichever way the vote goes, and we know that whichever way the vote goes the discussion will continue. In a sense it reflects badly on all us, does it not, that we are here today having this debate? We lock ourselves into our corners, but we also have to be true to ourselves and follow our consciences, as the Bishop of Manchester said in his opening speech. We have to protect the rights of the minority who find themselves unable to accept this legislation. The majority can afford to be generous. As Archbishop Rowan taught me many years ago, there is no right answer; both sides are right. We are all right and we all seek to be obedient. The discussion will continue and we will make sure that it does if the Measure fails today.

Like the Bishop of Chichester, I am committed to the process of ensuring that the code of practice delivers what we need it to, and therein will lie our battle. In everything that the Archbishop has always spoken of the absolute necessity to put in place provision that does not depend on the uncertain and shallow nature of a code of practice, we have to repeat in the gentlest but firmest way possible that a code of practice will not do. It was the mantra, the response to the psalm that I framed the very moment it was suggested, namely that a model of delegation not in primary legislation but dependent solely on a code of practice can never do, because a code of practice cannot enshrine theological conviction. If this legislation is not clear, what hope can there be that a code of practice will ever work? It seems that here we have reached an impasse, especially with the Archbishops' own amendment having been rejected – if only! But we are where we are.

I regret too that the discussion we were promised when I tabled my amendment to Synod at the outset of the process in 2000 asking for full and proper consultation with the wider Catholic Church wherein we can recognise in our practice and discipline the same manner of ordination – it is from the wider Church that our orders are derived in the first place – has not happened. By what authority do we today make this decision on our own? What would it do to the ARCIC process? It simply will not do to pretend that it will make no difference; it will make all the difference, and the Archbishop of

Westminster has recently made that abundantly clear. It does matter that there is something in our Anglican polity whereby the wider Universal Church can recognise the continuity of the Church's Catholic practice and discipline in the matter of holy order.

Waiting. We need to wait patiently in prayer – prayer that God will bring us to a consensus. It seems right to the Holy Spirit and to us, not just to some of us, and should we not have more waiting on the Lord in prayer instead of rushing to vote on divisive legislation that purports to offer provision for a minority, which not one member of that minority has indicated would remotely work for them? [*Several members*: Hear, hear!] However we need to go on praying, and pray I will. I am committed to this process, whatever we decide today, that the Lord's will may be done, because we all have an honoured place in the life of our beloved Church.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Janet Appleby (Newcastle): Today we will make a decision whose future effects we cannot predict. How can I say that with such confidence? For a start, I certainly failed utterly to predict the consequences of proposing an amendment that somehow became known as the Appleby amendment. Something that Prebendary David Houlding said in February keeps coming to my mind, namely that all our orders are provisional, and that has led me to reflect on the provisional nature of all our actions. We live in the in-between times waiting for the eschaton. As St Paul says, now we see only through a glass dimly, but then we will see face to face. Fortunately we can trust the future to God. We can have faith in God's extraordinary power to bring forth good even from our mistakes. This in no way absolves us from the responsibility to do our best, but should reassure us that if we fail all is not lost – thanks be to God.

We need to keep the purpose of this Measure before us. We should remember that we have more in common than that which divides us and not allow ourselves to be distracted by potentially alarmist scenarios. We need to be reassured that it is possible for us to remain one Church despite holding contradictory beliefs. Why is that proving so difficult? The trouble is that our disagreement is absolute – either a woman can or cannot be a bishop – so any concession to one side immediately risks undermining the other. We walk a tightrope between respecting the authority of a woman bishop and respecting the theological convictions of those who cannot accept her. I believe that this Measure is the best compromise we can possibly find.

Then there is the word 'respect'. Much has already been argued about its legal force, which is considerable, but what about its moral and spiritual force? For Christians the moral and spiritual authority of a word should carry more weight, reminding us that we are required at all times to trust one another with respect. That would ensure that parishes unable in conscience to accept women priests and bishops will be able to receive appropriate ministerial and episcopal oversight. To expect anything less would be to fail to keep faith with the Measure. The intention of my amendment was clear. It was proposed in good faith to that end, and my fervent hope is that we will have rare recourse to formal legal processes and that dialogue and mediation will ensure that we continue to work together for God's kingdom.

We should also trust and respect our bishops. They have experience of making Church law work in their dioceses and overwhelmingly they see this as the best way forward. We should trust and respect clergy of all traditions, including senior women clergy who indicate their willingness to work with this legislation, and the overwhelmingly supportive will of the dioceses. To vote No today would be to say that we are incapable of using mutual trust and respect to work out our differences. To vote Yes would give the bishops the gift that they have asked for, being able to include women in their number – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*)

Revd Canon Rebecca Swire (Chichester): Today I have to be true to my theological convictions and vote No to this Measure, because I do not believe that the Church of England has the authority to make this decision about women bishops. However I do not mind admitting that the Measure in front of us has been the cause of a significant number of sleepless nights. We have ended up with words that no one seems particularly keen on. The messiness of the Church of England is, I would contend, part of its theological identity. It does not have one clear doctrinal standpoint on many things, and we cannot pretend that it does. It is a broad Church encompassing a breadth of traditions reflected in every congregation. Today we need to ask ourselves whether this Measure remains true to this distinctive identity that values these different traditions as equal parts of the Church of England. Will it allow Christians of different traditions not merely to exist together but to thrive together, enriching the Church and God's mission?

A Sacrament consists of different elements – words, an outward and visible sign, intention, and the action of the Holy Spirit. Some liturgical and Anglican rites that are quite susceptible to this can at times contain quite vague wording but still say enough to be OK when set alongside those other elements. Alongside the wording of this Measure we must look at the intention. Is it about trying to include rather than exclude? Is it about making sure that all continue to have an honoured place or simply putting up with others? It is not clear, and we have heard and read different things. The words of this Measure have been widely criticized. The intention of many is far from clear. We have no visible sign in a code of practice. This is such an important decision. It is not about who we like or trust but about the nature of the Church and what it means to be a member of the Body of Christ. If it is to happen, let us make sure that the Measure is right.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam): In 1864 Revd Sir James Erasmus Phillips, Vicar of Warminster, spoke to a meeting of the Church Congress in Bristol and called on women to work alongside men in the mission fields. They had a part in the fall, he said, and must work for our redemption with us!

When I was made a deacon in 1979 my mother said, rather too loudly, that she would find it difficult to fully believe in the Church of England until there was a female Archbishop of Canterbury. I have grown up with this, and my parents worked for the ordination of women in all three orders; and yet had I been a member of the General Synod in 1992 I would have struggled to vote in favour of the ordination of women as priests because I felt that the legislation was too hedged around and encumbered, too qualified, and that what was needed was a clear decision, and I would have been wrong.

What we have experienced over the past 20 years is the ministry of women graciously leading in parishes and Christian communities in the ministry and mission of God's Church. A third of the clergy in the diocese of Salisbury are female, including the dean, the director of ministry and the new Archdeacon of Wilts. If we are serious that we want to choose and allow God to bring forth from among us the best of our clergy into the episcopacy we must include women in this order as well. Forty-two of 44 dioceses – 75 per cent of those who voted – have made it clear that this is wanted by the Church at large. It is important for us as a Synod within the Church and for the nation that today we vote Yes. Even if we feel that there are doubts and that the legislation is hedged around, the compromise is indeed a good one for all of us.

Mrs Lorna Ashworth (Chichester): I really struggle to see how, when facing the obvious reality, we continue forward telling ourselves that all will be OK. We have already been told today that if this Measure does not pass many women will be deterred from entering the ordained ministry, but I want to know what we do with the conservative evangelicals. We have already heard that churches are growing, that they are large and are planting more, and yet even before we have a chance to vote on this Measure today people holding my theological conviction are being told that they are not welcome. How?

Let me give three examples. First, not one diocesan bishop holds a complementarian view; second, there has never been a PEV who holds a complementarian view; and, third, papers that have been circulated to Synod members over the past few years up until this point encourage the shutting down of my theological conviction, that is, not even to select men for training who hold this view. If this discrimination already exists with the present legislation, how with much weaker legislation can we have any hope for the future? I could not possibly consider voting Yes in these circumstances when the words 'trust and respect' have no legacy thus far.

Miss Hannah Page (Church of England Youth Council): When I spoke in this debate in July I said that we need to get excited again. I feel that the excitement has returned but also a sense of fear. With a God as amazing as ours we need not be frightened. At the moment my university chaplain's favourite phrase is, 'God is bigger.' He is bigger than me, he is bigger than the groups with whom we associate and he is bigger than this Synod; he is definitely bigger than this issue.

Last week I was privileged to meet the most Christ-like person I have ever met. Never before have I seen Jesus in someone as much as I did in her. What struck me most about her however was that she is not even a Christian. Why do I find Christ and his loving, caring nature more in non-Christians than in my own church? This morning we shared Holy Communion using the words 'Though we are many we are one body'. Why do we not act like it? We shared the bread and wine together as Christians, not as our respective groups within the Church of England.

In 1992 I was one year old and I have grown up in a Church of England in which the ministry of women has always been there, active and enriching. Indeed it appears to me that we have been discussing this issue for my entire life and waiting for this decision for 20 years. I urge members not to make me wait until I am 30 to see this Measure approved. Now is the time to pass it. I hope that today will be the last time we can refer to 'women bishops' but instead simply as 'bishops'.

Mr Adrian Vincent (Guildford): I have always said to those who elected me that I would vote for the legislation on women bishops if it made provision to meet the theological needs of traditionalists. Ministry provided under the delegation of a woman bishop cannot by definition meet the biblical headship needs of conservative evangelicals or the sacramental assurance needs of Anglo-Catholics. Many options would meet those needs. I would have voted for women bishops in a third province or in a non-geographic diocese, for the Bishop of Guildford's transferred episcopal arrangement scheme, for the Bishop of Gloucester's special episcopal arrangement scheme, for the society model or for the Archbishops' co-ordinate jurisdiction proposal; and, against my better judgement because it did not really meet the needs, I would probably have voted for the legislation in July with the original clause 5(1)(c).

I am not being the awkward squad. However when the phrase 'theological convictions' has to be deleted from the Measure because some did not want those theological views to be given official recognition in legislation, do we really expect traditionalists to sign up to that, to expect them to agree that their theological convictions have to become the new love that dare not speak its name?

It has been said that this draft legislation represents a compromise on all sides. The dictionary defines the word compromise as 'a joint agreement made by contending parties'. Two of the three main contending parties, WATCH, Forward in Faith and Reform, oppose this draft legislation, so there is no joint agreement. Synod speeches and votes have failed as a method of dispute resolution. Regretfully we need to vote against this legislation. There will be much justifiable anger and impatience and we will need to channel it into a new process that begins outside the politics of Synod. The first step will be for the leaders of WATCH, Forward in Faith and Reform to meet with a mediator and ecclesiastical legal expert, such as Mark Hill QC, to agree a scheme with which the three of them can live. When our three lobby groups recommend that scheme when it comes to Synod, the voting will be far more than a two-thirds majority and the Church will be able to ordain women as bishops on the basis of some genuine unity. I urge members to vote against the motion.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): When I was first elected to the Synod as a young man in 1985 I was surprised and delighted that my mother, a staunch Methodist, chose to come to the inauguration service at Westminster Abbey. In the 28 years since that time she has supported me in my convictions that a church must be inclusive of young and old, of women and men, and I say to my shame that I have learnt only more recently to be convinced of gays as well as heterosexuals.

I was with my mother again last week in her final illness. When she died I had a powerful sense of unfinished business, but in this week that passes for normal between the death and the funeral I am strongly reminded of that. At that funeral on Monday my teenage children will be present, so for me now this is personal. I was not able to explain to my mother why over the past 20 years we have failed to make the Church of England fully inclusive of women. I do not want to wait too much longer to have the same conversation with my teenage daughter, who was confirmed into this Church recently.

I am very well aware of the danger of an emotional appeal and I do not want to make one. There are deeply held convictions on all sides here. However to those who

cannot in conscience accept women in the episcopate I would say: we are not trying to cast you out, we want to do this with all grace and generosity, but could you please also make a place for my teenage children who do not easily recognise in this Church as it now appears a place of grace and a place in which all may flourish?

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): The gospels do not record Jesus ever making a Synod speech, but he told stories, so here is a story.

The light of heaven skipped off the flat surface of the lake. God sat on the bank and watched a line drawn on the water's surface. Behind him shimmered the spires of the heavenly city. God sighed deeply. His friend the otter surfaced and scrambled up the bank, shook himself and settled down beside God. 'They're getting you down again, aren't they?' said the otter. God smiled. 'Let's just say it's good to be out here with you', he replied. 'Have you been watching the General Synod again?' asked the otter. 'Well, just keeping a paternal eye, you know', replied God, drawing circles in the water with his toe. 'Bit tense, is it?' said the otter. 'Well', said God with a wry smile, 'let's just say they don't seem to be enjoying life in all its fullness at the moment.' Silence descended on the pair for a few moments and then God stood up, picked up a smooth, flat stone, ran his fingers lovingly over it and with a flick of his wrist sent it skimming over the water.

It went almost as far as the otter could see, then it turned in a tight circle and sped back across the lake, skipping back into God's hand having kissed the water 300 times. 'You're showing off again, God', said the otter. God sat down again. 'Some of them sound as though they're afraid of me', he said. 'Well', said the otter after a pause, 'it's about how they see you. They call you almighty and king and everybody tiptoes round kings.' 'But', said God, 'you know that I love them. I just want every human being to be the best they can be and use all the gifts I've given them.' 'I want them to love and I want them to be free', he said wistfully. 'I know, I know', said the otter patiently, 'but love and freedom are dangerous ideas. Once they're out there you can't control them. They scare most humans, which is why they try to contain them, to contain you.'

God sighed again. 'You mean that's why they're trying to limit me, fencing me in with their history, their book and their ideas?' 'Exactly', replied the otter. 'If they can cut you down to size a bit, stop you and the Spirit being so unpredictable, so playful, they can actually hit each other over the head with you. If they can say that you've always said this or always done that, then there's no argument.' 'But I just want them to join us in the dance', said God. 'Dance?' said the otter – 'How about a swim instead?' So they both stood up, took a deep breath and jumped, making a splash that could almost be heard on earth – by anyone who was listening!

Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford): Tomorrow morning we will all have to wake up and deal with the consequences of our actions today. There will be relief and pain whatever the result of the vote. I therefore think it is important that we consider a sense of proportionality about these consequences. If the proposed legislation passes, there will be those who feel that the assurances they have been given are too weak, but those assurances will be firmly in place. If the proposed legislation fails, the consequences will, I believe, be far more severe. Of course it is personal. I will wake up knowing that the ministry to which I am called is not truly accepted by the Church,

but there are bigger issues here. First, as a church for a whole country we will be seen to have failed to do what is right and honourable. A church with lower moral standards than the rest of society risks its right to comment on other issues. Second, it will inevitably be seen as the act of a dying church more wedded to the past than committed to hope for the future. Third, it cannot fail but to be seen as a vote of no confidence not only in our present Archbishop but also in our archbishop designate and pretty much the entire House of Bishops.

There will be consequences for the way Synod votes. If we vote Yes, there will be those who feel sad and uncomfortable, but there is strong provision for them. If we vote No, the mission of the Church will be severely compromised, our future archbishop will be compromised before he has even begun his work, and the hundreds of women priests who serve faithfully, creatively and sacrificially will have been rejected and feel unsure of their future in this Church. I therefore urge members to use their votes wisely, most especially if they believe that women bishops can be part of the Church but have a natural sympathy for those opposed. Votes against will not improve the legislation; they will simply be votes that say No to women bishops. I ask members to abstain or to vote Yes.

Revd Prebendary Roderick Thomas (Exeter): I liked the story of God and the otter and the idea of God being a playful God, because I think that during the course of our many debates all sorts of game have been played, and one of the great surprises for me has been the discovery of friends whom I never knew I had. I never knew for example that Tom Sutcliffe could turn out to be such a friend who does not see eye to eye with me but nevertheless spoke and wrote very movingly about how this legislation leaves conservative evangelicals in an impossible position.

I want to say a little about why that is and what our theological problems are. I think it comes back to what the Bishop of Liverpool said – that what we do in the Church models something very important in relation to what we believe about God. Although the Bishop of Liverpool drew different conclusions, because he stopped at 1 Corinthians 11, it would have been good had he gone on to 1 Corinthians 15, where Paul writes of Jesus Christ: ‘When he has done this’ – i.e. triumphed over every enemy including death – ‘then the Son himself will be made subject to him who put everything under him, so that God may be all in all.’ In modelling subjection and headship in the Church we seek to model that equality that we see in God between Father and Son, but also model the subjection that we see eternally in Son to Father.

Our theological position on this is not satisfied by the legislation simply because the legislation requires us conservative evangelicals to accept the authority of women bishops who we believe the Bible says should not be in that position, simply because, if they are, they are unable to do the modelling that the world so needs. We have to accept that authority, because even when we are given an alternative bishop through a diocesan scheme we have to accept that he is a delegate of the female bishop. Therefore, all along the line we are accepting the authority of a woman bishop.

In other words, we are required to accept something that we do not believe the Bible teaches. It is profoundly un-Anglican to force people into this position. Article VI of the Articles of Religion, which refer to the sufficiency of Scripture, states that if something cannot be proved by Scripture one way or the other, it is not to be required

of anyone to be believed as an article of faith, and yet this would do it. I therefore ask Synod to preserve the Anglican position and vote against the Measure.

The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Geoffrey Rowell): This debate touches on the identity of the Church of England, which is affirmed in the Declaration of Assent to be part and only part of the One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. It shares a faith and order reaching back to the apostles, an order that is a given, which is surely why at services of ordination we are asked, ‘Do you accept the Christian faith as the Church of England has received it?’ John Henry Newman’s cardinalatial motto, ‘Heart speaks unto heart’, to which the Archbishop referred in his sermon at the Eucharist this morning, asks the sharp question at the beginning of that great movement of Catholic revival, ‘On what ground do you stand, O presbyter of the Church of England?’

As one brought up in the Catholic tradition of the Church of England, ordained a priest in that tradition, consecrated a bishop in that tradition, and believing that tradition to be an integral and identifying part of our Anglican heritage, I have of course throughout my life sought to serve the whole Church in theological reflection and pastoral ministry. I served as a member of the Rochester Commission, which sought to set out the biblical roots and ancient common traditions in relation to *episcopate*, and at the end we concluded that there were arguments for and an equal number of arguments against the ordination of women as bishops. I still believe that the Commission’s report should have been sent to the dioceses in order that they might reflect on those two different final conclusions. I believe that the ordination of women to the episcopate is a judgement that belongs to the whole Church, not just to a part of it, and my ecumenical experience as Bishop in Europe largely confirms this.

In our vote today therefore there is an issue of principle and an issue of the particular legislation before us. That legislation must provide for those who, like me, are not convinced that the Church of England has the authority to do this without wider Catholic consent and, if it does wish to do it, without proper provision for those who stand by the faith and order of the undivided Church. I do not believe that this legislation provides for the recognition and flourishing into the future of those who on biblical and traditional grounds take what might be called a traditionalist position.

The 1998 Lambeth resolution, which I and Bishop Victoria Matthews initiated, recognised that both those able to accept and unable to accept the ordination of women to the episcopate were loyal Anglicans. It is as a loyal Anglican and a bishop in the Catholic tradition who genuinely seeks to serve all within my care that I believe this legislation does not succeed in securing an honoured and continuing place for traditionalists.

I respect – and, as Paula Gooder said, the word respect could be translated as reverence where it occurs – the positions of those in the past and those of my brothers and sisters in Christ of the great churches of the east and the west, and in respecting those convictions, and my own, I will vote against the Measure – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*)

Colonel Edward Armitstead (Bath and Wells): Having been so very close on a number of occasions to finding a way of consecrating women bishops, it is a great

pity that the Measure we have before us now is so unsatisfactory. If this Measure is passed today, there will not be peace and growth in the Church but, instead, division and further decline.

The process has been long and drawn out, but I question how thorough it has been and whether the views of those who are opposed to women bishops have been listened to. Even at the stage of the Rochester report, we now know that those in favour of women bishops were determined to press ahead without giving those opposed proper consideration. Bishop Tom Wright appealed to General Synod in July 2010 to do properly what it had never yet done: to address the necessary theological and biblical case and not simply to fall in with what contemporary culture requires.

This Measure as it stands is discriminatory and does not offer assurance to the almost third of Church members who cannot accept female headship. In a democracy, the will of the majority prevails but the needs of the minority should be catered for. The majority of diocesan synods have given their approval to the Measure, but is Synod unwilling to acknowledge the 23 per cent of the laity who voted against the Measure? Can we be sure that diocesan synods were given the opportunity to hear the concerns and theological standpoint of those opposed to women bishops? I know that in one diocese, for example, a conservative Evangelical General Synod member was not called to speak, so how informed have these diocesan synod debates been?

It has been suggested that if this Measure fails today the Church will be mocked and ridiculed throughout the land. I do not believe that this will be the case, but what does it matter if it is? It will give an opportunity for an honest and open dialogue externally and internally. It will enable us to explain to people outside the Church that we are not governed by the secular culture and agenda of the day but, rather, by what we learn from God's revelation of himself in the Bible. Within the Church, those who are in favour of women bishops and who desire to hold the Church together in unity and with respect for those with whom they disagree may be encouraged to listen to and take seriously the concerns of those of us who are opposed as a matter of deep conviction.

The failure of this Measure to promote genuine inclusivity or to address adequately the needs of a sizable minority is a matter of deep concern for a number, both here and beyond, including for some who would otherwise have considered ordination. A likelihood of honourable and long-standing Anglican tradition being excluded and lost, and promoting disunity and decline rather than inclusion and growth, are more than serious shortcomings.

I urge Synod to vote against this Measure so that the process can re-start on a different footing, one that will achieve unity and inclusivity, which as it stands it will not.

Revd Martin Gorick (Coventry): 'There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.' William Shakespeare is buried in my church, so I thought that I should quote him right at the start – though Jesus Christ is Lord and we never forget that. It is worth listening to, however.

'There is a tide in the affairs of men.
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;

Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat,
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures.'

Call me naïve but I am really excited to be here – by the way, this is me now, not Shakespeare – as a lifelong supporter of the ministry of women and men together, a whole ministry. I was only 13 years old when General Synod stated that there was no theological objection to the ordination of women. I have grown up with it too. I am now 50 and here we are at last. Surely the time is now, brothers and sisters? Painstaking work over many years; 42 dioceses, including mine, a very strongly evangelical diocese, voting decisively in favour; a feeling in the Church and country that now is the time. The tide in the affairs of men certainly seems to be at the flood. Our only job is to catch that wave.

We need clarity, faithfulness and forgiveness. Clarity about what we are here to do: to enable the ordination of women as bishops; to be that radical wing of the Catholic Church, able to reform and lead the way. We need faithfulness to a purpose when things get tough. We need forgiveness, forgiving one another again and again, as God in Christ has forgiven us.

My first Synod was in York. I was feeling depressed because the vote was adjourned. On a poster in a shop window I saw 'Just when the caterpillar thought the end had come, it turned into a butterfly.' We can say Yes. We can do this today if we want to, and then move on together – one Church, one faith, one Lord.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): Synod members may have heard Giles Fraser yesterday with his Thought for the Day. He described two men of his acquaintance in London, both called Sam and both of them chefs. They are good friends; they exchange recipes and ingredients and often eat together; but they are wise enough never to talk about politics or religion, one being Israeli and the other Palestinian. Giles's point was that, although sharing food can be a wonderful tool for understanding others, it is a mistake to think that it can be enough for us really to understand the other, when the rifts are religious, cultural, or even disputes over land.

I think that this is where we are over the issue of women bishops, which may seem astounding when we share not only the same religion but the same Church. However, we have discussed and debated for 12 years, notwithstanding the protestations to the contrary. Sometimes discussion has been here in this chamber and sometimes elsewhere, often sharing meals together in the hope that this will help, but it has not.

The talking must now be over. A solution is available and the dioceses, not to mention the Church at large and the public whom we serve, are waiting. There are those who have campaigned for women bishops who find the Measure to be flawed to the extent that they could decline to support it but, as the Bishop of Manchester mentioned, much of our legislation is flawed, and I would suggest that most of it is.

There are many who oppose and who, like Simon Killwick, say they know the majority of the Church wants women bishops and they too are keen to see this

happen, but not with this Measure. My friends, I have news for all of you. There is no better solution round the corner. We started this process in 2000, we have had three new Synods since and they have all broadly followed the same line: Yes by a majority to women bishops. Yes to arrangements for those who oppose; no to a transfer of authority or to a society model. No to new structures, provinces or virtual dioceses. No to elaborating on the maleness of the particular bishops on the face of the Measure.

This is the circle which simply cannot be squared and this is our difficulty, as Rachel Treweek pointed out. What we have is an iPad – a square whose rounded corners were very expensively fought for by the electronic giants of the world.

All is not lost. Leaders of the traditionalist view, to quote the Bishop of Chichester, have demonstrated that they can live with the Measure and they intend to make it work. Five of them have accepted six bishoprics between them over the last 18 months. To these new bishops will fall the task of encouraging their flock to take advantage of the space they have been afforded to continue within the Church according to their particular theological convictions. As for Evangelicals, our new leader, with impeccable evangelical credentials, has expressed not merely acquiescence but enthusiasm – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*) Who are we to disagree?

The Chairman: Friends, I do not like ringing the bell. I give you an extra 20 seconds but if you go beyond, to 30 or 40 seconds, the bell is rung. Do not think that I am being rude; it is just that we have to allow others to come in.

Revd Jonathan Beswick (Oxford): It seems that it is not if, but when and how women are admitted to the episcopate in our Church. Now may be the ‘when’ but I do not believe that this legislation is a worthy ‘how’. I do not believe that it is legislation that, as the Archbishop encouraged us to hope, will allow the world to look at the Church of England tonight and see Jesus Christ.

We need legislation that will bring peace to the Church. I cannot see how this legislation can deliver God’s peace to us. We need a settlement that allows us all to get on joyfully; perhaps a settlement as significant as those of the 16th and 17th centuries.

There has been a lot of talk about what is or is not visible on the face of this legislation. As I look at the legislation, the only thing I see on the face of it is fear, often played out in the guise of grudging compromise, and I do not believe that compromise is a Christian virtue. We know that love and fear cannot exist together. One casts out the other. We have heard strong voices in the last few weeks, coercing, encouraging, at times threatening and even bullying us to pass this legislation. Love does not coerce or threaten or bully.

I do not have a famous poet buried in either of my churches. The nearest claim I have is that the author of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* built a porch in one of them. However, I want to finish with George Herbert’s reflection on the nature of love:

‘Love bade me welcome. Yet my soul drew back

Guilty of dust and sin.
But quick-ey'd Love, observing me grow slack
From my first entrance in,
Drew nearer to me, sweetly questioning,
If I lack'd any thing.'

Mrs Mary Judkins (Wakefield): I have not spoken in any of the debates about women in the episcopate. I have not signed up to any of the groups in General Synod, so I am speaking as an independent. My own vicar is a woman. I am speaking from my heart as a laywoman, seeking to follow Christ daily as his servant. But I am still unhappy about voting Yes today, for three reasons.

First, I believe that we are accepting second-best in order to get this motion through. We have had the Olympics and Paralympics, as we have heard. Competitors trained for years and their goal was gold. I fear that we are aiming only for bronze – this compromise. Is this the best we can do? The Archdeacon of Hackney said that we cannot do better, but surely it is better to try? If we went to the Olympics, as many of us did, everyone was welcome. Everyone was allowed to take part: old, young, all ethnicities, all physical capabilities, strangers and friends. How I pray that the Church of England could be that inclusive.

Second, I believe the legislation still does not provide the provision that was promised, as many other speakers have said. I remain unconvinced about the word 'respect', having heard many speakers over the last few sessions – often vitriolic, I am sad to say.

Third, it is not just about equality. 'Equal' does not mean 'the same'. We are different; we have different roles. Women are not there just to make tea, as I have heard today, although that is a diaconal role. There is diverse imagery – bride of Christ, father in God, et cetera – but it is about theology. We may not agree but we have to get to the place where we can accept each other and live together.

I therefore urge Synod members to think about the way they plan to vote, for the sake of unity, a place in the Church of England for everyone, for the advancement of God's mission with everyone included. This is not to say No to women bishops; this is a plea to get it right; to go for gold and not to accept silver or bronze.

Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Synod members, it is time. I am tired. Those of you who have been here in this chamber over many years must be very tired. This surely must be the time for decision-making. We cannot keep going on like this, again and again, drawing ever-diminishing circles, in the hope that at some point in the distant, maybe for some very distant, future – maybe for some when the Bishop of Rome decides for us all – we shall find peace and harmony and a fuller consensus in our own home. That distant dream would not make for a happy reality for many in our Church, and it is our Church for which we are planning – a future for the kingdom of God we have been asked to serve.

As we heard yesterday in the report on the ACC, we need to try to find a way to move forward; to recognise each other and live together in our wonderful and varied diversity; to understand that we cannot and will not always agree together, but that we

must learn better how to live in the good times and in the times when we will wound each other because of those differences.

Whether this motion stands or falls, the decision will be painful for all, as those who feel pleased at the outcome will also have to share the pain of those for whom this will be the wrong decision according to their conscience. This pain that we are all sharing may be the birth pangs of a new way of being Church and servants of Christ.

Apart from ‘respect’ – seemingly now a very dirty word – a couple of other touchstone words we have been hearing while doing the rounds are ‘flourishing’ and ‘trust’. While we cannot and should not be driven by public opinion, the call of the news media, or even our politicians and how they may vote when we make our decision, we have to make our decision for the flourishing of the Church. We must look to the dioceses from which we come, the desires of the people in our churches, and the mission call to serve them and the wider kingdom.

As we cast our votes, let it be his will, not ours. Let us vote for women bishops now and put our trust in the grace of Our Lord, the love of our Saviour, and the fellowship of our Church.

Mrs Sarah Finch (London): Recently, I was appointed the General Synod representative on the council of Oak Hill Theological College in London. Oak Hill is a beautiful place but, more importantly, it is an excellent place of learning with high academic standards, particularly in the area of biblical languages. It has performed very well in the recent Bishops’ Inspection and in the QAA inspection.

There are 54 ordinands at Oak Hill at present. Their average age is 32. They have come from churches that are growing. Because they love the Church of England, they are preparing to commit the best part of their life to the Church of England – the next 40–50 years – and others are applying to the college with enthusiasm and in good numbers. At a recent open day, there were 90 interested people. Oak Hill is vibrant, young and strong. These conservative Evangelical ordinands form part of the next generation of our nation’s clergy. They are committed to Christ; they have great love for God and for people; and they know how to engage with contemporary culture with a freshness of expression and an ability to communicate with young people and children. They represent hope for England in the future.

Because of the legislation in front of us now, however, there is an air of dismay in the college. These ordinands are fearful for their future because of their experiences en route to ordination and, as they look ahead, they actively expect that they will be discriminated against. They fear that their ministry will be hindered because of the sincere theological convictions they hold. They fear that they will not be joined by others in the future because they will not be welcome in the Church that they serve.

One ordinand wrote to me, ‘Will I be forced to the margins of the Church and ignored because my theological convictions are not currently in vogue? Will there be any jobs to apply for once I have finished my curacy? Will I get a look-in? Without proper provision, I may be considered a heretic by the rest of the Church of England for my complementarian views of women’s ministry.’ Another said to me, ‘We have been faithful to the Church of England but we feel we are being double-crossed.’

These ordinands have committed themselves to the Church of England. They want to see that the Church of England is committed to them – committed to making full and secure provision for them, so that they have an honoured place and a long-term future.

Can it be right in God's eyes to pass this form of legislation when the consequences will be so unfair and unjust? Because the provision in this legislation is unsafe and inadequate, this legislation will be an act of betrayal towards these ordinands and others like them. More widely, of course, it will have a devastating effect on the unity of the whole Church of England. People will leave. Unity really will be destroyed.

We can find a better way. It would be wise to vote down this legislation and start afresh. Voting against it today would not be voting against having women bishops; it would simply be voting down a bad piece of legislation.

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): There are many reasons why I will be voting Yes today. They are primarily rooted in what I see as the scriptural rightness of women and men together being apostolic witnesses to the truth of the death and resurrection of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as the hope for the world. They are rooted in the conviction that it is our very complementarity and not our sameness that adds to the value of the leadership of the Church of both; that our mission to a lost, dying and hungry world needs this complementary apostolic leadership.

My key point is about the consequences of our saying No today. Certainly a Yes vote will have consequences, and I have dear friends who I know will be upset that I am voting the way I am. I hope that no one will walk away. I accept that we will have issues to handle, of people seeking alternative episcopal oversight from retired bishops or even from other provinces. I recognise that there will be some confusion and there may be some chaos. However, I believe such confusion and chaos will be far worse with a No vote: women being invited to be consecrated in other jurisdictions and then returning possibly; certainly young women not coming forward for ordination, and many young men.

General Synod's status and reputation will be seriously impaired. Forty-two diocesan synods really will wonder what has been happening if we say No now. There is, I believe, little chance of ever producing a compromise deal ever again if we say No now. I think that No would be far more damaging internally and externally to our mission.

As I began, my main reasons for voting Yes are deeper than these. They are rooted in my understanding of the Scriptures; but a conviction about the chaos that may happen if we say No only adds further to this.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): It has been said that we should be able to live with this legislation and that there should be no need for legislative provision, if only we can all trust one another. I wish that we lived in a world and in a Church where trust absolved us of the need for legal safeguards. Just think. We would not have to audit our parish accounts because we could trust the PCC treasurer; nor would we have to go to the trouble of CRB checks for our children's workers, for similar reasons. We

do not live in that world, however; we live in a world where human beings are fallen – even, dare I say it, bishops.

The Church does not have a terribly good record with codes of practice. For example, there is a very important and supposedly binding code of practice concerning the circumstances under which livings can be suspended. I think that we all know that code of practice is not always rigorously adhered to.

Some members will have read the statement put out by WATCH during the last group of sessions, explaining their reasons why they could not accept the proposal that came before Synod in the summer. The crux of it was that they could not accept it because it legitimated the theological position of those who could not accept women bishops. That was what WATCH said. In other words, they are happy to allow a place for their opponents within the Church but only on the basis that their views are not actually recognised as legitimate. What kind of respect is that? Is that a basis for trust?

If members of Synod are uncomfortable with this legislation, I would urge them not to abstain. We have spent a very long time on this, I know, and I can understand why people want to bring it to a close now; but we will be living with the outcome of this for a great deal longer. I urge members of Synod to vote against this Measure.

Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (Guildford): I have abandoned my speech because most of it has already been said. I just want to respond to two or three things that have been said. We have been told that fear and love cannot exist together. I believe the original root of fear of God is to be in awe of God, and I believe that we can have awe and love together. We should approach this whole debate with a sense of awe because we are in awe of God, and with a sense of love because we love one another. They can go hand in hand.

It is true that the Olympics and the Paralympics were great events but it is not true that everyone was allowed to compete; only those who fulfilled the criteria of sporting ability and made it into the team could start on the starting line. However, all the competitors had to run the race, jump in the sandpit, or row in the canoe. They could not go on training for ever until they were absolutely sure of winning the gold medal. They trusted in the long preparation, the training, the advice of their coaches, the work of their physios; then they just had to get on with it and hope that they had done well enough. That is what we should be doing, with trust in the many long years of preparation, trust in the relationships that we have together, and get on with it, even if we are not sure that we are quite at the gold medal level.

My final response is to wonder why I am invited to be sympathetic to Oak Hill ordinands because they feel discriminated against. I do feel sympathetic towards them, but I would ask them too to feel sympathetic to the many women who, for much longer, have felt discriminated against.

Finally, two brief stories. We once had a female curate in Guildford who had a female training incumbent. She also had a five-year-old son. One Sunday, a friendly parishioner asked Johnny if he was going to follow in his mother's footsteps. 'I don't know' he said. 'Mummy, can men be vicars?'

In the July Synod coffee queue, I turned round and unexpectedly bumped into Bishop Victoria, of whom we have heard such good things, and found myself wondering ‘Can there be a woman bishop at our diocesan synod and General Synod?’ Of course there can. Therefore, I hope that we will now vote for this Measure, because we want it to be perfectly natural and normal for men and women to be priests, for women and men to be bishops, and for nobody to be surprised.

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): At university I studied both mathematics and theology. I understand logical argument. We must vote against this legislation because it is fatally flawed; it is illogical.

It would require a bishop with conservative Evangelical complementarian views and a bishop with traditional Catholic views on bishops to whom authority could be delegated by a woman bishop. Yet there would be and could be no such candidates, because if they hold those views they would not be prepared to serve under a woman bishop.

If we can go away and produce legislation that is not flawed and which honours the place of conservative Evangelicals and traditional Catholics within the Church, I could, having listened to the arguments, not vote for women bishops – that is against my conscience – but abstain, so that the mission of the Church, the evangelization of the nation, could go forward, unencumbered by continuing arguments on this matter.

Sister Anita Smith (Religious Communities): Around this time last year I was lucky enough to spend a month in Canada. There I met a retired woman bishop. Imagine that such a creature walks God’s earth! An interesting interview, but it led me to reflect rather sadly on the Church of England’s position now in the Anglican Communion.

Friends in Canada simply cannot understand why we are making such a fuss and bother about implementing a development which has such huge support across the dioceses. This puzzlement is not limited to transatlantic contacts. The bishop-elect of False Bay in South Africa is a woman. Swaziland – a country I know well and love, having lived and worked there for almost 18 years – now has a woman bishop, which is an amazing counter-cultural move; and we all know how fortunate the people of Christchurch are in having Victoria Matthews as their chief pastor.

Some of us find it difficult to explain Synod’s decisions to our own parishes, but if we look farther afield it is just impossible. In ecclesiology, are we some sort of Luddites, opposed to change even when it is change for the better? I would urge that this legislation is change for the better and it does make sufficient provision for those who are unhappy.

Yesterday was the Feast of St Hilda. The collect for that day urges us, like Hilda, to yearn for the Gospel of Christ and to reconcile those who are divided. This Measure allows us to do just that. I would urge Synod not to vote against it.

The Bishop of Hereford (Rt Revd Anthony Priddis): We have taken a great many years to reach this point and have given a great deal of care and commitment, rehearsing the arguments at length, and are doing so a bit today as well. Self-

evidently, we do not all agree and are unlikely all to agree. We have listened to one another and we have tried to understand and feel the pain of those with whom we disagree. In the main, the debates and discussions have been respectful, imputing the best of motives and arguments to the other and not the worst, and we have sought God's will and direction in and through all this.

We have a General Synod with its processes, whatever we may think of them, which we entrust to God's purposes as being ones which he can and will use for the direction of his Church. The majority of this Synod, as of our Church, think that women should be able to be bishops and that this is the logic and the consequence of the decision we took to have them ordained as priests. A minority, of course, does not agree but nevertheless mostly, as we have heard, accept that this is the trajectory of their Church, of our Church, in which they continue to worship, work and live as loyal Anglicans.

We all know that the truth is not to be determined by a majority vote, but nevertheless we wrestle with these questions and try under God to decide the right way forward. Nobody likes the Measure before us 100 per cent; all have compromised – although I do not really care for that word. Because Measures are of their nature the letter of the law, they cannot themselves give life. That needs our relationships and trust and, of course, grace.

Many of the younger people hold a view that is in favour of the ordination of women as bishops. My hope and plea is that those present who do not agree with the Church, their Church, ordaining women as bishops can nevertheless agree that God may indeed be at work even in our General Synod; that the majority will is for women to be bishops; that the mission of the Church would be hugely harmed if that is not made possible; that we have agonized to find the best possible way forward to bring us to this historic moment today; and that, in the light of all this, those opposed can abstain rather than vote No, so that this Measure can not only be passed but passed joyfully and so that the ordained ministry of women can be properly celebrated by those of us who wish to do so.

Revd Canon Christopher Cook (Liverpool): Yesterday there was much talk about the Coptic Church and the recent election of the new Pope Tawadros II. I visit Egypt frequently and have a great interest in and love for the Coptic Church.

Over the last 20–30 years, the Coptic Church has experienced a great revival. The churches are full and countless monasteries have either been re-founded or new ones have been founded. All this despite the on-going anti-Christian discrimination and the sporadic and localized attacks on Christians and on church buildings.

The Churches in eastern Europe too, despite generations of persecution, have now experienced an amazing resurgence of spiritual life. They have achieved this largely by remaining true to their traditional self-understanding and to their Orthodox belief and worship. By comparison, we and our sister Churches in western Europe, despite some signs of hope, are largely static or in decline. Mission, yes, is absolutely crucial therefore; but the experience of the eastern Churches tells us that mission becomes much more of an uphill task if we marginalize the traditional understanding of the Church and its ministry. Yet I believe that is exactly what this Measure does.

This Measure will make more difficult that central task we have as a Synod to bring, to a society so much in need of him, Christ as Our Lord and Saviour. This Measure does marginalize traditionalists; it makes the Church a narrower Church, more monochrome and less effective in mission. For the sake of that mission to the whole nation, we traditionalists need the space to survive and flourish: the space which this flawed, unfair Measure does not give us. For the sake of mission and growth, therefore, we need to maintain the rich diversity of our Church, so that each tradition can truly flourish and contribute to the fruitfulness of our Church life. For that to happen, this Measure must go down, so that a deep and prayerful process of really listening to each other can, for the first time, truly start.

I urge Synod, for the sake of mission, for the sake of the Church of England, for the sake of women bishops themselves, to vote this Measure down and to allow a better one to take its place.

Mrs Victoria Russell (Oxford): Like many members of Synod, for some years I have been concerned that there should be adequate provision in legislation for the traditionalists in our Church.

The view I hold today has been formed partly by encounters with two very different people. The first was with a female clergy member from my own diocese. We were discussing provision and the code of practice when she said to me, ‘Why should we make provision for these men? Women have suffered for 2,000 years. It is time to let the men suffer.’ Not a very Christ-like attitude, but is this very different from where we are now?

During my next encounter, I saw at first hand the distress of a promising young Anglo-Catholic ordinand, again from my own diocese. He was worried and concerned for his future. He explained that, with the inadequacies of the code of practice, he felt there was no place for him in the Church of England. Sadly, he did not go on to complete his training. How many more young men shall we lose and are we taking seriously the effect that this will have on Church growth and mission?

I was a professional woman myself before retirement and I do care deeply about women who are subjected to discrimination but I also care deeply for our young men, who feel there is no future for them in the Anglican Church. Do we really want women bishops at any price? How can we push out those loyal and faithful Anglicans who hold traditionalist views? Where is the honoured place for them?

I urge Synod to vote against this Measure because I think that we need more time to come together, to reflect, and to find another solution. Above all, we need to have confidence in a different Measure, where all can thrive and work together in love.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Justin Welby): I thank Synod for yesterday’s very warm welcome. Despite looking embarrassed and confused, I did genuinely appreciate it very much.

The Bishop of Salisbury reminded us that the ministry of women in the last 20 years has contributed enormously to the Church of England. Today, we include thankfulness for what has happened. For all our struggles, and with many setbacks, the Church has gained from its decision of 1992. For most of those coming to faith, it is the normal order of things. The ministry of women priests has been powerful in all areas of the Church, except as part of the episcopacy.

The Bishop of Liverpool very powerfully set out the case in favour of what is before us today. It is time to finish the job and to vote for this Measure. However, the Church of England also needs to show how to develop the mission of the Church in a way that demonstrates that we can manage diversity of view without division – diversity in amity, not diversity in enmity.

This is far more than showing that what unites us is greater than what divides us, true as that is. The Church is, above all, those who are drawn into being a new people by the work of Christ and the gift of the Spirit. We are reconciled to God and to one another, not by our choice but by his. That is at the heart of our testimony to the gospel. For this testimony to be convincing we must demonstrate it in lived reality, which is something that we have to express in institutional life, in Measures, rules, codes of conduct, and in forms of dispute resolution which need not involve the courts. That is perfectly possible in both law and experience today.

All these are necessary, and this approach we have before us today is, I believe, after much discussion with many people, as good as we can get. However, as the Bishop of Hereford has just said, our will and intention are far more important than the rules.

For all these reasons, as well as because of what I have experienced in my own life, being converted in churches that today would be led by those who in good conscience cannot accept this move, I am personally deeply committed, and believe that fellow bishops are also, to ensuring as far as I am able that what we promise today, and later in the code of conduct, is carried out faithfully, in spirit as well as in letter – expressing in attitude and by our actions that we more than respect but also love one another – and is a foundation stone for our mission in this country and the world more widely. We cannot be trapped into believing that this is a zero-sum decision, where one person's gain must be another's loss. That is not a theology of grace.

As we talk, in places from Israel and Gaza to Goma in the Congo, there is killing and suffering because difference cannot be dealt with. We are those, we Christians, who carry peace and grace as a treasure for the world. We must be those who live a better way; who carry that treasure visibly and distribute it lavishly. I urge the General Synod to vote for this motion.

Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford): I want first, as chair of the House of Laity, to welcome Bishop Justin as Archbishop-elect and express my very great appreciation for the speech he has just made. Sadly, although I agree with almost everything that he said, I cannot agree with his conclusion.

As Chair of the House of Laity, it is part of my role to ensure that the views of the whole House are heard, particularly on final approval business. Synod already knows that a substantial majority of the House and of laypeople generally are in favour of women bishops and of this draft Measure. Many speeches today are making that

point. Therefore, I want to focus on a significant minority of laypeople who are opposed in principle to women bishops and to the content of the Measure before us.

Essentially, I wish to say that it is unwise to go ahead with a Measure dealing with fundamental matters of ministry and doctrine with a significant minority of our Church unable to accept its provisions. I do believe that we can find a better way.

On 7 February this year in Westminster Abbey, representatives of the Church of England and the URC took part in a service of penitence and reconciliation to mark the 350th anniversary of the Great Ejection of non-conforming ministers in 1662. In November 2003, this Synod endorsed the covenant for unity with the Methodist Church in ‘a spirit of penitence for...our past divisions, believing that we have been impoverished through our separation and that our witness to the gospel has been weakened accordingly’.

Surely we do not want to make the same mistakes again? Can we not find a better way of taking this historic step of allowing the consecration of women as bishops without unchurching those who cannot in conscience accept it?

Last week I received a letter from a former distinguished lay member of this Synod who cannot in conscience accept the sacramental ministration of women bishops. He says, ‘All I ask for is a place in that one CofE where I can continue and flourish with integrity and mutual respect, but it is precisely that which this proposed legislation denies me’. I do not agree with his views on sacramental ministry but I do not see why our disagreement requires that one or other of us has no future in the Church of England.

In 1992 I voted in favour of ordaining women to the priesthood but knowing it was unacceptable to many of my fellow Evangelicals because of their understanding of the biblical teaching on headship. I voted for that legislation because it was designed to ensure that those who could not in conscience accept it could remain with us. Today’s legislative package will not achieve that.

Do we really believe that such diversity of opinion no longer exists? Legislation does not remove diversity of opinion. It is diversity. It is not prejudice. It is not simply refusal to accept change. It is solidly theologically based judgement. That is not my view; that was recognised fully in the Rochester report. We may disagree with the dissenting minority but does that mean we have to exclude them from a future in this Church?

Those who have worked for reconciliation in various areas of life know that you cannot achieve a solution unless all parties agree to and own it. That is the missing piece in this legislative package. Those for whom the provision is intended do not own it.

We have been told that we have debated these matters long enough. Long enough perhaps for those who are in the majority and can impose their will, but not long enough to gain the consent of those who are opposed and whose consent is essential if we are to remain a united and growing Church committed to mission. We should not be in this position. We can and should find a better way.

The Archdeacon of Lewisham (Ven. Christine Hardman) (Southwark): I have found it more difficult than I can say to decide how to vote today in this final approval debate. At the heart of this difficulty is the reality that the clause 5(1)(c) we have before us is not, in its essence, very different to the suggested clause in May. There is a subtle difference in legal terms between ‘respect’ and ‘consistent with’ but, to be honest, it is quite subtle. In terms of grounds, the only grounds on which a PCC may write a Letter of Request are those of theological conviction.

As the Bishop of Manchester said in his opening speech, clause 5(1)(c) places within the Measure itself the belief that not any man will do. There are those who believe provision for that view is necessary. I am not against provision. Quite the opposite: I am instinctively in favour of being as inclusive as possible. I hate the kind of systems and structures that exclude people because of what they believe. I want provision; provision that goes as far as it can, but not to the point where that provision would undermine the very nature of the Church itself.

All now hangs on how the code of practice fleshes this out. It is crucially important for the very nature of our Church that the code does not allow ‘Choose your own bishop on the basis of his theological beliefs’; that the code does not lead us down the path of the creation of two Churches that are entirely separate one from the other; and, most important of all, that it does not cast doubt on the status of our orders. For, if we do that, we do not cast doubt on the status of the orders of the individual but on the very status of the authority of the Church itself to confer orders.

Bishop Justin spoke powerfully, and with more experience than most of us will ever have, about the process of reconciliation and what has to happen. Fr Ken Leech once wrote that in the Church of England we think that if we get together in one room over a glass of sherry it will be all right. We know that is not true. He said that, to achieve reconciliation, those with profound differences have to move to the point where they believe they may have betrayed their very souls and gone too far. I am at that point today and, at that point, I will today vote in favour of this Measure. Ultimately, I will do that because I believe the theological principle that lies behind this legislation, that the episcopate should be fully open to women as to men, is right, just and true and of the gospel.

Last night, in prayer, I had a vision of a little mouse running round on a treadmill. My friends, it is time to get off the treadmill. Christ does not lead us on to treadmills; he encourages us to leap off them. We should do that, not in optimism but in hope, and turn outwards to our nation in mission and in love.

The Chairman: Members of Synod, I am grateful for the way in which we have carried out our debate and the way you continue to stand. We shall resume our debate at 2.30 p.m. The five-minute speech limit will still be in place.

(Adjournment)

The Chairman: I would like to clear up one matter before we resume our debate. Some people are concerned about the effect of an abstention during a vote. The Standing Orders say ‘those present and voting’ and that really means those who are voting in favour or against. An abstention is recorded but does not come into the

mathematics of the two-thirds. Is that understood? If a member abstains, that abstention will be recorded, but when working out the two-thirds it will be of those members who have voted in favour or against. I hope that has clarified the worry and the confusion.

It leaves me to remind members that under Standing Orders I still have the possibility of imposing a speech limit. We will start with five minutes for five speeches. Then I will go to three speeches and three minutes. I hope members have remembered what I reminded them of earlier this morning, that if there is tedious repetition of their own speeches or of arguments already well rehearsed by other members I may well call them to order under SO 17, although from the way we disciplined ourselves this morning I hope that will not be necessary. I would urge members to be patient with me still, as we are going through a very long list. I thank members for their good nature.

Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark): I suppose it was preparation in a way that this weekend I was reviewing ten hours of Wagner in Nuremberg and Lübeck, *Tristan and Parsifal*. ‘*Durch Mitleid wissend, der reine Tor*’: the pure fool enlightened by compassion. Compassion. Of course, this debate, with all its pressure, is designed to make it hard for us to say No. How can I, who want women bishops, decide to say No and dig my heels in now as an improbable liberal Anglo-Catholic donkey?

We are told that we must vote Yes. Our only real chance to stop this Measure is the last hurdle. If the Archbishop’s appeals for the minorities were voted down, what chance had I? The time to vote No is where we are now, at the last hurdle. It is perfectly okay to say No now. Yes we can. This is the moment for No.

We are told that we must vote Yes or people outside the Church will be confirmed in their contempt for religion if we do not. For Guardian bloggers and some other fellow citizens, we here are religious nuts, a bunch of crazies, and our legislating for women priests and bishops is just ‘getting a bit real’, being ‘practical’ and ‘just’. But our belief in God and the mysterious power of goodness teaches us that knowing what is good and of God, discerning the difference between right and wrong, good and bad, is not like telling the difference between black and white. One person’s good may be another person’s bad. God keeps moving the goalposts. That is why it is so hard to have a consensus about ordained women and about this Measure. Our God is full of surprises, miraculous surprises. He moves the goalposts and Churches split. But that is why we should have a concern with reception. We, the majority who want women as bishops, could still be wrong. The minority could just be right.

Religions are anchored in safety by the weight of their traditions. We are lucky as Anglicans in the C of E, with the richness of our opposing traditions, but when a religion shifts with something such as the ordination and consecration of women it is like an earthquake. My reasons for voting No come down to two crucial factors: the compromises being made and what it is to be a minority within this religion of Christianity that traditionally proclaims unanimity but has a sordid habit of door-slamming, closing ears and outlawing opponents of those with power and the pulpit.

I never forget the Bishop of Béziers at the time of the Cathars: ‘Burn them all. The good Lord knows his own.’ My friend Rosemarie Mallett, whom I truly respect for

her brainpower and spiritual gifts, has just repeated what she told us at a Southwark pre-Synod meeting, that this Measure is a compromise for women, in that it provides for a minority who do not accept ordained women. I do not think that is women compromising; it is facing reality.

Whatever this Measure does, whatever happens, women bishops as pioneers will not be universally accepted for years in Anglicanism worldwide. A majority of us here will be easy about them, but even here, for at least a quarter of us, and perhaps a third, consecrated women will not really be bishops. Rosemarie may want this Measure to establish an article of faith. It cannot. A Synod makes law but a Church decides in its heart and mind, in the private recesses where God lives, where people's strength to do his will lies.

Let us face facts. The Gordian knot the Measure cannot cut is about abolishing gender as a factor. Women bishops will not be quite the same as men bishops until they are accepted by all Anglicans who worship God in their hearts. We cannot make that happen. We must treat with love this minority, whose hearts I too hope will one day change, though I will vote No. We must honour the promises we made to them 20 years ago and give them security about their life of faith belonging with us and not just a hotchpotch of schemes reworked every time a new bishop comes into one of our 43 dioceses. We need one legal way of handling this, adapting the Act of Synod. Reception of our change may one day be complete, but if one just man was enough for God with the cities on the plain, and God's love and tolerance are eternal, how can ours be so much less? There is an alternative way.

Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Could I first convey the greetings of the Bishop of London, who is on his sickbed, to the Synod. Very sadly, he cannot be here. It is a pity in many ways because we epitomize in London how this can be made to work. In a diocese which has more parishes opposed than any other diocese, in a diocese which has more women priests than any other diocese, we know how to make provision work.

I have constantly fought for provision for those opposed. I have been involved in the Guildford Report, and all the things that came after that, the Revision Committee. Those who are opposed know perfectly well that I have taken their side and said, 'Provision must be given to those who are opposed.' We have not necessarily won the battle in the way in which those who are opposed wanted. I regret that the Measure is perhaps not as strong as it might have been on those things, but – but – we are now at a stage where we make decisions.

I do not get the rhetoric of 'we need some more time to discuss this'. I am sorry, for 20 years we have been talking about this, the theology of it, our understanding of it, how we do it legally. I could give members a perfectly compelling reason why women in holy orders are not accepted. I can make the speech. I know it off by heart. We know each other's positions. That is not just about learning rhetoric; that is about walking alongside each other. The people whom I know and love and respect in this Synod include many people who are traditional Catholics and conservative Evangelicals. We walk this walk together and we know it is a difficult journey. We know that we have tried to get something that will satisfy everybody and we may

have ended up with some degree of satisfying nobody, but we have legislation now before us which contains provisions for those who are opposed.

Some of the debate today has forgotten that the word 'respect' has a legal opinion behind it and says something about the way in which we will work this legislation together. Some members have forgotten that clause 8 was amended without any fuss at all, to talk about how we understand the matter of the jurisdiction of a bishop in relation to the diocesan bishop and in relation to their own ordination and office. We have made changes which say something about how we intend to continue to walk together once this Measure is passed.

I know there are many members who will not vote for this today because they are, in principle, opposed. That is absolutely right; Members should not vote for it if they are opposed to the notion of women bishops. There are also many members here who are saying, 'I'm not sure and I'm not sure my friends will be catered for by the provision that is put down.' I want to say, 'We can commit today to make this happen and to make the provision work.' I want to see us walking out of this Synod tonight having voted for the Measure and hand-in-hand saying, 'We will take our traditionalist friends with us and we will make these things in each diocese have a coherence that can be achieved.'

Do not forget that a scheme will have to be drafted in each diocese. The diocesan synod gets a say on that. The provisions have to be in conformity with the Measure and the Act of Synod. Anyone who thinks that a bishop can invent a scheme that is not trammelled by consideration for those who were opposed needs their head seeing to, quite honestly. The way in which we draft the code of practice will also convey something about what we believe. I want to see full bishops looking after those who are opposed. We have in London a mode whereby the Bishop of Fulham looks after those parishes that have voted for alternative extended oversight and does it as a full member of the college of bishops with the power to sponsor for ordination, the power to ordain, the power to appoint to parishes.

Those are the discussions we will have to have as we knock a code of practice together. We will have some disagreements about that, but it is quite clear that the code and the Measure and what comes in diocesan schemes must be coherent about how we cater for those opposed. This, as my friend the Archdeacon of Hackney is always saying, will be painful for all of us. There has been pain for 20 years in the Church about this, for women whose discernment of vocation has not been taken through, for people who are opposed, believing that the Church has done something entirely wrong. There is no monopoly on pain. We know that this will be a harmful and hurtful process to our psyches but it does not have to be a harmful and hurtful process to our Church. I want those young male ordinands from Oak Hill to say, 'Okay, come on, we're going for it.' I want to say, 'We're all going for it together.' I want us to be committed to this and walk into God's future and say Yes to women bishops today and Yes to making this legislation work.

Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans): I would like to agree with what the Bishop of Willesden has just said about the legislation. We have heard an awful lot said about the legislation that we have before us. I would like to suggest that it is not a compromise; that it reflects that we have what we have because of who we are, and it

is our reality right here. I think it is workable entirely, and it is good because it does what we mainly want it to do, which is to open the episcopate to women.

This is the pragmatics of what we do today because of what we agreed in 2005, to remove the legal obstacles. A year later we voted on the principle, which was that having women as bishops was consonant with the faith of our Church. That is what we are doing here today. It does rather concern me when I hear it said, 'We shouldn't be taking this decision until...' or 'We don't have the authority.' If members do not believe that we have the authority to decide on matters like this, I have to ask, 'Why stand for Synod?'

Many members will remember the Indiana Jones films. In the one where he has the quest for the Holy Grail, he is running through a cavern in the side of a mountain, about to reach his goal, when he comes out on the edge of a terrifying chasm. He knows he has to go over it. What he does is remarkable. He takes a step. He steps into what looks like thin air and certain death. What happens? A stone bridge manifests under his feet. What happened was that he had to take that step in faith. I think a lot of the things that have been said in this debate about trust mean that we have to take this step together, because others are not going anywhere, I am not going anywhere. We are here together, we know one another, we know we can trust one another. We have the authority to take this step.

I have another word about assurance and authority. Do I think having women as bishops, as part of our episcopal leadership is important, significant and will make a wonderful difference in our Church? Yes of course I do, but behind it all I think we need to diminish the size of what we are doing and say, 'What are we about as a Church? Where is our authority ultimately? What is our reference point? What is our lodestar? Where do we focus? What is our North Pole, our head?' It has to be that the only answer is Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ alone.

Let us keep this in a certain context. My conservative Evangelical brothers and sisters, my traditional Anglo-Catholics, we are in this together. We have spoken with each other; we know what each other thinks. We can do this. We can make this work. What it takes is our goodwill towards one another, the compassion and the love that other speakers have already mentioned today, but it also takes that step of faith. For those members who feel as if they are stepping out and cannot see the way forward, who cannot see the path under their feet, I would say that by voting Yes today they are taking that step and the bridge will appear, the road will become clear. We will walk it together but we have to walk it together in faith with a certain amount of mutual trust, willing ourselves to work together as the Body of Christ.

Revd Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I would wholeheartedly agree with much of what those who are enthusiastic about this Measure have said. It is the last five per cent, of course, that worries me. I rejoice with Rose Hudson-Wilkin very much in diversity; perhaps a different kind of diversity from that which enthralls her but diversity nevertheless. I rejoice and recognise the gifts of God given to women who have been ordained. I do not know what to make of it but I do recognise that and I recognise that as given by God. I just cannot, on the basis of Scripture and the witness borne to it by the Tradition, see that as priestly or episcopal ministry. However, those gifts are certainly there. I find difficulty saying Yes to this not simply

because I do not believe women's priestly and episcopal ministry has been shown on the basis of Scripture, or indeed the witness borne to it by the tradition, but because I cannot see the basis in this Measure for the kind of trust that is needed to go forward.

Much has been said on trust. If I may, I want to hold with that for a bit. It strikes me that the three most eloquent speeches on the importance of trust, the plea to people like me to trust those who will go with the ordination of women to the episcopate, have come from dioceses in the Church of England which have embraced most warmly the Act of Synod and put it into action with the greatest commitment – basically, a piece of law agreed by this Synod, not exactly a law but a Measure, not a code of practice. There is a suspicion that law is a default that has to be there when there is no hope for trust. I think that good law makes for trust and makes for relationships but it is essential. It is part of the goodness of law.

Law is not a bad thing, only there to constrain sinners; it is there to direct humans, men and women, to their final end. It is something which is patent of grace. We should not be suspicious of law. I think we need that law for the basis of the development of that trust and respect across our Church. It is not there. Members are kidding themselves if they think it is. It does occur in places and is a wonderful thing, but it is not dripping from half the dioceses of the Church of England. It simply is not. That is why I think I have to say No to this Measure. The lack of the basis of trust is not there. The assurances that to some people seem to be wonderfully firm, to others do not seem to be there at all. There is a question about the adequacy of this law and for that reason I think one has to say No to it.

I want to walk together but I cannot see an adequate path for me in these provisions at the moment. At best it is obscured. The bridges seem to have been built with grass and there are big gaps. By and large, I am not one who takes leaps. The image of the leap of faith is a very dangerous one. Indiana Jones gets to the end, yes indeed, but if I remember the film correctly – and it is a long time since I saw it – all things of beauty seem to get destroyed in the end. I am not sure that the image of a leap and a chasm is a very good thing when one is dealing with relationships and with the building of trust. With regret, I have to say No to this legislation.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): Quite a lot of debates in Synod are addressed to a very small number of people: those who might just change their minds. Today is no exception; but I do want to be clear about what sort of change in mind we are talking about. Most of us have arrived at our substantive convictions over a longish period, and we hold them with passion and, we hope, informed clarity. It would be odd to expect convictions like that to be changed during the course of a few hours.

I do want to say explicitly, to avoid any misunderstanding, that I have no intention and never have had any intention of trying to persuade those whose deepest convictions are against the substance of this Measure to abstain. If members believe that this Measure is in contradiction to the express will of God for his Church, they will doubtless vote against it, as I hope I should do if faced with a similar proposal that I believed to be subversive of the true nature of the Church. I know that for members it is a matter of obedience. That is why it commands respect and that is why we need and value their presence.

However, there are some here – there must be some – who are genuinely uncertain, either about the principle or about the tactics and the timing, who are not fully convinced that this is the right step to take or who are not sure that we have the best possible vehicle for securing the goals that this legislation seeks to advance. This is where change may happen. It is with such people in mind that I offer one or two brief considerations.

Can we be sure that this is the right step? For a good few, in the sense of absolute certainty, perhaps not. We have as a Church fought and prayed and argued for years. No blindingly fresh argument is likely to appear at this stage; but there is a direction clearly discernible in our Church's mind, an increasingly strong flow of feeling and thinking. We have to weigh the significant point about whether we can in the long run defend a system in which certain priests are forever blocked from having an episcopal vocation tested. There may be no abstract clarity here but there is something of a narrative emerging.

If we do advance on this road, there is, we hope, enough argument to support the claim that we are still seeking to honour and uphold what the Church has always meant by ordained and, especially, episcopal ministry. There is the substantive deposit of ecumenical agreement, not least in ARCIC, which this Measure leaves untouched, rightly. We are not deliberately overturning an historic Catholic consensus. There is a good Anglican tradition of acting on reasonable probabilities. I would like to think there is a good case for seeing our decision today as falling in this territory, if that is the starting point.

Is this the best possible vehicle? In the light of eternity, quite likely not, but this is what we have come up with after an intensely detailed process. There is no compromise in the Measure over the equality of male and female bishops. Equally, there is now a legislative requirement that any diocesan scheme should work in a way that members of a minority can recognise as taking them seriously in their own terms. The much-maligned word 'respect' means that there is a legal requirement to show that the convictions of the minority have made a measurable difference and I do not think we should underrate the significance of that.

The Measure is far from perfect. I myself began by hoping for a fuller account of what 'provision for the minority' might mean. Gradually I came to believe that the grounds for dissent were so varied that it was not a good idea to try to spell out in detail how accommodation might be found. Rather, what mattered was as clear a statement as possible that the minority's account of their own convictions could be expected in law to make a difference. It took me a while to get to this, to the belief that what was needed was the small but strong hook on which to hang the fuller discussion proper to a code. Others may be on a similar journey to the one on which I have been, and I say this to encourage them.

Finally, how do we weigh the considerations about the message we are sending today to our society? For those who are clear that this is against God's will for his Church, such thoughts cannot and should not determine how they vote. Others may, if they are not too sure, allow some weight to this question. It may be true that, as we have been told some surveys suggest, the failure of Synod to vote yesterday would not affect too adversely what people thought of the Church. Anecdotally, that seems a bit odd. I am

rather clearer that a No vote would not do anything positive for our mission at this juncture.

There remains the deeply troubling question of how much energy we want to spend on this in the next decade and – if I may be forgiven for mentioning this – how much we want to bind the extraordinary energy and skills of a new Archbishop into the same agenda. I hope that we can decide to liberate ourselves and our new leadership. Ultimately, speaking personally, that is what I am praying for today for all of us, even for those strongly opposed – for a sense of liberation, a clarification made so that we can go on to a next stage.

That next stage, as we have been reminded, will not be easy or peaceful. We will still have to argue through the contents of a code and we shall still have to find ways of supporting, consoling and affirming those who are feeling lost or hurt; but I do believe it is time to turn a page and discover what we can do about this.

If this rings any bells and if Synod does not find itself completely convinced that the only proper answer today is No, I am encouraging members to ask how they can play their part, whether by supporting or by abstaining, in a potentially liberating moment for us all.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Carol Wolstenholme (Newcastle): Over the past week, like many other members, I have received many communications about how to vote in today's debate. Some of the arguments have come from those who would have me vote against the proposal in today's Measure. They focus on the de-motivating effect on those who cannot accept women as bishops, the betrayal they will feel, and they include statements such as there would be 'no place for them in the Church of England'. I have sometimes needed to remind myself that these views are not those of the majority in the Church. As a lay person who has listened carefully to many people, both lay and clergy, in deaneries and parishes in Newcastle, the majority view, like the majority view of other dioceses, is a vote to have women as bishops.

My plea today is to remember the majority, the majority of laypeople and clergy in the Church who do so want women to be bishops and who equally may be demotivated, feeling betrayed and believing that there is no place for them in the Church if today's proposals are rejected. For the sake of mission in our country, we need the majority of our clergy to feel motivated, respected and valued for who they are, both female and male, and our laypeople to know that their Church listens to them, that the leadership of their Church is in good heart and that there is a place for both women and men in the House of Bishops.

I ask Synod to consider the effect on the majority of women and men, clergy and lay, at parish and deanery level, who ask us to say Yes today, so that we may together concentrate on the mission of God in the world.

Mrs Kathleen Playle (Chelmsford): When the vote to ordain women was made, the vicar of my church who had campaigned against it felt unable to continue in his role. He felt that for him to remain was untenable. Heartbreaking though it was for him and

for us, he resigned. The press reported at the time that members of his congregation tried to persuade him to change his mind. That I always found irksome, as anyone who knew him, particularly those of his congregation who knew and loved him, would never dream of trying to change the mind of a man who would stand by his own integrity and that of the word he preached. Yet, because of the provision made for them, he has always encouraged those men and women who stayed – and they did stay.

Now we are being asked to change our minds. This Measure is not yet right. It is not fair. Yes it is emotional and it is personal, but the truth is that, both now and more importantly for the future, it does nothing to reassure women like me, who are conservative Evangelicals in ministry, who want to follow the biblical pattern of leadership in the family and the Church as we see it in Scripture, that we are loyal Anglicans. There is no proper provision for us. I am finding it hard to see that the expression ‘enough waiting’ is a biblical expression, frankly, so I am asking that we wait some more.

I am not yet ready to abstain and so I have come – with broken ankle and broken foot and all – to vote No. Until it is right and we can uphold the provision that so many people made and so many believed 20 years ago, I urge Synod to vote against this Measure.

Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn): I have listened hard to this debate and I still want to listen. I happen to be an ordinary, middle-of-the-road Anglican, who has been nurtured in the faith from my Lancashire background of The Book of Common Prayer, through to an Anglo-Catholic chapel at Durham University, through to work overseas for USPG, to the Central Church where I am now. I still want to hear from the people who are very much encouraging me to support this Measure whether there is a place for me. I am not a misogynist. I really do believe that we need to stick with Scripture and so I am not convinced that this is the right time to take this decision, but I do honestly and genuinely respect those who, through thought, prayer and a lot of listening, have come to a different decision. I respect that but I want to hear today from those who are urging us and saying that we cannot wait any longer whether I have a legitimate place – and from those who supported me, may I add.

I want to mention the psalm in which we are told to wait on the Lord. Twenty years ago we were told that there were provisions made for those who in good conscience could not go along with the ordination of women to the presbyterate. We were told that they would remain in perpetuity for as long as we required it. Twenty years is nothing. I urge Synod to vote against the motion. There is a better way.

Mr Tom Hind (Bath and Wells): As vice-chair, I shall speak up for the laity. This has not been a 12-year journey. This has not been a 20-year journey. This has been a 150-year journey. One hundred and fifty years ago, three things happened. Frederick Faber left the Church of England and went to the Church of Rome. He wrote a wonderful hymn ‘There’s a Wideness in God’s Mercy’. The typewriter was invented – and, for those watching the news today, the last one was made yesterday. Elizabeth Ferard was licensed as the first deaconess by Bishop Archibald Tait, the Bishop of London.

A number of years ago I chaired a meeting of the Open Synod Group. His Grace came to give his insights following the first year of his archiepiscopate and in his reflections vividly described that the Church comes in two flavours: *ecclesia* (the gathered) and *parochia* (those outside). The *ecclesia* has been focusing our attention for a long time now and I fear it is at the expense of the *parochia*. It is of course right that the gathered community of Church of England Christians decide how they are to conduct the affairs of their own Church. This vote today does impact ecumenical relationships, I agree, but both ways. Whichever way it goes, it will impact ecumenical relationships. However, no amount of further work will provide for a more acceptable solution. This less-than-perfect legislation gives our Church an opportunity to move forward and, if passed, echoing what the Bishop of Durham has said, I commit to ensuring that it is honoured in its spirit as well as its words.

Without the ministry of women over the last 20 years we would be running at less than 80 per cent of current staffing levels. Without these women coming forward for the ministry to which they are being called, we would be in a very difficult situation. Between 2000 and 2009 average attendance dropped by 11 per cent in the Church of England, both as a weekly or a Sunday measure. This matched the 13 per cent reduction in stipendiary clergy. The point is that reduction in attendance correlates to the number of stipendiary clergy. Not passing this legislation would have a significant impact on those coming forward for ordination and may also cause those who have kept faith with the Church so far to ask questions about continuing in a Church that does not value them.

We have the opportunity today to ensure that we send out a clear message to the church people who support us and to the nation as a whole that the Church of England values the contribution that its women have made and that it recognises that a diverse nation requires diverse ministry. Frederick Faber wrote, 'We make His love too narrow by false limits of our own; And we magnify His strictness with a zeal He will not own.' Let us not delay and lose out on the episcopal ministry of those women whom God is calling to higher service.

The Archdeacon of Norwich (Ven. Jan McFarlane) (Norwich): This is the first time that I have spoken in the debate on this particular subject. I had not campaigned in any way either, until the 'Enough Waiting' initiative. Why? Because I do not think I was convinced that now was the right time for us to be taking this step and I wanted to listen – really, really listen – to those who oppose this move and this legislation. I have listened and I have listened, I have listened and I have listened, but for the past year or so I am not sure that I have heard anything new.

Today we have talked for, I dread to think how many hours, and I do not think I have heard anything new today. Will we keep on talking? Is not now the time that we need to act? To be honest, I think it is insulting to suggest that we have not given enough time to this issue, not least to those who have spent hours, days, weeks, months, years, talking and listening, consulting widely and writing reports.

Synod, it could be argued that we have been waiting over 2,000 years to reach this point. The legislation is not perfect, as has been pointed out. It has also been pointed out that we shall never, ever find legislation that will be right for everyone. Perhaps those who do not want this legislation might understand that, if we try to move it on

again, it will end up that those in favour cannot vote for it. It is like a see-saw and I believe that we have reached the pivotal point.

In his prophetic sermon in York Minster in the summer, Archbishop Rowan urged us to vote 'not for me and for what I want but for the good of the neighbour with whom I disagree'. I wonder if we have the courage, Synod, to do that. It involves compromise. It involves big compromise for each and every single one of us. If we are determined to move our message forward to a broken and divided world that it is possible to live together with disagreement – if we are determined to do so – then we can do it.

This is not, as some have suggested, the Church bowing to secular pressure. It is a case of us doing our theology in a context. We do not do theology in a vacuum. We adapt our message to the context in which we live. That is why our faith has survived for over 2,000 years and why it is as relevant today in Norfolk as it is in our partner dioceses in Papua New Guinea. We are not bowing to secular pressure; we are remembering that a Church that is so out of step with the world around it that it comes to be regarded as an irrelevance loses any possibility of speaking with a prophetic voice to that same world.

I urge Synod today to vote for the sake of the Church, our Christian witness, for the sake of women who in parts of the world are treated as second-class citizens and are looking to us to model a better way. Please, can we vote Yes?

Mrs Anne Martin (Guildford): I stand in the middle of the Church of England looking around me. This summer it seemed to me that there was a will across the Church to walk together, to find a solution to the sticky problem of clause 5(1)(c). Many of us joined together to try to find a compromise. We have to accept the impossibility of finding words in which we can all absolutely agree. If the draft legislation is rejected today, there is no guarantee that we can do better. For those who say it is not enough there is the possibility that what comes back is even less if it goes into the future. I believe in compromise. I would rather see a cup half-full than a cup half-empty and the possibility of a woman bishop in the near future. I would urge all those who intend to vote against the legislation to ask if they truly believe that it is possible to find words on which we can all absolutely agree, or will they vote against it because they believe the consecration of women bishops must be delayed?

If they do accept that women bishops will happen, please think that we have tried to walk together and trust that all of us want that to continue. Think on what we have in common, what we want in the name of Christ and the Church of England to preserve. Trust the legal judgment given on clause 5(1)(c) and the strength of a code of practice. Remember, the legislation makes it possible to appoint a woman bishop. Even if the legislation is passed, it then has to happen.

Sister Anita mentioned Hilda of Whitby this morning, a great lady of enormous wisdom, a revered figure by bishops and kings who had a profound influence on the 7th century Church. At the Synod of Whitby in 664 she was able to have the courage to compromise for the sake of the Church. I hope that we can all do that too and vote in favour of the draft Measure.

Revd Charles Razzall (Chester): Is it possible to regard the consecration of women as bishops as a holy and gracious gift to the Church on the one hand whilst recognising those reserved about this matter from Scripture and the Great Tradition as a holy gift too? Possibly.

I want to reflect on one or two comments made by the Bishop of Hereford, by the Bishop of Durham and to some extent by Archbishop Rowan. Appeals have constantly been made to grace and trust and goodwill. Of course it is true in the Christian Church that our background radiation should be that of grace and trust and goodwill, but we are discussing legislation here. All the natural law tradition teaches us that legislation should not be predicated on the presumption of goodwill.

Legislation in any context, particularly within the Church, which is composed of both saints and sinners – and the fault line goes through each of us, does it not, brothers and sisters? – must be indifferent to any presumption of goodwill. That is why the Archbishop of Canterbury, in a debate here last February, when we were discussing some of the most vulnerable communities in our society, said that one of legislation's primary purposes must be to protect the vulnerable. Is this legislation as objective as possible without any predicated presumption of goodwill? Many of us regretfully think not. Bishop Victoria Matthews, when in Canada, certainly acted with great personal generosity and goodwill; but other Canadian bishops were – how shall I put it? – less circumspect.

Second, this legislation provides for one holy gift in the Church to be normal and expressed fully ecclesially while the other, though not yet relegated to a matter of personal opinion, will live in an ecclesial half-world with, as yet, no full legal guarantee of a succession of bishops and ecclesial life in perpetuity. For these two reasons, the apparent attempt to base this legislation on predicated goodwill and the fact that it reveals an ecclesial half-life, means that regretfully – and I encourage others – we must find a new way. I urge Synod to vote against this Measure and we will start talking tonight.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): This is not the speech I was planning to make but I was moved by my dear friend the Bishop of Chichester, who I know thinks differently from me on this issue, saying that, whatever happened, he would want to make whatever happens work. I felt it might be useful if a bishop stood up and said the same but from a different point of view.

Whatever the outcome today, we are committed to make things work. I think Synod will notice later an overwhelming majority in the House of Bishops in favour of this Measure. We will be the ones in the dock if things go wrong. We are the ones with the greatest interest in making it work. Sometimes, as I have listened to the debate, I have wondered whether we are looking at the same Measure. I quite understand that, while it is not the provision that many people want, it is a provision that can work. The Act of Synod has worked extremely well – yes, not everywhere, but on the whole – for 20 years. I believe the provision set out in this Measure is a better provision.

I say to my friends in my own diocese, conservative Evangelicals, 'You will be better served by this set of arrangements. Whereas in the past, when Resolution C was passed, for instance, you received the ministry of the Bishop of Richborough and he

has done a brilliant job, now, under this new system, I will be able to offer you the ministry of a conservative Evangelical bishop.’ Although I recognise that this provision is not quite what members want, it has to be recognised that it is a provision and that it can be made to work. At the heart of this is our belief, which I think is shared by virtually all in this chamber, in two integrities, not two legislations. That is what it comes down to.

One last little thing. I was chatting with somebody in my diocese the other day who probably had not read the Measure. He worships in a Resolution C parish. He said to me, ‘Bishop, why is it that you cannot give us what we need?’ I said, ‘Tell me what would work for you’ and he replied, ‘If we could just know that we had a bishop of our tradition, who would serve in our parish, and if we knew that we could get in touch with you, Bishop, and you would provide that, that would be enough.’ I thought, ‘That is quite a good idea. Why didn’t we think of that?’ At the heart, this Measure has an elegant simplicity, in that members send in their Letters of Request and we are duty bound to respect the reasons for sending in that request. We will honour that request. If we do not, we will be in the dock. Brothers and sisters, it can work. It can work for all of us. This is Spirit led. We have been brought to this point where we can say Yes to this – every single one of us. I am voting Yes for the good of the Church and I am voting Yes for my dear brothers and sisters in Forward in Faith and in Reform. I believe it can work for every one of us, so please join me in that lobby.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): Synod, I am sorry to return to this, but we are not here to debate whether it is right to have women bishops or not. That has already been decided. Today the question is simple. Is there provision that meets the needs of those for whom it is intended? The people for whom we are trying to provide provision tell us it does not, so surely we should listen to them. We are not achieving our aim of Church unity if we do not. That is why I am asking us to take more time. My friend mentioned Psalm 27 earlier, which says, ‘Wait patiently for the Lord. Be brave and courageous. Yes, wait patiently for the Lord.’

A youth member mentioned earlier that they did not want to reach the age of 30 with this not passed. I will be 30 very soon – and it is not all bad, I can assure you. However, time is irrelevant in the grand scheme of things, as the Archbishop said – although I might be taking him slightly out of context – in the decision we need to make here and decide whether we are being gracious, loving and godly. Psalm 112 tells us that good will come to those who are generous and who conduct their affairs with justice. The Bible also tells us to command them to do good, to be rich in good deeds and to be generous and willing to share. Synod, let us be gracious, just and willing to share our Church and lives with one another. Traditionalists want their theological convictions recognised too.

The legislation really is not ‘good enough’. Today we have a clear choice. Today we define what it means to be an Anglican and to be a Christian. Even if we cannot agree, we have a chance to accept one another. I urge Synod to reject this legislation because it does not meet the needs of our whole Church. Let us not undo one injustice by creating another. Vote No.

Mr John Shand (Lichfield): We have heard quite a number of references to age. It has made me feel very, very elderly because – I have an interest to declare – I am 70 years of age. In my gloomier and less faithful moments that seems better than the alternatives.

Throughout my adult life I have worshipped in the Catholic tradition of the Church of England. In my gloomier and less faithful moments.... (Perhaps we need not go there!) I yearn to see women bishops in my lifetime, not out of some token bowing down to secular political correctness but as an affirmation of our gospel of inclusive love. I do not want to see them accepted with ill grace. I want to see them accepted with joy and acclamation. To those friends, brothers and sisters who struggle with that, may I simply ask them to come with me now, quietly, prayerfully, in trust to Bethlehem, to the house of Simon the Leper, where, to Our Lord's disciples' outrage, a woman anointed him with precious ointment. Why did she do that? Our Lord made it quite plain. He said, 'She has done a beautiful thing for me. She has anointed my body for burying' – a deeply sacramental act. What was Our Lord's reaction? Did he say, 'I wish she had not done that'? Did he say, 'Next time can we come to some convoluted and complicated arrangement that will not upset Peter'? No. 'Truly I say to you, wherever this gospel is preached in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her.'

Today, let us remember her and, having remembered her, put aside this last decade of acrimonious entrenchment, of megaphone diplomacy, of frenetic painting into corners. Forget faction, as we were reminded yesterday. I urge members to forget WATCH, to forget Reform, to forget Forward in Faith and – dare I say it? – even to forget 'Church Mouse,' whoever he or she may be.

We all come here with yearning – that word again – but the trouble is that we yearn for different things. We all know that if this Measure is passed many hearts will be broken, but if it falls many other hearts will be broken too, my own included. I would urge those who are still in a quandary over this to take time before they vote, quietly, prayerfully, with trust and respect, and to seek the will of the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit can penetrate even the darkest of places.

Canon Ann Turner (Europe): We have heard much today about justice, respect, equality, opportunity, excellence, compromise, waiting – or maybe not waiting. I am also aware that I have heard from a large minority, in which I happen to belong, that has expressed views on provision (or lack of), legislation that is inappropriate, lack of understanding and long discussions on the latest wording of clause 5(1)(c). However, from those speakers above all I have heard of a real and urgent desire to get on with the mission of this Church of England to which we all belong, without having to divert even more energy and resource in ongoing discussions about what is right for us or them in a code of practice that will be required if this current legislation is approved today.

I can understand the impatience and desire to get on with it. Anyone who knows me will say that I am process-driven; but inside me, the inner me, my conscience, says No. I have tried over 20 years to attend worship where the Eucharist is celebrated by a woman. My feet will not get me to the altar rail. I think it is my conscience that says,

for me at this moment, this is wrong. We have agreed as a Church of England that we will have women bishops, and I respect that – but, please, not at any price.

In answer to earlier speakers, yes I seriously believe that we can do better. This is not an expression of ingratitude to those who have toiled over this Measure so far. Not at all. We have to be bold. We have to hold firm to our achievement as a Church which accommodates a wide breadth of traditions of men, women and children and, like many who have gone before us, who through the centuries have had inner conviction, if that is what we have, say No at this time – just as we agreed to do with the adjournment of the debate in July, when the revision of clause 5(1)(c) was requested and granted by process – in the knowledge that, when the Spirit wills, a day will come when Yes means Yes for the whole of the Church of England to flourish together.

Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London): I think about my little daughter a lot, as all parents do. Recently I have wondered what sort of Church it is that she is growing up in. I have also thought about my own journey of faith, how I discovered a different aspect of Anglicanism when I moved house and grew into my own spiritual home as an Anglo-Catholic. I love being an Anglo-Catholic. I love the Church of England for its breadth and for its diversity, and I love that we can minister to such a wide range of people. Will my daughter grow up in a Church where being a traditional Anglo-Catholic is something one constantly has to fight for or where the gifts in spirituality are truly understood to be part of the breadth of Anglican expression? Because this Measure will lead to endless public debate about a code of practice and diocesan schemes and uncertainty about how we relate to each other as brothers and sisters, it has the potential to stifle the mission of the Church in future generations, tying it up in endless discussions.

When I was a child I read an engraving on a piece of jewellery. It said, ‘I love you more than I did yesterday and not as much as I will do tomorrow.’ I thought that it was pretty trite but now that I am older I realize that it is quite true. I love my husband each day more and more because I know him better each day. I love my friends more and more each day because I know them better. I believe it is the same in the Christian family. Our fantastic opportunity now is to get to know each other more and to grow together in love. For the sake of our children’s generation can we not spend a bit more time? What about my daughter’s daughters?

If we spend some more time working together, we can make a firm foundation that will allow them to grow up in a Church where this debate has been concluded, where the members of the Church are freed to do mission and no longer weighed down by having to debate the place of each other in the community or tied up in legal battles. I want our message today to ring loud and clear to everyone who is listening and right through the generations: we love each other and we want to love each other more. No to this Measure and Yes to a loving future together.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro): We are about to enter Advent: a time of waiting. We have been told today that waiting can be a brave and courageous thing to do. I believe that waiting is not always a bad thing. I would like to thank and honour each of the bishops who have stood up here today and told us that if this Measure passes they will

make it work. I am grateful for that, because if this Measure passes we will need them to make it work.

Though it may come as a surprise to the bishops, they are not immortal. There will come a day when they are no longer the House of Bishops and we will be relying on other bishops. It has been said that promises made by past generations cannot be held accountable to this generation. Lindsay's daughter needs to know that there is legislation that allows her to grow up equal in a Church. I genuinely believe that we can do better. I just wonder if we should look at this whole thing the other way round and say that we want to stay together first and then look to see how we can make legislation for women bishops.

Over and over again, I am told the primary cause of this legislation is to get women to be bishops. I want us to go forward together. I want us to talk to the world about unity and about us being saved by Jesus Christ. The Bishop of Manchester asked us, 'Will the mission of the Church do better with this Measure or without?' I believe that it will do better together.

Revd Jacqueline Stober (Liverpool): When I was first ordained five and a half years ago my kids were thrilled. My daughter was 13 at the time and she and her friends were so inspired by the idea of a woman priest that they started a Facebook page for me – my fan club. 'I Love the Rev' it was called. The Roman Catholic one even wrote a cartoon strip for SuperRev. Whenever a teenager was tempted to sin, I swooped down from the sky and intervened with a pertinent lesson in morality! My daughter and her friends are all now 18 and far more mature. One of her new university friends has bought her own ordination from the internet.

I accept that this is all very silly but it makes the point that students are at least potentially interested in what we in the Church are doing. There is only one thing that they refuse to discuss and that is the issue of women bishops. Whenever I try, they simply lose interest. I asked my daughter, born in 1994, point-blank for her opinion. She told me bluntly that she could not see how a particular piece of anatomy could possibly affect one's ability to do the job. That is how they see it.

In our Church and Sunday Schools we teach that in Christ there is no slave or free, no male or female. Our problem today is that they believe us. Let us not betray their trust. Let us not continue to disrespect women in the Church. The amended Measure is 'good enough'. If a parish requests alternative provision, their wishes must be respected, no matter how we feel about it. That is legally binding and enforceable. To go any further will mean we lose moral credibility and the right and the ability to preach the gospel to subsequent generations. They simply will not hear us. It is no accident that this debate hinges around the word 'respect'. So it should. People out there, especially young people, know all about respect. Let us show them that it is possible to disagree profoundly yet continue in love and respect to serve Christ and one another.

Lieutenant Commander Philippa Sargent (Armed Forces Synod): I ask Synod to bear with me for a moment, for I speak as one who has spent several years writing policies designed to keep a disparate community working to the same ends. For myself, I do not think the wording matters all that much. Yes words are important. Yes we need

legislation that is useable and, if necessary, enforceable. However, in the last analysis it is not words or legislation or pieces of paper that will keep us together; it is love.

We are part of God's family. A family does not stay together because of words or legislation or pieces of paper; it stays together through love. Let us accept that the words on the pieces of paper before us are 'good enough'. They give us a starting point, grounded in love and respect, to move forward and demonstrate in words and deeds the love for each other that our Lord commanded, but the real work of staying together will be done day by day, person by person, parish by parish, diocese by diocese. That will not happen unless we give the Holy Spirit the opening to work in our individual and corporate lives. What we have before us gives the Holy Spirit that room to begin to work. Let us vote for it wholeheartedly and get on with what really matters.

Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Oxford University): Next year I will have entered my twentieth year as a college chaplain. That means my day-to-day working life is largely with people between the ages of 18 and 24 or 25, and they give me enormous confidence in the future of the Church. In my college chapel, the main service is on Sunday evenings. On Sunday evenings our students, who in the morning have been to – how shall I put it? – every type of Anglicanism that Oxford can afford – which, as members might know, is every type that Anglicanism can afford – all come, having been to all these different churches in the morning, to the college chapel. That gives me enormous encouragement about the future of our Church. Working with people that age keeps you on your toes.

There is one point I would like to make about our ordinands. The least represented group amongst them is young women, not young men. Think about them too and their vocations. What are you saying to them? Most of all, the Synod should be confident about the future of the Church. The best speech today, if I may say so, was that given by a member of the Youth Council. The future of our young people is good and bright.

Revd John Cook (Oxford): An issue that has not been touched on at all is that to do with referring to secular courts – which to me is quite a big issue as I think about biblical obedience. The Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians 6 says, 'Dare we take it before the ungodly for judgment instead of before the saints? Do you not know that the saints will judge the world? And if you are to judge the world, are you not competent to judge in a whole variety of cases....How much more the things of this life you are going to judge?....I say this to your shame. Is it possible that there is nobody among you wise enough to judge the dispute between believers...?' The whole trajectory seems to be in the wrong direction in having the secular courts involved. In fact Paul says, 'On that trajectory you are defeated already.' Three times he says, 'Do you not know?' as if we are so dull as not to remember what is so obvious.

This is an important theological issue. We are not to have recourse to secular courts on disagreements. The secular courts are good, but we must not ignore the command, and prohibition of the Apostle. There is a proprietary right to go to court. Paul did appeal to Roman justice but never in the area of brother to brother, or sister to sister, or sister to brother; and, even with Jews, he did not refer to secular courts in disputes. This is important.

Let me end by quoting C T Studd, England cricketer, Cambridge graduate, a great missionary to China who was born into a wealthy family in the 19th century. He gave up his inheritance. In 1888 he wrote a letter to General Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army. ‘Henceforth our bank is in heaven. You see we are rather afraid – notwithstanding the great earthly safety of Messrs Coutts & Co (his bank) and the Bank of England – that they may both break on the Judgment Day.’

Are we looking to the wrong place? Because it is not helping us to go to the secular courts to help us live for the future now. With great reluctance, I would say it is not as good as it could be and, on that particular area, because of Christian obedience, I think I must reject this motion today.

The Bishop of Dorchester (Rt Revd Colin Fletcher): Thirty years ago, if, like John Cook, members had had the benefit of hearing my lectures in ethics at Wycliffe Hall, they would have heard me say that male headship is part of the order of the biblical record, understood in a particular way. Since then I have changed my mind. I started to look at the whole New Testament. I was too bound by 1 Corinthians. I should have gone to Rome. Rome is much more exciting in the New Testament period, if you read Romans 16. There you have a wonderful grouping of men and women who are taking the leadership in the Church. Of that there is no doubt whatsoever. Rome is our model.

Second, what has happened in the interim is that I have had the sheer joy of working with female colleagues over the last 20 years. The one body on which I now sit that feels very odd indeed is the House of Bishops. If we want to make that House less and less well connected with a Church of the nature we have today, we will continue to have it as all-male. It is a disadvantage to our Church to keep it all-male. Of that I am in no doubt at all.

Lastly, when I go into primary schools, the question every eight or nine-year-old asks me is, ‘Can a woman be a bishop?’ and I reply, ‘Not yet, but one day you will be.’ The little girl who has asked that question smiles, a huge grin in anticipation that she has been fully recognised. I urge Synod to vote in favour of this Measure.

Rev. Janet Kerton (Ripon and Leeds): I believe that this legislation is good news for the Church of England. It is good news because it provides the women bishops that 42 out of 44 dioceses express their longing for. It is good news because it provides a clear and relational way for parishes to request alternative pastoral and sacramental ministry. It is good news because it provides sound statutory arrangements for those who in conscience cannot receive the ministry of women bishops or their supporters. It is good news because it holds open the most generous space that we can within the Church for difference. It is good news because it keeps one, undivided episcopacy until the time when other Churches can come to accept any of our orders, male or female.

The differences between us have not collapsed in the long discussions that we have had. My hope is that by the end of today’s debate we will be able to show that we can come to a point of deep mutual respect, where difference can be embraced and can add energy and vitality to the Church, where it can give us a glimpse in our life together now of the completeness that will be ours when God becomes all in all. I

urge Synod to release the full potential of women as the Church itself has asked us to. I urge Synod to vote for this Measure.

Revd Andrew Howard (York): I work as a chaplain at Teesside University. It is a minor university. Some members may not even know where it is. It is in Middlesbrough. That is in the North!

It is a very secular place, and at times an aggressively secular place to be ministering and working, but I have learned a lot about being there, especially about working with young people. I have also learned a lot about the way in which minority groups can find a place in such an organisation. The university itself promotes the rights of minority groups by guaranteeing their right to equality and therefore participation in the organisation. Each group is allowed to preserve its own characteristic. The university sees that both the promotion and protection of the identity of minority groups prevents forced assimilation and the loss of something cultural.

Members may wonder where all this is leading. I am not talking about the Church aping the world. But if an institution like the university, which is largely secular in its outlook, can accommodate and embrace diversity of the kind I have been describing then why is the Church of all places apparently failing to do so? The current draft legislation, it is claimed, squares the circle and sufficiently addresses the needs of those parishes and individuals in a significant minority who, for legitimate and theological and ecclesiological reasons, are unable to accept the jurisdiction of a female diocesan. The circle is not squared; the Measure as it stands fails to do precisely what the university does with such success. Conversely, the very life and survival in the Church of England of a significant minority will be further denied and undermined by its operation. I urge Synod to vote against the Measure.

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): I am the freshly-baked new bishop's adviser for women's ministry in our diocese – an interesting time at which to start in post.

On Saturday I received a letter from a colleague who is part of a group of clergy in our diocese that opposes the ordination of women. It was a call to our General Synod members to ask them to vote against the legislation. Having indicated to him that I was highly likely to vote in favour, I also said, 'I have always appreciated your support in my time as area dean and simply want to say that, whichever way the vote goes, I hope we can continue to work together with the kind of mutual respect that I think we have for one another'.

I wonder whether the rural church too has an important contribution to make here, because the choice agenda does not work in rural areas. You just have to live together, especially in a very sparsely populated area like Northumberland; you do not go church shopping for the type of church that suits. So we make it work, from having a churchwarden opposed to the ordination of women to working with a female rural incumbent, to her female colleague inviting a male colleague in to preside at a pre-nuptial service of Communion in order that all members of the family, including those opposed, can participate. We do not even need a law to do it. It is just a matter of common sense to allow each other to flourish.

As Leonard Cohen said, ‘There is a crack in everything, that’s how the light gets in’, and that is how I would like us to use this legislation. Can we use this legislation as a platform from which to welcome and embrace the vocation of women to the episcopate and continue to include those who do not welcome it? Someone who was recently re-elected, albeit by a narrow margin, famously said, ‘Yes we can’.

Dr Charles Hanson (Carlisle): Last Saturday I was chatting with a friend who said to me, ‘Charles, what do you hope to achieve when you get to the General Synod?’ I said, ‘I think we should have twin aims – first, to approve women bishops, and second to provide a secure, permanent place for those who have such theological convictions that they cannot accept those people’. He said to me, ‘Surely that is not beyond the wit of man. You have some intelligent people there’. Yet we seem to have moved so far from that.

This morning we were told that the minority had strong provision. What is that provision? It is the code of practice. Where is it? None of us has yet seen it. We have seen an illustrative draft, but we all know that drafts can be changed in every particular before we reach the final version. I therefore suggest that in being asked to approve this legislation we are being asked to sign a blank cheque. During my lifetime I have signed thousands of cheques and no one has yet asked me to sign a blank one, and I am not going to do it today, because I think that it risks bankruptcy. Let us be frank. Even if we had the final version of this code of practice, I would still urge Synod to vote against it for the simple reason that it is second-class legislation for second-class members of our Church. That is the way a majority treats the minority in the secular world, and as Christians we can surely do better than that. I therefore urge members to join me in voting against this thoroughly bad proposal.

Revd Canon Maggie McLean (Wakefield): Over the past couple of days I have been reflecting on the ministry of Peter in Acts, and it seems to me that after baptizing quite a lot of gentiles he was criticized by the Jerusalem church for doing so because they had not first yet conformed to the Torah. We do not know whether provision was made for any in Jerusalem who felt unable to accept this innovation in the life of the Church, but it seems likely that those who objected were neither compelled to do what they could not accept nor given any more protection than the pastoral assurance of the council of that day. What is striking in the debate of the early Church is the openness of Peter to recognise and celebrate the Holy Spirit working a new thing in the life of the people. It was experience that changed Peter, not blind acceptance to the way that things had been done in a particular way in the past; it was experience.

Therefore, the decision that we must make today is not only about women in episcopal orders but about the kind of Church we are called to be. Any further delay or excessive provision for those who, let’s face it, have had 2,000 years of ministry on their terms will hinder mission and the credibility of the gospel. Echoing that early conflict in the life of the Church re-told in Acts, if thousands of women clergy have evidently been given the same gift as their male colleagues, who are we to stand in the way of God?

The Archdeacon of Northampton (Ven. Christine Allsopp) (Peterborough): I struggle to come to a mind about whether I could vote for the Measure before us. I long for the episcopate to be open to women, but I was uncertain about this legislation. Is it a

compromise too far? Is it worth the risk? Then I remembered the first sermon that I preached 23 years ago following my ordination as deacon; it was all about risk. It was about Abraham, who by faith, according to the Letter to the Hebrews, obeyed God's call and set out not knowing where he was going. I described how I was feeling as I embarked on that new ministry after moving to a new diocese with my husband and three children, and I encouraged my hearers to step out and take the risk of responding to God's call to journey in faith as followers of Jesus Christ.

A few years later, in 1992, I preached to the same congregation on the Sunday after the General Synod had voted to approve the ordination of women to the priesthood, and I quoted the words used by the then Archbishop of Canterbury in that debate, when he said, 'We are caught between faith and fear'. Perhaps we always are caught between faith and fear when we have to make these momentous decisions.

In spite of my fears I have decided to vote for the Measure before us. I have decided to take that risk, knowing that God always goes before us. Brothers and sisters, I hope that if you are uncertain you will nevertheless take the risk so that we can continue to journey together despite our differences and step out together in faith.

The Bishop of Chester (Rt Revd Dr Peter Forster): For 15 years I have gladly and joyfully ordained women as priests, and my diocese has almost the largest number of female incumbents of any diocese in the Church of England. So why do I find myself uncomfortable? I set out some reasons in the *Church Times* a week ago and it would be tedious to repeat any of them. However, picking up on what the Bishop of Chelmsford said very revealingly in his speech, there is one additional point that I would like to mention, namely that to vote for this legislation actually is to vote for a theology of the episcopate where parishes choose their own bishop, even more than is the case at the moment. It is to vote for a Church in which members of the House of Bishops and bishops in dioceses will not be in eucharistic communion with one another.

I long for the day when we can ordain women as bishops and that, as the Bishop of Dorchester said, they will be fully accepted in the Church, but I believe that in passing this legislation we would be doing more to change the theology of bishop than we have acknowledged. In this sort of legislation there is always the law of unintended consequences and I fear that we have not got it sufficiently right to support it today.

Mr John Ward (London): What is the difference between an accountant and a lawyer? Accountants know that they are boring and I am going to bore Synod for a short time with a bit of law, but I do so in answer to my cousin Tom Sutcliffe. This is a family affair and I fear that we may vote on different sides this afternoon. Tom said that he might have been able to vote for clause 5(1)(c) as originally drafted in July.

I want to look at clause 5(1)(c) now and particularly at the word 'respect' and the question whether this is wishy-washy or something that is properly known already in the law of England. It is well known in the law of England. In fact it goes back to the Geneva Conventions on the Law of War, which I hope will not be relevant here! Perhaps more usefully however it is already enshrined in Articles 8 and 2 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights. Article 8 is about the right to respect for family life. Article 2 is about the right to education and respect for the

rights of parents to ensure that education is in conformity with their religious and philosophical convictions.

In a very relevant case relating to corporal punishment in school, to which parents objected, the court said that respect means more than just to acknowledge or to take into account, but that it implies a positive obligation on the part of the state. In that case merely striking a balance between conflicting views was not enough, nor was a policy of gradually abolishing corporal punishment. I therefore put it to Synod that respect is known in law and will be respected.

Very Revd Robert Key (Channel Islands): Jersey is a small jurisdiction and when the fog comes down we are on our own. I need a divided Church like I need the proverbial hole in the head. Therefore, my vote today will have nothing whatsoever to do with my own views, which I consider do not matter very much, but everything to do with the views of those placed in my care by the Crown, and at her command by the Bishop of Winchester's Commission. They matter to me very much indeed. The evangelicals and Catholic churches within the Church of England in Jersey do not find the provisions in this Measure acceptable.

It will soon be Christmas. Midnight Mass will be followed by a short night and the Christmas celebrations, and after that Christmas dinner with friends. I am an enthusiastic carnivore, but my best friends do not eat meat. I could say to them, 'Here is a single-clause dinner – turkey, like it or leave it'. I could say, 'I have made some provision for you – you can have the vegetables by themselves without the turkey'. In either case I do not think they would feel that they had an honoured place at my table. It matters not that the provisions are acceptable to the host; it matters that they are acceptable to the guest. I want them to be my friends and to continue to have an honoured place round the family table.

Mr Robert Key (Salisbury): – and plain lay Canon! I support this Measure because I believe that it will work and is in the best traditions of the Church of England. In an age of religious terror when Englishmen were burning each other at the stake for their beliefs, the author of the great Elizabethan Reformation Settlement said that she had no desire to make windows into men's souls. She also declared that there was only one Christ Jesus, one faith, and that all else was a dispute over trifles. I do not think that the issue before Synod today is a trifle, but we need to get it into perspective.

Scripture, tradition and reason are our foundations. The Ven. Bede told us that the English nation was the child of the Church and that the Church of England was a reconciliation between the old Celtic and the new Roman churches and traditions. When St Osmund built our cathedral at Old Sarum his foundation uniquely included an equal number of Norman and Anglo-Saxon canons; he was a reconciler. John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, was largely responsible for our retention of the historic formularies of the Church of England. He said, 'We have planted no new religion but only renewed the old'. Richard Hooker, a priest in our diocese, defended the Elizabethan Settlement against the Puritans and brought harmony to the ambiguities of the reformed Church of England. Our happy diocese of Salisbury is tolerant and inclusive; we always have been for 1,300 hundred years and we are not about to change.

The church in England has always been a folk church, a church of the people. It still is today, as the Established Church of our nation. There will always be room for everyone, a trusted and respectful place for those who find it difficult to change. Here we sit, traditional Anglo-Catholics, reformed Anglo-Catholics, conservative evangelicals, charismatics, normal Church of England, anything but the front-pew, Anglicans. Only one thing really matters, that is to love the Lord our God with all our strength and to love our neighbours as ourselves, and to do that we need to vote in favour of this Measure.

Canon Janet Perrett (Ely): In York Archbishop Rowan reminded us tellingly of the frustrations we all feel over the difficult matters before us, and it occurred to me that it is often with our nearest and dearest that we express that frustration the most, those indeed for whom we most wish joy. This speaks to me most clearly that our Church is truly a family. All of this could not hurt so much, and however much we are disappointed or dismayed by one another, we must still remain as a family and not leave anyone out. Indeed no one to whom I have spoken about this has any wish for the Church of England to divide. The message I have heard is that we need to and must stay together. Imperfect the legislation may be, but it has been considered long and prayerfully.

The hardest thing for me is the repetition of distrust, which says that those of us in favour of women in the episcopate cannot be trusted to make good, robust provision for those who are not in favour. We have one great Commandment, that we love one another, and we have one familiar Anglican injunction to preach the gospel afresh in each generation. An example of that freshness is the Christians who fought against slavery – a system of life accepted in the Bible but abhorred today. Another is the women who first bore witness to Our Lord's resurrection; their word would not have been accepted in any legal system of the time but was by Christ's disciples.

Attitudes to women in the culture and social systems of the passing ages have changed constantly. I say attitudes because the position of women as judges for example in the Old Testament often was one of great power and authority, and in our generation post-rural and post-industrial as it is I believe that we need the new expression of faith that women in the episcopate will bring. I urge members not to let this opportunity slide out of our hands and to vote in favour of the legislation.

Ms Susan Cooper (London): I want to urge members to support the Measure today for the sake of the mission of the Church, and not merely that of the Church of England but for the sake of the mission of all Christian communities in this land.

One of my recent correspondents attends a Pentecostal church but believes that the Church of England still has an incredibly important place in our society and in sending a message to the UK about what Christians believe. At the moment the message we are sending about the position of women in the Church is a barrier to our mission here in the 21st century. Of course, in the first century Paul realized that circumcision was a barrier to mission in the gentile world, and he made a journey that would have been much more risky and time consuming than for example the journey today from Durham to Canterbury. Paul travelled to Jerusalem, where, with the help of Peter, he persuaded the elders of the Church, the traditionalists of his day, that to insist on circumcision for male gentile converts was a barrier to the spread of the

gospel. Paul was a pragmatic and leading-edge theologian, enthusiastic for mission in his day.

I entreat those who hesitate to think of the mission of the Church today and those who we serve and to vote for this Measure.

Revd James Dudley-Smith (Bath and Wells): I am grateful to the Bishop of Chelmsford for his very persuasive speech and I look forward to meeting that conservative evangelical bishop who holds a view against the ordination of women to the episcopate to provide for those parishes. There is no such bishop in the Church of England at present.

I am grateful, too, to the Bishop of Dorchester, though I worry about pitting Romans 16 against 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 or 1 Timothy 2. However the Book of Romans gives teaching to us on how the people of Jesus are to function in circumstances in which they just cannot agree. We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak and not please ourselves. Each of us should please our neighbours for their good, to build them up, for even Christ did not please himself. I sense that that somewhat puts us all in our place today, including me.

I guess that a great many of us have come to Synod hoping to achieve what I think is right. As John Shand said, actually we yearn for different thing. We all think that something different is right. We are divided into different groups and factions and have not reached agreement; and yet today we are forcing ourselves to debate and vote on this. Whichever way the vote goes, some brothers and sisters will be pleased at the outcome at the expense of brothers and sisters who will be in deep distress. If this Measure were to enshrine provision recognised to be good enough for both sides, it would be good and honourable to vote in favour of it, but that is not the case and we should vote No. It is not the case, as witnessed by the more than 22 per cent of diocesan synod members who voted against it. I urge members to care for their brothers and sisters. A better way forward can be found, one in which we please our fellow Christians for their good, to build them up.

Dr Philip Rice (London): Brothers and sisters, today we are doing some beautiful for God. We are meeting as a Synod elected by single transferable voting to represent the breadth of the Church of England. That is an honourable task and we should be very grateful for this Constitution, which in some ways helps the minorities to feel fully and perhaps even over-represented today.

However, there is a task. We live in a highly argumentative world and I fear that in considering the consequences of that for this world we need to look carefully at the legislation and give it the test of argument. How much will there be? We heard the use of the term 'reasonable probability'. I am afraid we live in a situation in which legitimate Anglicans will face the possibility of different tweaks to these schemes. Bishops may have their own particular views about how a scheme will work. I think that it would have been much better if the code of practice had been set out on the face of the Measure and a diocesan model scheme included in the schedule. What we have before us is not good law.

I could have supported co-ordinate jurisdiction. I commend the way in which the London diocesan complementarian approach works, but this is not good law. I will try my best to give it a nice hash tag – *lex scripta non est*. This is not good law and I suggest that we use the word No for it.

Professor Helen Leathard (Blackburn): This morning I walked all the way from Russell Square. Along the way I saw a *Big Issue* seller, a manifestation of a sign of a secular initiative to help people in need. However I saw no manifestation of Christian mission and outreach, unless I count posters outside St Martin-in-the-Fields advertising music concerts. As I walked on I pondered the contrast between that and the several hundred of us gathering here indoors today to deal with internal business rather than mission and outreach. As I reached Whitehall my legs started to complain about the long walk that my head was making them take, but they did not tear themselves off and sit down for a rest; we actually continued as one body and arrived here, as members can see.

In Christ we are members of one Body and it is time to put our internal wrangling behind us and start reaching out to the world. Today let us vote to remove the legal obstacles to the consecration of women bishops, work trustingly and diligently on the provision for those for whom this is problematic, and then get on with being Christ and showing Christ to the world that he came to save. According to some of the speeches today, one would have thought that the gender of the House of Bishops was going to be transformed in the twinkling of an eye. We are not voting for that today; we are voting to remove the obstacles to women becoming part of the appointments process for bishops. Even if we vote for the Measure today, it may a long time before there is more than a handful in the House, and I therefore urge members to say Yes to this legislation.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I want to say something about keeping faith. Those who were members of this Synod in the last quinquennium will remember a speech made at an earlier stage of this seemingly endless process by Andrew Watson, now the Bishop of Aston and a supporter of the principle of admitting women to the episcopate. He reminded us of the importance of God's people keeping their promises and pointed us to the story of the Gibeonites. Members will recall that the Gibeonites were Canaanites who deceived Joshua into making a treaty of peace with them by pretending to be from a distant country. Even when that deceit was discovered Joshua kept faith with the promise that he had made, and the Gibeonites lived in peace with Israel for centuries until King Saul slaughtered most of them. The consequence of Saul's breach of faith was severe drought, and Saul's descendants paid a terrible price.

The point is that our holy God is faithful to his promises and he requires his holy people also to be promise-keepers like him. Just 20 years ago, not several hundred, promises were made not to deceiving enemies but to members of our own Church who could not in conscience receive the priestly ministry of women that they could have a permanent, secure, honoured place in this Church in which they could thrive. I suggest that today we need to ask ourselves whether the Measure before us, which includes the repeal of all the provision made in Part II of the 1993 Measure, is faithful and keeps faith with those promises. I do not think that it does.

It is also important for those of us who were elected to the Synod to keep faith with those who elected us and not to be overborne in our judgement by others, however senior and influential. Let us therefore keep faith with our electorate and with the promises that we and our forebears made.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): In 1992 I voted in synod for the ordination of women as priests. Sadly it was not in wet Westminster but in sunny Swaziland, where by a miracle we voted not only for women to become priests but bishops at the same time. It was such a miracle to the church in South Africa that three years later Archbishop Desmond asked me as secretary to the synod to remind the synod of the decision that we had made at Swaziland, which I duly did. Six years later Archbishop Njongo said to me as secretary to the synod, ‘Are you sure we did what we did in Swaziland?’ Yes I was.

From that time in Swaziland two common themes come back to me that are still present in this chamber today. Several of our senior bishops could not in conscience ordain women, but out of grace and a sense of assurance of the collegiality of the house of bishops they either abstained or voted in favour of the motion. The most important speech was made by Colin Jones, the then Dean of Cape Town, who reminded synod that he grew up in a single-parent home – a not uncommon occurrence in his community – in which he asked us why, having received the gift of life from the hands of his mother, he should not receive the words of life from a woman.

This weekend, 20 years later in a sense of *déjà vu*, Bishop Ellinah Wamukoya completed the circle and the first African woman bishop was consecrated in Swaziland. In synod in the African church we often waited for the Church of England to lead the way! Perhaps now is the time for England to follow Mama Africa. I ask Synod to vote in favour of the Measure.

Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough): On 15 July this year Hillary Clinton said, ‘Democracy is not just about reflecting the will of the majority, it is also about protecting the rights of the minority’. I think that is a very important principle in politics and in the Church.

I have looked at this Measure very carefully through the eyes of theological and legal training and asked myself whether it bears the weight that has been set upon it in terms of its ability to make that provision of protecting the rights of the minority, and I have to say that, in the words of the very famous advertising campaign, it doesn’t do what it says on the tin. It does not provide any legal mechanism for any of the assurances given today to be put into effect, because all those depend on future decisions of this Synod and not of any one House within it.

The code of practice will be subject to revision by the Synod and succeeding Diocesan Synod Motions for years to come. The only way that assurance can be made for certain is by putting it into the Measure itself, and the only way we can do that is to replace this unfair Measure with one that is truly fair and on which we have sought agreement in advance before we come to final approval. I therefore ask the Synod today to vote against this Measure and make way for a better version to come forward with which we can all live and function happily together.

Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy (Archbishops' Council): I come to Synod as an evangelical priest who is in sympathy with my brothers and sisters but also in favour of this Measure. Today we have come to a crossroads, which gives us a unique opportunity to continue our journey together in unity, love and truth. Rest assured that we have heard the views of all who are opposed, and believe me we get it, but if we feel that we cannot trust in one another, possibly we can trust the synodical process that has guided God's Church for two millennia. Should some of us now find it difficult in our heart of hearts to trust that process, surely we can place our trust in God – trust that the God who has begun a good work in this Church and in this Synod is fateful to complete it, trust that God's plan for us is that we will all prosper together and not perish.

Today we have an opportunity to go forth trusting in God, the God who called all things into being and who is more than able to do immeasurably more than we can ever ask, desire or anticipate. He is fateful to preserve and protect what we all hold dear – our various traditions existing together in this great Church of England. Let us move forward exemplifying the rich legacy that truly has been the Church of England since its inception, with the distinctive ability to hold together in mutual grace and love all those whom she seeks to serve regardless of their tradition. Let us go forth exemplifying to our parishes, to England and indeed to the world that we are capable of remaining together in unity, with diversity and complementarity. I urge members to vote Yes in favour of the Measure.

The Chairman: Members of Synod, so far we have heard 79 speeches and some members are still standing. Earlier I advised that we need to vote on the Measure at around 5.30 to 6 p.m. to allow enough time for final approval of the Amending Canon and Petition between then and 7 p.m. Towards the end of that time I would like to hear four further speeches and I intend to call Philip North, Dr Elaine Storkey, the Bishop of Burnley and the Bishop of Leicester.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of one minute.

Miss Joy Gilliver (Chichester): The primary reason that I cannot vote for this Measure is my concern about unity and Catholic consent. However I do not want to develop that now; it has been developed by others. I simply want to draw attention to two points as a layperson. Are we really happy to have a Measure that gives the incumbent the power of veto if a whole PCC wishes to send a Letter of Request? Are we really happy to remove Resolution A so that a parish priest can invite a woman to celebrate irrespective of the views of the PCC? Of course we must trust that good relationships will mean that this does not happen, but is it right to enshrine it in law? It seems to me that it reflects a kind of clerical supremacy and almost discrimination against the lay voice, and the laity make up something like 98 per cent of the Church. For that reason, I cannot support the Measure.

Revd Jane Morris (London): Being a multimedia kind of vicar, I did a Google search for women bishops to see what was in the news this weekend. The result displayed on the screen read: 'Ads by Google. Women as bishops; low prices on women as bishops; free UK delivery on Amazon orders'! I would like to suggest that Synod votes for this Measure as a more ethical way of doing it. I also remind Synod that many conservative evangelicals who take Scripture seriously find it consonant with

Scripture. Jesus called both men and women. When the Holy Spirit is poured out on the Church in movements of renewal and revival, men and women and people of all ethnic backgrounds are drawn and called into ministry and leadership. There are generations of young men and women in our growing churches who would be devastated by a decision against this legislation. I urge members to keep faith with them and vote for the motion.

The Bishop of Bradford (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): As the Anglican co-chairman of the Meissen Commission and therefore dealing in ecumenical relations internationally, I want to speak to the ecumenical element of this.

We have heard the phrase ‘Catholic consent’. Brothers and sisters, we are an ecclesial community in the eyes of Rome and our orders are invalid, so let’s get real about this. If I really believed that we did not have the authority to do this I could not be an Anglican, and I am an Anglican by choice and conviction, not by birth.

We have heard about people feeling pushed out. No one is pushed out. It is a choice that we make as adults on the grounds on which we find ourselves at a particular time, and we have to take responsibility for the decisions that we make.

Earlier we heard about the Olympics. What strikes me about the Olympics is that there was a deadline. We cannot forever train and prepare; in the end we have to make a decision. Are members really going to try to convince me that we will be here in five years’ time doing it differently?

I want to tell Synod about the tomb of St Severus, Bishop of Ravenna in the 4th century, in Erfurt, where I was a day or two ago. St Severus, lain alongside his wife and daughter – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*)

Revd Mark Ireland (Lichfield): When we left York in July one of the university conference organisers asked, ‘And what will you be discussing when you come back next year – women bishops again?’ I longed to be able to say, ‘No, we will be talking about how we can make new disciples for Jesus Christ, how we can re-evangelize this nation, how we can transform local communities for the common good’. I long that we will be able to do that next July.

The Measure before us is a compromise, but that does not make it second best and it does not make it bronze rather than gold. Looking at Acts 15, I am quite sure that the apostolic decree was a compromise. I am sure that both Peter and Paul would have liked to have nuanced the wording a little differently, but for the sake of unity they agreed. In verse 31 we read that when the people read the message they were glad for its encouragement and the Church grew. If we are to win this nation back to Christ we need to harness all the leadership gifts that God has given to his Church.

Mr Gerald O’Brien (Rochester): Let us make no bones about it. If we vote for this Measure today there will be those who feel unable to continue their ministry in the Church of England. There may be one or two or more, but every single one will believe that God called him or her into the ministry of the Church of England – otherwise they would not have offered themselves. There will be some who we

believe God called into the ministry of the Church of England, because otherwise we would not have accepted them for training, and no bishop should have ordained them.

We have to make a very serious decision today. One or two rather flippant remarks have been made, which I regret, but this is deadly serious. If we have it on our conscience that the way we have voted has caused people to give up a ministry to which God has called them, it would be a sad day.

Dr Chik Kaw Tan (Lichfield): When I was 17 years of age I turned from folk Buddhism, Taoism and Animism to Christ. I had to unlearn old teachings and learn new truths. From the old life to the new I had to grapple with many moral and ethical issues. What the man who brought me to Christ taught me as a basic principle of this new life was: if you are not sure, don't do it. If members care about the Church and are not sure of the consequences of passing this draft Measure, I urge them to vote against it. We cannot roll back once we have voted in favour of it. Abstention is a Yes vote by proxy. This I will do. I ask members to join me and not push me out.

Mrs Anneliese Barrell (Exeter): Oh how I wish I could welcome and vote for this legislation, put an end to this dispute and return to peace and unity. I feel however that the legislation as it stands is like a door with one hinge. Once passed or closed, it will look as it stands – calm, contained and the status quo maintained, that is until pressure is put against it. PCCs will start actions in the civil courts, respect will be forgotten, the so far unwritten code of practice will be changed, what was promised will be forgotten, our security will no longer exist and chaos and schism will tear the heart out of our beloved Church; and, like the door with one hinge, it will collapse and then who knows what will come flooding through?

I beg Synod to not let this happen. We are so near to consensus on the difficult issues. We are all in this together. Let us together find a solution that will be workable and fair to all.

The Church in Wales is attempting just that. Why cannot we? Let us celebrate the good in the legislation and work together to solve what is not so good.

Mrs Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth): I wonder how many members of Synod have seen the wonderful play *War Horse* or read the book or seen the film and remember the scene in which the horse Joey becomes trapped in the barbed wire at the front. The soldiers call a truce and from each side come forward to work together to cut the wire from Joey and set him free. It seems to me that the Church of England is caught on the barbed wire that we have created by our own competing certainties. If we are to be free of the wire we have to trust each other, as has been said, just as the English and German soldiers trusted each other under their truce. A truce is risky, but it carries the potential to bring great good to all sides. Can we therefore trust in God's grace, vote for this legislation and place ourselves in his hands, secure in our faith that he will give us the grace, courage and kindness that we will need in the years to come to live with the outcomes of this legislation?

Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury): This has been one of the most inward-looking debates that I can remember in Synod, and that should be a warning to us. This is not about us, it is not about my right to exercise my ministry on my terms, it is

not about my right to receive the ministry I prefer, and it is not even about our corporate responsibility to continue to provide one another with the ministry that each of us wants.

Robert Key – the venerable one, not the other – spoke about the hospitality due to a guest. Who are we seeking to invite in Christ's name? Is it not those who are not yet part of our fellowship? I am sure that the spin doctor of divinity does not exist who can make excluding women from leadership roles sound like good news to those outside the Church.

Synod, we need to pass this legislation.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): If Bishop Colin had been asked the question, 'Can a woman be a husband?' I think he would have had more difficulty in replying 'Yes'. The doctrine of headship includes the proper relationship between men and women in marriage as well as within the life ministry leadership of the Church – the unique role of the husband, the unique of a bishop. This is not purely an internal debate.

The February General Synod gave a narrow window and a short time of space. The bishops made a proposal, the proponents were upset, we adjourned, we waited, and thesis did not go forward. Now we are offered an alternative – antithesis. Opponents are upset, but we are told that we cannot wait and that it must go forward now. I beg Synod to vote No so that we may have an opportunity to wait, not forever but for synthesis. We are ever so close. Thesis, antithesis, and now synthesis must come, and we are being given practical ways to proceed to that. In the bowels of Christ, think it possible, those proponents, that you may be wrong to proceed now.

Revd Canon Dr Gavin Ashenden (Southern Universities): I have two images in my head. One is of Indiana Jones stepping out into the chasm and that wonderful bridge appearing under his feet, the other of Bishop Mark Lawrence of South Carolina speaking on the internet, a vision that brought me to tears, because 30 years ago the Episcopal Church of America was where we are now, using the same kind of language, and it moved from accepting the minority to indifference and then to oppression. I cannot understand how the voices of members of this Synod who say 'This will not do to allow us to flourish, to be, to defend, to pray' cannot be heard.

At the same time, why does the language of risk and trust works only for those in favour of the Measure when those of us who say that we would like to sit down and begin conversations to get it right are told that that is impossible? We have done it before. The conflicts over eucharistic theology in the 16th century make this look like a doddle, yet the Anglican Church managed to live with two utterly irreconcilable theologies of the Sacrament. That is our tradition – inclusivity, looking after minorities. There is good news, namely the way we care for one another. I urge Synod to vote against this motion until we can do better.

Mr Tim Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): The present compromise is as good as we can get. If in voting against it we insist on what each of us regards as an ideal best, we will lose the good now offered by the present compromise Measure.

I will mention just two aspects of this loss. First, within the Church we would lose the potential leadership skills and sound judgement of women at the highest level. As parish priests, archdeacons and deans, talented women are showing the great contribution that they could make to the quality of the House of Bishops.

Second, outside the Church we would lose respect and influence. Among the non-Anglican general public, among those who lead opinion in the media and among those who govern us in Westminster and Whitehall the defeat of this Measure would convince many that we are so far outside society's present day norms on gender issues as to deserve only mockery and indifference. The Church's mission would be undermined and there could be no sadder end to Archbishop Rowan's ministry or a more weakening beginning for that of Archbishop-designate Justin.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): We have heard a lot about trust, that if we trust one another in love all will be well. But is that how we direct our affairs in other areas of church life? Do we just trust one another? No. We have numerous statutes, regulations and Canons governing our conduct. Do we just trust the clergy to behave themselves? No. We have a Clergy Discipline Measure. Do we just trust the bishops to act fairly if one of their clergy seems to have gone off the rails? No. We have laid down detailed procedures in the Clergy Discipline Rules – a statutory instrument approved by Parliament. Yet when we come to women's ordained ministry we are told that we do not need to set out clearly what is expected and what is to happen.

We are therefore proposing to pass legislation that goes to the heart of the Christian consciences of thousands of loyal Anglicans and yet we do not know what will be its effect. We do not know how the code of practice will work out. We are happy to leave the fate of those for whom this is not a matter of opinion but of obedience and Scripture to some sort of flexible standard that can be made up as we go along depending on the circumstances. This is bad legislation and must be rejected.

Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Southwark): I am seldom envious, but I have always felt some envy of the members of General Synod in 1992 and had the courage, vision and imagination to vote for the ordination of women to the priesthood. However hard it is today, I am delighted to be here and to have the privilege to vote in favour of this Measure.

My faith has been transformed by working with women colleagues, priests now in the chapter with me at Southwark Cathedral. I have been enriched by what they have revealed to me of the nature of God, of the nature of Christ. I am excited about the future. We can make this work. We are a community of love, faith and trust. We just need the courage now to go forward and unleash what God is giving to his Church.

Miss Emma Forward (Exeter): I speak as an Anglo-Catholic. This afternoon we have been told twice that we are being heard and that people really do know what we are going to say and what we feel about this issue. I do not think we are being heard. During the entirety of this debate not one person for whom provision is being made for those who oppose the episcopal ordination of women has expressed the view that this legislation would be good enough. Not one person has even come close to saying that it would work for them. What do members think of us? Do they think that we know what will work, or are they just going to tell us that it will work and treat us as

though they know better than we? We have sat down and looked at this because our survival depends on it. Ladies and gentlemen, I will be brave enough to vote No. Will you?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I have heard one small word used a lot this afternoon – the word ‘but’. There is another word of exactly the same length, a word which in my spiritual life has been much stronger than ‘but’ or ‘wait’; it is the word ‘yes’. Sisters and brothers, I invite you to say ‘yes’ and to come and dance with me. I am particularly fond of a dance called Strip the Willow. It is fast and furious, and you have to trust those with whom you dance. Actually you do not; you have to trust the music, the steps and the roll of the dance and go with it. Sisters and brothers, I urge you to dance with me.

Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham): Quite simply, fellow members of Synod, now is the time to seize the moment and make a positive decision that will allow women and men to flourish and be able to honour their vocation at every level of their ordained ministry. Now is the time to seize the moment and make a positive decision that will enable the full humanity of Christ to be reflected in the Church of England. Now is the time to seize the moment and make a positive decision that will demonstrate to the people of our nation and to the rest of the world the sort of Church we really wish to be. Now is the time to seize the moment and make a positive decision that will embrace the will of God, so that a new, joyful and exciting chapter in the Church’s history, life, witness and ministry can begin wholeheartedly.

Revd Canon Dr Chris Sugden (Oxford): Christian doctrine is not set by a popularity vote as though it was an episode of Strictly Come Dancing, though I suppose Synod could be promoted as ‘I’m a Bishop ... Get Me Out Of Here!’

We all want our bishops to be first class, but is that not assured by performance rather than legislation? Each will be first class within his own area of ministry. We already have a hierarchy and gradation in the College of Bishops. It is all very English. The Archbishop of Canterbury is 001, the Bishop of Sodor and Man is 39, and the Bishop of Durham is 004 and counting! Is the desire to ensure that women bishops fit precisely into this very English class system reason enough to turn those who disagree about women bishops into members of the Church of England on sufferance? We do not make ourselves taller by making other people kneel. I encourage Synod to vote against this legislation.

Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford): I am a pacifist. I think that there are very good scriptural reasons for being a pacifist, but I recognise that those who believe in a just war also have good scriptural reasons for that. We live together. If I wanted to be in a pacifist church I would join the Mennonites, who ordain only pacifists, but I want to be in the Church of England like the rest of us. We can live together without any difficulty – pacifists and those who believe in a just war. We can also live together with those who believe in the ordination and consecration of women and those who cannot. Let us vote for the Measure now.

Mr Edmund Marshall (St Albans): Last Sunday evening as a licensed Reader I was called upon to preach in my parish church, when the lectionary gospel reading was the

Parable of the Wheat and the Tares, in which the Lord of the harvest orders that the wheat and the tares shall be left to grow together until the harvest.

Two points from that parable are relevant to us here. First, the wheat and the tares are together. We are not faced with a perfect solution, a perfect alternative. We have to work with what is possible. Second, the work of separating the wheat from the tares and making the future evolve is the work of God. It is not the work of the House of Bishops or of us in the Church. God alone separates, and by passing this motion we will allow him to do that.

Miss Charlotte Cook (Church of England Youth Council): I am a 22-year-old ordinand, apparently a rare breed, and I stand before Synod today to thank the Bishop of Chelmsford and the Bishop of Willesden for setting down a challenge. I would like to say to Lindsey merely that I am committed to ensuring that her daughter has an honoured place in the Anglican Church. If I had a vote I would vote Yes today. I am also committed to both those who believe that women should be ordained to the episcopate and those who do not agree with either the ministry into which I will be ordained or my fellow sisters who will be bishops.

The Chairman: Members of Synod, we have now heard 100 speeches. I sympathize with those members who continue to stand. I remember in 1992 standing where they are now standing. Lord Hapgood was in the Chair. I stood from morning until the time at which the debate ended and I was not called, so I know the feeling and the experience. I wonder whether members still think they need to say anything. There can be no motion for closure and the debate can continue until 7 o'clock, when the rest of the business would collapse. I am therefore in members' hands as to whether it is thought that we have heard enough. [*Several members:* Hear, hear!] If any members feel that they still have something to say, they may still continue to stand. There are members still standing.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of 30 seconds.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Wakefield): It is the best step class that I have done today – 100 steps!

There is a sense of urgency in what we need to do today, but I urge Synod not to throw the baby out with the bath water. I want members to listen to what has been said. We need to listen to minorities. It is what happens in society. We used to have a majority imposing on a minority. Now we actively listen, consult and act, so this is our chance to vote No. People have now stopped shouting at each other. Let us get round the table and make a difference.

Revd Dr John Perumbalath (Rochester): I went to my present parish five years ago. I had never thought that I would go to a parish with Resolutions A and B, and the people who interviewed me never thought that they would accept a priest who supported the ordination of women, but the Holy Spirit can reconcile the irreconcilable. We have grown in our trust for each other and for God. Our Church flourishes and has a thriving, growing congregation. Trust is the way forward and we can trust God and each other.

Miss Sally Muggeridge (Canterbury): Everything is happening out there. Who is going to go to see The Queen, the Supreme Governor of the Church of England – a woman – and tell her that we have failed her? Let us just get this Measure through. It is so important that 42 of 44 dioceses want it to happen. We know that it is not perfect, that it is not right, but I urge members to please vote Yes.

Mrs Alison Wynne (Blackburn): The idea that the mission of the Church depends on this legislation being passed is a fallacy. For many years I have been involved in evangelism, including door-to-door visiting out on the streets to tell people the gospel. No one has ever asked me about women in the Church or said that they would not go to church because we do not have female bishops. Many churches are growing and flourishing under male headship, and this legislation does not and cannot provide them with confidence and secure, permanent positions in the Church of England. It is far more important to get this right than to do it quickly. This legislation is not right and I urge Synod to vote against it.

Revd Stephen France (Chichester): – for the last time. While Jesus was still talking to the crowd his mother and brothers stood outside wanting to speak to him. He said, ‘Who is my mother and who are my brothers?’ Pointing to his disciples, he said ‘Here are my mother and my brothers, for whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother’. So let us vote Yes and move forward in faith.

Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester): Today my prayer is that in the footsteps of Christ we may be counter-culture and show the world that we can work with difference. Our faith is governed by grace, love, trust and compassion, and may these qualities be seen in us as we allow bishops and dioceses to formulate their codes of practice within far-reaching integrity, respect and understanding, giving those who are unable to fully embrace the leadership of women confidence and security in the knowledge that their voices have been heard and will continue to be listened to.

Mrs Margaret White (Newcastle): I have been a faithful member of the Church for nearly 80 years and still continue in that role. Will someone therefore please tell me what I have done to be treated so badly? Why am I being treated as a second-class member of the Church by being offered a wretched code of practice instead of a proper place in our beloved, broad Church? I am willing to work with bishops, so why can my position not be respected? Because this proposal does not provide for that, I must vote against it, and I urge members of Synod to join me in doing so.

The Chairman: My vision is becoming more impartial now. At the beginning I was willing to be somewhat even-handed, and I can stop this, but members have to examine themselves with regard to whether we should hear any more speeches.

Mrs Jane Bisson (Channel Islands): Respect. What is the place of such a subjective word in our legislation? It will be interpreted by some in one way and by others in a completely different way. For some the interpretation will bring comfort and encouragement, for others devastation and sorrow. I ask that those who vote against this Measure, as I shall, will show R-E-S-P-E-C-T: ‘R’ for how we hope you will treat us; ‘E’ for empathy in relation to what we need when we suffer with your somewhat inhospitable decisions; ‘S’ for the sorrow in our hearts that we have come to this after years of debate; ‘P’ for the power that you have over us, which we pray

you will use wisely; 'E' for established in what we hope for with this proposed legislation; 'C' for courage as we walk forward safe in the knowledge that we are in the Lord's hands – (*The Chairman rang the bell.*) – and 'T' for trust that his will is done. What more can we pray?

Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester): The present legislation to enable women in the episcopate has a real potential to disable two significant traditions of the Church of England, particularly impairing growth. At this time we should be looking and going for growth. In fact we say that we are. What organisation would pass legislation that makes it more difficult for any part of it to grow? This Church needs to grow and not decline. Why make growth any more difficult through this legislation? I really cannot go with it and will have to vote against it.

Mrs Margaret Condict (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I had a sort of fantasy. Suppose we vote in favour. Just think of the joy there will be – smiling faces on front pages tomorrow, congratulations when we go home, delight and excitement from so many people, recognition that the Church of England has found a way to live with difference, to accommodate people with widely varying views. What a symbol of good news for the world. Reconciliation is possible and we can make this work, so let us vote in favour and show the world that the Church of England can take a risk. We are relevant; we move forward together.

The Archdeacon of Chichester (Ven. Douglas McKittrick) (Chichester): We have before us a compromise. Compromise is not a name given to God; love is, and I would like to see something in the legislation that reflects deeper the love of God for traditionalists who at the moment find it very difficult to accept the legislation as it stands.

Revd Canon Gordon Oliver (Rochester): Primarily a Synod is not a legislative body but a gathering to find ways forward together. The only conceivable excuse for a gathering as gruesome as this is that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Jesus did not go for gold, silver or bronze; he went for wood and nails. The dioceses have spoken very clearly and we must represent them and vote in favour of this Measure.

Mr Peter Collard (Derby): I would like to offer the Synod something new. It is how to square a circle and it is very simple. Take a can of beans. If you photograph it from the top you get a circle and if you photograph it from the side you get a square. All you have to do is add another dimension to your thinking, and I believe that this Measure is not as good as it gets and can be improved. I therefore ask Synod to vote against it.

Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford): I want to pay a huge tribute to the legislative drafting group for the enormous amount of meticulous work that it did month after month. Those of us who read that group's report in 2010 will know that it considered every possible option in great detail. As I recall, the group included Fr Killwick, Fr Baker as he was then, Lorna Ashworth and the Bishop of Beverley. Therefore, when people say 'Let WATCH and Forward in Faith sit at a table and mediate a solution' and 'we are so close', I wonder what they mean. What is the possible solution? I understood that virtually everything that could be thought of had been thought of by

the time we had arrived at this point. I would therefore urge Synod to vote for the motion.

The Chairman: I shall now call the four additional speakers to whom I referred earlier.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three and a half minutes.

Revd Philip North (London): We are all sick of this, aren't we? But think of my poor assistant pastor. She is having root canal surgery as we meet here today. She will be writhing in agony in the dentist's chair, longing for relief – not nice, but I must admit that I would give all the money in the world to swap places with her! There is no place in the world that I would not rather be than here today, because for me and many like me this debate holds no possibility whatever of joy. I stand here with a very deep sense of sadness that as a Church we have got ourselves into this situation.

There are two options and for me they both carry huge problems. It is like standing at a junction with two roads, one leading to a fiery furnace, the other to a lion's den, and having to decide which to take. One possibility is to reject this motion. If that happens I do not much care about what the reaction will be in the press, the blogs and the nation – they love taking the Mick and they will do that anyway – but I care passionately about the reaction of women priests and ordinands who are close friends, whose ministry I value, cherish and admire very deeply, and who would feel very profoundly hurt by it. I cannot bear to think of it. I can assure Synod that if this Measure falls there will be no celebrations from anyone; that will not be a thing of joy.

The obvious thing to do therefore is to take the advice offered by those such as the Bishop of Hereford and abstain. I suppose when I joined Synod I naively presumed that by now we would have reached an agreement whereby letting a Measure pass for the good of the Church would have been possible, but that dream died with co-ordinate jurisdiction.

It is with deep sadness that I shall vote against this motion because I have reached the conclusion that although its failure would be bad news, allowing it to pass would be even worse news. It is because I love the Church of England and value its unity that I have to vote against this Measure. Why? It is not about clause 5(1)(c) and respect or 'consistency with'. The much deeper problem is conscience. I simply do not accept the authority of the Church of England to make this decision. Christina Rees says that therefore I should not be a member of the Synod, but the historic role of the Anglo-Catholic movement and the Church of England is to do that, to remind us that we are not some small, independent state church that can do what it likes but a part of the wider Universal Catholic Church with all its limitations and above all the joys that it entails; that is our job.

The implication of this legislation is that people like me – and there are many of us – will have no choice but to be under the authority of a bishop, male or female, whose orders we doubt. That does not represent generous provision or compromise. The furore over clause 5(1)(c) and the consequent bowdlerization of its language of

theological conviction gives the game away. What a tragedy it is that in order to pass a contentious Measure a church needs to delete the words ‘theological conviction’.

This Measure will not bring closure, peace or reconciliation, but rather will engender in a large minority of faithful Anglicans a feeling that promises have been broken, that they are tolerated rather than loved, and that their places in the Church of England are provisional, not permanent. It will lead to more years of wrangling. Evidence for this, as a member of WATCH told us this morning, is that today’s edition of *The Guardian* reported ‘Assurances will be firmly in place’ as meaning that even if the Measure passes the job will not be done. Even before we have passed the Measure the argument is beginning to take away the small concessions that we have granted.

Is it to be the lion’s den or the fiery furnace? The good news however is that God is in both, so whatever happens let us at least commit ourselves to living, loving and worshipping together so that in the end God’s will might be done.

Dr Elaine Storkey (Ely): ‘Why are you not listening?’ is a refrain that has gone through the whole of this debate. We are listening. I have been listening incredibly carefully. I have written almost everything down. I have been listening to those who wanted a single-clause Measure. Not to exclude people but because they wanted to be clear that bishops are bishops, irrespective of gender, and that all bishops must have the same sacramental authority and be a focus of unity. I am hearing that they are going to vote for this Measure now. I am also listening to those who are opposed to women becoming bishops and who say that, in spite of all assurances to the contrary, the provisions are not enough; so they will vote No, not now, not yet, not this Measure, not these provisions. I am listening to those too.

What I am hearing, however, is that the problem is actually deeper for those people, and I can hear why. If what you feel is that it is fundamentally wrong, conflicting with your conscience and deeply held theological convictions, then there can be no way forward which holds the whole Church together. I will vote for the Measure and I cannot answer the anxieties, fears and apprehensions of these people; but, in these closing moments, I can try to put them in the bigger perspective.

First, I think that they have been reinforced in this debate by inflammatory words. We have been told that we will drive people out of the Church, impose our will on others, exclude appointments, create second-class members of the Church, discriminate, impair traditions, and make sure that ordinands from Oak Hill do not get any parishes. We are not going to do any of those things. We really are not. That is why we have taken all this time over this Measure, precisely because it is exactly what we do not want to do.

Second, I think that these oppositions have been reinforced by theological positions which then become self-defining and, finally, used as a text of orthodoxy. Let me give an example – Lorna Ashworth’s assurance that a definition of a conservative Evangelical is somebody who holds a complementarian position on gender. Since when? Conservative Evangelicals have been around for a couple of centuries. The complementarians only came out two decades ago, and they are predominantly American. Why is that suddenly defining the whole of Evangelicalism and conservative Evangelicalism?

My first job outside secular academia when my three children were tiny was at Oak Hill Theological College, where my husband was a tutor. I was a philosophy tutor, the only woman, and taken aback when my name was on the preaching rota for college Eucharist. I went to see the principal rather cautiously and said that somebody had put my name on the rota as a preacher. 'I did,' he replied. 'Okay, but what about Oak Hill's position on women? Women preaching to men? What about headship? Authority?'

1 Timothy 2? 1 Corinthians 11? 1 Corinthians 14, et cetera?' He put the kettle on – (*laughter*) – and for the next half-hour I had an entertaining discussion on hermeneutics with a wise and godly man who had spent his life in theological education. This principal, thoroughly Evangelical, thoroughly biblical, thoroughly conservative, saw a difference between loving doctrine and being doctrinaire; between defending Scripture and sitting under it; between defining truth and allowing truth to define him; between holding theological positions and convictions and believing that no other way could be right. I learned from him that you can say, 'This is where I stand. I can do no other. But you yet may have insights and understandings that I need to learn from and walk with'.

Evangelicals will always be those who love the truth. Catholics will always be those who love the sacramental tradition. We love ourselves because of that but, if we put those so high in our Church that we can no longer share together the vulnerability of Christ on the cross, we will never understand and experience his redemptive love for us also.

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd John Goddard): I have for a while been able to acknowledge that the majority of the Church of England wishes to have women bishops. In conscience, in theological commitment, that is not where I stand but I do recognise that is the weight in the Church. However, I have also been promised that there would be proper provision for people like myself; a provision I would embrace because I would love to continue belonging, loyal and flourishing, engaging in mission, bringing souls to Christ within the Church of England. It is my spiritual home. It does theology the way I do theology but, above all that, in it I find a touching place of Christ.

Over the years, I would be saying things and not be heard. If you have been a UPA priest for a long while, you know that governments and local councils tell you what you need. Brothers and sisters, I never expected it to be so total from the Church of England. I was prepared to give up non-geographical dioceses; to go down that great list and find there was nothing left. I looked to the Archbishops who gave us a lead and, extraordinarily, we rejected it. In pain, I wondered if there could be anything in the Appleby amendment. I regret that I do not consider it to have strong enough hooks. His Grace talked of one little hook that was strong enough. I think that we need more, particularly when we have not seen half of the documents.

We need the strength of purpose. There are those who say 'Just trust'. Trust can work. The Bishop of Carlisle and I have been able to unite a C parish and a parish with no resolutions, because they trusted us. It is not an institution, however; we are talking about people we trust. Although I use the term 'brothers and sisters', now, on my Christian pilgrimage, I feel marginalized. There is a danger that we will not listen to

each other. Why do we in the Anglican Communion talk about indaba and then we rush? Where is consensus? 'Well, as long as we get the two-thirds it will be okay. '

As to theology, we are now embracing a single ecclesial understanding of ministry. Why can we not look at covenant theology? An understanding that, by looking at both biblical and traditional material, understanding something of the Methodist Covenant and something about the effort, which I strongly supported, of the Anglican Communion Covenant, there are ways, brothers and sisters. We can fix this and, under God, we will. I, for one, while I am not able to feel any joy in today's proceedings, will work with others so that, under his authority, we will find a unified way of moving forward with the twin tracks: the ordination of women to the episcopate and proper provision for those who cannot accept it.

I urge Synod members to vote against this Measure but to commit themselves, as I do, to finding a way through and not to be too long.

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Timothy Stevens): When I first stood at 10.30 this morning I did not anticipate that it would be 5.40 this afternoon before I would be called to speak, but that has given me plenty of time to consider what voices we may not have heard today. What occurs to me more and more strongly is that we are not hearing the voice of those who are marginalized, excluded and unheard in our society.

I am thinking of the young unemployed, the displaced children, and wondering what they would have experienced if they had sat through these hours of debate, what kind of impression they would have had, and what they would have made of an overwhelmingly middle-aged and, dare I say, middle-class group of people, appearing to be profoundly anxious about things they could not understand. I am asking myself does that voice matter and what can we make of it?

Twenty years ago, when we voted in this chamber to ordain women as priests, it was on the back of a decade of concern of the Church of England for the urban poor, following the Faith in the City report. Twenty years later, our place in society is a very different place and the 12 years of discussion about women in the episcopate has coincided in the last four years with the most dramatic global financial crisis for 100 years. The consequences of that are being felt as we speak by those who are losing their homes and their jobs, those who are having to move out of town. Tomorrow the living wage debate addresses some of that, but will this chamber be as full? Will the queues for the public gallery be as long? Is that any longer seen as our core business?

Last week, a small group of bishops met with MPs in the Palace of Westminster for a discussion about the life and work of Parliament. The MPs were saying to us, 'Please make your voice heard more clearly on the issues of today that people profoundly care about. We are not hearing you. We are not hearing your clergy. We are not hearing your laypeople'. We know that not only is this voice wanted by people but also that a No vote today will directly diminish it in Parliament, questions will be asked about an all-male bench of bishops, and we shall commit ourselves almost certainly to another decade of dispute.

Those of our number who are experienced in the resolution of disputes testify to what happens when the moment of decision gets closer. That is the moment of greatest

anxiety and fear. The question for all of us at this very moment is can we live with the uncertainty that a decision to go forward will bring, for the sake of a bigger prize? Can we move into a new place and trust God with it? Can we let go now of our tribalisms for the sake of a larger identity under Christ? Above all, can we find the voice, the space, the vision, the energy and the courage to speak for millions who want to see us do this and, more important still, for millions of hurting, fearful people who have long since come to believe that the Church of England no longer really is a voice for them? I believe we can do it. Let us do it now, Synod.

The Chairman: I see no one standing. I call upon Angus MacLeay to speak against the motion. He has up to ten minutes.

Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester): As I reflect on this task of trying to sum up from a conservative Evangelical perspective, I feel that I am hardly up to the task, so many things have been said. However, there are perhaps four perspectives that I can share with Synod. The first is as I look at the Measure itself. The second will be looking forward into the future if this is passed. The third is looking back, and the fourth is looking into the Scriptures themselves.

The first is to look at the revised Measure as it stands and this critical word ‘respect’ or the fuller phrase, ‘in a manner that respects’. There has been plenty of evidence within the debate that there are great concerns. Part of the concern is that this word does not just come in a vacuum; it is an honourable word, but it comes within a context. It comes within a context of a decision-making body that is deciding to rip up promises that were made, apparently in perpetuity, 20 years ago. Therefore, the word ‘respect’ has to be interpreted within that context, and that is worrying. The word ‘respect’ also needs to be interpreted in terms of the way in which some female Reform members have been publicly vilified in various ways in the media; again, that does not promote the respect that I am sure Synod would wish to have. The word ‘respect’ is an honourable word but, within a specifically legal context, it is being asked to bear too heavy a weight and therefore it seems for many of us to be a hollow word.

If we were to pass this, let us look forward. First, there would be the code of practice group. Apparently, that is where all our problems will be solved. However, my concern is that, having had the experience of being on the previous code of practice group that produced the illustrative draft code, unless there is a significant increase in representation of both traditional Catholics and conservative Evangelicals the result will be as the illustrative draft code has put before us, and it will be insufficient.

Further, if we look to the future, we can rely only on words. That is all we have. However, words need to be backed up by actions and we have not had those actions. If we pass this, therefore, we look to a future where we would no doubt see greater and greater inclusivity within the Church of England but – oh, the irony! – there will be no inclusivity for those with our particular biblical and theological convictions.

Various folk have interacted with the definition of what it means to be a conservative Evangelical, but it needs to be clearly said that, whatever definition is come up with, those conservative Evangelicals who are in conscience unable to ordain women have not been appointed over the last 15 years. For the Bishop of Chelmsford to promise

that there will be many such arriving in the coming years again sounds hollow; because, although we have had promises and we have had the Pilling report, there has been no genuine respect shown for our theological positions in actions.

In the debate, the Bishop of Salisbury said, 'We want to bring the best of our clergy into the episcopate'. Clearly, looking at the last 15 years, that has not included any within that conservative Evangelical bracket. It is therefore a matter of great concern as we look to the future.

Perhaps more seriously, we do have some actions to look at. As one or two speakers have highlighted, we can look at the trajectory of the Episcopal Church in the States over the last 30 years. It has led to a growing liberalism and eventually to a different gospel. People have written emails, saying that if we reject this Measure it will be missional suicide; but genuine missional suicide, by any indicator one cares to use, comes with embarking upon the trajectory that we see over the other side of the ocean.

We look back, therefore, and as we do so we look back to earlier reports – Gloucester, Guildford – where there were certainly signs of hope for many of us who would call ourselves conservative Evangelicals and traditional Catholics; but almost everything that gave us hope has gone, through a process of synodical subtraction. We are told that all sides have compromised and we cannot believe it. All the content that we deemed to be helpful for a minority has gradually been squeezed out.

We look back to the original Rochester report, which gave a list of questions for us to look at, but this report has not been discussed in the dioceses or in Synod in this or the last quinquennium. Listen to these words from the chairman, Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali: 'The Rochester report aimed, as it was asked, to prepare the Church for a theological and ecclesiological debate on the question of women in the ministry and especially in the episcopate. It attempted, therefore, to set out all the arguments about the nature of women's ministry in the Church and to critique each one from the point of view of the others. It became clear, however, that many were not interested in such a fundamental debate but wished to initiate a process for the appointment of women bishops in the Church as soon as possible. This process takes for granted secular assumptions about justice and equality, rather than asking what the Bible means by such terms. '

We look to the Bible, therefore. As we look at the Scriptures, we rejoice in male and female ministry in the New Testament – and I rejoice in such ministry in my own church. Nevertheless, we also recognise that, as we compare Scripture to Scripture, for example in 1 Timothy 2, the authoritative teaching role should be male. Earlier this year, I wrote a short commentary for preachers on this book, carefully examining the various views. I was left with the question, why does Paul root and earth his reasons in the creation pattern in verse 13 rather than just give it as provisional for Ephesus at that time? No, it is rooted in creation.

Then we come to the matter of headship. Of concern is the method of some of the bishops, because we need to interpret 1 Corinthians 11 against 1 Corinthians 15, and we need to interpret it against Romans 16 – the whole all together in a creative tension. I cannot accept what I overheard what one bishop say at a fringe meeting in

July. He said flatly, 'I don't believe in headship'. If you take out that strand of headship, you are doing something serious to the Church.

Headship is there in the Trinity. The head of Christ is God. Father and Son are equal and different. They have different roles, so headship is not intrinsically a bad thing. There is divine order, complementarity and equality, and they go together – not equality and sameness. It is therefore unsurprising if male and female, created in the image of God, reflect headship in the way in which they are ordered: equal and different. Not the same; not identical. That flows out into both marriage and ministry. If we say that we do not believe in headship, if we say that we just want things to be equal and the same, then what will happen in Christian ministry, in Christian marriage, its re-definition and our view of the godhead?

We started this session with news from Harare yesterday of a victory but we know that, whatever the outcome here, certainly from a conservative Evangelical perspective there is no victory in the coming vote. It is a train crash. Therefore, as those who have to hold on to our evangelical convictions, we will have to vote against. However, we would generously want to respond to the offers of those, perhaps such as Bishop Justin, immediately to sit with members of WATCH and any other grouping in order to find a solution to which the whole Church can work forwards.

The Chairman: I invite the Bishop of Manchester to reply to the debate.

The Bishop of Manchester, in reply: Everyone is looking a touch weary but I hope members of Synod will join me in being very grateful to all those who have taken part in this long, occasionally passionate, sometimes moving, and almost always courteous debate; also to be thankful to our excellent Chairman. (*Applause*) I hope, your Grace, you will add those seconds of applause onto the timing for my speech!

It is obviously impossible for me to deal with all the points that have been put today, but I do want to try to answer some of the criticisms that have been made of the legislation and then to urge the Synod most strongly to give this legislation its final approval.

Many speakers have argued that this is bad and insufficiently generous legislation and should be rejected for that reason. Some have spoken from the conviction that women should not become bishops, or at least not now, chiefly on the grounds that the Measure fails to make adequate provision for those opposed. To put it another way, it is said that those of us who support the Measure have willed the ends of full inclusion without willing the means; that we say we want the Church of England to remain a generous Church with broad boundaries yet we are legislating, so it is argued, in a way that will not deliver that.

Let me take that head on. When we began these debates years ago, many of those opposed to having women as bishops were very clear that they wanted a third province or, failing that, additional dioceses. The Synod and the House of Bishops, however, decided very early on that, whatever we were going to do, we would not make fundamental changes to the structures of the Church of England; we would not create a Church within a Church.

It is perfectly possible to argue that Synod was wrong to take that view but, once the decision was taken, rightly in my opinion, to try to find a solution within the existing polity and diocesan structure of the Church of England, then certain things followed.

First, it would for most of us have been inconceivable to have contemplated legislation to create a statutory prohibition on the diocesan bishop celebrating Holy Communion or preaching at certain churches in his or her diocese. If the principle is to be preserved that the diocesan bishop is the chief pastor of all who are within the diocese, laity and clergy, it followed that the legislation could not create places in the diocese where the writ of the diocesan bishop would not run.

All this has taken so much time. Some speakers have said that we need yet more time; that we have been rushing; but we have spent years of time and I have aged considerably in the process! We have had representatives of all sides round the table, again and again, exploring if there could be a way of nuancing these points; for example, through some transfer of jurisdiction or co-ordinate jurisdiction, and other ideas too. All those attempts, struggle as we did, ended in failure. It has not been for the want of time or for the want of trying, and not least on the part of those of us who were initially sympathetic to seeking in some way to finesse, for example, the jurisdiction issue. In the end, we simply could not find a way of doing it that would not store up much more trouble for the future.

To those who have said today that this legislation has the potential to provoke a lot of litigation I have to say that I simply do not agree. Indeed, some of the earlier possibilities we explored and rejected would, in my view, have been much more of a recipe for confusion, turf disputes and legal arguments than what Synod is being asked to vote on today.

Second, most of us were quite determined to keep any difference of treatment between men and women to the absolute minimum necessary, to reflect the acknowledged differences of theological conviction. Therefore, we did not want the legislation to treat a female diocesan bishop any differently from a male diocesan bishop. That is why clause 2 says that there have to be diocesan schemes in all dioceses, irrespective of the gender or convictions of the diocesan bishop. Yes there may be some untidy consequences as a result of that, but the Steering and Revision Committees thought that the alternatives would be far worse.

The great majority of us have had to conclude that we simply could not go as far as those opposed to the principle would have liked. However, to portray the Measure on which Synod will be voting as something that is begrudgingly half-hearted to a minority and simply will not do is, I believe, fundamentally to misread the effect of this legislation.

In the case of episcopal ministry, all dioceses will have to have a diocesan scheme; all parochial church councils, clergy with laity, will have the right to issue a Letter of Request; and all bishops will have to give effect to them in a way that accords with the diocesan scheme. In the case of priestly ministry, all those concerned with appointing incumbents or priests in charge will have to take account of a Letter of Request. In addition, a parish can now expect to be consulted about the selection of

the particular male bishop or priest, so that the selection does respect the grounds of theological conviction underlying the Letter of Request.

Yes the legislation will need to be supplemented by self-restraint and graciousness on all sides. We all know that legislation is never the whole answer; but the Measure we have before us today provides a framework which can, and I believe will, be made to work. It does not have all the provisions that some would have liked but neither is it that simple legislation that many would have preferred, and which would have relied entirely on trust and goodwill. No one is being asked to sign a blank cheque on the code of practice. Clause 5 gives details that will have to be in the code, which itself will have to be approved by this Synod.

I strongly believe that the Church of England now needs to say Yes to women bishops. The last 20 years, as we all know, have not been easy. Not easy for diocesan bishops, who have stepped back out of deference to the convictions of those for whom they are chief pastor; not for those traditionalist Catholics or conservative Evangelicals, who felt themselves to be a minority; and not for female clergy, who in some places have encountered opposition and worse. It has been tough at all times for all sides but the fact is that, through those 20 years, we have together, on the whole, made it work.

I believe that we can still do so with women bishops. In terms of its legal status, this Measure is better and stronger than the Act of Synod. Defeat this legislation now and we will be ensuring that all the tensions and arguments will continue unabated for several years. Approve the legislation and we can get down to the hard but infinitely more rewarding challenge of making it and the subsequent code of practice work, and then release the Church of England to flourish, to reach out and make the love of God in Christ known to all, and especially those outside the Church.

If you wait for the perfect moment, if you wait for the perfect piece of legislation, then you will be waiting forever. Now under God, I believe, is the moment for decision, and so I urge this Synod, in all its three Houses, to give tonight the Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure its final approval.

The Chairman: Before we come to vote, I want to give Synod an opportunity of two minutes of prayer, silence and reflection.

(The Synod prayed in silence.)

The Chairman: We come now to vote on the item. Under Synod's Standing Orders, the draft Measure must receive the approval of a two-thirds majority in each House at final approval.

The motion was put and the Chairman, pursuant to SO 36(d)(iii), ordered a division by Houses, with the following result:

| | <i>Ayes</i> | <i>Noes</i> | <i>Abstentions</i> |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| House of Bishops | 44 | 3 | 2 |
| House of Clergy | 148 | 45 | 0 |
| House of Laity | 132 | 74 | 0 |

The motion was lost.

The Chairman: The motion having been lost, the Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure will not proceed any further and under SO 61 may not be considered again on the first consideration stage in the same form until a new Synod comes into being, unless the Presidents, the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity give permission for such motion to be moved and make a report in writing to the Synod, setting out a summary of the case for reconsideration and their reasons for giving such permission.

Synod having failed to give final approval to the motion, the following motions were therefore not moved:

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No 30” be finally approved.’

‘That the petition for Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence be adopted.’

The Chairman: Accordingly, that concludes this afternoon’s business and the Synod will now adjourn. This is not the time to say more but, before the Synod meets tomorrow morning, the Presidents will have met and it may be that there will be a further statement at that point.

The Bishop of Knaresborough (Rt Revd James Bell) led the Synod in a closing act of worship.

The Archbishop of Canterbury dismissed the Synod with the blessing at 6.30 p.m.

Third Day

Wednesday 21 November 2012

THE CHAIR *Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 9.30 a.m.

The Chairman: Before I invite the Revd Canon Clare Edwards to lead our worship, I would like to inform Synod that news reached Church House yesterday of the death last week of Lionel Wadeson, who will be known to some members of Synod and who served on the staff of the Church Assembly from 1964 and then on the staff of the General Synod. He was the Assistant Secretary General from 1976 until his retirement in 1990. I would ask members to remember him and his family in our prayers as we worship this morning.

Revd Canon Clare Edwards (Canterbury) led the Synod in prayer.

The Chairman: I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to make a presidential statement.

Presidential Statement

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): At the end of yesterday's proceedings, the Archbishop of York said that the Presidents would be consulting overnight in the light of Synod's decision not to give final approval to the proposed legislation about women in the episcopate. We met last night and this morning we also had the opportunity of an informal discussion with members of the House of Bishops. What I say is in the light of those meetings.

I have already said something in public about my personal reaction to yesterday's vote and I do not want to repeat now what I said then or offer a commentary on other people's comments, but there are a few things that perhaps it would be helpful to say today from the Chair, before we move on, as we must, to the rest of today's business.

Whatever decision had been made yesterday, today was always going to be a difficult day. There would have been, whatever decision was made, people feeling that their presence and their significance in the Church was in some sense put into question. There would be people feeling profoundly vulnerable, unwanted and unsure. That means that the priority today for all of us is to attend to one another in the light of that recognition. That is, to give to one another the care that we need and, whatever else we do today, think today and say today, I hope that is what we shall be able to offer one another.

Today is also an opportunity to express appreciation, which I am sure that Synod will share, for all those staff members and others in the Synod who have worked so devotedly in the course of this legislative process over the past few years. While it is invidious to single out any individual, a great deal of the burden of steering this process through has fallen on the Steering Committee in general and the Bishop of Manchester in particular. Bishop Nigel will be retiring in the New Year, there will be a formal farewell to him later today by the Archbishop of York, but I cannot miss this

opportunity of recording my personal gratitude to Nigel for the unfailing graciousness and skill that he has shown through this process. (*Applause*)

Recognising the work that has been done prompts the reflection that it will not really do to speak as if talking had never started between parties and presences in the Church of England or in this Synod. None the less, in the light of much that was said yesterday, I believe it is very important that we hold one another to account for the promises made of a willingness to undertake and engage urgently in further conversation.

I believe that yesterday there was both realism and unrealism in much of what was said, and the realism was largely in the recognition that there is now that urgent demand for close, properly mediated conversation. The offers that were made need to be taken up, the Presidents of Synod and the House of Bishops are very eager that that should happen and, in their meeting in December, will be discussing further how that may most constructively be taken forward.

I have to say, however – and I hope you will bear with me in my saying this – that there was an unrealism around yesterday as well. The idea that there is a readily available formula just around the corner is, in my view, an illusion. There is no short cut here; there is no simple, God-given, dare I say, solution to a problem which brings people's deepest convictions into conflict in the way in which they have come into conflict in this Synod and previously. Realism requires us to recognise that; to recognise the depth and seriousness of the work still to be done. The map is clear enough. The decisions we have to make are about the route and those decisions, given the nature of the terrain, will not be simple and straightforward.

As we enter into further conversation and as we reflect on the urgency of moving our situation forward, therefore, do not let us be under any misapprehensions about what it will demand of all of us – intellectually, spiritually and imaginatively.

I think part of recognising that also involves us in recognising the greatest risk of all that faces us as a Synod and, I suspect, as a Church in our internal life. Yesterday did nothing to make polarization in our Church less likely and the risk of treating further polarization of views and identity is a very great one. It will feel like the default setting.

If I may be frivolous for a moment, there is a Matt Groening cartoon set in outer space – an appropriate location at the moment, you may think – where crisis is impending for the staff of an intergalactic rocket, and they run around saying, 'What do we do? Who do we blame?' The temptation today to run round saying, 'What do we do? Who do we blame?' will be strong. I hope that we will try and hold back from simple recrimination in all this. The work to do internally is considerable, therefore, but it is tempting to say that that is as nothing compared to the work we have to do externally.

We have, to put it very bluntly, a lot of explaining to do. Whatever the motivations for voting yesterday, whatever the theological principle on which people acted and spoke, the fact remains that a great deal of this discussion is not intelligible to our wider society. Worse than that, it seems as if we are wilfully blind to some of the trends and priorities of that wider society. We have some explaining to do. We have, as a result

of yesterday, undoubtedly lost a measure of credibility in our society. I make that as an observation as objectively as I can because it is perfectly true, as was said yesterday, that the ultimate credibility of the Church does not depend on the goodwill of the wider public. We would not be Christians and believers in divine revelation if we held that, but the fact is as it is.

We also have a lot of explaining to do within the Church, because I think a great many people will be wondering why it is that diocesan synods can express a view in one direction and the General Synod in another. It means that Synod itself is under scrutiny and under question, and I should not be at all surprised if many members of Synod and groups within Synod were not today feeling confused and uncertain about how Synod itself works and whether there are issues we have to attend to there.

We rightly insist in the Church of England on a high level of consent for certain kinds of change. The failure to secure a two-thirds majority in the House of Laity does not mean that those high levels of consent are necessarily wrong. They do mean that there is a great deal of further work to be done, as I have said. However, that sense of a Synod, which for admirable, praiseworthy reasons gives a very strong voice to the minority, needs some explaining and some exploring, if it is not simply to be seen as a holding to hostage of Synod by certain groups. That is part of the explaining we have to do and we are all, I guess, feeling those uncomfortable questions.

How exactly we structure the conversations that lie ahead, as I have said, will take some time to work out. The House of Bishops will need to be thinking very hard in a couple of weeks' time about how that goes forward and the Archbishops' Council also meets next week. Bishops, of course, will meanwhile be taking soundings and pursuing conversations in their own dioceses. That does bear a little on a question that comes up later today, which is about the pattern of synodical meetings next year. We have a proposal that we should meet in July and November next year rather than in February. There is clearly a case for not losing momentum in our discussion. There is also clearly a case for thinking twice about pursuing, after a very, very short interval, a set of issues that are still raw and undigested. The difficult question that Synod will have to address in that context is how we best use the next six months or so.

It may be that, for example if we do not have the Synod in February, that reserved time should be set aside to some brokered conversations in groups rather smaller than 470. Members may well feel, however – and I think the House of Bishops as a whole feels – that the full Synod in February is a little close for comfort, given all the business, all the emotion, all the consequence we have to explore. The best way of keeping up pressure for a solution may not be to meet in February, but that, of course, is for further discussion and it is in no sense meant to minimise the sense of urgency that we all face. Within that timeframe is when initial conversations have to begin.

After all the effort that has gone into this process over the last few years, after the intense frustration that has been experienced in recent years – and I do not just speak of yesterday – about getting to the right point to make a decision, it would be tempting to conclude that it is too difficult; that perhaps the issue should be parked for a while. I do not believe that is possible, because of what I said earlier about the sense of our credibility in the wider society. Every day in which we fail to resolve this to our satisfaction and the Church of England's satisfaction is a day when our credibility

in the public eye is likely to diminish. We have to take that seriously, however uncomfortable that message may be. There is a matter of mission here and we cannot afford to hang about. We cannot, as I said yesterday in my remarks, indefinitely go on living, simply theologically, with the anomaly of women priests who cannot be considered for bishops.

I mentioned earlier the duty of care that we have, which does not lessen with the pressure and complexity of matters we face. I also want to repeat something that I said last night. Having said that I would not repeat what I said last night, let me say something that I did say because I believe that it is probably worth saying. It is that, in spite of headlines in the press, the Church of England did not vote for its dissolution yesterday.

The Church of England, in a very important sense, cannot vote for its dissolution because the Church does not exist by the decision of Synod, by the will or personality of bishops or archbishops, by the decision of any pressure group, but by the call of Almighty God through Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit. I hope that members will not regard it as disrespectful to Synod if I say that Synod cannot vote to abolish God the Holy Trinity. Therefore, what God asks of the Church and what God equips the Church to do are as true this morning as they were yesterday morning. To paraphrase something I said in another context, God does not wait for us to respond to his call for mission and service until we have solved all our internal problems.

We will be faced with a great deal of very uncomfortable and very unpleasant accusation and recrimination about yesterday, and there is no easy way of getting through that except to endure it. However, we can at least say God remains God, our call remains our call, our Church remains our Church, and it is in that confidence that, with a good deal of deep breathing and, as they used to say, heart-swearing, we prepare ourselves to do our business today, in the hope that the grace and strength of the Holy Spirit is what is always is, always was and always will be.

Diocesan Synod Motion

Amendment to Canon B12 and Regulations (GS 1881A and GS 1881B)

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod request that Canon B 12 and the Regulations taking effect under it be amended so that:

- (a) the Holy Sacrament may be distributed by any authorized regular communicant (including children admitted to the Holy Communion under the Admission of Baptised Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006);
- (b) if the diocesan bishop agrees, the necessary authorization may be given in relation to any parish by the incumbent, priest in charge or (during a vacancy) rural dean; and

- (c) no person shall be authorized to distribute the Holy Sacrament without the support of the parochial church council of the parish or, where the Holy Communion is celebrated in a school and the person concerned is a child, of the head teacher of the school.'

When the agenda arrived a few weeks ago, I was not sure whether we were being offered the graveyard slot or the light relief. I am tempted to ask for an electronic vote, to see if everything is working!

Kathy is eleven. She was admitted to communion, after careful preparation, at the age of eight. She loves communion. In her age group, both at school and in church, other children look to her for advice. She is seen as wise and thoughtful. At school, her class elected her to the school council, which in fact she co-chairs with Peter. In her church too, adults recognise Kathy as a leader, not only in her peer group but in the way she helps at Messy Church and in her thoughtful prayers. Kathy is living as a disciple of Jesus and recognised for her gifts. Both adults and children think she would be highly suitable to help serve communion. Kathy herself wants to keep confirmation for a later time, when she is a teenager. She sees it as a possible way of declaring a more adult faith in due course.

Khalil did not grow up in a Christian home but attended the local Church school. Here, through excellent corporate worship, well-presented RE and the after-school Bible club, Khalil came to love Jesus. He was so excited by all he discovered that he shared it with his mum. Khalil's mum was so stirred by Khalil's stories of Jesus she decided to find out more herself. She found the church ran an enquirers group. She joined it and, slowly but surely, came to her own living faith in Jesus Christ.

Together, mum and Khalil now attend church regularly. They were baptized together when Khalil was eight; mum was confirmed a week later and Khalil was admitted to communion. For both of them, their favourite service is the school termly Eucharist. Khalil is now in Year 5. He is boisterous but well-liked and respected in the school. He regularly shows visitors around the school and shows a great sense of responsibility. The head teacher has been reflecting on the fact that in all areas of school life children are given responsibility, take it and fulfil it well, including serving lunchtime meals on their tables but that, at the termly Eucharist, they do not help when it comes to serving communion.

This head teacher thinks that should change; so too does the incumbent, and they work out who would be good to do this, including Khalil. The incumbent decides that he had better check on this with the bishop, since the bishop issues permission to adults in his church. The bishop explains that he cannot grant permission as it is against canon law. The incumbent reports back to the head teacher, who is filled with a mixture of disbelief and anger. 'I wish I'd never asked and just done it,' says the incumbent.

This motion came about because some of us had hoped that, alongside the new Eucharistic Prayers for use when a significant number of children are present, the guidelines could have offered clear guidance on children who had been admitted to communion assisting with the distribution. Nothing is quite so simple in the Church of England. It feels like a long and heavy route to get us to a place where children

who receive communion could, with all due preparation and thought, be those who administer at the Eucharist both in church and school services.

My stories, I hope, illustrate the point. Children are given all kinds of responsibilities in both a school and a parish setting. This is never a free-for-all; it is always done with care and thought. Children are always helped and prepared in undertaking the responsibilities and they learn further by their doing them.

Assisting with serving at communion is a further way of recognising their full inclusion in the Body of Christ and the life of the local church. In many places, children already serve; they act as acolytes; they welcome people, take up the offering, read the Scriptures, lead intercessions – so why not this ministry of assisting with communion? They are wholly capable of doing it carefully, wisely, reverently and safely. It is simply a matter of changing the canons to keep up to speed with where we are now in terms of children's inclusion and involvement in our worshipping life and in the worshipping life of our schools.

In preparing this, however, we realized that here too is an opportunity to address what we see as something of an anomaly in our systems. Let me give another illustration, therefore. It is Tuesday morning in my office. The usual pile of post arrives and is sorted. Included is a letter from an incumbent with a list of names, asking for me as bishop to give permission for them to assist at communion. There is a copy of the PCC minute. In the numerous e-mails that arrive during the morning another incumbent sends a similar request. My secretary e-mails back, asking about PCC agreement. The incumbent has not done this, so another e-mail is sent, explaining what he needs to do.

The phone goes. It is the safeguarding adviser needing an urgent word with the bishop. I am in, so take the call immediately. It relates to a situation in a parish where a volunteer, who had been CRB'd, has been accused of inappropriate behaviour with a vulnerable adult. The incumbent is not handling it well. Conversation takes place; an agreed course of action involving the archdeacon is agreed.

At the end of the morning, I am presented with the licences to administer communion for the parish whose PCC had agreed the names to sign. I muse that I have no idea who these people are. However, I do recognise the trustworthiness of the incumbent and the PCC who have considered these people carefully. These people usually will administer in front of others, never alone with a vulnerable adult or child, but need my signature to do so. I think too about the volunteer and the damaged vulnerable adult. The volunteer had needed no licence from me as bishop to be visiting the old people's nursing home, yet was always more likely to be alone with them, trusted as coming from the church.

I have no wish to increase the range of licences I have to give, but I do think that something is out of line with my need to do so for eucharistic assistants. When I test this out with my clergy, the vast bulk agree with me. 'Reduce this bit of admin from your load, bishop,' they say. 'Delegate the authority to us and our PCC and, yes, hold us to account on it and our safeguarding practices.'

This does seem to be one aspect of episcopal permission-giving that can and should be delegated. We recognise that some bishops may not agree, hence the wording of the motion. This does not force the bishop to delegate; it simply allows him to do so. In doing so, he can lay down clear guidelines, which, we would agree with Canon Jeremy Fletcher, should include review and renewal – hence we welcome his amendment and will happily accept it.

I would urge Synod to use this opportunity to take a little administrative load off the bishop and allow him to delegate it where it is best located in this instance – with the incumbent and the PCC.

More importantly, take another step that will express clear inclusion of children within our eucharistic life. Support the motion to enable suitably chosen and prepared children to assist at communion in our parishes and our schools. Act positively for children in a way that will be positive for us all.

The Chairman: The item is now open for debate. I will begin by calling the movers of the amendments.

Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): It will give members an insight into the sad and nerdy world of the bishop's chaplain, if I say that I rejoiced when I opened my indestructible Synod envelope and found the green document GS 1881, dealing with the revision of Canon B 12 and Regulations. I was absolutely delighted to see that this was on the agenda but then, as I came to read it through, I discovered that I was only half-delighted. That is the reason why I have tabled the two amendments, Items 20 and 21, before Synod this morning.

My problem with the motion as proposed is that it is conflating two separate objectives. If this were Parliament, we would probably rule it out of order as a hybrid Bill. The first objective is to relax the requirements of Canon B 12 and the Regulations, as the Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham has explained. The second objective is to permit children to be among those who may assist with distributing the elements. That, I think, confuses the matter. It puts the cart before the horse.

The thrust of my amendments, therefore, is to remove the references to children, leaving us with a single, clear objective: a change – a relaxation, if one prefers to see it that way – to Canon B 12 and the Regulations.

So sad am I, Synod, that last year I actually spent some time in a stuffy room upstairs, researching the origins of the Canon B 12 permissions. It was exactly 50 years ago, in the days of the Church Assembly, that the separate Convocations of York and Canterbury got to the end of an eight-year long consideration (this is reminding me of something else) of whether laypeople should be permitted to assist at the communion rail. Let me give Synod a flavour. In the 1958 debate, the Rt Revd N W N Davis, bishop of somewhere – I have not had the chance to check up – said, 'It is cumbersome and not altogether desirable to allow a layman to minister the cup, even with the consent of the PCC' and the bishop went on to say that he thought it would be 'a very dangerous principle to bring in any layman'.

That was 50 years ago and the Convocations and the Assembly were very reluctant to give even the current permissions. They argued about whether only Readers should be permitted to assist. They wondered whether ordinary laypeople might be permitted to assist in parishes 'where the need is extreme', and they even had a debate about whether laypeople in this context meant laywomen as well as laymen. It was an unbelievably tortuous process, brought about by, in those days, the growth of suburban parishes and the increasing numbers of communicants because of the Parish Communion Movement. That was then but this is now.

It seems to me that there is some theology in this. The only reason the bishop ever gets involved in this stuff is because, when it was first thought out 50 years ago, it was a radical departure; so the safeguards of PCC agreement and the bishop were brought in to avoid what the old Prayer Book would call 'any notorious evil-livers' being permitted to assist with the sacrament and bringing the Church into disrepute. Since then, however, we have had an explosion in lay ministry. Then it would have been rare indeed for a layperson to read the lessons or conduct intercessions; now it is considered meet, right and, in some parishes, their bounden duty to do so. We no longer treat lay leadership as exceptional, and I believe it is inconsistent for this one particular ministry to have to go to the bishop for authorization.

I have another reason for proposing this. It is entirely practical and entirely selfish. As a bishop's chaplain, I work with a delightful and efficient PA called Penny, and Penny does what the Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham does – deals with a whole lot of paperwork coming in. The bishop signs the papers she prepares, without knowing any of the several hundred people in the diocese of Bath and Wells who have this licence. I am pretty certain that some parishes never send their names in; others never tell the bishop when someone has died or somebody new is starting up. It is a nonsense to say that the bishop has any way of knowing whether or not the people concerned exist, never mind whether they are suitable.

When chalice and paten permission was first invented there was an intense nervousness about it, but we are in a different place now. I hope Synod will support my amendments, in order to give us a golden opportunity to simplify the paperwork and to devolve the supervision to a more appropriate level.

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): Follow that! I should first assure Synod that I will not be heartbroken if my amendment fails. I am also half-delighted, just as Stephen is. However, it is the other half.

I consider it to be unhelpful that in the motion the delegation of authority for administering the sacrament goes from bishop to local clergy at the precise moment when we are thinking of licensing children to this; although I understand that, since I have put forward the amendment, it is already the case in some dioceses that this authority is delegated to a local level. However, this would certainly, if not enshrine it, encourage it.

There are two reasons for this. It seems to me that it carries with it a highly unfortunate narrative of downgrading the role of administering Holy Communion. It is authorization not from the bishop but from the local clergy. I wonder if it could be and would be understood by many parishes as yet another step on the road to

congregationalism, parochial individualism. The question ‘What does the bishop actually have to do with the life in our parishes?’ can sometimes be heard, or echoes of it. The fact that it is the bishop who gives the licence may in itself appear fairly trivial, not very practical, and create extra paperwork, but I also think that it can be a real touchstone for local members of the congregation, be they ordained or not: for the clergy, that it is the bishop’s ministry that we share and exercise, and for everyone, including schools, that we are part of a bigger whole, bound together in a common mission and ministry to our part of the world under the bishop.

Indeed, the bishop may not know the volunteer, just as I guess the bishop does not know most things that are happening in parishes where the cure is shared. The important point as far as I am concerned, however, is that the volunteers, of whatever age, will, even if they do not know the bishop personally, know of the bishop and will often display the certificate that they receive with some pride. By all means, let us welcome children to forms of ministry, as and when appropriate, but let us also keep the connection with the bishop.

Revd Jeremy Fletcher (York): – Former incumbent in the then diocese of Southwell and formerly nerdy bishop’s chaplain. The ‘formerly’ is probably just the ‘bishop’s chaplain’ bit rather than the ‘nerdy’ bit!

It was as an incumbent in the diocese of Southwell that it was my great joy, and one of the most memorable services I have been involved in, to welcome the entire Sunday School into eucharistic fellowship and admit them to communion, starting with the youngest first. It did rejoice my heart to see this particular motion about extending an involvement in the distribution of the Eucharist to those who are fully admitted to the Lord’s table.

I therefore want to express my support of the motion and to note that, really, Stephen’s amendment wrecks it. He did not speak at all to the fact that the people he wants to be administering communion are confirmed. I want to support that those who are admitted to communion before confirmation are also able to distribute the sacrament. I hope that some of us will be able to speak to that.

As the Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham said, this is a friendly amendment. In my own parish setting in Beverley, I know the value of regular review of those who administer the sacrament, to remind us that there may be some new people who would like to do that, as well as those whose ministries have come to an end in that regard. Regular review is meant to be an encouragement to parishes to do that. It may well be that is simply to do with a term of years; it may well be that a change of incumbent could cause such a review or, in a school setting, a change of head. I want to encourage that regular review and various kinds of review are included in this legislation, so that we can continue to affirm this valuable ministry.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I wish to speak in support of Stephen Lynas’s amendment. Perhaps I can pick up on the aspect of that amendment to which he did not give extensive consideration, that is, the role of confirmation.

When I read the briefing paper from the Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham and heard his account of the pressures there were in the exciting involvement of children in the life of the Church, a thought came to me very strongly. It was why a child of eight years, or eleven years, was not preparing for confirmation. My own practice, when I was a curate a long time ago, was to prepare children for confirmation quite young. Not as young as I would have liked, but the Church of England does not allow confirmation for children almost immediately after baptism – but that is an eccentricity. The Orthodox have a lot to teach us in that.

It seems to me that confirmation as we have it in the Church of England does combine two quite different elements and they have never sat very happily together. One is the prayer for the gifts of the Spirit and the other is the Confession of Faith, for which preparation is normally required. Until we have been able to allow the separation of those two, we shall have some difficulties.

I will tell Synod a story of a child who is beginning his confirmation and first communion preparation. He belongs to a bi-ritual family – partly Roman Catholic, partly Anglican – goes to church on a Sunday and likes it. At the age of three he was happily able to tell his Sunday School what the Trinity was, and I think he did as well as many ordinands can do. I do not think he is an exceptional child, except in some ways – he is my godson. He will be starting preparation for first communion and confirmation at the age of seven. He is in the Roman Catholic diocese of Salford. It works extremely well. This is a child who at five was reading and reading well, not as a nice little gimmick, from lessons from Genesis in school Mass. This is a child who takes part in the intercessions and did so at the vigil Mass for a much-loved parish priest. This is normal and it is related to confirmation, which is coming up.

I worry about confirmation being delayed too much. It is still part, and happily part, of the initiation process. We have separated it from first communion. Perhaps we need to give some thought to both its relation with the Eucharist at an earlier age – (*The Chairman rang the bell*) – and the use of alternative confessions of faith at a later age, not confirmation.

Revd Professor Paul Fiddes (Ecumenical Representatives, Baptist Union): I must ask Synod's pardon if it seems intrusive for a Baptist to comment on the practices of Anglican Eucharist. After all, in my tradition communicants do not even come up to an altar rail to receive bread and wine but sit in the pews, waiting for bread and cup to be served to them, rather as if they were seated at a meal table together.

I speak from the historic Baptist position, in which deacons of the Church – that is, laypersons – sit at the holy table, receive the bread and wine from the presiding minister, and serve them to the members of the congregation in a kind of extension of table fellowship.

For all the difference between us, however, I suppose that we are agreed that those who distribute represent the Church in its diakonia, in its serving of the world following the example of Christ the servant. Those who distribute represent and model what Christian service is on behalf of the whole Church. The servants at the table surely only represent the whole Church, local and Catholic, if they have fully

entered into the fellowship of the Church or been completely initiated into the Body of Christ.

Here I want to commend the recommendation of the 2005 joint report between the Church of England and the Baptist Union called *Pushing at the Boundaries of Unity* – and that may not surprise you. The report urges that initiation should be understood as a process or a journey. On the journey, baptism is the central moment when the transforming grace of God is at work. However, the report suggests that initiation is not complete until that stage on the journey when someone can confess personal faith in Christ for herself or himself and is commissioned as a disciple to share in God's mission in the world, receiving gifts of the Spirit for service through the laying on of hands. If all this cannot happen at baptism, the report proposes, then confirmation provides a later opportunity for confession of faith and commissioning for service.

I do not presume here to pronounce on whether the journey of initiation is or should be the accepted doctrine of the Church of England, but I would like to take up one insight from the picture of a journey that may be useful for our thinking about the motion before us, regardless of our theology of initiation.

If those who distribute communion represent and model the serving of the Church in the world, then it is surely appropriate for them to have been commissioned to serve as a disciple at some stage on their journey. It might happen through baptism as a confessing believer, followed immediately by laying on of hands, or it might happen through confirmation some years later than infant baptism. The question we are debating, of course, involves the nature of initiation but it also concerns the nature of service and being a mission-shaped Church.

The Bishop of Grimsby (Rt Revd David Rossdale): I welcome this opportunity to be able to support the main motion. Like many others, I see much good children's work in the life of the Church, but I do believe that the best is where children are treated as a normal part of their Church community and not as exceptions, to entertain the adults.

It seems to me that being a child in this generation is very different to that which has gone before. We live in a digital age and we have a digital generation, who expect to belong and take a part; they are used to interactive entertainment and interactive ways of being part of community. It seems to me that too frequently we treat children as though they were an exception rather than the norm. This motion gives us an opportunity to invite children to take their place as a normal part of the Church's life, ministry and service, not as exceptions.

The ability for us now to admit children to Holy Communion before confirmation has enabled children to participate with the status of being baptized and complete members of the Church. To take their place in administering the sacrament is an affirmation of that baptismal status but also gives adults an opportunity to receive from children, rather than seeing them as objects of the next generation who will do the jobs they no longer want to do.

I think that this is a healthy opportunity for the Church to embrace young people into the normality of our life and to give them the status they deserve, which I believe God gives them through baptism.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): I became a Christian when I was aged 13, through the ministry of the Pathfinder group in our village church, St John's Church in Shenstone in the diocese of Lichfield.

It was the custom in that parish that occasionally the Pathfinder group would lead the main Sunday morning service, and usually one of the Pathfinder leaders would preach. A couple of years later, our vicar decided that the next time it happened one of the Pathfinders would preach, not one of the leaders. We then had a Pathfinder group meeting, which was good preparation for being on PCCs later in life, because we were seeking one of our number to preach. We all sat looking at our shoes, hoping that somebody else would volunteer. I do not remember now how it happened, but I was volunteered to preach; so, aged 15, I preached my first sermon. It was on John 13, the foot-washing, and I remember practising it in front of my bedroom window, day after day.

In case canonical law-minded people are wondering 'Wasn't that an illegal thing to do and shouldn't your vicar have been up before a clergy discipline procedure?' the vicar concerned has since retired, but between then and now he became an archdeacon and the Director of the Ministry Division. His name was Gordon Kuhrt, and I thank Gordon for that very important part of my life.

Later on, when I was an incumbent in the diocese of Manchester, I used occasionally to get children in our church to lead parts of the service with me and to sign the blue service book afterwards. I did not get them to preside at the Eucharist – in case anybody thinks that I am as illegal as Gordon Kuhrt was!

I think that the Church can often lead the way and model for society the full inclusion of all people, including children. That is what this motion does. I would urge Synod to focus on this and not to be distracted by issues of confirmation. It would take a long time to have a big debate about confirmation, but it is not an agreed position that confirmation in any way completes Christian initiation, although some Anglicans may well believe so. We should not be distracted by references in one of the papers to the book *The Journey of Christian Initiation*, which is not an official document of the Church of England and, at best, is a potboiler – although personally I am not inclined to eat what is in the pot.

This motion is consistent with the admission of children to communion and is consistent with the idea that we are all the Body of Christ together. Let us focus on this, therefore, and not be distracted by what confirmation is about. We can reinvent confirmation as something else but it is a distraction here, quite frankly. Let us go with this motion and maybe with some of the amendments.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): My anarchic reaction after yesterday is to want to say Yes to absolutely everything and just go home! However, this particular motion does call for some serious thought. It is a hybrid, as Stephen Lynas has reminded us, and I want to comment on the two aspects of the motion.

The first is about children. In our episcopal area, about half of our churches admit children to communion before confirmation; so I have absolutely no problem about the theology of baptism, sacrament and initiation that underpins this proposal. However, there is a serious question we ought to ask, which is about the status of children. There is a sense in which it is very good to say, 'Everybody has a ministry. Let them all exercise it' but what is the most appropriate ministry to be exercised? As our Baptist colleague reminded us, there is something about leadership and eldership inherent in what we commit in relation to people distributing communion, which needs to be given some thought to.

I am not entirely convinced that we should be saying to ourselves, 'Let children do it because it is a way of demonstrating that children are a full part of the Church'. There must be things that people do not do because they are not yet at the right stage to do it. I would therefore want us to pause on this.

This will go through a revision procedure if it actually gets to that stage and we can have that argument then, but I wonder whether the presupposition about 'Let children do stuff because it includes them' is necessarily thought out theologically.

The other aspect is about bishops' offices and suchlike. Stephen Lynas is staying with me at the moment. He has seen the 300-odd permissions that I am signing off presently, as we renew them all; so I can understand the issue about paperwork and workload. However, there is a really good link between the bishops and parishes, which has already been expressed. The fact is that we authorize people to distribute communion, to take communion to people at home, to do extended communion, to preach, to lead services, in some circumstances to lead funerals; and all those lay offices are under the auspices of the bishop's permission to the parish. People welcome and value the fact that they are given those permissions and we actually do know those people. Not all of them, obviously, but many of them.

There are two safeguards inherent in that. One is that the bishop's permission allows the incumbent to be able to say, 'It's the bishop who lets you do this' and that lets you off the hook if you want to stop someone from doing the ministry, because the bishop is the person who it falls back on. The other is that those who are commissioned to do these things actually feel that they are part of an episcopal Church and not a congregation. They sense that they are in connection with their bishop and that these ministries in which they engage – which are a whole series of lay ministries in the Church – are ministries which have their sense of being authorized by the Church Catholic. (I am becoming a Catholic overnight – great rejoicing!)

We therefore need to think very carefully about whether we take these things back. The motion allows discretion in this, but I think that we ought to be careful about what we are doing here and perhaps take pause.

Revd Prebendary Patricia Hawkins (Lichfield): I speak in favour of the substantive motion and in particular in the way it relates to children. I do so as the vicar of a church which would see itself as a traditional church, one within the Catholic tradition and therefore sacramentally based.

We have had a very interesting process this year, with the question of whether we should apply for children to be admitted to communion after proper preparation. Although I take the point about confirmation, nonetheless we are not able to admit children to preparation for confirmation before 11 and we wanted to be able to admit children to communion before then.

At the first meeting when a member of the PCC brought this matter up, there was universal rejection of the proposal. The PCC formed subgroups, went away, read the material, thought about it, prayed about it, came back, and unanimously agreed to write to the bishop to ask for that permission, which we have now received. We have yet to see how that will work out but part of the motive was our work with Messy Church, the hope that that will become a service in its own right and that at some point, as we gather round the Word, we also gather round the Lord's table. In that context, it seems to me to be entirely appropriate that we may begin, not indiscriminately to say 'Every child should be able to share in distributing' – we do not do that with every adult – but to discern those in that context whom we see as having that role as members of the Lord's family gathered round his table and beginning to grow into their own particular calling. I welcome this move. I see it as a way of building up the Body of Christ and as mission.

Briefly to return to who authorizes it, I think there is a very strong case for keeping a link with the wider Church, but let us sort it out. I realize that, as a rural dean renewing the authority every three years, I have been authorizing people to administer at the heavenly banquet, and I am sure that is beyond my competence!

Mrs Pamela Bishop (Southwell and Nottingham): I want to speak up for children. I have been challenged to do that because last week I attended an excellent diocesan education conference, when Sir Al Aynsley-Green, the first Commissioner for Children, challenged us all to place children absolutely centrally to our thinking and our actions, citing evidence that that was always the sign of a healthy organisation and healthy society. We were encouraged to do what we do, and this is a golden opportunity to follow that high-level professional and spiritual advice.

We can all recall significant events that have been very formative for us in our faith journey. Anecdotally, the first time I stood as an acolyte in the serving team I was up close to the celebrant, I was close to the altar. I could see, smell and hear the unfolding of the Eucharistic Prayer in a way that I had never done before. It was a very moving and affirming time. For me, the administering of the chalice for the first time was also a great privilege.

We have to acknowledge that practical experience is always more powerful in forming and shaping our understanding and our development than simply listening and watching. What we have here, for carefully selected and well-prepared children, is the potential, by their experiential involvement, to inform and nurture that spiritual development in a very special way, which nothing else will quite do. It could be a really significant experience in their faith journey and one that we should be encouraging and supporting.

Today, perhaps more than any other day after yesterday, we should move onwards, upwards and forwards, maybe shaking off some of the shackles of our Church and

valuing and including all in this way – particularly children. I would therefore urge Synod to support the motion.

Revd Philip North (London): I have spent a great deal of my ministry engaged with children and eucharistic worship and I welcome anything that tries to encourage that. However, I find myself rather disturbed by this motion because I believe that it is based on two misunderstandings: first, a misunderstanding of childhood; second, a misunderstanding of the nature of eucharistic worship.

To start with childhood, by definition children are growing up, and that should be celebrated. Today there is a tendency in culture to deny that – a muddle-headed inclusivity that thinks we honour children by allowing them to do anything they like whenever they like. But surely part of the joy of growing up is that new experiences and privileges become available to you, so allowing unconfirmed young children to take on an important responsibility such as this perhaps undermines that precious process of growing up in the faith and in the life of the Church. To argue that children are somehow excluded simply because they cannot do all the jobs strikes me as actually taking away something of the joy of maturing.

I especially wonder whether the process of administering Communion is an adult job. I have a 12-year-old nephew. He is a lovely, bright boy and he engages in worship, but he is also growing up fast and is therefore clumsy; he trips over and drops things. There is a great risk that if someone like him were to administer Communion he would accidentally drop or spill something and would be very upset at doing so. There is a risk that actually this development might embarrass the children that it is meant to include as they dishonour a Sacrament for which they have so much respect. A proper approach to the faith development of children allows them to grow up and take on new roles as they become ready for them.

More seriously, the motion is based on a misunderstanding of what it means to participate in the Eucharist. All sacramental ministry flows from the bishop. When I stand at the altar I do so simply because my bishop cannot make it on that Sunday. That is why it is important that bishops authorize this ministry, because it is an expression of their sacramental role as the focus of sacramental unity in a diocese.

There is a very strange sentence in paragraph 5 of GS 1881A, which refers to children who are not able to distribute the elements being excluded and limited in their involvement and participation in worship. I have to say that that is a very odd theology of the Eucharist indeed. It would mean that every week 98 per cent of my congregation would be excluded because they do not administer the chalice. It is not doing jobs that enable us to participate in the Eucharist; it is the all-enfolding love of Jesus Christ poured out in Scripture and bread and wine. If we want to involve and engage children, tokenistic gestures such as that proposed will not help. What we need is imagination in our ordering of worship. We need authenticity and a genuine belief in what we are doing. That is what engages children in worship, not who does what job.

This is a very well intentioned but I think ill-conceived motion and I urge Synod to resist it, and in so doing to think more creatively about the importance of children in the life of the Church.

Miss Joy Gilliver (Chichester): As a member of the Steering Committee for the Eucharistic Prayers when a substantial number of children are present, I really welcome imaginative ways to enable children to exercise full, conscious and active participation in the Eucharist. That means that I have considerable sympathy with the intentions of this motion, but I am afraid that I have some concerns about the implications of it.

I also share the concerns already expressed about the removal of confirmation; I do not think that it is a distraction. Admitting children to Holy Communion before confirmation has had enormous benefits, and I wholly support it. However, we have not managed to address what that has done to our understanding of the place of confirmation in initiation. It is almost as though we have begun to have a sacrament – confirmation – that has become lost or confused about its theology. I am therefore unsure about proceeding at this stage, when what we are actually doing is changing canon law, until we have started to address those issues more thoroughly, and those issues are of course controversial, as has already been indicated.

I have a couple of other concerns as well. It seems to me that what we are doing is not simply asking a child to take on the administrative task of administering Holy Communion, but it is a ministerial task, which has an element of representation about it. When we work with and train adults for this, we encourage them to explore the implications for their lifestyles, attitudes, beliefs and capacity to model. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that children or young people cannot model mature discipleship; they often do it very much better than adults. However, if we ask this of them, I wonder whether we lay too great a burden on them at a time in their lives when they are undergoing rapid change, growth and development. What would we do with adults who have been admitted to Communion as children, who have also been ministers of Holy Communion, who perhaps have gone away from the Church and come back later? It seems that there is some confusion that we need to work through and reflect on before we can take this decision.

I also share the concerns expressed about the relationship between the bishop and this Sacrament, but that has been adequately expressed by others.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I speak in support of the motion, for a number of reasons that I will elaborate.

One of the frustrations of being a member of this Synod is that we tend to say one thing and then do something else. I remind members that at the beginning of this quinquennium in GS 1815 we said that we wanted to re-imagine ministry. Some members may have noticed that I have been asking a question about progress with that ever since and that we have not got very far. I welcome this motion because I believe that it is a practical way of re-imagining ministry. It does so by removing administrative burdens from the bishop and by thinking more imaginatively about the use of the gifts of all God's people. We are all children of God, as we were reminded in the reading yesterday morning. I therefore hope that the motion will be carried with the addition of the amendment from Jeremy Fletcher.

Just one twist on this in relation to the important matter of connecting the parish with the wider Church and avoiding the dangers of congregationalism, which I think is

staring us in the face: I am a big fan of the role of the deanery and I have benefited enormously from attending the previous two national conferences of the deanery. Therefore, if this motion is passed, one possible compromise – and compromise can be a good thing – is that perhaps the area dean would have a role to play in this regard. So let us try to move forward with something in re-imagining ministry, and this would be a good place to start.

Mrs Anne Bloor (Leicester): – for my maiden point; I would hardly called it a speech. My gut reaction is that this is a wonderful motion. However, having listened to the debate, I want to raise a practical point and what might become a quite mundane consequence. Do we need to ask ourselves whether selecting some children but not others could create enormous problems, not with the children but with the parents – or as in my case grandparents? Rivalry among parents can be quite fierce and disruptive – I have seen it in the sports world – and could result in some quite tricky parish situations, and I wonder whether we ought to think about that.

Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (a) leave out all the words in parentheses and insert “who has been confirmed”.’

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham: The amendment removes the whole concept of children, which is a very important matter. I therefore urge Synod to reject it.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of one minute.

Revd Alastair Cutting (Chichester): Far be it from this Synod to agree a principle to include a group of people in ministry in the Church while not quite agreeing the mechanism to engage them to do it.

I am all for creatively producing proposals to Synod, but every now and again when I table a Question the Legal Office carefully tells me that actually I have tried to make two, three or four points in one place and that I need to carefully pull it apart. This motion refers to children, to the administering of Communion and to authorization, and with Jeremy Fletcher’s amendment to monitoring and review. They amount to too many components of one motion, which confuses matters and risks the loss of the main motion by trying to do too much at once. I am all for children’s ministry and would love to see children doing this, but I think that it would be helpful for us to see it emerge bit by bit.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): So far in the debate this morning we have come from our own experiences and images of Church. I believe that we are one faith with many expressions, and we find some strength in that diversity, whether on this issue or others. Importantly, therefore, this amendment takes away what the main motion would empower parishes, parish priests and those in leadership at local level the right to do, namely to choose how best to express their ministry in the life of Christ Jesus.

I feel that priests already have authorization from bishops. With regard to whether or not someone is confirmed, different considerations will apply according to the views

of individual churches. My own church probably would decide that this is not really for us because we are Anglo-Catholic with smells and bells, but other churches in our diocese have different expressions of ministry that we would be taking away by not allowing them to involve and engage with children and young people who have not been confirmed. I therefore would like all the amendments to fail and the motion to pass unamended, because I think that it is very exciting.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘Leave out paragraph (b).’

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham: Although I recognise Dagmar’s point about the unfortunate narrative that appears because the two come hand in hand, I really believe that we can delegate this down. I accept her comment about the bishop’s licence being valuable as a touchstone, but I think that it is being overplayed. I therefore encourage members to resist this amendment too.

Revd Canon Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I want to speak against this amendment. The motion as it stands would give the necessary flexibility. Paragraph (b) begins with the words, ‘if the diocesan bishop agrees ...’. Presumably a parish could still write to the diocesan bishop, even though he is allocated to it, and ask: ‘Will you please authorize these people to do Communion?’ Where do we stop on authorization? It could be argued that the people who make tea and coffee and arrange flowers need the affirmation, or that the people who make tea and coffee after the service could do far more damage, so that they need to be properly commissioned! If we are about sharing bishops’ episcopate, we should resist this amendment and stay with the main motion.

Dr Christopher Angus (Carlisle): I am licensed to distribute the Sacrament and I find it a quite profound experience. When I listened to what Dagmar Winter said I suddenly realized that it matters to me a great deal that my licence comes from Bishop James, and I therefore urge Synod to pass the amendment.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd Prebendary Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. In the light of previous decisions, my amendment at Item 22 is redundant and I therefore do not move it.

The Chairman: That has my consent.

Revd Jeremy Fletcher (York): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After paragraph (c) insert as a new paragraph –
“(d) the authorization given in relation to any parish is required to be kept under regular review in accordance with guidelines issued by the diocesan bishop.”.’

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham: Members have already heard that we support the amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I rise with a very heavy heart to oppose this motion. When I first read it I thought that affirming children to take part in the Eucharist would be absolutely wonderful. However, I then read the detail, as a result of which I am unable to vote for it as it stands. Had the amendment to leave out the words relating to baptized children in paragraph (a) been passed, leaving just a reference to confirmed children, I would have supported it 200 per cent.

I am a governor of our local Church of England school, where we celebrate the Eucharist regularly. We also hold annual confirmations of some of our year-6 children, and the visit of the Bishop of Beverley is a highlight in our lives. The children come into school on a regular basis and attend eucharistic services and I really would like to see our confirmed children doing this. However, as a primary school head teacher of 30 years – and I understand what Philip North said about children – I hope that we will think carefully about the wording. I would have loved to see the motion passed, but it needed that amendment. I shall therefore vote against.

The Archdeacon of Sarum (Ven. Alan Jeans) (Salisbury): Come on, Synod! This is about mission and ministry; it is about the values of the Kingdom of God, of justice, peace, love and mercy, and in the diocese of Salisbury we have around 200 Church schools that seek to live out and love those kingdom values. Every day probably 40,000 young people between the ages of five and 18 gather to worship Almighty God in Jesus Christ, and as promoters of models of a Church community that is relevant to today’s society we must be risk-taking and permission-giving. Quite simply, baptism, not confirmation, is the normative rite of initiation, and to set another hurdle for young people to get over to exercise a ministry seems a step too far.

The concern that children may not have the co-ordination required to administer the chalice is ridiculous, especially as I consider how I watch older ministers tottering around the sanctuary every Sunday! Properly prepared children behave in a liturgically aware way, reading Scripture and leading intercessions, and distributing the Sacrament should be well within their capabilities. Welcoming children into this ministry will offer a welcome to their parents, and every school and parish ought to have a nurture programme that will challenge and lead them to confirmation. This will not prevent that. I urge Synod to get behind this and see the Church grow.

A member: On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

The Chairman: The bishop has up to four minutes to respond to the debate.

The Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham, in reply: With only four minutes, I hope I will be forgiven for not responding to every member personally.

The fact is that we are where we are with mission to children, and yes there are questions about confirmation that many members have raised, but many churches admit children and we deal with the Church as it is. The confirmation debate needs to be had elsewhere.

Commission for service: certainly, Paul Fiddes, but actually I believe that children are a great model for service and that we should include them.

I absolutely agree with those who have noted comments about childhood and so on. However, as a diocese we do not happen to agree that children growing up should be excluded from this. We think that they should be included and are perfectly capable of carrying out the task. They are, as Alan Jeans helpfully pointed out, far less clumsy than many much older people who I see assisting at present.

We note all the comments about permissions and the link to the bishop. That is why we included the phrase that each individual Diocesan could choose to keep hold of this, and every diocese could hold its own discussions on that.

I thank members for all their comments and for their encouragement and support. Thank you especially to Anne Bloor for making us laugh about parents and grandparents. She is probably right that they may cause us more trouble, but the children will guide us through.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. May we please have a vote by Houses?

The Chairman: We can have a vote by Houses if 25 members stand in support. There are not 25 members standing.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

‘That this Synod request that Canon B 12 and the Regulations taking effect under it be amended so that:

- (a) the Holy Sacrament may be distributed by any authorized regular communicant (including children admitted to the Holy Communion under the Admission of Baptised Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006);
- (b) if the diocesan bishop agrees, the necessary authorization may be given in relation to any parish by the incumbent, priest in charge or (during a vacancy) rural dean;

- (c) no person shall be authorized to distribute the Holy Sacrament without the support of the parochial church council of the parish or, where the Holy Communion is celebrated in a school and the person concerned is a child, of the head teacher of the school; and
- (d) the authorization given in relation to any parish is required to be kept under regular review in accordance with the guidelines issued by the diocesan bishop.'

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent)* took the Chair at 11.13 a.m.

Private Member's Motion Living Wage (GS 1882A and GS 1882B)

The Chairman: I draw members' attention to the financial statement in paragraphs 12–15 of the eighth notice paper.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

'That this Synod, recognising that the widening gap between rich and poor harms all of society and that paying a living wage lifts people out of poverty:

- (a) affirm the Christian values inherent in the concept of the living wage; and
- (b) strongly encourage all Church of England institutions to pay at least the living wage.'

My motion encourages the Church of England to pay the living wage in all possible circumstances. Since putting down the motion there has been increased support for it across the country. Members will see from the Mission and Public Affairs Council's excellent background paper that this campaign goes back a long way and has its origins in the work of Bishop Charles Gore, successively Bishop of Worcester, Birmingham and Oxford – three dioceses whose bishops are among those currently supporting the 'Living Wage' campaign. Bishop Gore took up the campaign following the living wage originating among coal miners in Victorian times. As confession is good for the soul, it would have been interesting to hear the conversations between my maternal grandparents, one family of colliery owners, the other of clergymen.

I would like to reinforce what I am after. Although the minimum wage has been a step in the right direction, it does not result in a sufficient income to provide for the poorest in our society. It is therefore part of our Christian duty to ensure that the least well paid, who often do menial jobs that we all depend on, receive a fair reward for their efforts. It is estimated that five million people – 21 per cent of the workforce – are in this unhappy situation, and we should make sure that the Church of England is not among those paying below the living wage. Equally, there is hard evidence that paying the living wage reduces absenteeism and staff turnover, which helps to make it cost effective.

As noted in paragraph 14 of my background paper, this has been a well researched area led by, among others, work at my Alma Mater, Loughborough University, to determine just how much makes up the living wage. Their latest figures, announced on 5 November, of £7.45 per hour and £8.55 for London – where you celebrate another of my forebears, ‘Mr Meaners’ – deserve our wholehearted support. Our Covenant partners, the Methodist Church, looked at recommending the living wage and found that the costs to them were not as prohibitive as they had first feared, and all are required to pay the living wage.

As noted in paragraph 13 of my background paper, by and large the Church of England’s central bodies have adopted the living wage, and there have been demonstrations of support from the dioceses of Bristol, Chester, Winchester, Oxford, Portsmouth, Sheffield, Southwark, Southwell and Nottingham, St Albans, Ripon and Leeds and York, and by now probably others.

I owe the diocese of Sheffield an apology. Paragraph 7 of my background paper and paragraph 23 of the Mission and Public Affairs Council’s background paper quotes them as saying that the financial costs of paying the living wage were £6,500; it should have been £3,600 – sorry, Sheffield!

Other Churches that have adopted the living wage include the Church of Wales, the Baptist Union, the Church of Scotland, the United Reformed Church, and only last Friday the Roman Catholic bishops recommended it. That leaves the Church of England as the only large Church in the country that does not support the living wage. If we join our fellow Churches in paying the living wage, we will together be one of the largest employers paying it and an excellent example to the country.

In addition, politicians of most political persuasions, along with the many secular organisations listed in paragraph 11 of my background paper, have expressed their support. We have no better supporter of the living wage than His Grace the Archbishop of York, who has said that people should be paid a fair wage for a fair day’s work and that anything else is unjust, and recent editions of *The Church of England Newspaper* and the *Church Times* expressed strong support for it. This should not be taken as applying only to those whose sole employer is the Church of England; it will also include many in part-time work, often working for more than one employer in a week to help make ends meet.

As I point out in paragraph 9, paying the living wage to those who work for the Church of England should not detract from the many that make voluntary commitments or see it as part of their vocation to the Church, for which the Church of England is eternally grateful.

I shall resist Clive Scowen’s amendment and will leave it to Synod’s infinite wisdom whether to support John Mason’s amendment.

As I am operating here on half a poor eye, having had a detached retina mended in my good eye, in the interests of openness I should inform members that helping me at the back, because I do need some help, has been Alan Thornton of Church Action on Poverty, an organisation that the Church of England helped to set up in 1988.

In conclusion, I repeat the final paragraph of my background paper: ‘This motion respects the autonomy of dioceses, parishes, church schools and associated charities to handle their resources. So this is not the mandatory guidance other churches have adopted. But as a Church we have a duty of care to our own staff to accord them the dignity that God gives us all. As such, the people who care for our elderly, our children, our churches, and our offices should be paid the living wage rather poverty wages’.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mr William Seddon (St Albans) – for a maiden speech. The supporting papers for this important debate mention the Methodist Church and its pioneering lead in becoming the first of the major British Church denominations to commit to paying the living wage. As an employee of the Methodist Church through its Central Finance Board, I rejoice in this – not, I hasten to add, because it makes a difference to my pay packet but rather because I am proud to be closely associated with an organisation that wants to put its words into practical action.

Leo Osborn, President of the Methodist Conference at the time, said: ‘As Christians we care deeply about justice and fairness ...The reality of low-paid work for many is very long hours and multiple jobs, leaving little time for family, community or leisure. In a fractured society where family and community matter more than ever, paying the living wage is one practical way of showing a commitment to these aspects of life’. I hope that the Church of which I am a member will feel able to move in the same direction as the one for which I work.

Arguments for the business case for the living wage are supported by the report of Professor Jane Wills of Queen Mary College, London University. However, although a cost benefit analysis may be appropriate for a commercial organisation, the Church has a rather higher standard against which it should measure itself. If the Church is prepared to pay below the level necessary for its employees, and those contracted by it to work for it, to meet the material needs to sustain their personal and family lives, why should the world take any notice of it when it speaks out on other examples of economic injustice?

In 2010 the Church Investors Group, of which the Church of England’s three national investment bodies are members, commissioned a report on the ethics of executive remuneration. It concluded that we should be more concerned about levels of pay at the bottom of an organisation than restraining excessive executive pay at the top. The Church of England has a proud record of speaking out to the business world, not least through the work of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group. However, its effectiveness to do so on executive remuneration will be diminished if the Church itself is not prepared to pay the living wage.

Earlier this year FairPensions launched its ‘JustPay!’ campaign to encourage companies to become living wage employers. Given the position of the Methodist Church, it was entirely appropriate that its Central Finance Board should be a signatory to the letter sent to the FTSE 100 companies. Before doing so, however, it was important to ensure that we were compliant ourselves, and that meant looking beyond those whom we employ directly. Consequently, we asked our cleaning

contractors whether they paid the living wage; unsurprisingly, they did not. Unexpectedly, though, they had other contracts that were compliant, to which our name was quickly added. When this was done I was able to sign the 'JustPay!' letter along with 20 other investment institutions. Sadly, they included none of the Church of England national investment bodies.

Passing this motion today would be an important step on the journey to ensuring that the actions of the Church match its words, and in so doing giving extra power to the message that we preach. I urge Synod to support the motion.

Revd Amanda Ford (Leicester): I want to crave Synod's indulgence and put a human face to this motion, and I do so because of people like Alan and Carol, a married couple with a teenage daughter, a child who, like a large percentage of children in this country, has grown up in poverty despite the fact that both her parents are in work.

As both parents have health problems, this family could probably choose to live on benefits without being endlessly hassled about seeking work, but Alan and Carol are people of immense dignity who have a sense of their own worth, so they go out to work and do the kind of jobs that pay the minimum wage. Alan works as a kitchen porter, Carol in a fast-food chain – the kinds of job that we might think of as starter jobs, which youngsters on leaving school or students during holidays might take; but, friends, in my part of Leicester these are the only jobs available if you are unskilled or have health or learning challenges.

This is the low-skill, low-wage economy, and it is shrinking all the time. Many parts of it have long since been exported overseas, but for some folk in England it is the only economy that they will ever be able to access. Such work is erratic. Often shifts are not allocated until the week before and there is a demand to work split shifts, which means that people may be away from home for 10 hours and be paid only for seven hours. They are either kicking their heels in the middle of the day or it is another bus fare home and back again. It is physically demanding drudgery and much of it is invisible to us.

To make that kind of work pay enough to live on, Carol and Alan do not one job each but two, working nights and weekends to earn enough to make ends meet, and when one or other is laid off the benefits system kicks in eventually – and please do not get me started on the iniquity of the family tax credit, which pays in advance and then claws it back when you are back in work! In fact, Carol's and Alan's experience of that process was so frightening that they do not even bother to claim it any more. People like them ought to be afforded the dignity of a wage that allows them a simple standard of living and time for family life and leisure, and Church. They ought to be rewarded for staying out of the benefits system.

Yesterday many members of Synod spoke about the distinctiveness and counter-cultural character of Christian faith. Our belief in the dignity of human life and the value of human work is distinctive in a world that makes an idol of profit and values people only either as the creators of profit or the consumers of its goods. This is a simple, practical, prophetic motion, which can nudge us all into asking questions about the wages that we pay, and if it nudges us into asking about the wages paid by

our partners in managing buildings, running charitable activities and working on contract for us, so much the better. I urge Synod to vote in favour of the motion.

Revd Robert Byrne (Ecumenical Representatives) – and making my maiden speech for the Roman Catholic Church.

As we have already heard, in its recent plenary meeting the Catholic Bishops of England Wales passed a resolution in support of the living wage against the backdrop of Catholic social teaching and concern for the common good. It was as early as 1931 in his encyclical letter *Quadragesimo Anno* that Pope Pius XI stated: ‘In the first place the worker must be paid a wage sufficient to support him and his family’. The Holy Father was calling for a wage that takes account of people’s fundamental needs, such as healthy food and adequate housing, yet more than 80 years later this is not a reality for many families throughout the United Kingdom.

More recently, in 1996 the Catholic Bishops’ Conference stated: ‘Employers have a duty to pay a just wage, the level of which should take account of the needs of the individual and not just his or her value on the so-called labour market’. I am told that today in this country two million children live below the poverty line. The Trussell Trust, which by the end of this year will have fed some 200,000 people at volunteer-run food banks, reports that many of those people are in employment. For them, work has not brought dignity or provided a route out of poverty. We know too, of course, that financial hardship itself is not only a burden but often the root cause of other social ills such as crime, addiction and mental health. Furthermore, research has shown that there are clear, practical benefits from the employer’s perspective, such as enhanced quality of work, positive staff recruitment and retention, and a fall in absenteeism.

I am told that several Christian Churches, including the Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church, besides the Roman Catholic Church, now support the living wage and work towards its implementation in their employment practice. I am confident that we as the Christian community can together be at the forefront of challenging the serious levels of in-work poverty in our society, and in doing so we will promote human dignity, which is central to the gospel message.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): The purpose of my amendment is not to disagree with the principle of the motion but to try to focus it on the question of principle, on which this Synod may properly formulate a view, rather than tying the Church to support a particular campaign and set of financial calculations over which we have no control or influence and which over time may change considerably in both methodology and amount.

I find it difficult to prove from Scripture, or anywhere else for that matter, that an employer in London who pays £8.60 an hour is righteous whereas one who pays only £8.50 is wicked. What I do find in Scripture, however, is that the Lord requires that we do justice and love mercy; that he wants justice to roll on like a river and righteousness like a never-failing stream; that he refuses the worship of those who exploit their workers; and that the gospel of Jesus is liberating good news for the poor. This is solid ground on which we can base a resolution.

My amendment asserts that the pursuit and doing of justice are biblical imperatives, because they reflect the character of the God we worship; and, as both the Archbishop of York and now we hear the Pope have said, justice requires that labour is fairly rewarded. In the light of the scriptural witness, fair reward of labour must entail that those who work full-time should not be in poverty. All these things, I suggest, we can affirm with confidence and probably with no dissent at all.

The background paper tells us that the living wage is enough to ensure an adequate standard of living and not be in poverty. So my amendment embodies the principle behind the living wage but does not require the Synod to express a view, which it simply is not equipped to express, as to the detailed matter of what level of income that requires in a huge variety of circumstances or to presume to dictate the outcome of local wage negotiations. It also extends the audience that the motion addresses to all employers and not just those who happen to be part of the Church of England. Let us stick to the moral principle and leave the detailed outworking of it to those whose job it is to do that work and who are equipped and qualified to do so.

I urge Synod to support my amendment when it is moved.

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): Mr Freeman should be congratulated on his Private Member's Motion. You will be in difficulty, Chair, because as he is the mover of the motion he will not be able to move a motion for closure!

In 2006 the Commission on Urban Life and Faith published a report entitled *Faithful Cities: A Call for Celebration, Vision and Justice*. Our task had been to study some of the changes in the 25 years following the publication of the *Faith in the City* report to see what had been achieved in terms of justice and equality in our cities and to be ready to question and challenge whether something still needed to be done.

In our recommendation on 'Wealth and Poverty' we stated: 'For the flourishing of a just and equitable society, the gap between those living in poverty and the very wealth must be reduced'. We noted that the first implication of this was that the Government should consider the effects of implementing a living wage rather than a minimum wage, and that report was presented to and debated in this Synod.

Two weeks ago I joined the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in launching the national living wage, and today I want to support John Freeman in strongly encouraging all Church of England institutions to pay at least the living wage. By the way, I did not say 'National Church Institutions'. The financial statement refers only to National Church Institutions, not all the institutions of the Church, so the figure quoted in it really should not be taken into account when we consider the rest of the Church of England.

In these tough economic times we need to remember that not all in our society are blessed with good jobs, incomes, housing and leisure opportunities. Indeed, one in five people in work in the UK is not paid a living wage, and six out of 10 families with at least one adult in paid work are living in poverty. Yes, they are working but actually are still in poverty. Given our corporate wealth as a nation, this is an absolute scandal. We will not make this country stronger by impoverishing others. Indeed the end result is more likely to be that our society becomes sicker and less cohesive.

It has been my great privilege to sponsor the Fairness Commission in York, one of whose key recommendations was to call for a living wage to be introduced across the city. Two weeks ago York City Council voted to do just that, and then I had to check whether truly we were paying the people who work in Bishopthorpe Palace a living wage; I thanked God that we were. Introducing a living wage recognises that people should be paid a fair wage for a fair day's work, and for me anything else is unjust. We need to value each and every person rather than cutting adrift those unfortunate enough to find themselves at the bottom.

Having launched the living wage levels in York, it is my hope that the whole of England, especially the Church of England institutions, will follow the same example. Paying workers a living wage for their endeavours should be a badge of honour for us as Christians. Why? First, because it is a matter of justice: 'He has told you, O mortal, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God'. [Micah 6:8] It is a matter of justice in the end. Second, it is a matter of kindness: 'Those who oppress the poor insult their Maker, but those who are kind to the needy honour him'. [Proverbs 14:31] Third, it is a matter of generosity. Our Lord told a story of the labourers in the vineyard. For each worker who was called to work, a day's pay was awarded. He calls us to recognise the value of each person's contribution: 'The labourer is worthy of their reward' [Luke 10:7/1 and Timothy 5:18].

My problem with Mr Scowen's amendment relates to the wording, 'to pay their employees at a level which enables them to have an adequate standard of living to keep them out of poverty'. Who will be the judge of the adequate standard? For me, in that respect the amendment is flawed and I suspect that it should be rejected.

Dr Mason's amendment at Item 25 includes the phrase, 'except in exceptional circumstances'. Who will determine the exceptional circumstances? We should set the standard and let people live up to it. I hope that the amendments will be resisted and that Mr Freeman's motion unamended will be passed by the great majority.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): I am delighted to be able to speak in support of John Freeman's motion. I believe this is exactly the sort of subject that the Synod should be discussing because it is not only extremely important but also something that we can implement within our own Church.

The particular appeal of this motion is that it would be difficult to say it is based on the politics of envy. We are talking here about raising people up, not pushing others down. We should also remember that there is a wider cost to very low-paid jobs just above the level of the minimum wage – it is important to stress here that the National Minimum Wage Act is probably the best piece of legislation passed in the last 20 years – and that is taxpayers' cost.

Let me explain. If an employer is paying the national minimum wage then the employee is having their income topped up by tax credits. Who pays for that? We do. I have no objection whatsoever to my own taxes being used to help those on the lowest wages, but I would be happier still if an employer paid a living wage. The Church of England should express its full and unqualified support for the living wage, and we should do everything we can to ensure that all of those who work for the

Church or are subcontracted to work for the Church, as the Archbishop commented, receive it. Paying a living wage not only provides more spending power in our economy – and, goodness, how we need that over five years after the credit crunch started! – but it helps correct the imbalance of the huge discrepancies which operates between the highest and lowest paid within organisations.

Another real positive for the living wage is that it reduces the need for people to take out pay-day loans, the considerable problems of which were highlighted by Newsnight yesterday. In many but not all cases, if you pay people more you will push out of the mainstream this less desirable form of lending. The promotion of a living wage by the Church should also reduce, though not eliminate, the need for food banks, an initiative that the Church of England has been heavily involved in, quite correctly. However, what does it say about our society in 2012 that we have to have food banks in the first place? Surely it is a massive failure of our economy that these are even necessary?

I hugely welcome John Freeman's motion. For it to have even more weight, it should be followed by a strong commitment to act on the Church's behalf and to bring moral pressure to bear on all aspects of society. This is where the Church should be spending its moral capital.

Revd Stephen Pratt (Lichfield): In many ways I support the main motion. It is immoral that the gap is widening between rich and poor in our society. It is an immoral thing and we should be standing out against that.

In our city of Stoke-on-Trent we started a food bank six or seven months ago. A distribution centre operates out of one of my churches. The number of people accessing that food bank has increased over the last few weeks. Most of those people are in work; they are just not being paid enough. That number will increase further as time goes on towards Christmas. In a poor city there are also poor churches. The generosity of our people in providing food and money and time for those food banks is outstanding.

We employ two people part-time within our parish. They are paid just above the minimum wage. It would be good if we could try to up their wage to the living wage, except that they are also older and on pensions and they do not want to be paid too much because that takes them into tax brackets above their present standings. The fact that they do not want to be paid too much more is good for us as a church, because the funding of the living wage as it has to come from churches and our churches are being financially squeezed in all sorts of ways, particularly in the poor cities, which is a problem.

The Archbishop asked, in relation to Clive Scowen's amendment, who decides the adequate standard of living. I would ask who should describe the living wage. My answer to that came from Radio 4 a few weeks ago. A group of people – I am not sure about the numbers – was asked what is needed to live in our country. One of the suggestions was a holiday. The holiday they were talking about was a holiday in Spain. People from Stoke-on-Trent do not go to Spain very often. Most of them holiday in Wales in a caravan, which for them is a luxury.

The question we need to ask is do we want to tie ourselves into a living wage defined by some outside, undefined group of people, or do we want to tie ourselves down to gospel principles and urge our churches to pay an amount that is just according to the standards of God rather than to the standards of people, which can waver?

Revd Canon William Croft (Peterborough): I speak as a member of the Joint Implementation Commission of the Anglican-Methodist covenant. I think there is an ecumenical imperative for us to support Mr Freeman's motion. His paper alerts us to the fact that in 2010 the Methodist Church of Great Britain required all Churches, districts, circuits and projects to pay the living wage, which has been alluded to already in the debate.

We must remember, however, that the Church of England is in a national covenant with the Methodist Church of Great Britain and so we should pay great attention to what this particular ecumenical partner is doing. To support Mr Freeman's motion would be a way of realizing the second of the commitments that the Church of England has made within the covenant with the Methodist Church. I would like to remind Synod of that second commitment. 'We commit ourselves to realize more deeply our common life and mission and to share the distinctive contributions of our traditions, taking steps to bring about closer collaboration in all areas of witness and service in our needy world.'

Supporting Mr Freeman's motion here would realize, indeed, service in our needy world. Our brothers and sisters within the Methodist Church have taken a lead in this and, as their covenant partner, we should get in step with them. I strongly support Mr Freeman's motion, particularly from an ecumenical perspective.

Revd Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Synod, it was suggested this morning that the things that were set out for today were perhaps part of a graveyard slot, but I would say that they were set out to enable us to pause and to look outwards to the world and the people whom we serve.

In my Church school the children are a great model for service. Not only are they finding ways to serve their community, they are leading the way in the community in Brixton, in Angell Town, where I serve. They have been campaigning on issues relevant to our context, which focused a lot on safety, on collecting for the local food bank and also on the living wage. In the light of some of the comments made about children earlier, members might wonder how children in the primary school are so connected to understanding the living wage. Members need to remember, as I am sure they will, that it is the children's parents who are working, sometimes in two or three or four cleaning jobs, to be able to manage to keep their households together. This is an important issue for these children and they campaigned in our local community on behalf of the living wage.

It is also perhaps why Lambeth Council, our local council, launched their payment of the living wage in our primary school last week. The council and all the subcontractors have signed up now to pay the living wage. The children heard from council leaders. More importantly, they heard our school cleaners talk about how important this extra money – £2 or £2.50 – will be to them, of how they will not reach the till and have to put so many items back. That extra £2 will enable them to shop

and, sometimes, only sometimes, to buy things that are not an absolute necessity but, rather, a luxury for themselves and for their children. That is how important this payment of the living wage is.

I would ask this Synod to recognise the bodies that have been mentioned previously but also the work done by Citizens UK, London Citizens and Loughborough Citizens, where we are, in campaigning for the living wage over the last ten years. I would say that this issue is a golden opportunity for the Church of England to demonstrate leadership, by putting our faith into practice in an authentic and tangible way that will resonate far beyond these walls in ways in which we would want our society to hear, that will have an immediate impact in the lived realities of our individual Churches and the parishes we serve. We ought to go further than a simple affirmation of our values and our morals, as perhaps has been suggested by some, and do more to make our commitment to the living wage real. I urge Synod to support this motion.

Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons (Ripon and Leeds): Ripon and Leeds is a diocese of very great contrasts: we have lots of sheep in the north and lots of people in the south. But poverty is one of the things that unites us. Within the diocese the DBF has already agreed to pay the living wage to all the staff with whom it has associations, but from the urban perspective and the rural perspective we are taking the motion to deanery synods and diocesan synods to challenge all the different parts of the Church within the diocese to reflect on whether they can pay the living wage. There are challenges for both small organisations and large organisations with the living wage.

I would like to tell members a story about a not particularly wealthy church in Leeds. The vicar asked the church to pay the living wage for their cleaner who was working four hours a week. The treasurer said they could not afford it because there was a limited amount of money coming in. What was to happen? There was detailed discussion in the PCC about principles. What should they do? Ultimately, they agreed to pay the living wage for fewer hours but not to expect the same work to be done in those hours and to find a way, through volunteers, to add to that work. This is a very small example, we are talking about four hours, but the challenge to the PCC was around how to respond in our part of Leeds to this poverty that we are seeing all around us. I have great admiration for that PCC in the way that it took it forward.

There is, of course, a different challenge for our larger institutions. I have heard what I hope is a rumour that some of our large National Church Institutions do not feel able to pay the living wage because it will cost too much. I think it would be a discredit to the Church if we were to continue in that way. We pay a certain amount on wages, on salaries, on the costs of running our national institutions. If there is not enough money to pay those at the bottom end of the salary scale, perhaps those at the top end of the salary scale need to think about their salaries and how that money is divided across the whole of those who are employed.

Yesterday we heard lots about listening to the needs and fears of minorities within the Church. I urge Synod to vote in favour of this motion and to take it back to dioceses and parishes, in order for the voice of minorities who do not sit in this House to be heard in our Church.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner): I would like to speak in favour of this motion and to reflect on why I think the Church is in a particularly strong place to support it and to enact its implications. I want to begin by looking at the people who are most affected. The people most likely to benefit from the minimum wage are those in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs – the cleaners, caterers, porters or security staff. Those whose livelihoods have invariably been put at risk as unskilled and semi-skilled labourers in the parts of our country where the big industrial providers of employment have ceased to exist, in areas such as I worked in recently in Teeside, and the many rural areas where the number of people employed in farming and agriculture has reduced considerably.

This is very good for providing for those people who find it most difficult to secure worthwhile employment, for them to have something that is positive. The Church is in a strong position to offer that living wage to those workers, because in many respects we have an investment in precisely those jobs for cleaners, caterers, porters and security staff, for example. Many of our cathedrals offer hospitality as part of the tourist trade. They employ large numbers of people. To ensure that our cleaners, caterers, et cetera, who are employed in cathedrals are on a living wage is a great statement about our commitment to their dignity. It is not only cathedrals; it is also some of the big churches, our retreat houses and pilgrimage centres. At Walsingham, where I am still a trustee, we recently managed to secure the living wage for all our cleaners, caterers, et cetera. The enormous importance of that was not simply that we felt we were doing the right thing but the dignity and the sense of worth that our staff know we invest in them. Over and above that, it provides realistic work in a rural area and regenerates or continues to sustain the otherwise fragile economy there.

It is not only in these places where we have employment connected with the Church but also in our schools, academies and other institutions that we can have an influence in ensuring that the jobs which are unskilled and semi-skilled nonetheless carry with them a decent and living wage. At St Stephen's House, Oxford, where I am a member of the council, we have recently been able to secure a living wage for all our staff and particularly for those who come in to clean and cater. Although Oxford may sound like a very prestigious sort of place, out in East Oxford, where that theological college is located, those who are fragile in terms of their own economic background are nonetheless important and have an important profile among those whom the college is now employing on a living wage.

We know that nearly two million people somehow come across the threshold of our churches every month. Coming to worship should be an opportunity for them to experience the beauty of holiness and to have some sense of what we ask people to do with their money. It is not simply to give some part of it to God but also to use it in the world responsibly and creatively. To influence those people who may themselves be employers and to persuade them that the living wage is an important thing for us all is something to which we should be committed as a Church.

I want to say something finally about what happens when people do not secure a living wage and when their employment runs out and they find themselves in dire straits. This happened recently to Wayne, a worshipper at St Andrew Holborn, where I worked for a short time. He ended up first in prison and then on the streets. He lived an extraordinarily tough life but he knew Jesus Christ as his Lord and Saviour. The

average life expectation for somebody in that situation is 47. He died on Sunday, aged 45. A living wage would have made all the difference. I hope that we will not only support this motion but also go home and do something about it.

Mr Robin Hall (Southwark): Synod, we often hear the rationale that cutting tax for the richest amongst us will result in a trickle down of wealth for everybody and that we will all somehow share in the state's largesse towards its richest citizens. Sadly, whatever the thinking amongst our Government ministers, we have recently seen the tax burden reduced for the richest and there has been precious little of this wealth making its way into the hands of the poorest-paid. The living wage is an example of trickle-down economics that works, where even the lowest-paid employees earn enough not just to reach the breadline but to help them and their families live rather than to merely exist.

The difference between the national minimum wage and the living wage is £1.26 an hour outside London. For a part-time parent working 20 hours a week that means an extra £25 in the weekly pay packet. We have already heard how that may mean the difference between affording the weekly shop or accessing one of the many food banks that the Church is supporting. That relates to the home. We have heard that there are benefits for employers in the workplace too, with lower rates of absenteeism and, crucially, a lower turnover of staff. That in turn means that low-paid staff, especially in big organisations, can secure training and experience and ultimately promotion.

It is not enough just to call on our Church institutions and our contractors and sub-contractors, however. We must also expect those firms in which the Church of England holds millions of pounds of investment to pay the living wage. If it has not already done so, I think we should expect the Ethical Investment Advisory Group to investigate. Synod, even at a time of relatively high unemployment, especially among young people, as we will hear later today, it is not enough just to create jobs. We must also heed the command in Scripture in Malachi 3 that we shall not oppress our staff through their wages.

Please support this motion. In order to act in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in the Methodist and the Roman Catholic Churches, I believe that we should resist the amendments we have before us.

The Chairman: Mr Scowen, would you now move your amendment formally?

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘Leave out all the words after “recognising that the” and insert “pursuit and doing of justice are gospel imperatives and that justice requires that labour be fairly rewarded, encourage all employers, including all manifestations of the Church of England, to pay their employees at a level which enables them to have an adequate standard of living to keep them out of poverty.”’

Mr John Freeman: I am asking Synod to resist the amendment from my friend Mr Clive Scowen. Whilst the theology of caring for those under our care is still within the amendment, the practicalities have been lost. The paragraph about a level which

enables employees to have an adequate standard of living and to keep them out of poverty is open to multiple interpretations. At its best it amounts to a living wage but at its worst it is an open-ended obligation to lift all employees out of poverty. However, that is ill-defined and my fear is that it could lead to nothing.

Whilst these two positions might be contradictory, it highlights that the amendment is not straightforward in its guidance. Passing the amendment also leaves the Church of England in the possible position of being embarrassed in the media and society – a position in which we can ill afford to be – of being the only Christian denomination not to be wholehearted supporters of the living wage. I ask members to resist Mr Scowen's amendment.

The Chairman: The debate is therefore on the amendment. I would urge members not to recycle speeches that were prepared for the main motion.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): I must first declare that I am a parish treasurer. I appreciate that living wage support would be good to send a positive message about our Church today but I think we must recognise that in some circumstances paying the living wage is not always practical or necessary. In my parish the rector regularly seeks to take on part-time lay assistants. He does so for more than one reason: partly from ministerial assistance, partly to develop the skills and the qualities of the person involved, and sometimes even to improve the relationships with an unchurched family.

These lay assistants are typically young people in a gap year before university and they live at home. They have other separate part-time work, in a local supermarket for example. The money they are earning from the Church is not to support living but more likely it will be saved for the future. In these circumstances, it seems to me that they do not need to be paid the living wage. It is more important that we can afford to employ them at all, and to make the most of those other benefits, making them grow and forging contacts.

I would like to support Mr Scowen's amendment. Although it does not use the headline 'living wage' phrase, I believe it offers more flexibility and practicality, which is needed in our Church situations, but it does retain, of course, the moral and biblical imperatives.

The Archdeacon of Bath (Ven. Andrew Piggott) (Bath and Wells): I am very sympathetic in one sense to Clive Scowen's proposed amendment. I like the fact that he wants us to think about principles. I like the fact that he wants to draw us to what Scripture has to say. I like the fact that he has attempted to broaden the scope of Mr Freeman's original motion. However, in my view his amendment simply comes far too late.

The Living Wage Campaign is up and running. We have heard from many speakers this morning, particularly from Mr Freeman himself, that it has been adopted by a number of our dioceses, and other speakers have added that various other dioceses and Church institutions have adopted this excellent campaign. By amending the motion we would be leaving our brothers and sisters in different parts of the Church high and dry. I urge Synod to reject the amendment and to support Mr Freeman's motion.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford): I speak as a former Chairman of Traidcraft Trustees. One of our goals in Fair Trade was to ensure a fair wage for producers. The Scripture is clear, that the good news of the kingdom of God in Jesus Christ is good news to the poor. That means that what the daily paper calls poor is not a metaphor for sin or humility. It also means that whatever the good news means to all of us will be defined by what it means to the poor who receive it. There are various ways the gospel of the kingdom brings this good news. Importantly, it gives them the dignity and a new identity which often the world around does not give them, an identity as children of God by grace and heirs of the kingdom. This brings hope, confidence and trust that the God of justice and love is for them. No government or charity programme or scheme can give this. It is a high privilege to share this good news with them.

This has immense impact on their personal and family lives and helps them address the challenges of poverty, not least because of the huge social capital they inherit by becoming part of the family of God. However, more needs to be done to lift people out of poverty and we must define poverty carefully. There is little absolute poverty in our country because we have welfare safety nets but we have much relative poverty; for example, where people cannot afford the travel costs to visit their in-laws or grandchildren.

A century ago, the Rowntree Trust concluded that it was quite proper for people to spend money on cigarettes as part of their normal costs. This was to replace the gin. It was brought in by evangelicals to replace gin as a dependency. The Letter of James insists that the God of justice requires that labourers receive fair wages and hears the prayers of those who are deprived of them, be they Christian or not. This requires matters of principle and best practice in wider society. It is important that we support the concerns and campaigns to ensure justice in society, but we must be holistic in doing this and set our concerns for justice in that which we have been entrusted with, to share the basis and justification for the various temporary, changing and inevitably political expressions of this. For example, the price of the level of the living wage for some is in many cases the jobs of others. Decisions about these calculations, such as to whether to replace gin with cigarettes, and their appropriateness are beyond our competence. I urge Synod to support this amendment.

Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs (Chester): In the absence of Mr Freeman, Chairman, would you consider a motion for closure on the amendment?

The Chairman: I shall welcome your Freemanesque intervention after I have heard one more speaker on the amendment.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Wakefield): I had not planned to speak in this debate but this is something I feel the need to speak towards – and not the amendment, I hasten to add. We have heard from Mr Freeman about our duty of care. This is a duty which I have experienced first-hand, not only by looking around my impoverished parish in the ex-mining community of Barnsley, a community hit again by another pit closure, but also as someone who grew up in an impoverished family, living in a council house. Having to hide from the rent collector and the ‘Provi’ was not much fun, I will

tell you. That was even though both my parents worked and my mother had three jobs – one of which was not making cups of tea.

Things have not changed. As a parish we are having to work as advocates for Acts 435, the project which is absolutely fantastic, even for those who are working, but people do feel stigmatized when they ask for help. We know about poverty, relative and actual, and we have an opportunity as a Church to set an example. Maybe we can challenge and inform those who have never experienced poverty – and this links directly to this amendment. For those who have, they may not have a true understanding of what an adequate standard of living is. Members only have to watch The Secret Millionaire programme on TV to get a feel for this. Poverty for some is impossible to escape. We have only to look at the increase in the number of people who are sleeping rough on London's streets. I do not know about others, but I have certainly noticed that in my coming and going from Synod this session.

Brothers and sisters, believe me, we have it easy. It makes me sad when I hear questions asked about increases in stipends. We are in a very fortunate position, let me tell you. Barnsley is in the process of setting up a food bank, like many other churches which have to deal with these situations, but is it not a great shame that this has to happen? We do not really have this situation under control. We need to challenge, but the way to challenge is not through this amendment. There is not enough direction.

I welcome the original motion, although I do wish it could be stronger, with a mandatory obligation on the Church as an employer to pay a living wage. We should not just talk about the gospel, we should live it. I will resist this amendment and support the original motion. I urge Synod to do the same, for clarity.

Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs (Chester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman: I now ask John Mason to move his amendment.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘Leave out paragraph (b) and insert –
“(b) believe that, except in exceptional circumstances, all Church of England institutions should pay at least the “Living Wage”.’

I believe that paying a living wage is primarily a moral issue. That is why it is totally appropriate and in fact essential that we, as Christians and as a Church, should state our views on this subject unambiguously. That is the aim of this proposed amendment.

As a child, my mother frequently read a true story to me called The Golden Rule – no complex theology here. It told of a son who inherited a factory from his father and went on a tour to meet the workforce. As he spoke to each worker, he asked them what their job was and what they were paid. In many cases he was horrified.

Then he asked himself, ‘What would I want to be paid if I were doing that job?’ and he acted on it. He ordered the manager to increase wages accordingly. He then went away, confident that he had followed Christ’s commands to love one another and to do to others what you would have them do to you. Although he was worried that his newly inherited business might shortly go bust, he need not have worried. On his return, productivity was up, sales were up and the business was booming. His workforce was happy and motivated and it continued as a successful business throughout his lifetime.

It might be thought that is pie in the sky and unrealistic, but it is a true story. It might also be thought that I have my head in the clouds, but I have lived in the real world. In my earlier career I was a director of a large international company. We had over 1,000 employees and we tried to apply fair wages across our business by maintaining a comparatively small differential between the highest and the lowest paid of this workforce. We were successful and we were profitable.

I am aware of the concerns. I have heard from people that we may, as a Church and as an institution, be under such a financial constraint that we cannot afford to pay the increase in wage bill that will result. What sort of reason is that for not paying it? If we believe it is morally wrong not to pay a wage that would take us out of poverty, how can we carry on doing so? If we believe that we should do to others as we would have them do to us, why would we not want to pay the living wage? Would we not want it for ourselves? Whether or not it is good business cannot influence its inherent morality. This amendment is designed to make it clear that this is a moral issue. ‘Strongly encouraged’ goes only so far. It indicates that we think it is a good thing, something commendable, but it is more than that. If we say that we believe this is something that we should do, then we signal that there is a moral imperative to do so.

The default should be to pay the living wage. It should only be if there are exceptional circumstances that it should not be the case. Support this amendment, so that we can send the strongest message possible that this is the way that we should behave as a Church that believes and acts as Jesus said, to love the Lord our God and to love our neighbours as ourselves.

The Chairman: I shall ask Mr Freeman to comment. Then I will invite someone to tempt me towards a straightforward closure on this, so that we can dispose of the amendment.

Mr John Freeman: I indicated earlier that I was under the Synod’s infinite wisdom and the Chairman is guiding matters even further. I am afraid Mr Mason’s amendment is not very clear about what the exceptional circumstances are and who would determine them. That is why I went for ‘strongly encourage’ in the original motion. There is plenty of advice to help those from Oxford who are having difficulty in working it out. Lots of people have been down this road. There is help for you.

Support the original motion and then members can all get to 12.30 p.m. – and worry about what they will be doing next year.

Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

The Chairman: I would quite like another little motion for closure.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

Mr John Freeman, in reply: I thank all those who have spoken and all those in support. There was very little resistance to paying the living wage, so let us get on with it and do it. As I pointed out a minute or two ago, for those who are finding difficulty there is plenty of help. Lots of people have been down this road, so this is not pioneering news.

I apologize for not mentioning members by name, as is custom, but the world is asking us to move on. The Church of England picked this up in the 19th century and our colleagues in the Roman Catholic Church in the 1930s and in 1996, and all have said that time for action is now. Raising people up is what we are meant to be doing, and the employers should pay, not the taxpayers. We are there to set a darn good example.

I am reliably told that lots of councils have adopted it. There are 30 others. At Newcastle it was the bosses who cut their salaries, so they could keep everybody on and lift them up to the living wage. That was an excellent example and I suspect the same thing was done in Southwark. Congratulations to them both. It is right to say that it is a challenge, and, as I say, there is help.

The Walsingham Retreat Centre is one of the areas that are nervous. The comment made by the Bishop of Chichester, I think it was, was that the staff now have more dignity. Pay the living wage, folks, and those who work for you will reward you. They will feel better, they will work better and they will stay with you longer. It will help those at the bottom of the pile. I encourage Synod to support my motion.

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Michael Perham)* took the Chair at 12.30 p.m.

Dates of Groups of Sessions

The Archdeacon of Dorking (Ven. Julian Henderson) (Guildford): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod meet on the following dates in 2013:

5-9 July

18-20 November.’

At its meeting in September the Business Committee decided to propose to Synod that there should not be a group of sessions in February 2013 and that, instead, our two statutory groups of sessions should be in July and November. The Business Committee was not unanimous on that, but most of us concluded that the arguments against meeting in February were stronger than those in favour.

At that stage, we obviously did not know the outcome of yesterday’s debate. Now that is known and we have heard the Archbishop’s statement this morning, my sense is that the Business Committee will not want to revise its proposal and it will hope that Synod will not want to rush into another group of sessions. Time to reflect and refocus on how to handle the consequences from yesterday’s decision will be extremely important. Urgency in the need not to lose momentum must not cause us to move ahead with undue haste and without the appropriate and necessary preparation. As has been intimated, time that has already been set aside could be used not for a formal Synod but for some of those urgent and important conversations.

One of the key reasons against a February Synod is that the amount of formal business in our forecast for a Synod in February is small and none of it is time-critical. Yes, there are a number of key matters for us to debate, but the material for those would not be ready for February. That fact has led some voices to say that a February Synod would afford the chance of a less crowded agenda and the time to consider the challenges we face as a Church, with time to do work in groups to strengthen relationships and to grow in our mutual understanding. While that may seem attractive in principle, it is not practically possible here in London. There are simply not enough separate rooms and spaces available for that kind of consultation.

Another factor which influenced the Business Committee’s thinking was the cost of holding a group of sessions. The content of the agenda has to justify that expenditure. It would be justified in November next year but would not be so in February.

Added to that is that in 2010 and this year, 2012, we have met three times. While we have three meeting dates in the diary for each year, we are only required to meet twice a year. The Synod itself decided in 1992 that we should meet twice, except in the year of inauguration and unless there are exceptional circumstances requiring a third meeting. The Business Committee concluded that three meetings of Synod in 2013 were not justified.

Two other factors were also persuasive. The first is the tight timetable for producing an agenda with suitable papers. Those issues are outlined in paragraph 36 of the Business Committee report. If Synod votes today to meet in February, the Business Committee and the staff will do what they can to create an agenda that will make the meeting worthwhile, but there are only ten weeks between the end of this group of sessions and 4 February and those weeks include the Christmas and New Year holidays.

The second factor that was persuasive is that the election of the new Archbishop of Canterbury will be confirmed on 4 February. If Synod meets that week, he will be in office, but only just. He will not have been enthroned. The Business Committee thought that some of the items of future business would be more appropriate for a July agenda, when Bishop Justin would be fully in post. It is for these reasons that the Business Committee wishes to recommend to Synod that our group of sessions in 2013 should be in July and November and that the dates in February should be released.

I look forward to hearing the views of Synod.

The Chairman: I will explain before we begin the debate, in case anyone is in any doubt, that those who want there to be a Synod in February have simply to vote against this motion. If this motion is passed, we do not meet in February. If it is not passed, the dates already set come into force and we will meet. No amendments are necessary. How members vote at the end of this debate will decide whether we meet in February or not. The matter is open for debate.

Revd Canon Peter Spiers (Liverpool): I would like to speak against this motion. We need to begin the task of restoring the credibility of this General Synod before July. I believe that the vote yesterday was disastrous for the mission of the Church of England. We need to ask ourselves some critical questions and we need to do that before July. How have we ended up ignoring the opinion of 42 of the 44 dioceses? How can we restore the morale of hundreds of women clergy up and down the country and that of the thousands of laity who are incredulous at the decision we made yesterday?

How shall we show Parliament that we will have an episcopacy open to all? How did we manage to ignore the virtues of male headship yesterday? How representative are we of the Church as a whole? How can we better represent them? How did our decision yesterday contribute to our quinquennial goals of Church growth, working for the common good and re-imagining ministry? How can we ensure that the money and time spent over the last 12 years have not been wasted?

I do not think our synodical processes are fit for purpose. I have often said that. They are too adversarial – for or against. Yesterday, twice as many people were in favour, and yet we were still for or against. One hundred and seventy requests to speak were submitted, in which, once again, we had to say whether we were for or against, but we spent little time debating each of the speeches. For example, people consistently said that repealing the Act of Synod was a bad thing, but right at the end of the debate Bishop Nigel assured us that the Measure would have in fact strengthened it. Why did we not debate that yesterday?

We were told in a BBC poll that 80 per cent would not think less of the Church of England if we did not have women bishops. That means that 20 per cent would think more of it. That is a bonus. People said that they did not feel it had had an honoured place, despite assurances. If only we had more time. It is not time to blame individuals. We need to face up to this together as a Synod.

Like many of us, I have not slept very well. I have been asking God to show me what he has been saying to us through all this. We need to meet sooner rather than later. I would like to propose that we all meet again for a day – perhaps we could suspend Standing Orders – and that we repent, that we truly listen to each other and ask ourselves what we can learn from this. I welcome Archbishop Rowan's remarks this morning but believe that this is something for which we all share responsibility. Surely we need say to the Business Committee and the House of Bishops, 'We will meet together sooner rather than later and work this through together.' Please vote against this motion. (*The Chairman rang the bell*)

The Archdeacon of Hackney (Ven. Rachel Treweek) (London): There is much I would like to say but will resist saying at this point. I would like to echo what has been said. I do not have an answer but I do feel that we have a big PR exercise here. I do not see how we can say to the Church and the world, 'We have a Church in crisis' – and I do put it as strongly as that – and then say, 'This is too difficult' or 'We cannot face speaking to one another for eight months'. That is how it will be seen.

I have no great desire to gather together in February for another Synod like this – not least because it falls on a significant birthday of mine and I have no desire to celebrate it here – but we have talked a lot about re-imagining ministry and I think we desperately need to re-imagine Synod. I would echo that we do something and I have a suggestion in mind. Many, like me, will have booked onto the Faith in Conflict Conference at the end of February, in which Bishop Justin will be playing a key role, and I wonder if there is something we could do around that which would allow us to show to the world and the media that we are committed to faith in conflict and that we do want to work out our differences together. Whether we could give a positive message about that and imagine something around that conference, I do not know, but I would like to put that suggestion out there.

Mr Martin Dales (York): I put down to speak today before yesterday's vote and to support the Business Committee's proposal not to have a February Synod. I wanted to offer a suggestion and perhaps a further suggestion. I wanted to suggest that some time between now and the July Synod we could be called together for a sacred Synod.

I noted Archbishop Rowan this morning talking about using the dates reserved for the February Synod and, for the reasons we have heard, that is not possible here. Ahead of the 2008 Lambeth Conference Archbishop Rowan announced a move away from plenary meetings to 'middle-sized groups for discussions of larger issues'. He went on to say, 'We have given these the African name of indaba groups, groups where in traditional African culture people get together to sort out the problems that affect them all, where everyone' – everyone – 'has a voice and where there is an attempt to find a common mind or a common story that everyone is able to tell when they go

away from it. This is how we approached it. This is what we heard. This is where we arrived as we prayed and thought and talked together’.

Whether it is called a sacred Synod or an indaba, let us have one or more on the issue of women bishops somewhere, so that our Church can in time come to a common mind and move forward together. What a powerful witness that will be to our nation.

Mr Tim Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): Before yesterday, the proposal to meet next July was a sensible way to move most efficiently and speedily towards the appointment of the first women bishops from spring 2014 onwards, an event that was much looked forward to by the vast majority of Anglicans. Today, after the yesterday that Bishop Justin described with masterly understatement as ‘grim’, it would be negligent and complacent of us to cancel the February Synod. In the eyes of most of those to whom the Anglican Church ministers, yesterday’s vetoing of women bishops was worse than grim; it was a disaster. In the eyes of most of our congregations, of the general public and of our rulers in Whitehall and Westminster, the Church has lost credibility.

As I understood Archbishop Rowan to say in his statement this morning, we cannot just park this unfinished business but we must move urgently to restore credibility, to permit women bishops and to establish acceptable provision for those who cannot accept them. In this hard task we simply cannot afford to continue to proceed at the measured pace of the last ten years. We should put our synodical procedures into overdrive, making use of Bishop Justin’s conflict resolution skills to accelerate discussions to find a solution to the unresolved issue of provision.

When he spoke to us this morning, Archbishop Rowan said the February Synod might be a little close for comfort – more episcopal understatement, I guess. There is no doubt that the pace of discussion and other work necessary to make good use of the February Synod would be uncomfortable, but the urgent need to put right yesterday’s disaster requires a drastic clearing of diaries and a degree of discomfort in speeding up the work so as to make a good start, at least, in clearing up the mess as early as February.

It is just not good enough to say that nothing much can be done in December or January because of Christmas or that Bishop Justin would only just be technically in office or up to speed. In the present crisis, we cannot afford an interregnum. It will not be understood if Synod gives itself a holiday until July. Rather, a short February Synod devoted solely to women bishops, which might well include suspension of Standing Orders and some work in small groups, would be a useful spur to the House of Bishops to get on with the urgent work needed to repair yesterday’s disaster. We should not be put off the idea of working in small groups by the lack of space in Church House. There are plenty of Church buildings close by that could be put to use.

The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Trevor Willmott): ‘Synod buries its head in the sand.’ ‘Synod runs scared from conflict.’ Pete Spiers has written the headlines for us, and I agree with him entirely. But is that the right way to go? Today I am one of those people who thinks that we do look pretty ridiculous. But giving in to the sense of looking ridiculous and saying, ‘Therefore we must meet in February’ needs some questioning. It seems to me that there is much work to be done and we perhaps need more time to do it but – to paraphrase the Archbishop’s words this morning – Synod,

get real. To imagine that in ten weeks we can create a process in which we can have those sort of conversations and repair the damage of yesterday is utterly naïve, but we should not be doing that work, that beginning to talk with each other, that beginning to plan how we are to bring forward proposals, in secret, and somehow saying that we will do it behind closed doors. We should be looking together, in our various Houses and with the Business Committee, at how we can share the work that we believe needs to be done with the wider world and how we will do it.

Finally, I am one of those people who, I am afraid, continues to believe that meeting in this place is becoming increasingly toxic for the sort of conversations that we need to have. The space of York, where we live together, eat together and pray together, is the real place in which some of that healing can and must take place. I urge Synod seriously to support the Business Committee.

Revd Canon David Felix (Chester): For all of the reasons given so far to call ourselves together in February, I would like to support that suggestion. I would only add one further point. One of the things that concerned me yesterday was the offer by the various Church party groups to get together to try to sort things out, but what about those who are not members of the same Church party groups? Dare I suggest that one of the reasons we are in the mess we are now in is because of those groups and Church party politics? (*Applause*)

Surely a Christian assembly such as this should stand above such things and lead by example? Surely we should show what demonstrates accountability and what accountability actually means by giving a lead in representative democracy? Surely we should show that we take our problems seriously and that we can find a way to solve those problems as openly and as trustfully as possible?

I ask Synod to reject the idea that we do not meet in February. I ask that we do meet in such a way as to effect what we really believe, and that is talking to each other openly and frankly.

Mrs Sue Johns (Norwich): I support much of what has been said, in particular what Bishop Trevor has just said to us. I want us to resist this move and to carry on and meet in July. I do not want us to rush into meeting in February. The reason I say that is that I do not think we are listening to the right people. We need to listen to the people in our parishes, in our dioceses, in our deaneries. We have listened to each other endlessly. In fact, yesterday, we all did far too much listening – I certainly reached my level of tolerance – but we are not listening to the people who voted to put us here. We are not responding to what they want. I think it would be far better if we all spent a day in February listening to the people in our dioceses, listening to them properly and bringing information back to this group.

I agree with what Bishop Trevor said about York. It is a far more positive experience than that in London, where we are isolated from one another. I do not believe that rushing into a February meeting will restore our credibility with anyone unless we can find something to come out of it that is positive and meaningful. I think it might have the complete opposite result, inasmuch as we will sit here doing more navel-gazing and that will undermine our credibility, because it will be waste yet more of our precious financial resources. How does that look to our dioceses?

I would ask members to support the Business Committee in all that they are trying to do. I agree that we need to re-imagine what we are doing and how we are doing it. As part of the Business Committee, I would say that we definitely are listening to that. Please support this move to wait until July and think seriously about going back to our dioceses and our parishes to hear what people want to say to us.

Revd Canon Celia Thomson (Gloucester): I did not want to come here this morning. I do not particularly want to come back in February. I am rather ashamed of this Synod because it was absolutely packed yesterday and there are many empty seats today when we are talking about two of the most important things in our society – increasing poverty and youth unemployment.

If we reach the decision that we do have to come and talk to each other in February, could we please have some biblical exegesis to correct some of the surprising theology that was mentioned yesterday? Could we have an outward-looking debate that would perhaps do something to restore our credibility in the eyes of this nation, a nation that we have failed so lamentably? (*Applause*)

Mr John Freeman (Chester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): A point of order. I wonder whether the Chairman of the Business Committee might reflect in his comments about the possibility of the House of Laity meeting in February.

The Chairman: I am not sure that is a point of order. I think it is a speech – which unfortunately he has heard. (*Laughter*) I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee to reply to the debate.

The Archdeacon of Dorking, in reply: I would like to thank Members of Synod for all their contributions and comments. I think it is good and opportune that there has been this moment for us to express some of the reactions that have been necessary following yesterday. The fact that there has been this item tabled for today has allowed us to express some of those concerns that otherwise would not have been expressed. I think that has been a valuable and useful moment.

I hear the concerns and all the issues members have raised about rebuilding the credibility of Synod, of the big PR exercise ahead for us, of the need perhaps to re-imagine Synod, thinking of different ways of doing our business and whether we need to meet in February, not as a formal Synod but as an indaba group. I hear all those things and I am sure that others have heard them as well. There is a real sense in which yesterday has put us in a difficult place, but I do hope that members have heard the concerns in relation to trying to arrange something for February, how difficult that would prove to be, in order for it to be worthwhile and not to cause us to lose even more credibility. We need to make sure, if we do meet in February, that we have a very good programme and set of material in place.

I personally do not see how that will be possible. I think there is an argument for giving space to allow some of the high and important emotion of yesterday to settle and for us then to reconvene in July having considered our positions in all sorts of different ways. I am grateful to the Bishop of Dover for putting matters very clearly and forcefully.

The ideas that have been mentioned by Synod members are good ideas to share and to pass on to others. Do please pass them on to the Business Committee or to the staff here in Church House. We are always open to hear your comments. Please be assured that the Business Committee and the staff here will continue to do all they can to ensure the godly working of our business.

The Chairman: At the risk of exceeding my powers, I would like to say before we vote that it seems to me to be clear from this debate that no one is asking that nothing shall happen between now and July. Everybody who has spoken believes that there should be something – very likely in February – even those who are quite clear they do not want the Synod to meet.

It therefore seems to me that not only the Business Committee but also the House of Bishops will bear in mind this debate, should we vote not to meet in February. I see the Archbishop of Canterbury nodding. I think I could give members an assurance that the Business Committee or the House of Bishops or both will take action to see that we move forward in the period in between. If that exceeds my brief, I apologize.

We come to a vote. A vote in favour of the motion is a vote for the Synod not to meet in any official way until next July.

The motion was put and carried.

(Adjournment)

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester)* took the Chair at 2.30 p.m.

Farewells

The Chairman: Under SO 4(b) the Presidents have made an addition to the Agenda, to insert after Item 5 a rubric, which reads ‘Not later than 4.20 p.m.’, and under that rubric we are to insert the word ‘Farewell’ so that the Archbishop of Canterbury can give a farewell to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who will be retiring at the end of June.

The Clerk to the Synod (Dr Colin Podmore): There are one or two other farewells to begin with.

First, this weekend new representatives of the Church of England Youth Council will be elected to serve on the Synod, so this is the final group of sessions for our three current representatives. Can we thank them for their contribution to the Synod’s debates? *(Applause)*

Second, this is also the end of the three-year term for our current ecumenical representatives. Some of them may be appointed again to come back for more synodical debate, but for some at least this will be their last group of sessions. Can we also thank them for their contributions? (*Applause*)

I now turn to our first individual farewell this afternoon, which is to the longest serving member of the staff team that services meetings of this Synod – Judith Gracias. Judith is the longest serving member of the team by quite a long way. She has worked in Church House for almost 40 years. She first came here as a temp in 1973 and after three months she was made a permanent member of staff, and it really was permanent. She attended the Synod for the first time in July 1973 in London – in those distant days the Synod did not meet in York during the summer – and she has been part of the secretariat for every single group of sessions since 1973. Initially she was the personal assistant to Brian Hanson for over a quarter of a century, since when she has served Stephen Slack in the same capacity.

Judith, we wish you a very long and happy retirement, in which you will have more time to enjoy your house in Goa as well as more leisure in your home in London. We would like to thank Judith for the remarkable achievement of serving faithfully in Church House for nearly 40 years and serving the Synod for almost all of that time. Her Majesty the Queen has inaugurated nine successive Synods and Judith has witnessed no fewer than eight of those inaugurations. So to remind her of that, and as a token of our gratitude for all that she has done, we would like to present her with a framed photograph of the most recent inauguration. (*A presentation was made and Miss Gracias was accorded a standing ovation.*)

The Chairman: I call on the Archbishop of Canterbury to bid farewell to the Clerk to the Synod.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): ‘Podmore is an impressively qualified man of the utmost reliability, intelligence, good humour and good sense, and I can recommend him without reservation. He is a calm and cheerful man who does not wilt under pressure. He is, as Harold Macmillan used to say, a good man to go tiger shooting with – not that that, of course, is likely to be a demand imposed on him by this post!’ That was part of the reference submitted by Colin’s doctoral supervisor to Church House in 1988. Opinions may vary on the tiger-shooting capacities necessary in this place, though it is quite possible that as a Cornishman experience of the beast of Bodmin may have helped here! I think that the gist of that reference will find many echoes around this chamber.

At the same time another academic colleague and mentor wrote about Colin: ‘He works well in a team and whilst maintaining his own clear views (a touch of his native Cornwall) he is sympathetic and open to the views of others’ – Dr Geoffrey Rowell, then Chaplain of Keble. Bishop Geoffrey continues: ‘He is the kind of person about whom others are always commenting, “What a very good person he is”.’ That could be one of those propositions around which Synod rallies at this moment – a small but significant number of propositions, but I think that the excellence of Colin Podmore would carry a substantial majority in all three Houses.

Colin has worked for the Church of England devotedly and with immense skill, resource and academic expertise for nearly a quarter of a century. Although his term as Clerk to the Synod has been relatively brief, his contribution to the life of the Church of England, and especially its ecumenical engagements, has been almost incalculable. Colin did a huge amount of the heavy lifting to bring about the Meissen agreement with the German Protestant Churches, and the Porvoo agreement, which resulted in our full Communion with the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches. As Secretary of the Liturgical Publishing Group and then Secretary to the Liturgical Commission, he played a very significant part in the publication of Common Worship and so was part of that renewing spirit that has touched every parish in the land in recent years.

He was Secretary to the Perry review group, examining the workings of the then Crown Appointments Commission, then Secretary to the Pilling group, reviewing our arrangements for senior appointments in general. He was Secretary to the House of Clergy in Synod for many years, and when the Dioceses Commission came into being, unsurprisingly, it was Colin yet again who supported the new body in its early days, producing a huge amount of historical background material for it to draw upon and doing an immense amount of organisational and analytical work for the first phase of the historic West Yorkshire review.

In all of this Colin has needed to bring to bear some of that academic skill that was commented on by his referees in 1988, a skill honed in Oxford, where he was working on research on the Moravian Church in England in the 18th century. But during his time in Oxford Colin, who in his teens had been treasurer of the Methodist Association of Youth Clubs – I am sorry to ‘out’ you as a former Methodist, Colin, in this company, but I speak as another one! – discovered Anglicanism and demonstrated his enthusiasm for his newly-found Anglican identity by preaching and conducting services for the German-speaking Lutheran congregation in Oxford. Not the least of his gifts has been his linguistic skill, which has so enriched and enhanced the ecumenical work that he has done.

Over the years he has also published extensively in history and theology. Of his 2005 *Aspects of Anglican Identity* the Bishop of London observed, ‘Anyone wanting to understand today’s Church of England would be well advised to start by reading this book’. I expect that sales will promptly rise dramatically, because a lot of people will want to understand today’s Church of England! So when in 2008 the Synod asked for some description of the relationship between the governing bodies of the Church of England and the organs of the Anglican Communion, it was to Colin that the House of Bishops turned and he produced a document on the governance of the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, which clarified a wide range of questions.

It is always difficult for someone with that degree and range of academic expertise and theological sophistication to work in the relative anonymity and impersonality of a staff post, but Colin’s objectivity, integrity and professional detachment have I think been exemplary in every way over these years; for all of us in the Synod they have never been in question. However, it is quite a costly and difficult position to maintain, and I know that Colin will feel that some of his theological passion and his imaginative, intellectual capacity will have a little more room for expression and exploration in the job to which he is moving as the Director of Forward in Faith.

Colin, we will not begrudge you the opportunity to spread your wings after 25 years' loyal, totally professional and reliable service. In his note announcing the appointment the Secretary General said that Colin's outstanding skills and depth of knowledge will be greatly missed. If there is any consolation, it is that he will still be devoting his notable abilities to the cause of mutual flourishing within the Church of England – language that we heard a good deal of yesterday and that we would all want to affirm.

Colin, it is perhaps a little early to say goodbye as you have, I suspect, four and a half months of pretty hard work ahead of you before you leave Church House, but the work that you have done as Clerk to the Synod and simultaneously looking after our ecumenical agenda as a Church has been of immeasurable value, as has everything you have contributed over the years to our identity as a Church of England and to our integrity and capability in ecumenical relationships. Church House really will not be the same without you, and as you take up your new responsibilities in due course you can be assured that you will go with great affection and gratitude not only from your colleagues in the National Church Institutions but from the House of Bishops, the Synod and the Church of England as a whole. Thank you so much, and God bless you. (*Dr Podmore was accorded a standing ovation*)

The Chairman: Finally, we are going up north to the diocese of Manchester, my home, and I invite the Archbishop of York to give a farewell to the Bishop of Manchester.

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): When consecrated, the Bishop of Manchester was the first bishop known as Nigel in the Church of England since Bishop Nigel of Ely in the 12th century. According to Bishop Nigel, his earlier namesake is said to have caused such trouble that the Church steered well away from Nigels for centuries! You have remedied the situation, sir. However, once divine sat-nav located him, it led him on a circuitous route to his present destination: first to Christ's College, Cambridge, where as chaplain he overlapped for a year with a brilliant young theologian by the name of Rowan Williams.

Appointed by the veteran evangelist Bishop Maurice Wood of Norwich to be diocesan missionary, or as the job description at the time put it 'a fisher of men', the first thing he did was to fish his wife, Celia, a vicar's daughter descended from ten generations of Irish clergy. Their wedding was filmed by the BBC in the Norfolk village of Lyng for John Betjeman's television presentation *A Passion for Churches*. As the Betjeman biography records, the BBC team gave them a wedding present of a coffee percolator, to which, in his own hand, Betjeman attached an especially composed verse:

Let all the bells of Norfolk ring
On this your wedding day in Lyng
Nigel and Celia may you be
Fonder of coffee than of tea!

Soon they moved to Salisbury with their two daughters, where Bishop Nigel combined his role as parish priest with being a much loved Archdeacon of Sarum. Bishop Nigel's appointment as suffragan Bishop of Taunton was announced on the day before the Faith in the City report was published. Across the diocese of Bath and

Wells he gained the reputation for being a caring pastor, wise reconciler, and a versatile though thought-provoking and engaging preacher.

Twenty one years ago Bishop Nigel became the diocesan Bishop of Wakefield and soon became the Church of England's leading media bishop. Members will recall that he referred to Wakefield the missionary diocese of Wakefield. Since his first broadcast over 40 years ago on Thought for the Day he has occupied each and every one of the different religious slots, as well as many others, on radio and television. He is also a frequent columnist in the national press. As a broadcaster he can do what few achieve – he can deliver a crisp and salient point live to camera amid strong debate and manage it within time and without fluffs.

Throughout his ministry, wherever he has found himself, he has taken time to get alongside clergy and congregations and the local community. During the sad days of the pit closures in West and South Yorkshire he publicly supported the miners, marching with them and conducting their brass bands. A very accomplished musician, On Songs of Praise he conducted the Black Dyke Band, together with the largest ever ensemble of brass and silver band players, in a rousing rendering of 'For a Thousand Tongues' to the tune On Ikley Moor Baht 'At. I commend the tune, by the way; it was written with that tune in mind. Wearing a miner's hat, he preached an inspirational sermon in Westminster Abbey at an emotional service for school children from the 31 pit villages that had to be closed.

Just over ten years ago he returned to his north west roots to be Bishop of Manchester. He is believed to be the first bishop there to have Mancunian blood. His great grandfather was born and brought up during the 1830s in Ancoats, an area described by Engels at the time as one of the worst urban slums in the world. His Victorian forebears, one of them a roof tiler, would never have imagined that their direct descendant would one day hold such high office in that great city. Once again, here Bishop Nigel quickly got to know his clergy, visiting them all, sharing their joys and sorrows, sending them cards, notes of support, thanks and brotherly affection.

He then made his pilgrimage to each church and parish, taking with him the baton used for the opening of the Commonwealth Games. His constant message was: 'Run the race, look to Jesus and pass on His faith, hope and love'. Wherever he went he led a mission service during which he invited people to come forward individually to receive a blessing and a commission to hand on the baton as they spread the gospel in the diocese. During those mission services something like 50,000 people came forward. For many of them those few moments were life-changing. The Archbishop of Canterbury and I experienced such a gathering in the cathedral. There were thoughts that in his final two years he should do a fourth missionary journey round the diocese. This he resisted on the grounds that it would be immodest to try to out-do St Paul!

A wise pastor, skilled reconciler and able speaker, he has drawn the Manchester diocese together as one family and has gained respect from all sides over issues such as human sexuality and the ordination of women without ever compromising his own principles. Last year local MPs from all parties asked him to chair the Commission on Poverty in Greater Manchester, which will publish its recommendations in January 2013. Held in high regard by people of all faiths and elected as their convenor, he has

spoken up especially on behalf of the faith community leaders in Greater Manchester and exercises a significant and widely respected role in Jewish-Christian relationships, both locally and nationally, at a very difficult time.

In the House of Lords Bishop Nigel has played a significant role particularly in helping to ensure that the requirement for religious broadcasting and acts of worship was contained in the Communications Act 2003 – one of the largest pieces of legislation in modern times. Shortly afterwards, while serving on the Select Committee to review the BBC Charter, his courtesy, warmth and firmness ensured that a major chapter was included on the importance of religious broadcasting by the BBC despite the initial resistance of some members.

Recently Bishop Nigel was asked about the power of a bishop and what it felt like to lead a diocese. He replied by describing the first time that he conducted the famous Brighouse and Rastrick brass band. He said, ‘It is just like running a diocese. I picked up the conductor’s baton and the euphonium player whispered to me, ‘Don’t you worry about us, bishop. We’ll just carry on as usual’!

He was also asked what had been the most memorable moment in his episcopal ministry. He replied that for him personally the most moving occasion had been ordaining his wife Celia.

Bishop Nigel has accomplished the rare hat trick of being, at the time of appointment, the youngest archdeacon, the youngest suffragan bishop and the youngest diocesan bishop in the Church of England. He has now trumped that achievement by becoming the oldest and longest-serving among the current crop since the introduction of the retirement age of 70! But he has had good reason. As chair of the Revision Committee on the ordination of women to the episcopate, he wanted to see the legislation through, and I hope that he will not have to wait too long in retirement before seeing his work come to fruition.

Bishop Nigel, we thank you and salute you, we offer you every warm appreciation for all you are and have done and we pray that you and Celia may be blessed with the long, happy and healthy retirement that you now so richly deserve. In the name of Christ, God bless you. (*The Bishop was accorded a standing ovation.*)

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent)* took the Chair at 2.54 p.m.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT: REPORT BY THE MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL (GS 1883)

An audio-visual presentation was made.

Mr Philip Fletcher (Archbishops’ Council, ex officio): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod, mindful of the corrosive effect of unemployment on young people, their future prospects and social integration, and recognising that

economic policy solutions alone cannot tackle the problems without strong networks and initiatives in the community at large:

- (a) encourage parishes and church groups to listen to the voices of unemployed young people, both locally and through reports such as ‘I Am One in a Million’; and
- (b) commend and encourage the multiplication of church and community initiatives which can provide training and other support to assist young people into work and help them manage the experience of unemployment without despair.’

When the Business Committee first requested this debate, which in part follows from our debate in July on the August 2011 disturbances, the Committee suggested that we might offer some audio-visual material to illustrate the issues behind the motion. We jumped at the chance. We wanted to avoid the risk of discussing the experience of a large group of people who are notoriously under-represented here on Synod without their voices having been audible to us. With thanks to our colleagues at the Church Urban Fund who produced this short video, I would like to introduce members to a small sample of unemployed young people. (An audio-visual presentation was made)

In that video we heard a few authentic voices from young people who are not in employment, education or training – the notorious NEETs. Members may have warmed to some of them, may have compared them favourably or otherwise with young people they know, perhaps in their own families or churches, or may feel that their comments covered only part of a hugely complex social issue, and they would be right, because the focus of the video was on how young people themselves experience unemployment, rather than on causes or solutions. However, I hope that what came across is that even sparky, articulate young people – like Theo in the video – find the experience of being constantly turned down or ignored in their search for work deeply disheartening and destructive of hope. We are indebted to the Church Urban Fund and the Frontier Youth Trust for their research and for the report *I Am One in a Million*, which help us to hear the stories of young unemployed people.

Last week the latest unemployment figures were published: 2.5 million unemployed, of whom 963,000 are young people; but, as GS 1883 tells us, the number of young people who are not in work, education or training is now more like 1.4 million. To some extent the impact came across from the video, but the impact on our society at large is harder to portray visually. Enforced idleness was one of the social scourges that the Church set itself to address following the great depression of the 1930s, again in *Faith in the City* in 1985, and in *Unemployment and the Future of Work* in 1997. One thing we have learnt from those previous downturns is that unemployment among young people is particularly damaging to their developing personalities, to their sense of having a stake in society and their ability to grow into responsible citizens; we know that their chance of recovering that lost ground when there is an upturn in the economy is not all that good.

Synod will note that the motion does not include the almost traditional clause ‘calling on Her Majesty’s Government’ to do this, that or the other, and I am very grateful for the restraint of Synod colleague in not seeking to fill that gap by tabling amendments.

It is very important that although we must not absolve the present or previous Government from their responsibility – and incidentally perhaps the solutions are not dependent on particular ideologies or strategies – this afternoon, following John Freeman’s motion on the living wage, we focus on what the Church itself needs to do and could do to address some of these issues. Therefore, our focus today is on what we might do to mitigate the impact of unemployment on young people. If you like, it is an extension of Archbishop Rowan’s plea to us this morning to attend to one another in the shape of the wider society of which we are a part; and if any action of ours is to be effective, we need to get to grips with the causes and explanations for this aspect of the labour market.

Essentially we see two separate strands at work. In any recession or period of very low growth inexperienced, low-skilled young people with few or no qualifications will find it difficult to enter the labour market. The current such period is the main cause of the rise in youth unemployment. Our response as a nation to improving our competitive position includes steps that will be critically important for young people, notably on education and training.

However, there is another more structural, perhaps more intractable, trend at work. The cause is less easy to identify, the effects no less harsh. It is the way that social and economic disadvantage carries over from one generation to another, so that for those whose start in life is affected by long-term unemployment, poverty, poor housing or other indices of deprivation the chance to develop the skills necessary to get a job is greatly reduced. The attitudes, the soft skills as well as the formal qualifications, cycles of poverty, low self-esteem and a lack of skills become ever deeper and more entrenched. This is obviously a dreadful waste of human potential. It is also a big hurdle to building the kind of society and community in which people in tangible ways feel that they belong to one another.

In time we as a nation will come through this economic slough of despond, but experts, including the Governor of the Bank of England, warn us that it will not be quick, and however soon it comes real damage will have been caused to young people experiencing these periods of unemployment – the feeling that they count for nothing, often not even worth a stamp from prospective employers to tell them that their applications have again been unsuccessful.

As a Church we should include in our prayers the need for principled economic revival, and I suggest that those prayers should lead us to actions. GS 1883 and the CUF report give examples of Church initiatives that seek to do something about the dignity and employability of young people. The research report lists some of the kinds of initiative that churches can be very good at delivering: help for example with building a convincing CV or writing an eye-catching job application – the sort of positive action that does not require big pots of money, project management committees and huge logos. For example job clubs need more organisation, but even there nothing is beyond the capacity of many congregations or churches working collaboratively. There is an entire scale of responses from simple one-to-one offers of specific assistance with a job application through to big-funded projects that mobilize skilled workers to deliver clear outcomes. The most visible initiatives all started small. At a lunch-time meeting we heard about work in Peckham organised by PECAN.

Sometimes changing the world starts with changing a life. Changing a life begins with a simple offer of friendship and assistance. Yes it may mean putting people with relevant skills in touch with the young people who need them, but I suspect that the networks are there in most of our communities. Very often it is the Church that puts the networks in touch with each other. The research shows that young people often respond best to ways of working based on strong, supportive relationships led by people with empathy and commitment, and we in the Church should be in a good position to offer just such support and thereby make our distinctive contribution to tackling youth unemployment.

I hope that in the course of the debate we will hear many other examples, but some examples are in the papers in front of us, others in our dioceses or churches near us. The MPA website 'how2help.net' accessible through the C. of E. website has examples of work with young unemployed people and of how churches have responded to local need. Much of the experience is transferable, but the figures contained in the research suggest that at present only 3 per cent of churches are doing anything intentionally directed at helping unemployed young people. There is room for new ideas, new initiatives, and for established initiatives to be multiplied. I hope that those who are already doing that work will feel affirmed and encouraged by this debate. Most of all I hope that it will encourage others to follow their lead, responding to local need according to the capacity and gifts that we have.

We may not be able to turn the economy round, but we should not, I suggest, stand aside when we know how the corrosive effects of youth unemployment linger through the generations, across the economic cycle. If we can demonstrate to the young that their worth as people far exceeds the value that the job market seems to place upon them, they may be less willing to believe that the job market's verdict is the last word and more able to hear the truth of how valued they are by God.

I hope that Synod will support my motion.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Miss Hannah Page (Church of England Youth Council): It is nice to stand here and speak on an issue that is aimed at young people and is relevant to today's society. I very much welcome the I Am One in a Million report. It is wonderful to hear that the Church is willing to help disenfranchised young people, especially given everything that is happening in the Church at the moment.

I am a young person who has been through several gruelling months of unemployment. I was lucky enough to come out of it by getting a job. Some members may remember that in July I had a job at McDonalds, where I was earning less than the minimum wage at £4.95 an hour because at that time I was under the age of 21. The issues of the people referred to in the report are so real to me. It really is a disheartening experience in which you feel that society does not care about you and does not want to help you. This is definitely an area in which the Church can show young people that we care and want to help.

Although I support the motion, I have a few points to make about it. First, writing reports is all well and good if actually they are put into practice. We cannot let good

reports and actions plans like this sit on shelves, never to be used. Many of the young people mentioned in this report will not understand anything that does not help them practically. Listening to them is a great thing, but what I hear is: 'Please, please do something to help us'. So let us get on and do it.

My second point is that although there have been previous schemes through the Church that have actively helped young people to gain employment, due to funding cuts they have been disbanded. If we are really committed to these disenfranchised young people we need to put our money where our mouth is. We cannot make these papers talk the talk without walking the walk.

This motion suggests to me that we need to do something now, and that is so true. Let us take this report and use it. As a young person who knows something about the turmoil of these young people, I urge Synod to vote for the motion.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I warmly welcome the motion and particularly the call for strong networks and initiatives in the community.

As I said in July – and I assume that this motion is, in effect, a continuation of my following motion to the RACSC debates then – young people are seriously let down by us, the older generations. We saddle them with personal debt as students; we bequeath them with a massive national debt; we pass on a severely damaged environment and a broken society; and to all this we add youth unemployment, which has increased so substantially over the past five years, as paragraph 4 of the report shows. It is particularly acute in the lower skills area as so much of the economy is moving from the physical to the virtual world; and, contrary to popular opinion, not all young people can handle the digital world to a degree that would offer them employment in it.

My personal view as an employer is that the abolition of the retirement age in 2011 and the business world's anticipation of that abolition have contributed significantly to worsening youth unemployment. Since early 2008 the number of people aged over 65 in employment has risen by 238,000 whereas the number of those aged 16–24 in employment has fallen by 347,000. Simple mathematics would therefore suggest that two-thirds of the youth unemployment problem has resulted from older people staying on in work. Of course, it is not as simple as that. It is not a zero-sum game situation, but the impact of the European Directive to abolish the retirement age so abruptly needs to be kept under review as young people all over Europe are suffering. For example Greece's youth unemployment rate is 58 per cent. In my view the Government and the European Commission need to review this correlation.

I would like to address two specific areas. First, I want to support the call in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the report to engage young people with the community action initiatives that are flourishing all over the country. This is well endorsed in paragraph (b) of the motion. Community action initiatives do not have to rely on volunteers alone. Many young people want to become involved and contribute but need to be paid for their efforts. The 'how2help.net' website referred to in paragraph 25 of the report and at Question time has many sources of finance to help projects make this possible. Community action does not just have to be pro bono. It can be properly funded and provide training and other support to assist young people, almost as a parallel route to employment for those attending higher education. As Philip Fletcher

said, at the fringe event on youth unemployment we heard other initiatives. Members can speak to Malcolm Brown in Mission and Public Affairs for the details.

Finally, I want to address the particular needs of young people in care. The ACEVO Commission on Youth Unemployment, mentioned in the report, highlighted the situation of those who, on leaving care, fall off a cliff edge of state support when they become adults. As the report says in paragraph 13, young people living independently are especially vulnerable, and this applies particularly to those who have been looked after, because they have no family support. The Department for Education has a scheme called 'virtual head teachers' to provide a continuing point of reference for young people in care at school. I would like to suggest that we explore the potential for a similar scheme to provide Church-based mentoring for those young people who would welcome it. We need to engage with those who start adult life from such a disadvantage.

I thank Mr Fletcher for tabling this essential motion and I hope that Synod will support it wholeheartedly.

The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds (Rt Revd John Packer): I am very grateful to the Mission and Public Affairs Council for presenting this report to Synod and for its work and that of the Church Urban Fund in highlighting the scourge of youth unemployment, and I want to reflect especially on the final words of the motion: 'to assist young people into work and help them manage the experience of unemployment without despair'.

Yesterday morning I rejected the attractions of Synod in order to fulfil my role in a parliamentary inquiry into asylum support for children and young people, on which we hope to report by the end of January. Somehow that seemed at least as crucial as what we were doing here. During one of the sessions we heard evidence from a number of people with expertise in industry and indeed in welfare provision, but by far the most moving part of the session were the words of two young workless asylum seekers who spoke of their rejection by society, the rudeness and dismissive nature of those whom they encountered, and above all of the refusal to allow them to work.

These are very articulate young women with young children themselves, fleeing persecution, separated from their families because of that persecution, wanting to contribute to our society and simply being told that they cannot do so. Therefore, my one moment of unease with what Mr Fletcher said to us in his introduction to this debate was when he said that the motion does not contain any political element. It seems to me that political pressure as well as personal support is crucial if we are to make progress in these areas. The refusal to allow some young asylum seekers in this country even to apply for jobs must be a blot on our society.

However, there is much that churches can do and are doing. They can help to demonstrate and share the skills that many asylum seekers bring to this country. In Leeds much of the advice given to those seeking voluntary work comes from asylum seekers themselves, yet those who I met yesterday were very close to despair. They are among those who most need our support. Many of them are fellow Christians. One of the two from whom we took evidence yesterday specifically challenged me as to what I was going to do as a fellow Christian. I salute the work that churches do among

them and I ask the MPA Council for both personal and political pressure to enhance the lives of those young people and the contributions that they can make to our society.

Mr James Townsend (Manchester): I commend to Synod Hannah Page's words. I have many friends who have experienced very similar situations to those that she described. The feeling of impotence in that regard is absolutely phenomenal and Hannah Page expressed it in very articulate words.

This morning the Archbishop of Canterbury underlined the enormity of the task that lies before us today in regard to credibility with the nation that we claim to serve. In this we can be the good guys. When I was elected to the Synod I committed myself to speak as a member of a generation that is utterly disengaged from the Christian message, but searching for some spiritual leadership in what seems to be an increasingly vacuous and transitory world. In the light of all that, I commend the motion before us. In particular, like Philip Fletcher, I am pleased that it encourages action. It is worth remembering that we are in a good position on this. We are one of the few organisations that can boast over 16,000 outlets across the country, and in that regard we are up there with Pret a Manger. However, perhaps unlike Pret a Manger, very often our outlets serve some of the most disadvantaged communities in the country, and we must make the most of that.

The motion encourages training and other support, but in the course of their existing activities our parishes can do a lot to help. For example when carrying out repairs on our church roofs, which I know many people are concerned about at the moment, we can ensure that our contractors have apprentices who are being trained properly. However, if we want to make a truly significant impact we can make sure that we give young people experience. The video that we saw earlier, as well as Hannah Page's comments, underlined the importance of gaining experience. As a teacher and friend of many unemployed folk, and indeed as someone looking for employment myself – copies of my CV are available on request! – the complaint that I hear most frequently, as mentioned in the video, is: 'They say I need experience, but I can't get any experience unless they give me some experience'.

The biggest difference that we can make is to give the young people of our parishes – I use the word parish rather than congregation – structured roles and responsibilities within the life of our churches, such as CV-friendly opportunities to build and demonstrate experience of people skills, organisation and professional understanding. Members will forgive me if it is a flippant example, but one person's contribution to the tea rota might be seen as another person's occasional hospitality assistant. Just a few entries on to a CV can make a world of difference when it comes to getting one's first foot on the ladder.

The daily life of our parishes relies on a variety of roles that could give unemployed young people the experience that they so desperately require. If each of our parishes took on one intern after school or at the weekend, 16,000 young people would be given a leg up at no extra cost. We can do plenty to celebrate and enable the God-given potential of young people. Who knows, we might even be able to demonstrate that the fabled Big Society is not a Cameron idea at all but a Christian one.

Revd Prebendary Philippa Boardman (London): I thank the Mission and Public Affairs Council for its report and the motion, particularly paragraph (b) concerning the role of the Church in providing training and other support to assist young people into work and help them manage the experience of unemployment without despair. I live and work in the London borough of Tower Hamlets, which a government report last year identified as having the highest incidence of child poverty in the whole of the United Kingdom. During the preceding years, through ministry our church had increasingly encountered that poverty among teenagers, which we believe God was calling us to develop.

With many thanks to the Church Urban Fund and a grant from the Mustard Seed programme, we were able to hire the services of a youth worker to undertake research especially through conversations with young people themselves about their lives, their needs and their aspirations. Through those conversations he discovered teenagers living in families where no one had worked for generations. He also discovered situations in which managing their home lives was a significant job in itself due to a high incidence of mental illness among parents and carers and of family breakdown and domestic violence. In stark contrast to the teenagers in the suburban church in which he had worked previously, where the vast majority of young people aspired to go to university and get good jobs, time and time again he encountered a profound lack of aspiration, and undergirding it a deep lack of self worth. His key conclusion – in a way a mission statement – was that we need to start at a very foundational level to bring value and purpose into the lives of young people.

I would like to commend the work of schools in Tower Hamlets and the unstinting efforts of teachers and other staff to raise standards for teenagers, and the work of Inter- University Foundation, a growing charity that some members may be aware of, with a number of centres, including one in our own church building, which provides daily study support and mentoring for young people who dare to believe that they may be the first in their families ever to go to university and develop their full potential. The I Am One in a Million report highlights a number of other initiatives that have already been mentioned this afternoon.

As an inner urban church with very limited resources – perhaps some other members come from churches that also have very limited resources – what can we do as we return to our parishes this week, as we go to worship in our parishes on Sunday?

I believe that we can all engage with some very simple steps: building the social skills of teenagers by sitting down and having serious conversations with them; building life skills by establishing some ground rules concerning turning up on time and therefore fulfilling commitments that they have made; building their presentational skills by involving them regularly in leading worship, giving talks, preaching sermons, reading Scripture, participating in drama and providing feedback to the wider congregation; building the aspirations of teenagers by linking them with youth groups in parishes where it is much more the norm to go to university and get a job; and building their leadership skills by giving them responsibilities for leading small groups and other activities in the life of the Church. I offer those as very simple, practical suggestions, which I hope all of us will have an opportunity to put into action and which involve the expenditure of no extra money at all.

Undergirding all this, as we seek to bring value and purpose to the lives of young people, is the distinctive, unique gift that we offer to them in the person of Jesus Christ and in the reign of his kingdom, for it is in the love and courage of Christ dwelling in their hearts, and shown in the life of the Church we pray, that we can give them the most precious antidote to their despair and the foundation of their value and purpose.

Revd Canon John Kiddle (St Albans): I warmly welcome this debate on an issue of such huge importance. There are no easy or quick solutions and perhaps we also need to think long term.

One of the things we can do is to seek to ensure that the resources we have as the Church of England nationally, in our dioceses and in our parishes, can be used to help address the issues we are talking about today, in practical and effective ways. To that end, I would draw Synod's attention to two innovative programmes that can make a real difference.

There are 1.4 million young people unemployed and yet there is a chronic and growing shortage of people with the skills to take up vacancies in engineering, construction and other fields. The Baker Dearing Trust – a cross-party body set up to respond to the gap between what our young people learn at school, the needs of our economy, and opportunities for good and sustainable employment – is developing a new kind of schooling for 14-18 year-olds called University Technical Colleges (UTCs). One has recently opened in our diocese of St Albans. One of our parish priests, Revd Chris Beales, is heavily involved in developing a UTC in Stratford, east London. The diocese of Chelmsford is one of the sponsors, as is an IT company run by one of the parishioners in our diocese.

UTCs cater for young men and women of all abilities and provide both academic courses and technical vocational skills training. They are typically more like workplaces than schools and their first exam results have been among the best in the country.

Secondly, I would commend the work of the Apprenticeship Training Agency, a social enterprise which will employ apprentices, provide them with skills training and place them, for a fee, with a small business which cannot afford to employ an apprentice itself.

In my diocese, the deanery of Flitwick has been encouraging us as a diocese to ensure that companies contracted to do property maintenance and repairs in churches, church schools, church halls and vicarages, should be encouraged to take on an apprentice. The Apprenticeship Training Agency would be an ideal way of doing this. Not overstretching a small business with responsibility for someone they may not have enough work for, but providing a way of placing apprentices for limited periods or specific projects, so that they acquire experience and receive training. I know that people in St Albans, Southwark, Birmingham and elsewhere are very interested in this idea. We perhaps need now to pilot it in several dioceses across the country.

By doing so, I believe that in the coming years the Church can make a significant local impact on youth unemployment and thereby on the national economy and the

shortage of skills which we need to address. I urge Synod to support this motion and to work towards using the resources we have, in order to make a real difference.

Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester): Unlike other speakers, I start at an even earlier level and would commend to Synod and the wider Church the use of the Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme – bronze, silver and gold.

It is possible for a church or deanery to run such a scheme. My wife and I assist as basic expedition leaders with an ecumenical Church group in our deanery. This is a great way to get to know the age bracket as it moves up towards employment age, so that when potential unemployment comes a relationship is already established. What is more, the scheme itself assists the development of young people in outdoor expedition skills to learn responsibility. It includes a physical element, skill element and voluntary element over a three-to-six-month time period, all of which is helpful to gain confidence. There is then the expedition itself, where they learn to read maps and work out routes to get from here to there – something that this Synod may find useful! In addition, it adds a recognised award to their CV for future employment, demonstrating capacity for teamwork and commitment.

In our case, it is a good example of working under the auspices of the local authority as a church-community partnership, where Christian action can be seen in practice. I appreciate that it may not deal with the immediate issue, but starting early does mean that when difficulties have to be faced they will know where to turn.

This is a very helpful paper and gives suggestions as to where it can be built on, but establishing relationships in the individual parishes and deaneries is the first step.

The Chairman: The next speaker is the Archdeacon of Bolton.

Ven. Dr John Applegate (Manchester): – Sadly no longer the Archdeacon of Bolton but Principal of the All Saints Centre for Mission and Ministry. I think your records need updating, Chairman, but thank you for calling me to speak.

I want to welcome this report and the motion before us, but also to ask a question about what further resources the Church might put into helping parishes and communities to address youth unemployment. We are not talking about a short-term fix but a long-term problem, and I do not underestimate the difficulties that anyone tackling this issue may face.

Twelve years ago, I led a team of residents and officers from the local authority, housing associations and business in setting up a community-based regeneration agency. It took a sustained act of collaboration over three years in order to set that up, but the Broughton Trust in inner urban Salford has since helped many young people and others into training and employment, as well as tackling wider issues of social regeneration. I remain profoundly grateful to my PCC, which took a decision to release me and support me in that work, and to my bishop, who understood the need and encouraged me to get on with it.

I am sorry that, to my mind, the motion and papers from the Mission and Public Affairs Council are still underdeveloped and lack some focus. I am grateful for the

concentration on local parishes and on encouraging them to do their work, but I wonder where the skills, resources and encouragement really will come from.

My youngest son is one of the NEETs referred to in the paper supporting this motion. Even with the advice and support of my wife, who works for Jobcentre Plus – so who knows a thing or two about getting people into work – he has been unable to find a job for more than a few weeks, occasionally months, at a time.

Changes to the infrastructure of the Youth Employment Services have not been positive. Removing finances from local authorities in areas of deprivation has badly affected their services and those of local charities. Although there are new Youth Contract structures within Jobcentres, as I Am One in a Million reports, young people find them almost universally difficult to engage with. The short-term targeting of training resources has serious side effects. For example, young people relying on benefits may lose them if they access longer employment training courses. It does not stop there. The welfare reform agenda will soon introduce sanctions for young people on benefits, which could easily perpetuate rather than solve youth unemployment.

My observation of my own son's situation is that the alienation of many young people, and the consequent disaffection that results, is storing up real problems for our society. We covered that last year in some elements of the debate on the riots. Apart from that, however, in allowing the impression that society does not mind about youth employment we are unwittingly aiding subversive, anarchistic and extreme political groups in their work. I am therefore glad that we have an opportunity today to think through some of the issues and to encourage parishes in their role of helping people back into work.

My experience of young people is that they are full of ideas, creativity, hopes and ideals, but those incredible characteristics are often fragile and in need of support, nurture and direction. As the MPA Council suggests, that may be an area in which the Church can usefully offer its experience in mentoring and the formation of young lives; but young people also expect engagement and commitment. If we are not able to put resources behind what we are asking parishes to do, that will be seen as something of a betrayal. As Hannah said earlier, if the Church does not commit time, people and resources to tackling their issues, it will be seen as a failure.

The motion before us needs to be a little sharper, focusing on how bishops, dioceses, PCCs, and the MPA Division can encourage lay and clergy involvement in supporting our nation's young people to address issues of employment and employability, personal formation and purposeful living, and to learn from the good practice already around.

The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart): I thank Synod for raising this topic now and for raising it in an incomplete way. The enormity of the challenge is breathtaking. We talk in millions rather than hundreds or hundreds of thousands.

In Birmingham, unemployment in the 18-24 age range is running at 23.2 per cent; for the West Midlands it is 16 per cent; for the UK it is about 13½ per cent. This is an appalling situation to be in, in one of the best-off, richest countries in the world,

where young people's talents, abilities, opportunities and hopes, as we saw in the video, are not being fulfilled on our watch.

I am delighted that paragraph 25 in the paper encourages us to build stronger intermediate institutions. I think that what the CUF is doing, and what we have heard already in the debate, illustrates that the Church is well placed not only to provide that intermediate help but also to be in partnership with it. We read in the paper about Worth Unlimited, which is particularly active in the Hodge Hill constituency in Birmingham, where social enterprises are bringing into work young people of the sort we have seen in the video. They are not alone, however. Further north of the city, Urban Devotion does the same thing in another estate. In London, there are charities like Regenerate, bringing young people to opportunities for hope and employment. Through the Church Commissioners' growth agenda, we have been able to have seven mission apprentices – indigenous young people in local parishes, engaging with relationships in the churches.

We heard earlier about apprenticeships. I hope that, if in congregations there is someone who is an employer or who is part of a large organisation where there is employment, Synod members will ask them, this weekend or when members see them, if there is an apprenticeship scheme in their organisation. At the weekend, a newspaper covered the 100 best apprenticeship schemes in the country, ranging from large institutions like Jaguar Land Rover down to small, even micro, economic enterprises – because they believe that there is talent that can be released into the community and into the economy instead of draining from it.

I want to go a little further, however. There is not only the opportunity for stronger intermediate institutions, such as our local parishes; there is also the need for greater confidence in partnerships with others on a wider scale, in the very complex economic and social condition we are tackling today. Therefore, as local authority budgets are cut, as government policies change and strategic partnerships wrestle with some of these issues — as they have the ability to do, particularly in areas of poverty around the country, bringing together community groups, local authorities, businesses and statutory agencies — we need to make sure that those relationships are not lost in the next couple of years. For example, locally we have a Social Inclusion Project.

This is where leaders in the Church, not just at the local level, are still being asked to contribute. If a bishop, an archdeacon, a parish priest or a senior layperson is asked to give voluntary time to lead, to bring together smaller institutions and groups in a partnership system, I would encourage them to find ways of doing that, in particular where these hard issues of policy about which we have heard need to be addressed.

We need discussion about education, about the Lighthouse Group, which brings young people who are excluded from school into employment. We also need to know about the work of Herman Stewart, who has just written a book from the Christian Church entitled *Every Child Needs a Mentor*. I think that is something we could promote very strongly. Above all, if we are to be together then we need to know that every local church engages with at least one or two young unemployed people; but at the same time we must not dodge the hard policy questions of economic growth. If members have a Local Enterprise Partnership in their area, I would urge them to

challenge its chair to put this issue on the agenda of those who are responsible for economic growth. We cannot detach economic policy from social policy.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): I refer to paragraph 22 of this report, which says that young people value projects that are ‘led by people with real empathy and commitment’. I think that is talking about youth workers, and I speak as a former youth worker, youth work trainer and youth adviser.

In paragraph 21 it also says that 3 per cent of churches have organised activities. I do not know the statistics but I am pretty certain that more than 3 per cent of churches have youth workers. What I suggest, therefore, is that when members go back to their dioceses they should check the priorities of their youth workers. It may be that they need to change.

One of the consequences of being denied access to economic independence is that we shall have a generation of young people who will be locked into a long adolescence. As the Bishop of Birmingham has said, they need mentors to help them to deal with that.

Philippa Boardman talked about valuable things that can be done that do not cost extra money – building life skills and so on – but I suggest that we should look at how existing money is being spent.

Some years ago, Peter Brierley carried out some research – I think it was the Reaching and Keeping Teenagers project – where he talked about churches and challenged us to look at our budgets, to see if we were amongst those churches that spent more on their flowers than they did on their young people. When members go back to their dioceses, I would urge them to look at what the youth workers are doing and see if those priorities need to be changed.

Revd James Dudley-Smith (Bath and Wells): It was good to hear about Worth Unlimited. I want to mention the next initiative in the paper, which is job clubs and work clubs. These have had an increasingly important presence in recent years, and the Universal Credit welfare reform is likely to be promoting them even more.

One of the biggest epidemics in the UK of our time is that of loneliness and isolation. We have heard about it: the breakdown of community and relationships. That can only be exacerbated when it involves people at the start of their adult life.

Job clubs in their simplest form are a chance for unemployed people to meet in community and to provide mutual encouragement and support for one another. They can build community in these settings, even when they do not have a workplace community. They can learn to build relationships in adult life, to support and help one another. When it is done through the Church, they can be brought into a loving church community as well.

There is a strong correlation between unemployment and debt. In my church in Yeovil we run a CAP centre – Christians Against Poverty – helping people in debt. CAP reports that 29 per cent of their debt clients nationally are unemployed people.

There is a significant correlation between unemployment and relationship breakdown. In the UK, 43 per cent of children in workless households are in severe poverty, as measured by Save the Children. According to the British Medical Journal, the unemployed are ten times more likely to commit suicide. It is a big issue that needs to be engaged with in a holistic way.

Job clubs are able to provide practical support and guidance, emotional support, and a loving community, led by a volunteer motivated by the love of Christ. Job clubs really can make a difference.

At this point I need to say ‘Watch this space’, because a Christian organisation is currently formulating a strategy for a national roll-out of church-based job clubs, with a public launch due in March of next year. Local churches are brilliantly positioned to help in places of need, with buildings, good-hearted volunteers, motivation from the love of Christ, and lots of good Christian initiatives to help us, such as those I have mentioned.

I am delighted that we have this motion and the accompanying paper before us, and I urge that we push it through with all speed.

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): Our debate has obviously had a mainly urban focus today, but Synod would probably expect me to say something about rural unemployment amongst young people. It is rising even faster in rural areas than it is in urban areas. A report published in the summer by the Commission for Rural Communities (CRC) found that, since the start of the financial crisis in 2007, the proportion of young people not in education, training or employment in rural areas has increased by more than a third, compared to the rise of one-fifth in urban areas.

There are a number of reasons, of course. There are the high transportation costs to get to jobs, further education or training, which all adds to what is rather invidiously called ‘access poverty’. These are real barriers for people in rural areas.

The CRC is calling for the creation of a government minister for youth services, to focus specifically on the issues facing young people across the UK, because there is currently nowhere in government that has the clear, overarching responsibility for securing the employment of young people in rural areas.

I briefly want to tell Synod about something that I am involved in. It is the European Rural Development Programme, a LEADER programme. It is a bottom-up programme that works with local people and I am vice-chair of the Northumberland Uplands group. One of the very encouraging experiences in being part of this group is that, although we are all wearing different hats, there are a great many committed Christians in the group. They are worshipping in their own churches and then working in the group – doing the real kingdom work there.

One of the issues we identified in our group was a lack of aspiration in young people, and all the things we have been hearing about. We have allocated resources and employed two young women on a job-share basis. They are speaking with young people, trying to find out what we can do to encourage business start-ups and how we can raise aspirations. We are working with a partner organisation in rural Sweden and

there have been some exchanges. We are giving young people the opportunity to see rural life in a different area. It has opened up a whole new world for them and been a really positive experience.

Of course we should encourage parishes to become involved and to do more than they are doing, but we should not underestimate the amount of kingdom work we can do – getting involved in the LEPs, in organisations like the one I am involved in, or any other – and working together with these organisations where there is already quite a lot of expertise and opportunity but often a lack of volunteers and time, which we may be able to commit. It is important that we also encourage people in our churches to get involved in that way.

Sister Anne Williams (Durham): I wonder if anybody can guess what I am going to speak about. No? That shows that you have listened to me in the past. Church Lads' and Church Girls' Brigade, of course, which I have been part of for a mere 50-something years.

Listening to the different things people have said, it is the Church of England's youth organisation. It does teach the faith; it also teaches children how to have fun; but it does not stop there. It goes on to teach them all sorts of things and it then trains them, as they get older, to run the group or to set up other youth groups and to work with children. It also gives them confidence in many other things.

I was just thinking, when the Archbishop was talking earlier about being a Methodist, I might have been one. It is the fault of Church Lads' Brigade that I am not, because my mother was a Methodist, my father was Salvation Army and my brother, who is many years older than me, went between the two. At one of them, he was asked to make promises each time he went. He could never remember the promise and he said to a lad at school, 'Oh, it's awful. I've got to do it and I'm always being told how stupid I am'. This lad said, 'Why don't you come to the one I go to?' and so he went to the Church Lads' Brigade in Shotton.

My brother loved it and, within a few weeks, they asked him to read the lesson at the parade service. He asked Mum and Dad, 'Will you come and listen?' and so they did. Mum sat there and apparently said, 'Do you know, this is the first time we have ever worshipped together as a family?' and from then on they started to attend the Anglican church in Shotton. By the time I arrived, they knew that was where they wanted to be and it was anticipated that I would continue.

That organisation used to do cookery. My brother loved it. He did not think that he would but he did. My brother is a qualified chef. Because he started it then, it gave him the confidence to move on. I learned lots of things from it. When I was applying for various jobs, I put it in my CV – that this is what I had done, albeit in a voluntary capacity. It helped me in interviews to get jobs.

We work with young people, helping them to move on and to have the confidence to go on. We have had to help some of them to have the confidence to go to university, when they were nervous about being away from home. They also work at how to listen to one another; how to work with people from other groups; how to organise. It

is an amazing organisation. It is not just for giving youngsters a good time. A lot of training is involved and it leads them on to having the confidence to do other things.

Some young people have gone to work in a local community centre in my area. They were a bit nervous about it but they are now doing lots of different things, working not only with children but with the elderly. They are being paid for it now. In the past they had done it for nothing, but while doing it for nothing had learned and moved on. I recommend Church Lads' and Church Girls' Brigade to Synod. Come and join us!

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford): I wholly support this motion. The Bishop of Ripon and Leeds made a special case of the asylum-seeker children. May I mention another special group? Those with learning difficulties and personality disorders, and those on the autistic spectrum.

Some families try to provide support for these youngsters, but those who are unfortunate and do not have such support can have severe problems. They have greater difficulty in getting work. Paragraph 14 of the MPAC paper says, 'Young people's experiences of Job Centres were almost universally negative...Young people said that staff were often rude, did not listen to them....' In the case of people with learning difficulties, Asperger's and so on, the rudeness almost borders on bullying and they find it extremely difficult. Also, if they do not have family support – and that is not always a given – that could lead not only to depression and mental health problems but also homelessness and all that entails: drugs, abuse, crime and so on.

The need for such youngsters and their families to feel wanted is even greater. They need to be supported, and that is something that churches could provide.

Revd Alison Cox (Chester): I want to share one experience in relation to giving young people work experience that I have found success with, which Synod may find helpful. That is, getting in touch with a local volunteer bureau.

In common with many clergy, I am sure, my desk overflows with paperwork and I was struggling to know what to do with it. There was no one in the context of my church who could help, so it was suggested that I tried my local volunteer bureau to find somebody to help with parish admin. I nervously went along, unsure whether or not this would be successful; but it was hugely successful. I was greeted with great enthusiasm and warmth. They were delighted to work with churches and, to my surprise, I found that they were crying out for the opportunity to give work experience to young people in admin. If members want to get rid of their piles of paperwork, this is their opportunity!

I had four applicants, including a university graduate from Birmingham with an engineering degree. We made two appointments, one of whom was training in admin and who just wanted work experience. There are other opportunities with the volunteer bureau, of which admin is just one. It took me by surprise and, as I say, they were delighted to work with churches.

Revd Canon Roger Driver (Liverpool): I love our young representatives on Synod. They have the ability to make us realize how old we are! I was talking to Anna yesterday and asked her ‘Anna, what’s a UB40?’ and the response was ‘A pop group who do lots of cover versions’. What I went on to say to her was, ‘When I was 16 and had left school I was on unemployment benefit and a UB40 was the unemployment benefit claim form’. I was struggling with my education and ended up being unemployed for eight months.

Someone quoted Shakespeare yesterday and I am going to quote some UB40 now. One of the songs UB40 brought out at that time was this:

‘My arms enfold the dole queue,
Malnutrition dulls my hair.
My eyes are black and lifeless
With an underprivileged stare.
I’m the beggar on the corner,
Will no-one spare a dime?
I’m the child that never learns to read
‘Cause no-one spared the time.

I am the one in ten,
A number on a list.
I am the one in ten,
Even though I don’t exist.
Nobody knows me
Even though I’m always there:
A statistic, a reminder
Of a world that doesn’t care.’

That was penned by a group of guys from Birmingham who were unemployed themselves. It is such a shame that, 32 years later, young people are able to empathize with those words. In Bootle, at the north end of the Liverpool Docks in a quite localized area, it is about 40 per cent youth unemployment in our community, with all the associated issues.

I value this report; there are so many good things in it. I will not repeat what other speakers have said, but there is a role for the Church. I am glad that the Church’s role is valued in this report, in terms of our role in troubled communities.

One thing I want to encourage in people is vocation in public life. We want people to step forward for public office and in local elections, where they can be an influence in directing policy. There is also the role of Church schools in those communities. I am a governor of an FE college. All of these institutions have an important contribution to play in addressing youth unemployment.

Years ago in the late-1980s, when I was training, I came across a youth worker in Dalton-in-Furness in Cumbria. I said to him, ‘What are you trying to do?’ He replied – and I have always remembered it – ‘I am trying to be a significant person.’ By that, he meant that so many people let young people down.

As a Christian, as a Church youth worker, I want to be there, continually and on-going, in the life of young people. I pray and hope that this report helps us to continue to achieve that. I would urge Synod to support this motion.

Ms Alison Fisher (Wakefield): I speak this afternoon as somebody who has worked for the Probation Service for over 30 years. I cannot quite believe that. I know I cannot possibly look as though I have!

I want to say thank you for paragraph 8, where there is mention of ‘ex-offenders’ and a recognition of a very significant group we need to consider when we are thinking about young people with whom we can perhaps engage. At the moment, despite all the threats to the Probation Service – which was also having its future reviewed and debated yesterday – it is really engaged in the rehabilitation of people who are on the margins of our society. They have a big agenda around partnership. They need people. They need interested organisations, interested schemes and ideas. They are very open to working with organisations that can offer time, mentors and peers to people who need stability, people who can offer a different future.

The Bishop of Birmingham made an excellent point: that we have in our congregations – and I am sure here in Synod – people who are employed by big organisations; employers who could perhaps work with the Probation Service to offer opportunities. There are some excellent local probation schemes that are getting employers to take that very difficult leap to employ people who have a criminal record. If we can also support that, we will do well by a particularly marginalized group of people.

I would particularly give congratulations for referring to ‘ex-offenders’ in paragraph 8. The Probation Service is trying hard not to be calling them ‘offenders’ and to use ‘ex-offenders’.

Dr Philip Rice (London): I will take a risk. I will say some kind words about high-flying bankers and lawyers on the edge of the Tower Hamlets/City area. Here goes. Bringing hope to Tower Hamlets – one of our very interesting social enterprises with a strong Christian ethos – what are they doing?

City Gateway runs training courses for young people, aimed at progressing them into employment by working in partnership with a wide range of corporate and community partners. Let us pause for a moment. Where do those resources come from? I said the high-flying bankers and lawyers, and this is where there is perhaps a wider example.

There is a very high degree of goodwill for ‘doing something’ to get young people into work, and the bankers and the lawyers I have in mind – some of the big City names and houses on the edge of the City – have been drawn into offering the release of their staff at grassroots level to help, train and mentor. This has been an eye-opener. We are talking about something like a half-day a fortnight or a half-day a month. Various schemes do this. Synod may know this and maybe I am telling members what they already know. If not, however, there is a pool of interest and expertise here that is drawn into this social enterprise world.

I want also to say something about how my parish church fits into this – St Paul’s Shadwell. There are two strands to this year, ‘Making disciples’ and ‘Impacting the community’. When we look at our quite large congregation – about 100 wage-earners, let us say – we have five people working in City Gateway. I have to admit that one of those five is my son. However, the Christian ethos, the way this interacts, is extremely positive. The deputy chief executive of City Gateway is one of the persons who makes the contacts and uses the networks. We are a well-heeled church, so we do have ways of helping to do this.

My observation is really this. Let us look out for this. Let us esteem highly the opportunity to tap into some of these mentoring skills that may be available. I believe that where the church is on the edge of the City, this may well be particularly helpful.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): On a point of order, Chairman. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

The motion was put and carried.

Mr Philip Fletcher, in reply: I thank Synod for the debate and for the contributions. I will not try to respond to everybody. Together, I think we have confirmed that we are talking about an issue which is big, socially, economically and spiritually, and that the Church has a proper role to play in addressing it.

That is where I would like to start, with a response in particular to the Bishop of Ripon and Leeds but John Applegate and the Bishop of Birmingham have also mentioned it. I do not think that with this debate we are for a moment letting the Government off the hook. They have an absolutely key responsibility. Without over-egging the point, however, I think the Church, not least now, needs to demonstrate our own credibility if we are to be heard clearly. I hope the various things that have been said this afternoon will help to demonstrate that credibility, together with what we then go on to do out of this Synod, as we go home, back to parishes and dioceses, and think about the impact on youth unemployment that we can make.

The debate has shown that there is a lot going on already. I am grateful to Hannah Page and James Townsend for sharing their personal experience and pointing us positively forward from it. A number of speakers have drawn attention to particular sets of issues. Again, the Bishop of Ripon and Leeds has spoken of asylum seekers; Gavin Oldham, those leaving care; Dagmar Winter, the rural dimension; Anna Thomas-Betts, the autistic spectrum; Alison Fisher, ex-offenders. All of those are highly relevant; all need to be addressed in particular.

In doing the addressing, the examples have been multifarious. There is the need to work with other secular institutions. The Probation Service, Alison Fisher again; Philip Rice, hope to Tower Hamlets; John Kiddle, University Technology Colleges. It was John Applegate who brought out the difficulty that, if you are going for a big solution, you have to plan it. If you are setting about a war – in this case on unemployment – you have to plan it out. A three-year set-up for a significant community-based agency does not sound at all unreasonable to me; so plan it – but please do not let us give up. Let us use what is already there.

Anne Foreman and Roger Driver gave us examples. Anne Williams gave us again – and nothing wrong with that – the Church Lads’ and Church Girls’ Brigade. Apprenticeships came up on several counts, with the potential ability for the Church, where it is relevant, to look for their own contractors to be using apprentices, whether directly employed or through other organisations.

Then we come to the things that most of us should be capable of doing if we are called in our hearts to do this. Mentoring came through consistently. The ability to help young people who do not have quite the right skills, sometimes right through to real literacy difficulties. We can help. Alison Cox brought out the issue of work experience. Jacob Vince, other skills.

That leaves us at the end with where to start. ‘How to Help’, the website, gives a lead-in. I would urge members to look at the CUF stand outside this hall. Do not just look at the very short report that we have been given, but at the various other examples there of what is possible. I hope that it sparks our imagination. CUF is doing a great deal and we should thank them.

The final thought to leave with Synod is this. If 4,000 – that is, a quarter of our parishes – were each able to help five young people a year over a ten-year period, it would approximately halve the issue. I know that is far too simple, but it is little on little on little that will change this, and we can play our part. I hope that Synod will endorse this motion overwhelmingly.

The motion was put and carried.

THE CHAIR *Canon Ann Turner (Europe)* took the Chair at 4.20 p.m.

Farewell

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): Before I move to say something about Bishop Peter Price, the question has arisen as to whether we are formally saying farewell to Glyn Webster as Prolocutor. There is apparently a rather technical answer: that we do not usually say goodbye to Prolocutors because they go at the end of the quinquennium, but in this case we are in a rather different position. I am pretty sure that Synod would want me, on behalf of all of us, to say this to Glyn. Thank you for the invaluable work you have done as Prolocutor. Thank you for all the extraordinary witness and contribution you have made in your current ministry to the Church of England, and every blessing in the future ministry which you are undertaking. You go with our love and our thanks, Glyn. *(Applause)*

It is very strange how certain place names acquire a sort of patina of extra, and sometimes rather disreputable, meanings around them. Lovers of Gilbert and Sullivan will know the significance of Basingstoke; viewers of Little Britain will remember the unfortunate associations of Llanddewi Brefi; and those who can think back to Black Adder will recall that the baby-eating Bishop of Bath and Wells plays a notable and rather discreditable role in one episode, whose details are far too sensitive for mixed company. *(Laughter)* I cannot quite make any association between Peter Price and the baby-eating bishop in Black Adder, except for a certain quality of relentless energy,

displayed in somewhat more constructive and Christian ways by one of them than the other.

Peter has been Bishop of Bath and Wells for ten years and in the Lords since 2008. He is, as perhaps not many of you know, one of those Oak Hill ordinands with uncertain futures about whom we were hearing yesterday. (*Laughter*) After which he worked in the Portsmouth diocese, including work as a community chaplain on an overspill housing estate, moving from there to be chaplain of the Scargill community – one of two truly formative moments in Peter’s ministry, because Christian community has always been a major concern for him.

He brought the experiences of Scargill to bear on some very different contexts during his ministry at Croydon and at Southwark Cathedral. From 1992-97, however, Peter exercised a ministry as General Secretary of USPG – or ‘Us.’ as we have now learned to call it. This is the second formative experience, where an intense involvement in the life of the world Church, and particularly in the lives of base communities, small Christian communities across the world in vulnerable settings, shaped his theology and his ministry for good and all.

He had considerable experience visiting the Churches of Central and Latin America during the period of the ‘dirty wars’ of the 1980s and 1990s and has first-hand contact with those communities living through the days of death squads and government-sponsored murder. In 2011, Peter revisited El Salvador and was able to meet up with one bishop whom he was instrumental in saving from execution 20 years ago.

Reconciliation has been a central theme in the whole of Peter’s ministry – in Northern Ireland, in connection with Iraq and Zimbabwe. That gift for reconciliation has been put to work for the Anglican Communion more recently in Peter’s ministry in chairing the panel of Archbishop’s Visitors, who have been travelling to different parts of the Communion, taking part in regional meetings and attempting to learn at first hand what is actually going on in the Communion, filtering it back to myself and my colleagues, helping us to get a better grasp of issues in situations of conflict and to respond appropriately. He has contributed to a wider discussion of some of these issues through a number of significant publications: *Changing Communities*, *Church from the Grassroots*, *Seeds of the Word*, *Playing the Blue Note* and, a favourite of my own, *Undersong*.

At the heart of all this has been both his marriage to Dee and their hospitality at the Bishop’s Palace in Wells, where they have worked tirelessly to make the historic palace a home and a hearth for all kinds of people – clergy, people of the diocese, and the general public. At first, Peter was polishing the wooden pews in chapel himself, as a way of beginning to get to grips with this extraordinary mediaeval legacy; but he moved on to reshaping The Palace Trust charity, which manages the site, inspiring them to put through a major £5 million development to safeguard the palace, not only as a home and working base for the bishop but also to have its 14 acres open to the public as a park. Money was drawn in from the Church Commissioners, English Heritage, the Lottery and other donors, and there are probably some in this chamber who have had their arms twisted by Peter at some stage in this process. That project, now almost complete, offers visitors a smart new restaurant called The Bishop’s Table, a video presentation intriguingly entitled *The Animated Bishop* – are there, I

hear you ask, other kinds? – (*laughter*) – and a modern garden of reflection, under construction at the moment.

The palace, of course, is known for the swans that swim around it. Peter has appeared on the front page of the *Daily Telegraph*, not in one of those photographs that bishops dread appearing on the front page of the *Daily Telegraph* but simply carrying two swans, one under each arm in black bin liners, as they were being brought in and introduced to the moat around the palace.

Peter has worked tirelessly in the diocese, to become known to those inside and outside the life of the Church. In 2009, to mark the 1100th anniversary of the diocese, he undertook a 300-mile pilgrimage walk around the diocese, visiting parishes, schools and farms, making contacts all along the way.

Not the least distinctive feature of the life of the diocese of Bath and Wells is the presence there of Glastonbury. Peter's presence at the Glastonbury Festival has become a highlight, I know, for him and for the festival itself. For several years he has had a main stage slot on the Sunday, a prospect which I think would fill many of us with some alarm – three minutes to speak to the vast crowd there. He says that it is the hardest sermon he ever has to prepare and I can well believe it; but it does mean that he has been there in close proximity, one handshake away, to Joss Stone, Paul Simon and who knows who else.

Visitors to the palace have, of course, been very diverse. His friendship with Jools Holland, no less, began when the great man was visiting the palace grounds as a tourist. Peter got to hear of it and hurried to invite him in for tea. A similar event happened when Dr Ian Paisley, on holiday in Somerset, visited the palace. Peter's PA said, 'I've never seen the bishop move so fast', although I do not have the information as to in which direction he moved!

All of that underlines the uniqueness of the partnership that Peter and Dee have formed and the way in which together they have shaped the life and the ministry of the palace in Wells. Peter's official portrait shows Peter and, very appropriately, Dee sitting in the background.

I must add one word about Peter's contribution to the House of Bishops, because it has been of a very distinctive kind. When Peter intervenes in the discussions of the House, as I think most of my colleagues in the House would agree, an entirely new perspective is brought to bear. We are invariably challenged, in the purest and simplest sense, by an evangelical word; that is, a word about the priorities of the gospel and how and whether we have forgotten them in our discussions, and what we ought to do to rethink issues, problems and the stand-offs of some of our business in a quite new light – the light of the words of Christ, the death and resurrection of Christ. Into that comes all that experience that I mentioned earlier: the experience of fostering and nurturing Christian community at Scargill, and that of facing directly some of the most horrendous challenges that the global Church experiences in connection with tyranny and injustice.

Peter has brought that into our life as a House of Bishops. He has brought it into the life of the diocese of Bath and Wells and into the whole experience and perspective of

the Church of England. He has, in that and in many other respects, been an exceptional colleague; to me personally, a loyal, challenging and enriching friend. I know that we will wish him and Dee every blessing as they move to Gillingham in Dorset, thanking them for all they have done for the Body of Christ here in the Church of England, and all they have done for our fellowship. I would ask Synod to join me in wishing them well and sending them on their way with love. (*The Bishop was accorded a standing ovation.*)

Farewell to the Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York (Dr John Sentamu): I beg to move:

‘That this Synod record its deep gratitude for the Archbishop of Canterbury’s outstanding ministry to Church and Nation, and offer him and Mrs Williams its very best wishes for the future.’

Your Grace, Archbishop Rowan, I thank God for you. In the thick of recession and of conflicts near and far, we have come to rely on you for the voice of reason, faith, and deeply rooted Christian hope.

You are also an Archbishop with wide intellectual interests and a prodigious memory. Most Synod members will be aware of your renowned knowledge of and writings on the works of Fyodor Dostoyevsky, but not so many will be aware that at an early age you memorized pages of Ronald Knox’s *Essays in Satire* – and also, I gather, complete episodes of Fawlty Towers! However, it is to Ronald Knox, Anglican priest and broadcaster of the 1920s, that I turn first.

I am sure, if we asked, you could repeat one of Knox’s most famous BBC broadcasts. In January 1926, Knox broadcast a pretended live report of revolution sweeping across London entitled ‘Broadcasting from the Barricades’. In this broadcast, in addition to live reports of persons, including a government minister, being lynched, Knox cleverly mixed band music from the Savoy Hotel with the hotel’s purported destruction by mortar fire. The Houses of Parliament and the Clock Tower were also said to have taken a direct hit. I leave Synod members to decide for themselves the influence of Ronald Knox upon Archbishop Rowan’s ministry.

No, you have not fought shy of conflict but you have been courageous and outspoken, especially on matters of our humanity and justice. We have seen you stand firm, whether in dialogue with ministers of the Crown or in supporting Zimbabwean bishops in their struggles. We have now heard of their victory in the Supreme Court of Zimbabwe and we extend to them our continued love and prayers, and thank God for your courage when you went to Zimbabwe.

You have been a friend of the weak and from you they have derived strength. In your role as Archbishop you have attended particularly to the concerns of the other religious communities in England, holding before the Church always the challenge of working together with all our friends and fellow travellers for the common good. You have carried a particular burden of prayer and concern for our brothers and sisters in Christ in the Holy Land and for the peace of that region, for which we are praying so much at this time.

You have far more friends than you know across the Anglican Communion. A priest friend was in Sri Lanka the year after the tsunami, visiting parishes in Batticaloa, along the east coast. The local vicar, Fr Chandran Crispus, took him to where his people had lost their lives. He told of his friends and how they had died as the great wave swept through. Afterwards, he took him to the vicarage. There on the bookcase, my friend spotted a picture postcard of Archbishop Rowan. 'Chandran, the Archbishop of Canterbury sends you his greetings' he said. Chandran paused, looked him in the eye and said, 'You will never know what it means to us to belong to this great family, the Anglican Communion'.

You have borne this symbolic role with tremendous courage and commitment. It may be symbolic, the first among equals, but it has been costly to you personally. You have gently shown us at times how ludicrous our business can be. Sometimes, to spot the subtleties of your sense of humour, we have to look for the twinkle in your eye or to the raising of those fantabulous eyebrows. Just as you have done right now! Of course, like me, you have been criticised by a few for not being true-blood English, but I have appreciated the solidarity this has given us as missionary bishops in this land of hope and glory! (*Laughter*)

You are a Celt. Celts, like God's ancient people, the Jews, tell stories and recite poetry to express their deepest truths and explore their deepest longings. Your poet's intellect is restless, not satisfied with part-truths or with one side of the story. You understand the views of those with whom you differ and will not allow those insights to be dismissed which arise from their particular perspective. It is a particularly generous form of gracious respect.

As you wrote in *The Wound of Knowledge: Christian Spirituality from the New Testament to St John of the Cross*, 'It is the intractable strangeness of the ground of belief that must constantly be allowed to challenge the fixed assumptions of religiosity; it is a given, whose question to each succeeding age is fundamentally one and the same. And the greatness of the great Christian saints lies in their readiness to be questioned, judged, stripped naked and left speechless by that which lies at the centre of their faith.' You have demonstrated this to us as Archbishop.

When asked about the role of a bishop, you have said that it is 'to interpret the Church to itself'. For you the Church is 'what happens when the impact of Jesus draws people together...when Jesus is encountered, when the meeting of believers with one another is grasped as a meeting with him'. You once said, 'The Church could be a lot worse. I tell myself that every day. It cheers me up a bit'!

At your heart there is a passion for the gospel, for you have always had in your life and heart the words of St Paul to the Church in Corinth, 'Woe to me, if I preach not the gospel'. For you, this starts and finishes with 'the God who achieves his purpose by reckless gift, by the cradle and the cross'.

We will miss that reckless grace and, most of all, in a cynical world we will miss your willingness to see the good in everyone, to attribute positive motives even to those who have opposed and maligned you. This is a treasure of the kingdom in you that we all need to covet.

I am sure that you know the writings of Dorothy Day of the Catholic Worker Movement, a lady renowned for her tireless service to the poor and her courageous witness for peace, a wonderful example of the gospel in action. The grace you show in your life is the embodiment of her words, 'Our love for God is only as great as our love for the person we love least'.

We would like to thank Jane for her strong contribution to the Church here and throughout the Anglican Communion, and for masterminding the spouses' programme at the Lambeth Conference 2008. Rumour has it that it was much better than the bishops' programme. I know that because my wife was there! We thank her also for her on-going support for the spouses in the Global South, by helping to set up a fund to help equip and up-skill bishops' wives, and, above all, for her teaching and pastoral ministry exercised here and abroad, which has been greatly appreciated. It is said that behind every strong man there is an even stronger woman. Jane, you have been strong and supportive of Rowan and have borne the heat of the day, quietly, gently and unassumingly for the sake of the kingdom of God. For that we thank God.

It is now nearly 40 years since you and I and Jane were at Cambridge, and you may not remember but I have a very clear recollection of our attending Donald MacKinnon's seminar, the D'Society, together. It was always truly illuminating – and you have been truly illuminating for most of us.

When I received the news that the Archbishop of Canterbury would be stepping down at the end of this year, I wrote these words. 'Our partnership in the gospel over the past seven years has been the most creative period of my ministry. It has been life-giving to have led missions together, gone on retreats and prayed together. In his company I have drunk deeply from the wells of God's mercy and love. and it has all been joyful. He is a real brother to me in Christ.

The last decade has been a challenging time for the Church of England and the Anglican Communion. Thankfully, Archbishop Rowan is a remarkable and gifted leader who has strengthened the bonds of affection. Despite his courageous, tireless and holy endeavour, he has been much maligned by people who should have known better. For my part, he has been God's apostle for our time. His stepping down to pursue something he dearly loves – teaching and writing – is received with gratitude, as this will continue to be a blessing to the Church.

I am delighted that he is not going far away and will continue to offer service to the Church of England and the wider Church in its witness to our society. May God's blessing continue to be showered upon him.' (*Applause*)

The Chairman: In line with custom, I am proposing to call only the Prolocutor of Canterbury to speak on behalf of the clergy, the Chairman of the House of Laity to speak on behalf of the laity, and the senior ecumenical representative to speak on behalf of the Ecumenical Representatives. If, after they have spoken, there should be anyone standing, I shall be looking for a motion for closure. (*Laughter*)

The Archdeacon of Lewisham (Ven. Christine Hardman) (Southwark): I am conscious of the privilege of being asked to speak on behalf of the clergy in expressing deep gratitude for the ministry of Archbishop Rowan. I also want to

acknowledge my own personal debt to the Archbishop, who, as my spiritual director in the early years of my own ministry, helped me to discover more deeply the meaning of my own journey and vocation in God's service.

At a recent mealtime at an Archbishops' Council residential, I was reminiscing with Archbishop Rowan about the first time we met. The Archbishop had come to lead a weekend on spirituality on the theological training course on which I was a student, which must have been 30 years ago. 'Oh, yes' said the Archbishop. 'You spent a long time arguing with me at the bottom of the stairs.' Funnily enough, I had blanked that bit out of my memory! (*Laughter*)

At this point, I would also like to record my own personal admiration for Jane, who has made such an outstanding contribution to the Church. I speak for the clergy and we know how much we have gained from her as a teacher and theologian, as have the laity she has taught and encouraged. So much of her contribution has been made, not as the wife of the Archbishop but in her own right. I am entirely confident that this work will continue and flourish. However, I also know, as Archbishop Sentamu has said, how much she has meant to the spouses of Anglican bishops around the world and how her love and concern has encouraged them in all they do. In this role, I am also equally confident that she will be much missed.

We cannot pretend that yesterday did not happen. I am acutely aware that, for the vast majority of the people in the Church of England, the last thing in the world they would have wanted would have been for this farewell to be taking place in that context; but we are where we are. I am determined – in fact I am even more determined than I would have been – that nothing will hinder the tribute we pay to all that Archbishop Rowan has brought to the Church of England in his time as our Archbishop of Canterbury.

Coming from Southwark, in whose cathedral Lancelot Andrewes lies buried, perhaps I should first honour the outstanding contribution the Archbishop has made as a scholar archbishop. Scholarship is one of the many treasures of the Church of England. In 1624, Joseph Hall called the learning of her clergy stupor mundi – the wonder of the world – yet the clergy he named were both scholar and servant: men whose learning led them in the service of the Church. Anglican scholars have long known that scholarship is more than an end in itself, although it is that also. When scholarship has done its work for us, then, in Austin Farrer's words, 'There is still something to be done', and that is the most important thing of all: to use our spiritual ears.

This is the tradition of learning in which we have been led; a tradition of thoughtful holiness, of spiritual scholarship. The Archbishop's many books, articles, sermons and speeches have brought us holy learning and wisdom, by which we will be nourished not only for years but for generations to come. More than this, the Archbishop has set us an example; an example which I think comes out most clearly in his study of *Arius*. There he offered us, 'A detailed reworking and re-imagining of the Church's formative conflicts', alerting us to the continuing conversations which form, shape and make orthodoxy.

In the preface to the first edition of *Arius*, the Archbishop wrote of his hope that the book's readers '...will include those concerned for the Church's health and honesty'. Archbishop Rowan himself embodies such a concern. He has resisted the temptation of answers and endings, insisting on questions and explorations, despite the personal cost of this. He has insisted, scholar-like, that we attend to what is the case, even if we wish it were otherwise.

Scholarship is part of what he has brought to teach us – to try to teach us – to do this, but not scholarship alone. Scholar archbishops are well and good, but he has been more to us than that, in the way that he has led us in the prayer of the Church. He has reminded us, most recently yesterday – and indeed recently in Rome reminded the wider Catholic Church – that the prayer of contemplation is at the heart of things; seeing what is so; seeing people as they are and not as we would have them be; regarding God other than as the means to gratify our desires.

Archbishop, if we have learnt this from you in your time as Archbishop of Canterbury, then you will indeed have helped the Church to see what it really is and should be: a community in which we can learn to see as God sees and so to see God.

Scholarship and contemplative prayer both demand integrity and authenticity. It is these qualities, I think, that children and young people recognise in their encounters with Archbishop Rowan. Children and young people can spot something phoney or patronizing a mile off, and Archbishop Rowan is never ever either of those.

One of my treasured memories is of the morning the Archbishop came to Southwark Cathedral to celebrate the tercentenary of the Cathedral School. The service sheet – we were looking at it in the sacristy – had an image of two children on the cover as they would have looked 300 years earlier. When Archbishop Rowan looked at it, he was struck by how isolated and lonely the children on the cover looked. In his address, he wanted to help us make the connection between language, communication and belonging, and he told the children the story of the little boy who was brought up by wolves. He asked them what language they thought the little boy would speak when he came back into human society. A five-year-old boy shot his hand up, 'Welsh' was the confident answer. (*Laughter*) The famous eyebrows and the twinkle in his eye said it all.

As well as integrity and authenticity, good scholarship requires love. Love of the subject which submits to the subject. True prayer is the prayer of love, from one who loves or yearns and loves to love God and who submits to God. 'Archbishops' requires a harder love: love of the Church of England, in all its scholarly glory, sometimes prayerful peace, and family fractiousness.

The Church of England, despite the sign we see on the ceiling of this chamber, is greater than the General Synod. The Church of England does not belong to the General Synod. The Church of England belongs to the people of this country, to everyone. In 2009, Christina Patterson, who is in fact an atheist and humanist, and to whom the Church of England belongs, tried to explain why she loved the Church of England. She wrote this. 'I love it because it is patient. It does not expect the world to change in an instant or to be bludgeoned into belief, because it knows that certain things take centuries. I love it because it is kind. It is kind enough to welcome

strangers...I like the fact that it is mature enough to recognise doubt. I like the fact that it is calm. I like the fact that it recognises that the religious impulse is here to stay and that the more you try to crush it the stronger it will be, and that all human beings, irrespective of their beliefs, have yearnings for the transcendent.'

Significantly, this recognition of the treasure we have in the Church of England was at the heart of a speech made by Her Majesty the Queen at Lambeth in February this year, when she came to celebrate her Diamond Jubilee at an inter-faith event. Her Majesty said this. 'We should remind ourselves of the significant position of the Church of England in our nation's life. The concept of our established Church is occasionally misunderstood and, I believe, commonly under-appreciated. Its role is not to defend Anglicanism to the exclusion of other religions. Instead, the Church has a duty to protect the free practice of all faiths in this country. It certainly provides an identity and spiritual dimension for its own many adherents. But also, gently and assuredly, the Church of England has created an environment for other faith communities and indeed people of no faith to live freely.'

Archbishop, Her Majesty described the Church of England of your archiepiscopate. You have been a very Anglican archbishop, welcoming the other, reminding us that we exist for the other, giving us learning, showing us prayer. You have been a very Corinthian archbishop, for from you we, who are as argumentative and as foolish a Church as that of Corinth, have had faith and hope and love.

It is not easy to say farewell but I take inspiration from one of the finest sermons I have heard preached – the sermon you gave on the occasion of Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee at St Paul's Cathedral this year. You spoke movingly of service, dedication and sacrifice, and it was clear to all who know you that you spoke from your heart, from your own experience of both the joy and cost of seeking to serve others in the name of Christ.

We give you thanks from the bottom of our hearts for your love, dedication and service as our Archbishop, and we pray that you and Jane will be richly blessed in all that will emerge in the next phase of your lives. (*Applause*)

Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford): Archbishop Rowan, I think that I can say with confidence that the House of Laity wishes to express its unanimous gratitude to you for your ministry to us, to this Church, to this nation, and indeed to the world, in what, by no stretch of the imagination, could be described as being an easy time to be Archbishop of Canterbury.

The words that came to me, when I was asked to say a few words, third in a row, in terms of tribute to Archbishop Rowan's ministry, are those much-used words 'servant leadership'. Archbishop Rowan has been a distinguished servant to this Church, to the world Church, to the Communion. He has served us, I suspect, at a greater cost than many of us will ever know, particularly in the most difficult of all causes at the moment, the unity of the Church, for which Jesus prayed and which is one of the keys to our mission. Archbishop Rowan has displayed a passion and perseverance for unity, at very great cost.

We have already heard that he has been subject to much undeserved, unhelpful and, on occasions, spiteful criticism, and we should repent of that. What we should give thanks for is the work of the Holy Spirit in that work of perseverance for the unity of Christ's Church, which is so necessary. It is necessary here; it is necessary across the Church of England; it is necessary across the Anglican community; it is necessary across the world Church, that the world might believe. Archbishop Rowan has given himself unsparingly to that task and we are deeply grateful for that.

That, it seems to me, is more than several full-time jobs, but it is not the only one, the only role, the only ministry that Archbishop Rowan has been sharing with us. The other very prominent note in his ministry, particularly as Archbishop of Canterbury and particularly in this Synod, has been the commitment to mission in its widest sense. The proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, proclaiming it in terms that are relevant and comprehensible to a complex and difficult world. Proclaiming it not only in church but out of church, in the public square; engaging in an astonishing range of ways with the people of our community – with the world of science, the world of law, the world of ethics – all with great distinction and yet conveying, accurately and challengingly, to us as well as to the world, the implications of a world created by a triune and loving God. Archbishop Rowan has given us an inspiring example of spur and has strengthened us in our ability as a Church to share in that mission, that gospel proclamation.

My abiding memory of Archbishop Rowan is placed in Whirlow Grange, where from time to time the Archbishops' Council meets. It is in the early morning, looking out over the garden, as the Archbishops' Council celebrates the Holy Communion at the beginning of its day. It is the memory of those little talks which Archbishop Rowan gives, apparently without any preparation, with no visible notes (I am never quite sure what are inside clergy robes!) about the lections for the day, bishops of the past, saints and martyrs – of whom many of us have never heard but about whom he seems to have an extraordinarily personal knowledge – always given in a very comprehensible way and, above all, in a way which is relevant to the Scripture and relevant to the task that we have in hand. A ministry of enormous encouragement and, from time to time, the Archbishops' Council needs encouragement.

The last thing I want to say is a very personal one. I regret losing from Synod a fellow member of the prominent eyebrows club – (*laughter*) – because we demonstrate something which we communally all need to think about and perhaps to work on. That is, in order to communicate we do not always need to use words. That little picture illustrates Archbishop Rowan's humanity, which is such an important part of his ministry, as it is of us all. Archbishop Rowan has been and is, and I trust will continue to be, a wonderfully approachable person with whom to talk, to share and, above all, to whom to listen. We all have complicated diaries individually. I dread to think what his looks like, but he finds time for that ministry of the pastor, to listen and to converse, and for that we are grateful.

I have recently become very concerned about the way in which retirement is presented. This is not retirement; it is moving on to another ministry. That is very important. I just hope and pray, Rowan, that as you move to the 'other place,' as I call that university to which you are going, there is a group of colleagues that are more

biddable than we have been; but what I know of the academic world give further testimony to your faith. (*Laughter*) In sure and certain hope we pray.

On behalf of the House, I express our thanks to you and to Jane and convey to you our love and our prayers to you and to your family, as we say goodbye to you in this hall as you move on to your next ministry together. Rowan, thank you. (*Applause*)

Very Revd Archimandrite Ephrem Lash (Ecumenical Representatives, Orthodox Churches): When Archbishop Rowan was first appointed I was in this Synod and, as I went past him, I whispered to him ‘Have fun!’ I am not sure, ten years later, whether that was an appropriate greeting.

In 1837, the Honourable Robert Curzon visited the Patriarch of Constantinople with a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, requesting the Patriarch to give him a permit to visit the monasteries of the Holy Mountain of Athos. Curzon gives a vivid account of his visit.

‘After we had smoked our pipes, I presented the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was read aloud to the Patriarch, first in English and then translated into Greek. “And who,” quoth the Patriarch of Constantinople, the supreme head and Primate of the Greek Church of Asia, “who is the Archbishop of Canterbury?” “What?” said I, a little astonished at the question. “Who,” said he, “is this Archbishop?” “Why, the Archbishop of Canterbury.” Archbishop of what?” said the Patriarch. “Canterbury,” said I. “Oh,” said the Patriarch. “Ah, yes! And who is he?”

‘Here all my English friends and myself were taken sadly aback; we had not imagined that the high priest before us could be ignorant of such a matter as the one in question. The Patriarch of the Greek Church, the successor of Gregory Nazianzen, St John Chrysostom and the heresiarch Nestorius, seemed not to be aware that there were any other denominations of Christians besides those of his own Church and the Church of Rome.

We explained that the Archbishop of Canterbury was a man eminent for his great learning and his Christian virtues; that he was the Primate and chief of the great Reformed Church of England, and a personage of such high degree that he ranked next to the blood royal; that from time immemorial the Archbishop of Canterbury was the great dignitary who placed the crown upon the head of our kings – those kings whose power swayed the destinies of Europe and of the world; and that this present Archbishop and Primate had himself placed the crown upon the head of King William IV and that he would also soon crown our young Queen.

“Well,” replied the Patriarch, “but how is that? How can it happen that the head of your Church is only an Archbishop? – (*laughter*) – I cannot write an answer to the letter of the Archbishop of...” – “of Canterbury,” said I. “Yes, of Canterbury – for I do not see how he who is only an archbishop can by any possibility be the head of a Christian hierarchy; but, as you come from the British embassy, I will give my letters as you desire, which will ensure your reception into every monastery which acknowledges the supremacy of the Orthodox faith of the Patriarch of Constantinople”.

Exactly 150 years later, in December 1987, the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Archbishop of Canterbury were present together at Evensong in Westminster Abbey before attending, in this very hall, the annual Constantinople Lecture, given that year by the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, Dr Rowan Williams. Those of us who were present can testify that it was an impressive account of classical Nicene Christology, informed by the lecturer's profound personal knowledge of those whom Queen Elizabeth I described as 'the Fathers of the best antiquity'. The text was never published but the original manuscript was discovered in the genizah of Lambeth Palace last July, so I hope that we shall soon be able to read it.

It is this living acquaintance with the teaching of the undivided Church that has enabled Archbishop Rowan to enjoy warm relations with the Church of England's many ecumenical partners. He has made a number of fraternal visits to the Bishop of Rome, despite his jurisdiction – (*laughter*) – and, with his blessing, celebrated the Anglican Eucharist on the Papal altar of the ancient Basilica of St Sabina.

On a personal pilgrimage to that hotbed of hot-headed orthodoxy, the holy mountain of Athos, a number of the monasteries greeted his arrival with the ringing of the bells and the invitation to take a stall of honour during the divine office, his assiduous attendance at which from three o'clock in the morning was much admired.

A bishop is, above all, a teacher and most of St John Chrysostom's teaching is to be found in his sermons to his ordinary congregations. They are extremely vivid and they do not pull their punches. This is the tradition of preaching that, Archbishop Rowan, you still exemplify and to which on many occasions in this Synod we can testify. I particularly remember an impromptu sermon on the vision of the Prophet Isaiah. Although I think it is unlikely that you have ever compared Her Majesty to Herodias, as St John Chrysostom did once in relation to the Empress!

Time does not allow me – I have been very strictly told this – to mention everyone or everything (the Epistle to the Hebrews said something of that kind, did it not?) but Jane too is no mean theologian. In the far-off days of the British Council of Churches, Jane, Paul Fiddes and I were members of the group that produced a report in three volumes entitled *The Forgotten Trinity*. It is still in print, though a cynical friend said to me, 'Yes, you mean the forgotten *Forgotten Trinity*'. (*Laughter*) Jane contributed a particularly challenging paper on the Fatherhood of God.

So now, Archbishop Rowan and Jane, on behalf of my ecumenical colleagues, I give you the ancient imperial acclamation, 'Εἰς πολλά ἔτη' or, as it would be translated into the language of the West, 'Ad multos annos'. I do not know what it would be in Welsh! I give you great thanks for all that you have done and are still doing for the ecumenical movement and I wish you both long, happy and fruitful years by the Cam. There is a very excellent wine merchant just opposite Magdalene – (*laughter*) – from which I keep my brothers supplied with malt whisky and special gins!

I would like to end on a more serious note, with a passage which you will know well but which some members of Synod may not know. It is a passage from St Dorotheos of Gaza, a 6th century Palestinian abbot. He is talking to his community about love in the brotherhood. He says, 'Imagine a circle drawn on the ground. This circle is the

world and its centre is God. The radii of the circle represent the paths that people can follow to God. Longing to come closer to God, the saints move towards the centre of the circle, so that the nearer they come to the centre the nearer they come both to God and to one another. The closer they come to God the closer they come to one another, and the closer they come to each other the closer they come to God.' I believe that this has been a guiding principle of your ministry as Archbishop. I commend it as a principle to the members of Synod. I add, although St Dorotheos does not, that if we take any other path than a radius to the circle we shall simply be going round in circles. (*Applause*)

The motion was put and carried.

Revd Canon Glyn Webster (York): On a point of order, Madam Chairman. May we suspend Standing Orders for a brief presentation?

The Chairman: That has my permission.

(A presentation of a bouquet of flowers was then made to Mrs Williams, amidst applause.)

The Chairman: I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to address Synod.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr Rowan Williams): Synod will have heard quite a bit from me this week and I do not intend to prolong this occasion unduly, but I must first of all say a word of thanks for the overwhelming generosity that has been shown by speakers this afternoon, a generosity which is a token of the generous affection and support I have received from so many of you over these years.

It is tempting to look back over these years and do a little bit of autobiography, but I have sworn in front of witnesses that I will never write a memoir – and I am now repeating it in front of even more witnesses. Rather than do that, I will simply give you one picture of the work of an archbishop, which may perhaps help you understand some of what will bind you to my successor as it has to me, and to say just one brief word about Synod itself.

The picture comes from an experience a couple of years ago when I was taking part in a workshop on the spiritual development of communities, one exercise in which consisted of sitting in a circle with a ball of wool. When anybody made an intervention, somebody passed the ball of wool to them; so that, by the end of the conversation, the middle of the circle was criss-crossed by any number of strands. At the end of the conversation, we rewound the ball of wool, retracing what had been said, step by step, during the conversation. It sounds a bit artificial; it was in fact a very searching exercise in understanding how conversations develop, how connections are actually made. One of the things that is bound to strike any archbishop in the discharge of their work is that making connections is a central and essential part of it.

I have sometimes described the job of the Archbishop of Canterbury as being one in which, quite literally, you move from taking a primary school assembly in south London to having lunch with the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the

time for adjusting between the two audiences is not always quite adequate. I hope that I have not made too much of an idiot of myself in that context! But that connection-making, that unlikely connection-making that belongs to the office of Archbishop of Canterbury, is one way of understanding the mission that an archbishop undertakes. What you cannot but feel in a moment like that is that in some sense you are being sent by the primary school in south London to speak to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and sent by God through the medium of the primary school in south London to speak to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

In all the extraordinary variety of this work what has sustained me, will sustain you, Justin, and sustains all of us as pastors, bishops, ministers and disciples, is precisely that sense of a sending God who meets us in situation after situation, sends us to somewhere else and someone else, to make the connection – a connection that somehow or other connects them with God or allows God to use you to connect them to him. Let us give God the glory and the priority always.

That is the picture, therefore. The criss-crossing lines of connection, the strands and threads of connection, the sending that happens in that connecting relationship; the sense that God sends you in every encounter to another one.

That leads me on to my second thought about Synod. Synod is a place where we seek to and do not always succeed in making connections. If I have a prayer for Synod, it is that its capacity to make connections will be strengthened and deepened and will constantly grow.

The two people I quote from the Christian past most frequently are probably St Augustine and St John of the Cross. St John of the Cross famously said on one occasion, 'Where there is no love, put love and you will find love'. In the wake of quite a lot of the conversation we have been hearing in the last couple of days, and indeed in recent months, I am tempted to adapt that a little and say, 'Where there is no trust, put trust and you will find trust'. What do you say after you say, 'I don't trust you' to your Christian neighbour? Quite a lot of the sad and difficult stand-off in which we have found ourselves as a Synod at the moment seems to come from a mutual lack of trust. For a Christian it is never enough to say, 'I don't trust you,' unfortunately; because if St John of the Cross is right, the next question is 'How do I put trust and how do I become trustworthy?'

I therefore hope that connections will go on being made and deepened in that sense, in that context, among the brothers and sisters who are gathered here in Synod, and who will have to go on working at this, because there is no other thing to work at for Christians except the making and putting of trust as the ground for the building of love. We are here because God has shown himself to be trustworthy and God has entrusted us with the ministry of reconciliation. What more is there to be said? The connection between us and our Creator and Saviour has been made and it stays made. What we have to do is to honour it, reflect it, deepen it and further it with one another.

Synod has immense capacity and potential for doing just that. My prayer is that Synod will live into that potential by the grace and gift of God and, in the years to come, show the Church to be indeed the servant and the minister and the sacrament of a

trustworthy God, because it is full of people who have learnt how to grow beyond mistrust and suspicion and to rejoice in one another.

With that sense of the depth of our connectedness and the many, many ways in which those faces that I see before me have deepened for me the sense of connectedness, both at the human level and connectedness with God, I thank you once again with all my heart for all that has been said, all that you have given, and I wish you God's blessing in the future.

(The Archbishop was accorded a standing ovation.)

The Archbishop of Canterbury prorogued the group of sessions at 5.25 p.m.

Index

- accountability, mutual 30, 32
- ACEVO Commission on Youth
 - Unemployment 210
- Act of Synod (1993) 61n., 83, 85, 123, 136
- Acts 435 project 191
- administration, shared 79
- Admission of Baptised Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006 160
- Affirming Catholicism 51
- airport chaplains 75–6
- Alexandria Declaration 75
- Anglican Alliance 14, 22
- Anglican Church in North America 16, 72–3
- Anglican Communion 228
 - Archbishop's Visitors 225
 - Instruments of Unity 8, 9–10, 14, 21
 - and women bishops 87, 107, 137
- Anglican Communion Covenant 3, 13, 99, 150
 - report on reference to dioceses 18–33
- Anglican Communion Office 9–12, 17
- Anglican Consultative Council 3, 8–18, 48–9
 - networks 11, 15, 17
- Anglican Health Network 17
- Anglican Mainstream 30
- Anglican World* 10, 17–18
- Anglo-Catholicism
 - and sacramental assurance 96
 - and three-fold ministry 90
 - and women bishops 85, 88, 92, 96, 107, 109, 114, 116, 126, 133, 142–3, 147, 155
- Appointments Committee 49
- apprentices 211, 216, 224
- Apprenticeship Training Agency 213
- Archbishop of Canterbury,
 - appointment procedures 46–8
- Archbishops' Council, questions to 34–42
- Archbishops' Secretaries for Appointments 47
- Article 7 and 8 business
 - Anglican Communion Covenant 18–33
 - women in the episcopate 81–156
- assurance, sacramental 96
- asylum seekers, unemployed 210–211
- Baker Dearing Trust 213
- Baptist Union, and living wage 178
- 'Bible in the Life of the Church' 14, 16
- bishops
 - children's and young people's involvement in appointment 48
 - and common tenure 72
 - delegation of authority 85–6, 92, 96, 98, 107
 - licensing lay assistants at Communion 161–5, 173–5, 178
 - training and development 47–8
 - see also* women bishops
- Board of Education, questions to 54–5
- Business Committee
 - appointment of Clerk to the Synod 51
 - dates of groups of sessions 3, 159, 194–200
 - questions to 77–8
 - report on the agenda 2–8
 - report of Anglican Communion Covenant 18–33
- Canon B12 160–77
- Cardiff Centre for Chaplaincy Studies 77
- Central Stipends Authority,
 - Archbishops' Council as 35–6
- chairing of debates 78
- chaplaincy, airport 76–7
- Charities Act 2006 52
- Charity Commission, public benefit requirement 51–2
- Chichester diocese, and safeguarding 45, 46
- children
 - admission to Holy Communion 160–61, 165, 167–70, 172
 - assisting at Holy Communion 160–77
- Christian Research 85, 86

- Christian Zionism 17
- Christians Against Poverty (CAP) 218
- Church Buildings Council, question to 73–4
- Church Commissioners, questions to 33–4
- Church of England Marriage (Amendment) Measure 1
- Church of England Marriage Measure, and statutory times for weddings 38
- Church of England Youth Council *see* Youth Council
- church growth, and community action 39
- Church House, staff 19, 157
- Church Investors Group 179
- Church Lads' and Church Girls' Brigade 219–20
- Church Representation Rules 77
- church schools, children assisting in distribution of Communion 160–77
- Church of Scotland, and living wage 178
- Church Urban Fund 206, 210, 212, 216, 224
- Church in Wales
 - and living wage 178
 - and women bishops 86, 140
- Churches' Legislation Advisory Service 52–3
- churchyards, fees 5
- City Gateway 222–3
- civil partnerships 42
- Clarke report 46–7
- clergy
 - and common tenure 68, 69–72
 - female 84, 91, 94–5, 98, 121, 155, 195
 - housing 34, 68–9
 - in interim posts 68
 - and leadership development 46–7
 - minority ethnic 39–40
 - morale 84, 119, 195
 - retirement housing 36–7
 - and safeguarding risk assessments 45–6
 - stipends 35–7
- Clergy Discipline (Amendment) Measure 1–2
- Clergy Discipline Commission 45–6
- Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 45
- Clerk to the Synod 4, 49–51
 - Farewell to 201–3
 - question to 43–4
- Climate Justice Fund 75–6
- colleges and courses, standards 56–7
- Commission for Rural Communities (CRC) 218
- Commission on Urban Life and Faith 182
- Committee for Ministry of and Among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) 41
- common good 39
- common tenure, transfer to 69–72
- community action, and youth unemployment 209–210, 214–16
- complementarianism 88, 95, 104, 107, 136, 148, 153
- confirmation 4
 - and assistance at Communion 165–8, 172, 176
- congregationalism, risk of 164–5, 172–3
- conservative evangelicals, and women bishops 85, 88, 92, 95–6, 98, 104–5, 107, 114, 116, 120, 123–4, 133, 138–9, 148–9, 151–3, 155
- Council for Christian Unity, questions to 72–3
- Council of Christians and Jews 74–5
- Covenant Design Group 25
- credibility
 - loss of 84, 127, 131, 159–60, 195, 197–9
 - and youth unemployment 211, 223
- Crown Nominations Commission 46–8
- curates, placement 66–8, 104
- dates of groups of sessions 3, 159, 194–200
- deacons, placement 66–7
- deanery synods, and Anglican Communion Covenant 20, 25
- debt, and unemployment 209, 218
- Declaration of Assent 25, 99
- Deep Engagement and Fresh Discovery* 16
- delegation, to male bishops 85–6, 92, 96, 98, 107

- diocesan synod motions 5, 7
 - Amendment to Canon B 12
 - (distribution of Holy Communion) 160–77
- diocesan synods
 - and Anglican Communion Covenant 20, 22, 25, 28
 - and women bishops legislation 83, 87, 94–5, 100–101, 105, 115, 129, 145, 159
- Diocese in Europe Measure 1–2
- dioceses
 - and Anglican Communion Covenant 18–31
 - diocesan schemes 83, 89, 98, 115, 118, 135, 154
 - extra-provincial 73
 - and faculty system 73–4
 - shared administration 79
- Dioceses Commission
 - question to 79
 - and Yorkshire dioceses 6–7, 202
- diversity
 - ethnic 39
 - living with 6, 8, 10–11, 14, 31, 91, 94, 103–4, 110–111, 116, 130
- Draft Act of Synod Adopting the Anglican Communion Covenant, Report on Reference to Dioceses 18–33
- Draft Amending Canon No. 30 7, 8, 81–2, 138, 156
- Draft Bishops and Priests (Consecration of Women) Measure
 - abstentions 112–13, 140, 147
 - Archbishops' amendment 86, 92, 149
 - code of practice 33, 49–50, 83, 84–5, 87–8, 92, 94, 106, 109–110, 112, 115, 118–19, 122, 131, 135, 137, 140, 142, 145, 151, 155
 - Final Approval debate 2–3, 81–156
 - and House of Bishops amendments 82–3, 85, 96, 141
 - impact on mission of the Church 84, 86
 - and Letters of Request 83, 112, 124, 129, 131, 138
 - and need for respect 85, 90, 93–4, 95, 99, 103–4, 110–111, 115, 118, 127, 129, 132–3, 140, 145–6, 151
 - and need for trust 87–8, 94, 95, 104, 105, 108, 116–17, 123, 134, 138, 142, 144, 149–50
 - Presidential Statement 157–60
 - and provision for traditionalists 85–6, 88–99, 102–6, 108–9, 111–15, 118, 124, 129–31, 133, 137, 142–3, 145–53, 197
 - Revision Committee 86, 114, 154, 205
 - Steering Committee 83, 154, 157
 - summary 83
 - and theological conviction 83, 88–9, 92–6, 98–100, 104, 110–111, 117, 119–20, 124–6, 131, 147–8, 151, 155
- Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme 214
- Durham University, and common awards process 64–6
- EAPPI (Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and Israel) 74–5
- Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament 2
- Ecclesiastical Judges Association 73
- Ecclesiastical Judges, Legal Officers and Others (Fees) Order 2012 2
- Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations 2009 68
- economic crisis 77–8, 150, *see also* youth unemployment
- ecumenism, and women bishops 121, 139
- employment, and young people 3
- 'Enough Waiting' campaign 33–4, 37, 121
- episcopacy, overlapping jurisdictions 10, 16–17
- Episcopal Church of the USA
 - and Anglican Church of North America 72
 - and liturgical resources 79
 - and women bishops 141, 152
- Episcopal Ministry Act of Synod (1993) 61n., 83, 85, 123, 136
- Ethical Investment Advisory Group 179, 188
 - question to 79–80
- ethnicity, and leadership 39–40
- European Rural Development

- Programme 218
- Exclusive Brethren, and public benefit 51–2
- faculty system 73–4
- Fair Trade 190
- FairPensions 179
- Faith in the City 150, 182, 203, 206
- Faith in Conflict Conference 196
- Faith and Order Commission, and marriage 43
- Faithful Cities: A Call for Celebration, Vision and Justice 182
- Farewells 200–205
 - to Archbishop of Canterbury 3, 227–38
 - to Bishop of Bath and Wells 224–7
 - to Bishop of Manchester 203–5
 - to Clerk to Synod 201–3
- Fees Measure 5
- Fees Order *see* Legal Officers and Ecclesiastical Judges (Fees) Order
- food banks 181, 184, 188, 191
- Food Standards Agency 52–3
- Forward in Faith, and women bishops legislation 96, 124, 125
- Frontier Youth Trust 206
- gender, theological significance 90–91, 114, 127
- General Synod
 - calling of speakers 78
 - dates of sessions 3, 159, 194–200
 - ecumenical representatives 201, 234–6
 - and inclusive language 5–6
 - new members 1
 - platform advisors 53–4
 - and voting rights 77
- Generosity and Sacrifice* 35, 36
- Gift Aid 35
- GRAS 85
- Guildford Report 114, 152
- Harare diocese 1, 153
- headship, male 89, 91, 96, 98, 100, 111, 129, 141, 149, 152–3
- health care, end-of-life 76
- Hillsborough report 44–5
- Holy Communion
 - assistance at 3–4, 160–77
- House of Bishops
 - questions to 42–6
 - Standing Committee 42, 43–4
 - and women bishops legislation 82–3, 85, 123, 126–7, 129, 157–9, 197, 200
- House of Laity 199
- housing
 - minor repairs to 34, 68–9
 - retirement 36–7
- ‘how2help’ website 39, 208, 209, 225
- human trafficking 12
- ‘I Am One in a Million’ report 206, 208, 212, 215
- IME, and placement of ordinands 66–8
- indaba process 11, 13–14, 22, 29, 31, 150, 196, 199
- initiation, and assistance at
 - Communion 4, 167–8, 175
- Inter-University Foundation 212
- International Anglican Family Network 17–18
- internships 211–12
- Israel, investment in 79–80
- Israel and Palestine
 - and Jewish–Christian relationships 74–5
 - Synod debate on 74
- Israeli Committee against House Demolitions 75
- Issues in Human Sexuality* 55
- jam jars, re-use 52–3
- Jewish-Christian relationships 74–5, 205
- Jews for Justice for Palestinians 75
- Job Centres 215, 220
- job clubs 207, 217–18
- Joint Employment and Common Services Board 37
- Joint Safeguarding Liaison Group 45–6
- journals, theological, electronic versions 66
- The Journey of Christian Initiation* 4, 168
- jurisdiction
 - co-ordinate 86, 96, 136, 147, 154
 - delegation 85–6, 92, 96, 98, 107

- transfer 86, 96, 102, 154
- ‘JustPay!’ campaign 179–80
- ‘Label Jars, Not People’ 29
- laity
 - assisting at Holy Communion 163–4, 169
 - and re-imagining ministry 41–2, 87, 172
- Lambeth Conferences
 - 1930 21
 - 1998 99
 - 2008 196, 229
 - funding 9
- Lambeth Palace, and ‘Enough Waiting’ campaign 33–4, 37
- language, inclusive 5–6
- leadership
 - development 47–8
 - and ethnicity 39–40
 - by women 83–4, 91–2, 129, 141–2
 - and young people 212
- Legal Officers (Annual Fees) Order 2012 2
- Legal Officers and Ecclesiastical Judges (Fees) Order 5, 7
- Legislative Committee 2
- Letters of Request 83, 112, 124, 129, 131, 138, 154–5
- Lighthouse Group 216
- Liturgical Commission, question to 79
- liturgical resources
 - for loss of an animal 79
 - for mental health concerns 41
- Liverpool Care Pathway 76
- living wage 3, 177–93
- Local Enterprise Partnerships 217
- marriage, same-sex 42–3
- Marriage Law Working Group 38
- members, new 1
- mental health matters, liturgical and pastoral resources for 41
- mentoring, for young people 210, 212, 215, 217, 222–4
- Messy Church 170
- Methodist Church, and living wage 178, 179–80, 181, 185, 188
- minimum wage 177, 183, 184, 188, 208
- ministry
 - collaborative 87
 - re-imagining 41–2, 87, 172
 - and recognition of orders 72–3, 92–3, 112, 139
- Ministry Division
 - Quality in Formation Panel 59
 - questions to 55–68
- mission
 - and contribution of women 91–2
 - and impact of women bishops legislation 84, 86, 92, 98, 104, 105, 108–9, 118–19, 134–5, 142, 145, 195
- Mission and Public Affairs Council, questions to 74–7
- Mustard Seed programme 212
- National Church Institutions
 - and living wage 182, 186
 - staff salary costs 34–5
- NEETS (not in employment, education or training) 206, 215
- Network for Inter Faith Concerns (NIFCON) 17
- New Zealand, Anglicanism in 10, 15, 16, 18
- northern province, lay representation 77–8
- north–south divide 77–8
- Occupied West Bank, investment in 79–80
- orders, recognition 72–3, 92–3, 112, 139
- ordinands
 - lifestyle 55–6
 - post-ordination placements 66–7, 104
- Oxford Centre for Ecclesiology and Practical Theology 77
- parishes
 - Resolution A and B 83, 85, 89, 138, 144
 - Resolution C 123–4
- Parliament
 - Ecclesiastical Committee 2
 - and voice of the Church 150
- parsonage houses, minor repairs to 34, 68–9

- pastoral schemes, and interim posts 68
- PCCs, and charitable status 52
- Pensions Board, and stipend levels 36–7
- Perry report 46–7, 202
- Pilling group on human sexuality 42–4, 152
- Plymouth Brethren, and public benefit 51–2
- poverty
 - child 212, 218
 - and living wage 177–92
 - and youth unemployment 207
- presentations 8, 205–6
- Presidential Statement 157–60
- Primates
 - and Anglican Consultative Council 9
 - and General Synod 78
- Prime Minister’s Secretary for
 - Appointments 47
- Private Member’s Motions, on living wage 177–93
- Probation Service 222
- Progress of Measures and Statutory Instruments 1–2
- Public Administration Select Committee 52
- Pushing at the Boundaries of Unity* 167
- Questions 33–80
- Reform, and women bishops
 - legislation 96, 124, 125, 151
- Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee, questions to 68–70
- Repair of Benefice Buildings Measure 1972 34, 69
- Resolution C 123–4
- Resolutions A and B 83, 85, 89, 138, 144
- retirement age, and youth
 - unemployment 209
- Review of Clergy Terms of Service 68
- Rochester Report 99, 100, 111, 152
- Roman Catholic Church
 - and living wage 178, 181, 188
 - and ordination of women 90, 92–3
- safeguarding 45–6
- salaries vs. stipends 34–5
- Secretary General, questions to 46–53
- self-esteem, and youth unemployment 207
- sexuality
 - General Synod resolution (1987) 55–6
 - House of Bishops’ group on 42–4
 - ‘Shrinking the Footprint’ campaign 75–6
- Small Donations Gift Aid Scheme 35
- Social Inclusion Projects 216
- Standing Orders
 - and appointment of Archbishop of Canterbury 46–7
 - SO 4(b) 200
 - SO 17 81, 113
 - SO 20(b) 82
 - SO 21(c) 81
 - SO 61 156
 - SO 91 18
 - SO 92 82
 - SO 97 8, 205
 - SO 113(a) 77
 - SO 122 48
- Tearfund, and Climate Justice Fund 75
- traditionalists, provision for 85–6, 88–99, 102–6, 108–9, 111–15, 118, 124, 129–31, 133, 137, 142–3, 145–53, 197
- training, for young people 206, 211, 213, 215, 219–20
- training, theological
 - common awards process 64–6
 - criteria for inspection 58–64
 - and diversity of traditions 58, 61
 - electronic resources 66
 - exceptions 65
 - training pathways 56–8, 65
 - women students 62n.
- Trussell Trust 181
- Turning up the Volume* task group 39–40
- unemployment, for young people 205–224
- Unemployment and the Future of Work 206

- Unfinished Business* report 40
- United Reformed Church, and living wage 178, 181
- University Technical Colleges (UTCs) 213
- Veolia, investment in 79–80
- visas
and placement of curates 68
transit 12
- vocations, black and minority ethnic 40, 64
- volunteer bureaux 220
- voting
by Houses 81, 155, 176
two-thirds majority 159
- wages *see* living wage; minimum wage
- Wakefield diocese 6
- Walsingham Retreat Centre 187, 193
- WATCH 85, 96, 106, 125, 148, 153
- weapons, investment in 80
- weddings, statutory times for 38–9
- Weddings Project 38
- women bishops
abstentions 112–13, 140, 147
Archbishops' amendment 86, 92, 149
code of practice 33, 49–50, 83, 84–5, 87–8, 92, 94, 106, 109–110, 112, 115, 118–19, 122, 131, 135, 137, 140, 142, 145, 151, 155
Final Approval debate 2–3, 81–156
speech limits 81–2, 86, 93, 102, 109, 112–13, 126, 138, 144, 147
and Letters of Request 83, 112, 124, 129, 131, 138, 154–5
and need for respect 85, 90, 93–4, 95, 99, 103–4, 110–111, 115, 118, 127, 129, 132–3, 140, 145–6, 151
and need for trust 87–8, 94, 95, 104, 105, 108, 116–17, 123, 134, 138, 142, 144, 149–50
Presidential Statement 157–60
and provision for traditionalists 85–6, 88–99, 102–6, 108–9, 111–15, 118, 124, 129–31, 133, 137, 142–3, 145–53, 197
Revision Committee 86, 114, 154, 205
Steering Committee 83, 154, 157
and theological conviction 83, 88–9, 92–6, 98–100, 104, 110–111, 117, 119–20, 124–6, 131, 147–8, 151, 155
- women priests 84, 91, 94–5, 98, 108, 110–111, 116, 120, 136–7, 142, 160
- Yorkshire dioceses 6–7
- young people
in care 210
see also youth unemployment
- Youth Council
and appointment of Archbishop of Canterbury 48
representatives 77, 200
- Youth Employment Services 215
- youth unemployment 3, 205–224
and community action 209–210, 214–16
and community action initiatives 209–210
and ex-offenders 222
and learning disabilities 220
rural 218–19
youth workers 217, 221–2
- Zimbabwe
and Anglican Communion Covenant 28
diocese of Harare 1, 153, 227