

# **Report of Proceedings 2015**

**General Synod  
July Group of Sessions**

**Volume 46, No. 2**



# Officers of the General Synod

## Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

## Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

*Canterbury*

Ven Christine Hardman

*York*

Ven Cherry Vann

## The House of Laity

*Chair*

Dr Philip Giddings

*Vice-Chair*

Mr Tim Hind

## Secretary General

Mr William Fittall

## Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

## Chief Legal Adviser and Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

*Secretary to the House of Bishops*

Mr William Fittall

*Legislative Counsel*

Mr Christopher Packer

*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 (Friday 10 July 2015)

Introduction of New Members	1
Welcome to Anglican and Ecumenical Guests	1
Presidential Address	4
Report by the Business Committee	15
Appointment to the Archbishops' Council	22
51 <sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Orders Committee	23
Legislative Business:	
Amending Canon No. 35	24
Administration of Holy Communion Regulations	25
Presentation on behalf of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and the National Investing Bodies	31
Questions	43

## Second Day (Saturday 11 July 2015)

Legislative Business:	
Draft Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 34	95
Draft Diocesan Stipends Funds (amendment) Measure	112
Draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (amendment) Regulations	115
Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015	124
Farewell	140
Private Member's Motion: Senior Leadership	143
Legislative Business:	
Draft Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015	163
Single Transferable Vote (amendment) Regulations 2015	168
51 <sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Orders Committee	169
"The Church: Towards a Common Vision": Report from the WCC	173
Church Commissioners' Annual Report	190
Archbishops' Council Annual Report	198

## **Third Day (Sunday 12 July 2015)**

Liturgical Business:	
Christian Initiation: Additional Texts for Holy Baptism in Accessible Language	206
51 <sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Orders Committee	216
Legislative Business:	
Administration of Holy Communion Regulations	218
Diocesan Synod Motion: Nature and Structure of the Church of England	220
Presentation by the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns	234
Introduction to Group Work and Bible Study on the Environment	245
The Archbishops' Council Budget and proposals for Apportionment for 2016	253
National Society: Development of Teaching and Educational Leadership Partnerships	264

## **Fourth Day (Monday 13 July 2015)**

Combatting Climate Change: the Paris Summit and the Mission of the Church	275
Climate Change and Investment Policy	298
Farewells	322
Dissolution of the Convocations of Canterbury and York and of the Synod	326
Prorogation	327

## **FULL SYNOD: FIRST DAY FRIDAY 10 JULY 2015**

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 3.00 pm

*The Revd Prebendary David Houlding* led the Synod in an act of worship.

### **Introduction of New Members**

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, we come to Item 1 which is a formal item. In a moment I am going to read out the names of the new members of the Synod or those here in a new capacity. Please would they stand in their places when I mention their names and remain standing so that we can greet them all with applause at the end? The new members are:

The Rt Revd Rachel Treweek, recently elected and confirmed Bishop of Gloucester

The Rt Revd Martin Seeley, Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich

The Rt Revd Paul Williams, Bishop of Southwell and Nottingham.

The Ven Dr Timothy Stratford (Leicester), replacing the Revd Canon Dr Amanda Ford

The Rt Hon Caroline Spelman MP, Second Church Estates Commissioner, replacing The Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry MP

May we please greet them all? (*Applause*)

We also welcome the Very Revd Archpriest Maxim Nikolsky as the representative from the Pan Orthodox Assembly of Bishops. I invite him to stand so that we may welcome him too. (*Applause*)

It would be good then to acknowledge with satisfaction the presence in the recent Honours List of at least two who are present but I am going to mention all three and I will give you reasons why that is the case. In the Birthday Honours List, the First Estates Commissioner, Sir Andreas Whittam Smith, His Grace Bishop Angaelos OBE and Christina Rees CBE. Could we please congratulate them? (*Applause*)

Unfortunately, and with his permission, Andreas has had to send his apologies for this group of sessions. He is undergoing treatment for cancer of the prostate. In the midst of this he also developed a hernia, which was operated on just over a week ago and from which he is now recovering well. I would ask Synod to spend a short time in prayer for Andreas.

I express again congratulations to the Revd Roger Walton who has been elected to serve as the Methodist President for 2016-17.

### **Welcome to Anglican and Ecumenical Guests**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 2. Welcome to the Most Revd Dr Antje Jackelén and her Chaplain, the Revd Joel Ingmarsson.

In addition to our nine ecumenical representatives, who are with us in each group of sessions, in July we always have additional Anglican and ecumenical guests. I am going to ask them to stand and invite you together to greet each of them in turn when I introduce them.

The Revd Dr Mark Clavier, representing the Church of Wales. He was at dinner last night but there we go. He is Dean of Residential Training and Acting Principal of St Michael's Theological College in Cardiff. Originally from the United States, Dr Clavier served for 16 years in parishes in Maryland, North Carolina, County Durham and north Oxfordshire before taking up his present position at the College.

We congratulate him on his recently announced appointment as the new Vice Principal of St Stephen's House.

Then I also welcome our speaker tonight, the Most Revd Dr Antje Jackelén, the Archbishop of the Church of Sweden. The Archbishop is the Archbishop of Uppsala and primate of the Church of Sweden. She received her PhD at Lund University. She was previously Professor of Systematic Theology/Religion and Science at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago, and is the former Bishop of Lund. Archbishop Jackelén is a member of the Lutheran World Federation Council, and serves on the Committee for Theology and Ecumenical Relations.

The Archbishop is accompanied by the Revd Joel Ingmarsson, who is Chaplain to the Archbishop of Sweden and Secretary of the Swedish Bishops' Conference. He has previously served in parish ministry and in prison and probationary chaplaincy within the Church of Sweden. Please will they stand and we will greet them in the name of Our Lord. *(Applause)*

It gives me great pleasure to invite Archbishop Antje Jackelén to address the Synod. I still remember her sermon when she preached when we welcomed more churches from the Porvoo community. She taught everybody on this wonderful text "he is still lying there".

*The Archbishop of Uppsala (Most Revd Dr Antje Jackelén):* Your Graces, members of the Synod, thank you for your generous welcome. I am delighted to be with you today and I am very pleased to speak to these three houses, bringing you warm greetings from the Church of Sweden.

Church relations between England and Sweden date back to the beginnings of Christianity in Sweden. Missionaries came from the British islands as well as from Germany (or what was Germany then). My very first predecessor was an Englishman, Stephen, a Cistercian monk.

Another predecessor, the great Nathan Söderblom, inspired much of what was to become the ecumenical movement of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In those days, nationalism won over the Christian gospel. World War I brought disaster to almost everything that was the pride of Europe. At that moment in history, Archbishop Söderblom's bold discipleship paved the way for a renewed and joint commitment to the mission of the Prince of Shalom, our Lord Jesus Christ.

The relationship between the Church of England and the Church of Sweden has entered a new era since the signing of the Porvoo Agreement in 1996. Formal agreements are helpful when it comes to the exchange of clergy, for example. However, communion and common witness to the grace of God in proclamation and service require more than that.

*Koinonia*, communion, is “learning by doing” in response to the needs of the world. We have been learning, sometimes the hard way, that it is about sharing the richness of traditions rather than building fences around one’s own turf; that it is about empowerment rather than about power. That it is about celebrating unity in the midst of existing diversity.

We are only two years away from the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Reformation. Martin Luther’s 95 theses in Wittenberg in 1517 mark the beginning of a movement with powerful consequences for theology, culture and modern democracy as well as the start of yet more divisions in the Church. “So that they may be one” (John 17:11) No. 2017 will not undo the splits. Nevertheless, it is a sign of hope that in the fall of 2016, on the doorstep of the Reformation anniversary, a common commemoration will be held, jointly hosted by the Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church: In thanksgiving for the Gospel, in repentance for the pain that conflict and divisions have caused, and in joint commitment to common witness.

We who in baptism were made disciples of Christ, we live *in* the world; partaking in structures that do not always support life, structures that are unhealthy for humans and the rest of creation, structures engrained with fear and hatred, a fertile soil for violence, racism and extremisms of various kinds, all of which are defiling the face of the earth that God so loved. (John 3:16)

Insecurity provides a fertile soil for xenophobia and intolerance, a growing problem on the continent we call home, Europe. Albeit not a new one; tomorrow’s twentieth anniversary of the massacre in Srebrenica reminds us of wounds still open and prone to infection. As churches, we need to do innovative interfaith work and at the same time resist violence in the name of religion.

The world is crying out for credible words of hope. The leaders of the world look to religious leaders to take a stand and offer guidance. They do so because religions provide a cultural integrity, a spiritual depth and a moral force often lacking in purely secular approaches.

The list of challenges for church leaders is long, as it is for the international community: poverty and injustice, the plight of Christians in the Middle East, the tragedies of migrant deaths, freedom of religion or belief, protection of minorities, humanitarian aid to the victims of war, terror and catastrophes, and last but not least climate change. When churches decide to divest from fossil fuels, the world notices.

Moreover, we are all challenged by the spiritual poverty that otherwise well-to-do societies are facing. Secularization leaves us with mixed feelings. On the one hand, it is a result of the success of the Gospel of Jesus Christ: The values of freedom and dignity are so strong that they carry through all of society. Hence, when “the world” is challenging us to be braver in affirming human freedom, equality and dignity, it is challenging us, the Church, with the fruits of our own preaching which is good. On the other hand,



secularization has undermined the knowledge and practice of faith, leaving especially young people without access to the spiritual resources offered by the Church. Thus, loneliness, the haunting feeling of never being fully accepted, and the lack of courage to fully face life's ups and downs are threats to the existential health of whole generations. If there is nothing outside yourself that can feed your sense of being accepted no matter what, if you have to carry the whole burden of the meaningfulness of your life all by yourself, then it is indeed difficult to live. Let us therefore remember Jesus praying: "so that they may have my joy made complete in themselves" (John 17:13)

It is about joy. Jesus cares about our joy. It is for the sake of joy that we strive for churches and congregations that are joyful in worship, caring and prophetic in their diaconal work, creative in teaching the faith, and strong in dialogue. It is with gratitude I acknowledge that experiences with fresh expressions in your church keep inspiring people in the Church of Sweden.

Faith can generate a joy that may be hard to find elsewhere. Yes, changes of lifestyle will be needed. Yes, sacrifice will be needed. But who, if not people of faith, can be examples of joyful sacrifice? If material and intellectual choices are inspired by spiritual choices, we will find that the path to a climate-smart and climate-just life is not just a tough one, but also a joyful one.

Today's challenges are no longer defined by local or national borders. They are global, both global and local. Borders are no longer what they used to be and that should not scare us. Because at the centre of Christianity, there is a God crossing the most dramatic borders of all: the one between divine and human and the one between death and life. Transgression of borders always entails anxiety, the anxiety of touching and being touched by what is different, strange, other. As people of faith, we can joyfully live with these anxieties, remaining centered in the Gospel of the incarnated Christ and open, very much open, to the world.

May the triune God bless you all with joy, wisdom and confidence as you embark on the deliberations before you! Thank you.

*The Chair:* Your Grace, Dr Antje, tack sa mycket. Good. Well, that concludes this item.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Canon Dr Rosemary Mallett* took the Chair at 3.35 pm

## **Presidential Address**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. We now come to Item 3 on our Agenda and I call upon the Archbishop of York to make his Presidential Address.

*The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Thirty-eight years ago in Uganda, a large crowd gathered outside St Paul's Cathedral, Namirembe to bury Archbishop Janani Luwum. They waited for hours singing hymns of trust, love and hope in Christ's Resurrection.

President Idi Amin did not release the body as he had promised. His soldiers had secretly

buried Janani's desecrated body in his birthplace, in order to cover up Amin's lie that the Archbishop had died in a motor accident.

His predecessor, Archbishop Sabiti, looking into the empty grave said, "Don't look for the living among the dead. The soul of Janani is alive with Christ. Don't be alarmed or afraid. By his death and Resurrection, Jesus did turn death into a family servant who opens the door to let the children come home".

The crowd replied, "Alleluiah, Christ is risen".

Well, on 16 February this year I was at Janani's resting place in Mucwini, Northern Uganda, in a memorial service to preach and bless the martyr's grace - 38 years since Janani Luwum was martyred.

A survivor, Apollo Lawoko, who was with Janani on the night he was brutally tortured and then shot dead by Idi Amin, gave a bloodcurdling account. I will spare you the gory details, save to say that the Archbishop had been stripped down to his underpants, his body revealed severe beatings, his jaw was broken - but he still smiled. Telling his fellow victims in the Dungeons of Nakesaro "not to be afraid, that Jesus has conquered the flesh, sin, the world and the Devil". Suddenly Amin appeared and shouted at the Archbishop, "Before you kill me I am going to kill you". He shot the Archbishop twice in the head at very close range.

You could hear the deep, deep sound of silence when that account was given.

Then, Janani's widow, Mama Mary, spoke. No bitterness, self-pity or raking over the awful past. With great humour she talked of their marriage, friendship and Jesus. So did the seven children when they spoke as well.

Before my very eyes I saw the miracle of forgiveness. You know what? Christ's Resurrection is God's forgiving love writ large. His constant forgiveness is his greatest miracle in all of us.

I suddenly remembered that when I worked in Gulu with Janani Luwum for the resettlement of large numbers of refugees from South Sudan in 1973, Janani was constantly quoting from St John's Gospel, Chapter 17. Here was a bishop imbued with the spirit of the prayer of John 17.

Given some of the challenges and opportunities before us as the Church of England by Law Established, I thought it would be good to look at the great prayer of Jesus for his disciples in John 17. Your Grace, thank you for seeing my notes before you preached.

Of course, most scholars who have sought to harmonise the accounts in the four Gospels have the Lord Jesus praying in the Upper Room in John 17 after he had finished his instructions to his disciples. Then, he and the disciples sang the traditional Passover psalms, left the Upper Room and headed for the Garden of Gethsemane where Jesus had been accustomed to meet with them and pray (cf. Matthew 26: 30 - 46; Mark 14:26 - 42). Whether he prayed in the Upper Room or en route to the garden, this much is sure; it is the greatest prayer ever prayed on earth and the greatest prayer recorded anywhere

in Scripture.

John 17 is certainly the “holy of holies” of the Gospel record and we must approach this chapter in a spirit of humility and worship. To think that we are privileged to listen in as God the Son converses with his Father just as he is about to give his life as a ransom for sinners!

No matter what events occurred later that evening, this prayer makes it clear that Jesus of Nazareth was and is the Overcomer. He was not a “victim”. He was and is the victor embodying holy love and justice.

In John 16:33 he had encouraged his disciples, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world". The word 'world' is used 19 times in this prayer, so it is easy to see the connection between the prayer in John 17 and John 16:33 - which I have just quoted - "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." And if we understand and apply the truths of this prayer, we too will become overcomers like Jesus.

Before I proceed, let us pray:

O God, who said, “Let light shine out of darkness”, shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Corinthians 4: 6).

In this great prayer, in St John's Gospel Chapter 17, our Lord declares wonderful gifts of grace bestowed on all God's children adopted by grace, gifts of grace that makes them all overcomers, filled with God's love and imbued with justice. Please look at the verses from John 17 verses 1, 4, 5 and 10.

v1. "When Jesus has spoken these things, He lifted up His eyes to heaven and said, Father, the hour is come. Glorify and exalt and honour and magnify your Son so that your Son may glorify and extol and honour and magnify You."

v4. "I have glorified You down here on the earth by completing the work that You gave Me to do."

v5. "So now, Father, glorify me in your own presence with the glory that I had in your presence before the world existed."

v10. "All Mine are Yours and all that are Yours belong to Me; and I am glorified in (through) them - they have done Me honour, in them my glory is achieved".

Our Lord began this prayer by praying for himself, but in praying for himself he was also praying for us. A prayer for self is not by any means a selfish prayer. An examination of prayers in the Bible shows that this is true.

Our Lord's burden was the glory of God. A child of God has every right to ask his Father for help whose sole purpose is to glorify his name. "Hallowed be thy name" is the first petition in the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6: 9), and it is the first petition in his prayer of Jesus.

Jesus of Nazareth had lived on a “divine timetable”, as it were, while on earth and he

knew he was in the will of God.

So he now asks the Father to give him back his pre-incarnate glory with the Father, the glory that he had laid aside when he came to earth to be born, to serve, to suffer to die and rise again for our salvation.

More than anything else, even more than evangelism, we should be concerned with the glory of God. I love that question in the Scottish Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?" Answer: "To glorify God and to enjoy him for ever." It is the purpose for which the world was created. It is the end for which the saints are called and converted. It is the main thing which we should seek, that, "God in all things may be glorified" (1 Peter 4: 11).

If we are really concerned with God's glory more than anything in this world I believe that the squabbles and division in the Church would largely cease and I believe that money and missionaries would flow to every part of England and we would receive the divine power to re-evangelise England and to reconnect the Church of England with England.

I believe that the world at least will be convinced about the reality of God and the revival and renewal from which many are praying would be upon us.

Now then, the first gift of grace bestowed on us is Seeing the Glory of God. That is the first gift, seeing the glory of God. As St John put it, "The Word became flesh and pitched his tent among us. And we saw his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." (John 1: 14).

Seeing God's glory as the Incarnate baby of Bethlehem reigns supreme from his Manger Throne - the Cattle's feeding and drinking trough -- symbolising that one day he will feed those who are hungry for eternal life with the "true living bread and the living water come down from heaven". (John 6: 33, 35, 51; 4: 13-14). The symbolism is far too obvious for us to ignore.

Seeing God's glory as our Lord is totally immersed in the Baptism of Repentance and the heavens are opened, the Spirit of God descends on him, and a voice from heaven declares him God's son. (Matthew 3: 16-17)

Seeing God's glory as our Lord is transfigured on the mountain is seen talking to Moses and Elijah. What a transfiguration. Moses, had seen this mountain from afar, and he was told he would not enter the Promised Land because of his disobedience. He is now, in glory, standing in the Promised Land with Elijah speaking with our Lord about his departure (Luke 9: 28 - 36). What a transfiguration.

Seeing God's glory as our Lord reigns supreme, lifted up high on the Cross, doing for us that which we could not do for our ourselves and reconciling the world to himself (John 3: 14-15).

Seeing God's glory in the Resurrection of our Lord. By the physicality of the Resurrection, Paradise is regained as he stands in the Easter Garden calling Mary, calling you, calling me, by name. No longer, "Adam, where are you?" (Genesis 3:9). But rather, "Woman,

why are you weeping? For whom are you looking? ... Go and tell ... I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God". (John 21: 15, 17). Paradise regained.

Seeing God's glory in the Ascension of our Lord, yet still bearing the marks of his Crucifixion in his Resurrection Body, "Raising us up with him and seating us with him in the heavenly places with Jesus Christ" (Ephesians 2: 6).

Seeing God's glory in the coming of the Holy Spirit, "Filling the entire house where the disciples were sitting and filling everyone with the Holy Spirit and giving them the power of speaking in other languages" (Luke 2: 1-4).

The word 'glory' expresses in a remarkable way the unity of the doctrine of creation, the incarnation, the cross, the Holy Spirit, the Church and the world to come.

It is this 'glory' we are called to live in and shine on God's world and infect it with God's goodness. Like 'the Tent of Meeting' in the Exodus account (Exodus 33: 7 - 11), "The pillar of cloud descending and standing at the entrance of the Tent, while God spoke with Moses."

As St Paul put it in 2 Corinthians 3: 18, "And all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another, for this comes from the Lord, the Spirit."

So the first gift of grace bestowed on us is Seeing the glory of God. And, as we do this, his glory is etched in us and our vocation is delighting in God. This was the greatest witness of Archbishop Janani Luwum: Always delighting in God because he had seen the glory of God.

The second gift of grace bestowed on us is eternal life (verses 2 and 3 of John 17).

v. 2, "Since you gave [your Son] authority over all people [flesh] so that he may give eternal life to all whom you have given him."

v. 3, "This is eternal life, that they should know you, as the only True God and the one whom you sent, Jesus the Christ".

It is because of what Jesus of Nazareth accomplished on earth that we as believers have the gift of eternal life (John 17: 2-3). Seven times in John 17, Jesus states that believers are the Father's gift to his Son. That is verses 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 24. We are so accustomed to think of Jesus of Nazareth as the Father's love gift to us ("God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that anyone who believes in him may not perish but have eternal life" - John 3: 16). But the Lord affirms that believers are the Father's "love gift" to his beloved Son.

As a proof of this, the Father, through his Son, has given us "eternal life" - the very life of God - as a free gift to us because we trust in him. The Father gave his Son the authority to give eternal life to those whom the Father gave to the Son. (John 3: 15-16. 36; 6: 47; 10: 28) And eternal life isn't something we earn by character or conduct; it is a gift we receive by God's grace. Because we share his life, we are overcomers for we also share

his victory.

When we are born the first time we are born 'in Adam' and are losers. When we are born again by water and the Spirit in Christ, we are born winners. Like the saints and martyrs through the centuries, "We overcome the evil one by the blood of the lamb." (Revelation 12: 11).

We have been given eternal life and share his victory of love. As 1 John 5: 4 puts it, "For whatever is born of God conquers the world, our faith."

A story is told of a Frenchman who admired the English way of life and applied for a British passport. The papers came through and he was now a British citizen. He was so excited, but his behaviour and mannerisms were still very French. He enjoyed a glass of wine, still ate frogs' legs, used his arms a lot, the accent was still very French. So his friends said, "You say you are now an Englishman. We see no difference at all". "Ah", he said, "Now that I'm an Englishman I have won the Battle of Waterloo." He was now on the victory side.

In 1928 the German Lutheran pastor, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, wrote, "Jesus Christ is not the bringer of a new religion, but the bringer of God". Writing from prison at the end of his life, Bonhoeffer said in words that have become actually very famous, "Jesus does not call to a new religion, but to life" (letter of July 18, 1944 - and he was executed in 1945 by the Nazis - Sabine Dramm, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eine Einfuhrung in sein Denken*; Gullersloh, Germany, Kaiser Gutersloher Verl-Haus, 2001, p 228).

For Bonhoeffer, religion by definition concerns only a part of human existence, whereas, in his eyes Jesus Christ had necessarily to be the relationship with the whole of life. All attempts to confine him to a restricted sphere, to limit him to particular times, places or practices could only distort the true meaning of Jesus's life and work. And he wrote, "The Church is not about religion but rather about the figure of Christ and its taking shape in a multitude of persons". (Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethik*, quoted in Dramm, p. 232).

And Brother Roger of Taizé wrote, "Are we sufficiently aware that, 2000 years ago, Christ came to earth not to start a new religion but to offer every human being a communion in God?" (Brother Roger of Taizé, *God is Love Alone*; Chicago GIA Publications, 2003, p. 51).

To follow Jesus means actually that every part of life must be subjected to Him. By the way, when that book came out, *On Rock or Sand? Firm Foundations for Britain's Future*, people fell into two categories: those who read it and who those who hated it, because they thought we should limit our life purely to religious matters.

God in Jesus Christ has graciously bestowed on us the gift of seeing the glory of God, and He has given us Eternal Life.

The third gift of grace that has been bestowed on us in Jesus Christ, "He has made the Father's name known." (John 17: 6-12).

v.6, "I have manifested your name - I have revealed your very self, your real self - to the

people whom you have given me out of the world. They were yours, and you gave them to me, and they have obeyed and kept your word".

In the Bible, 'name' refers, of course, to 'nature' because names so often were given to reveal something special about the nature of the person bearing the name.

The name Isaac, for example means 'laughter' (Genesis 21: 6) because the Lord brought joy to Abraham and Sarah. The name Jesus reveals that he is the Saviour (Matthew 1: 21). Sentamu means, 'The one who keeps the King's fire burning'. I hope your name has a meaning to it as well. If not, well I cannot do anything about it.

In the 'I AM' sayings, Jesus reveals the Father's gracious name, showing the disciples he was everything they needed. He reveals the Father's character in the whole of his earthly life and ministry.

Jesus had glorified the Father in his miracles (John 2: 11; 1: 40); his teachings (John 5: 17-19); the training of the disciples for future service and, most of all, his sacrifice on the cross (John 12: 23-25; 13: 31-32; Hebrews 9: 24-28; 10: 11-18).

Yes, Jesus made known the Father's name. And in the Lord's Prayer we are taught to pray that the Name of God - the character of God - may be, "Hallowed". In using these words, we do not mean that there are degrees to God's holiness, or that any prayers of ours can make God's character more holy than it is.

By the 'Name' of God we mean all those attributes under which Jesus of Nazareth made God's character or God's nature known. His power, wisdom, holiness, justice, mercy, truth, love and joy.

"Hallowed be your name." We declare our hearty desire that God's character and attributes and perfections may be more known and honoured and glorified by all God's intelligent creatures. This has an evangelistic zeal to it. We know God's name and we have a desire to make it known. As the *Towards the Conversion of England* report (GS 1944) put it, "England will not be evangelized until every follower of Jesus Christ becomes a witness." Hallowing the Name of our Father who is in Heaven.

God in Jesus Christ has graciously bestowed on us the Seeing of God's glory; Given Eternal Life, the Knowledge of the Father's Name.

The Fourth gift of grace that He has bestowed on us in Jesus Christ is His word (John 17: 13-19)

v.14, "I have given them your Word".

v.8, "I have given them the words you gave to me".

v.6b, "They were yours, and you gave them to me and they have kept your word".

The same word "to keep" also occurs in verses 11, 12 and 15 of John 17. For example, in verse 12: "While I was with them I kept and preserved them in your name. That is in

the knowledge and worship of you. Those you have given me I guarded and protected and not one of them has perished".

So it is to keep safe or intact, to guard and hold fast to the uttermost. And this is precisely what the Church must do with the word of God. God himself has entrusted his word to us.

In 2 Corinthians 5: 19, St Paul says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not counting our trespasses against us and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation". And in 2 Timothy 1: 14 St Paul tells Timothy to "guard the truth that has been entrusted to him".

We must therefore keep it and guard it as a solemn trust. Suppose I ask Archbishop Justin if I may borrow his iPad. Being a very kind person he would say, 'Yes'. Then I go ahead and borrow it. If so, he has entrusted his iPad to me and expects me to keep it safe, to look after it and to treat it well. What would his reaction be if he came into this hall this evening and found his iPad taken apart, the SIM card cut into pieces, the memory destroyed by a virus, the screen broken and all the circuitry destroyed. Why, like that? Because I am doing research and there are bits in it I do not like. He will have every right to be furious.

What about us? Is that how we handle the Word of God? Stripping it down and leaving it totally ineffective and useless. We are to keep it, obey it and not sit in judgment over it.

"I have given them your word" (v. 14 and v. 8). The Word of God is a gift to us. The Father gave the words to his Son (v. 8) and the Son gave them to his disciples who, in turn, have passed them along to us as they remembered them by the power of the Holy Spirit (2 Peter 1: 20-21; 2 Timothy 3: 16). And, as a gift, we must use it in daily life.

How does the Word of God enable us to overcome the world? It gives us joy (John 17: 13), and this inward joy gives us the strength to overcome (Nehemiah 8: 10). The joy that our Lord wants us to have is the abiding enjoyment of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

If we really believe in Jesus Christ, said St Peter, we should rejoice with inexpressible joy, joy unspeakable, full of the glory to come.

The Word not only imparts the joy of the Lord, but it also assures us of his love (John 17: 14); and reveals to us what the world is really like - its deceptions, dangerous disguises and confusions. Overwhelming love and joy are like a warm light on a summer's night. It draws all sorts of insects to it.

The Word of God imparts God's power for holy living (John 17: 15-17). In verses 6-12 the Lord prayed for the disciples' security; here he prays for their sanctity - practical holy living for the glory of God.

True sanctification (being set apart from God) comes through the ministry of the Word of God (15:3).



God's truth has been given to us in three realities: His Word is true (v 17); his Son is the truth (14: 6); and his Spirit is the truth (1 John 5: 6). We need all three if we are to experience true sanctification, a sanctification that touches every part of our inner person.

As I tell my confirmation candidates: If you want to build your Christian life solely on Scripture, you will dry up. If you build your Christian life solely on the Holy Spirit, you will blow up. If you build your Christian life on scripture and the Holy Spirit, you will grow up.

With the mind, we learn God's truth. Though the Word, with the heart, we love God's truth, his Son. With the will, we yield to the Spirit and live God's truth day by day. It takes all three for a balanced experience of sanctification. Learning and loving should lead us to holy living, allowing the Holy Spirit to enable us to obey his word and become his effective witnesses.

Jesus of Nazareth set himself apart for us, and now he has set us apart for him. The Father sent him into the world, and now he sends us into the world.

We are people "under loving orders" and we had better obey in love. Jesus is now "set apart" in glory, praying for us, that our witness will bear fruit as many of our friends and neighbours turn to him - the bread of life, the great I AM.

How can we be overcome by the world when we have the Word of God to encourage us and the Holy Spirit to enable us and the Father to love us?

God's gifts of grace bestowed on us in Jesus Christ: seeing God's glory; we have been given eternal life; we know the Father's name; we have been given his word.

The fifth gift of grace that has been bestowed on us in Jesus Christ is to overcome Satan. God can keep us from every evil when we have to be on our own, but there is no assurance of his protection if we neglect the fellowship of Christians around us.

For example, if you take a page out of a book, *General Synod Proceedings*, and you decide to tear it out - that is no indication of how I feel about them - it is very easy to tear, but if you took all the pages together it's a totally different story. It is not easy, unless of course you are a Viking.

The Christian on his own can be torn into two spiritually speedily by Satan but Christians together are strong to overcome Satan. As Hebrews 10: 24-25 says "We need to meet together and encourage one another because as the day draws near, Satan will be increasingly active and the Church must overcome Satan".

The sixth gift of grace bestowed on us in Jesus Christ is to be 'in' but not 'of' the world (John 17: 14-19)

The Church in many ways should be like a boat - the Ark of God - sailing on the waters. A boat should be in water but not water in the boat. And in the same way the Church should be very much in the world, but not the world in the Church.

In but not of; and the balance here is not easy. We should be deeply involved in social, political and economic matters, otherwise we can too easily form cultic comfort stations where we spend all our time on 'churchy' things. We are to be "the salt of the earth" said Jesus.

We are to be the light of the world and we need to be in the darkness of the world. You do not go and put a torch in a room that is blazing with light. You use it for darkness. In the midst of the corruption of this world certainly we need fellowship with others, but we must be in places where Christ can use us to win the world for himself.

You may ask, "How can we be in the world without the world squeezing us into its mouldy mould?" In verses 17 and 19 of John 17 we have to be sanctified in the truth. We are to be made more like Jesus as the truth becomes part of us. He says in verse 19, "And so for their sake and on their behalf I sanctify, dedicate, consecrate myself that they also may be sanctified, dedicated, consecrated and made holy in the truth."

Jesus was so attractive because he mixed with the most unlikely people in places where you and I might not be seen dead at. He mixed freely with them, but although he was with them he was utterly different and people were attracted that here was someone who came to them in love and not in judgment; came with compassion, not with criticism, yet he was utterly different, he was pure; full of everything that people most long to be in their best moments. That is why he is so attractive. That is what you and I are called to be in this world into which God sends us: into which Christ has sent us as members of his body: in but not of the world.

The seventh gift of grace that has been bestowed on us in Jesus Christ is sharing in His glory. (John 17: 20-26)

His prayer moves on from security and sanctity; now the burden of his prayer is unity. He longs for his people to experience and show forth a spirituality and unity that is like the Oneness of the Father and the Son. Christians may belong to different embodiments of the life in Christ, but they all belong to the Lord and to each other, and "have all drunk from the One Spirit" who incorporated them into Christ's death and resurrection. (1 Corinthians 12: 13)

Unity in Christ is a given. Sadly, in our fleshly way, we are tempted to seek agreement in the vain hope of achieving unity. We start with the given, and by God's grace, reach agreement, guided by scripture, tradition, reason and lived Christ-like experience.

Similarly, life in Christ, being incorporated into the life of the Holy Trinity is a given. Sadly, again, we are tempted in a fleshly way to think that we must start with virtue/holiness and move towards incorporation into Christ. From incorporation, participation into the life and death of Jesus by the power of the Holy Spirit, we are led into virtue and into holiness. For "No-one can see the Kingdom of God without being born from above". (John 3:3)

Friends, does this give us a clue of how we may progress with determination and love "The Anglican/Methodist Covenant"? Recognising our Oneness in Jesus before we begin to talk about schemes.

Pope John Paul II, receiving in Rome leaders of the Orthodox Church of Greece, on 11 March 2002, spoke of an “ecumenism of holiness that will finally lead us to full communion, which is neither absorption nor fusion, but a meeting in the truth and in love”. I want to say that is it: an ecumenism of holiness which is neither absorption nor fusion, but a meeting in the truth and in love. Could Anglicans and Methodists do that and meet in love and then we can work out all our varied ambiguities and confusions?

As Cardinal Ivan Dias, addressing the Lambeth Conference in 2008, said: “If a part of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church forgets that it is the Body of Christ united in life, mission and witness in the power of the Holy Spirit, it will suffer from ecclesial Parkinsonism. If a part of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church abandons the historic inheritance of the faith of the apostles, and the witness of Holy Scripture and the Living Tradition, it will suffer from ecclesial Alzheimer’s”.

All adopted children of God have God’s glory within. We must all go beyond the elements of our first birth - colour, ethnicity, gender, sexual, orientation, and so on and so forth - and build our fellowship on the essentials of our new birth in Christ.

In verse 21 of John 17, Jesus prays, “that they may all be one, just as you, Father, are in me and I in you, that they may also be in us, in order that the world may believe that you sent me”. The world cannot see God, but they can see Christians, and what they see in us is what they will believe about us. If they see love and unity, they will believe that God is love. If they see hatred and division, they will reject the message of the Gospel of love. The unity of the disciples is inseparable from the glory which Jesus gives them.

Sadly, some Christians are prosecuting barristers and judges instead of faithful witnesses and counsels for the defence, and this only turns would-be disciples away from the Saviour.

This is the challenge and opportunity for us all as the Body of Christ in England and as members of the Anglican Communion.

We have all been summoned by God, to behold his glory, to share his life, to know his name, to keep his word and to share his glory. He has made us his family, made us his friends and his fellow co-workers.

The foundation of the Church - of all believers - is Jesus Christ . Our duty is to share his life, know his name, to have his word and share his glory.

As Christ’s Body in England, we all have the responsibility to advance the transforming Gospel, and in so doing to strengthen the social fabric of England. This is our greatest opportunity.

At a time when we face unprecedented challenges on so many varied fronts, we need to speak up for freedom and against injustice, for fraternity and community - how to build together in a system based on respect of the individual and care for each other in the community - and we need to speak prophetically about the need to turn away from the culture of self-absorbed individualism, self-referentialism and rediscover the benefit of service to one another.

We are not to condemn other people's failures, but rather help us towards the acceptance of common goals which uplift the heart. To help lift the heart of a nation is an exciting challenge, and it is one which we can do together because it is what God has called us to as part of his mission and our ministry.

Friends in Christ, as I finish, let us give God the glory. Let us worship God. Let us keep God's word. Let us be centred on Jesus Christ. Let us be united in love. Let us be filled with joy. Let us overcome the evil one. Let us be 'in' but not 'of' the world. Let us bring others to Christ. Let us be with Christ in glory.

You could sum it all up in David's invitation in Psalm 34: "O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together".

And so we can rejoice and overcome the evil one because John 17 is a Charter of liberty and power. We see God's glory. We share our Lord's life. We know the Father's name. We have his joy. We have his word. We share his glory. We are, we are, truly blessed. Hallelujah.

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business and we now move to our next item.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester)* took the Chair at 4.13 pm

## **Report by the Business Committee (GS 1988)**

*The Chair:* We move to Item 4 on the Agenda and the eagle-eyed amongst you will see that there is timed business at 4.25 p.m., so I wonder whether the Chairman of the Business Committee might want to seek a variation in the order of business. I see her approaching.

*Revd Canon Susan Booys (Oxford):* That is so very kind of you, Chair. I wonder if, given the number of people I know who have indicated to me that they would like to speak in this debate, and the fact that we have only ten minutes left, you and the Synod might consider a variation in the order of business to 4.40 p.m.?

*The Chair:* That has my consent. Does it have the consent of Synod? Please show.

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I call upon the Chairman of the Business Committee to speak to the motion. She has up to ten minutes but I hope that you might be considerably shorter.

*Revd Canon Susan Booys (Oxford):* I beg to move:

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

I think I may have to gabble, so I apologise in advance. I wanted to talk a bit about the past five years, the busy time that we have had and the fact that that is reflected in GS

Misc 1111, which sets out our work together and some of its outcomes. We propose that this will be updated and circulated regularly as a resource for members.

Without doubt the most widely publicised business of this Synod has been the Women Bishops Measure and Amending Canon. But just as significant for our future are the Quinquennium Goals and the debates that have arisen out of our focus on spiritual and numerical growth, mission and witness and service to the community. These have helped shape the Church's agenda and our own. Retaining this focus in the Synod Agenda will be important for all of us who return to serve for another quinquennium.

A particularly important milestone is reflected in the final approval for our safeguarding legislation - which reaches final approval at this group of sessions. This completes work begun in the debate in July 2013 which reported the findings of the Chichester Commissaries and included an apology from the lead Bishop for safeguarding. Two years later, many of the Commissaries' recommendations are being implemented in this legislation.

I hope you will forgive me if I look back even further to November 2012 with the particular intention of giving thanks for the gradual progress we have made towards working together in a way which respects and values our differing traditions. There is still much to do and to learn and I hope and pray that our new Synod will go on to build on the work of listening, learning from one another and seeking to live out Paul's instructions to the Ephesians "to bear with one another in love, and to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace". Those who return as members in the next quinquennium will have a particular calling to ensure this.

The Reform and Renewal programme will be the exciting part of our business next time. You have an update on this in GS Misc 1116 and some of you will be attending fringe meetings taking place during Synod. Related to this we look forward to debating Fr Killwick's Private Member's Motion on Senior Leadership. It is crucial for our future that we continue to have robust and purposeful conversations within that bond of peace.

Inevitably, much of our business this weekend focusses on completion. So we shall be concluding work on Safeguarding, Clergy Discipline and Baptism Liturgy. There are also a number of changes to our Standing Orders which either consolidate or will help us work together in a more streamlined manner. In February we initiated some changes to Question Time that were generally well received. I am delighted to report that we have scheduled the relevant part of the Standing Orders debate early enough to dispense with that irritating response "I refer to the answer printed" et cetera. I very much hope you will vote to expedite this.

The Business Committee has requested a change to Standing Order 130A, explained in paragraphs 12 – 15 of the report, about the circulation of documents. I want to be clear that this proposes only a change in the default position whereby members would receive Synod papers in electronic form but would be able to opt-out and ask for them in printed form. This will save the cost of staff time, printing and postage which is charged back to your dioceses. But there is a wider issue relating to our excessive use of paper that is inconsistent with our intent to shrink the footprint.

The consolidation of Standing Orders represents a significant amount of work by the members of that Committee, by their Chair and by the Legal Office. I want to thank them as the unsung heroes of the frameworks that help us to hold together in our business.

Our final day together on Monday is focussed on study, prayer and debate around the environment. This offers an opportunity to speak clearly before the Paris Summit and to debate our investment policy. I am grateful for the co-operation of the Oxford and Birmingham Dioceses who had moved Diocesan Synod Motions on the subject of Disinvestment, and a sign of this gratitude is that the background papers they had prepared have been distributed as GS Misc papers. We look forward to hearing from them in Monday's debate.

In reporting on the work of the Business Committee I would like to draw your attention to matters of security. Because we take the security and the safety of members and visitors seriously the Committee has agreed that bags and coats will no longer be permitted in the public gallery either in York or in London. We have provided visitors with a cloakroom nearby in the Berrick Saul building and this will be overseen by a security officer. We have introduced these new arrangements to ensure that Synod is a safe and welcoming place.

In recent years Synod worship has developed in such a way that it is no longer sustainable for a member to oversee this and attend properly to their Synodical duties. The Archbishops have therefore appointed a non-Synod member to act as our Honorary Chaplain. GS Misc 1121 introduces the Revd Michael Gisbourne from Blackburn who will take up his role from November. He will be attending part of this Synod, so please look out for him and welcome him over the next few days.

On your behalf I want to thank the Revd Canon Gavin Kirk who has helped establish our Continuous Praying Presence and initiated the separate worship space at York. The new Chaplain will be building on your work, Gavin, and we are enormously grateful to you. These changes have been part of the broader work to "Change the Culture of General Synod" summarised in GS Misc 1117.

I would like to thank those of you who attended our fringe meeting last year and those who continue to offer reflections and further ideas no doubt in a few moment's time. This is ongoing work in which the Committee welcomes your continuing engagement. There will be plenty for a new Business Committee to take forward from November. In particular I would like to thank those members of the Committee who have indicated their retirement – Sue Johns, Charles Razzall and Christina Rees – and thank them and our fantastic staff team for their commitment and hard work.

For some this is the last Synod but it is only just beginning. We have significant business to attend to, the Synod Revue to enjoy and plenty of farewells to make. I pray that together we will also begin to look ahead to an exciting and challenging period for the Church of England and our Synod as we commit ourselves to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

I beg to move that Synod do take note of this report.

*The Chair:* I am going to move straightaway to a three minute speech limit. Members will know that it is in order for a member to refer to a matter which is not on the Agenda which they believe should be on the Agenda, but whether the matter is on the Agenda or not, the speaker should not get into the substance of the subject but should confine themselves to the place on the Agenda or otherwise.

*Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn):* Chair, I believe there used to be a convention that we did not take legislative business on a Sunday. This seems to have been broken. I think it was broken some years ago when we were very short of time. It is the Lord's Day, we should mark it in some way by doing something different, so I would ask the Business Committee in future to try and avoid or in fact to avoid putting legislative business on a Sunday. There is also a practical problem that some northern clergy return to their parishes to take their services on a Sunday morning and may not be back if we are doing legislation on a Sunday afternoon.

Secondly, I want to refer to the debate on *Towards a Common Vision*, the World Council of Churches' document. We did not have copies of this document except by electronic link. I would argue that if it is important enough to discuss, which it certainly is, then members ought to have been provided with hard copies in advance so they could be read more conveniently than by an electronic link.

*Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry):* Thank you, Chair. This is the last meeting of this quinquennium, so what does our Agenda say to anyone thinking of standing for General Synod? I have identified three lessons I would like to be answered.

Lesson one: motions. Despite over a hundred people signing a motion in February 2012 to affirm the Church's current teaching on Christian marriage, there will be no debate. Not allowing this Synod to debate this motion is undemocratic. Many with wisdom are leaving us. What a lost opportunity to have heard what they had to say. So lesson one, do not come to Synod thinking your voice will be heard or the rules will be followed.

Lesson two: questions. Despite the Business Committee Report, GS 1988, saying that the new format of Questions was a success in February, the reality is, as we can see from the answers to questions already provided, you can only ask a question if it is phrased in a particular way, questions are often not answered and there is rarely enough time to get your question in anyway. So lesson two, it is unlikely you will get a straight answer, if any answer at all.

Finally, lesson three: issues that we should debate. On Saturday we are going to spend the morning speaking to each other when we could be speaking to the nation. We could be debating an important issue, for example the Budget: clergy will be losing £1,500 a year; Sunday trading hours are due to change; and there is going to be an unjust effect on the poor. We have missed an opportunity to talk about the Church's response.

I did ask this to form part of the Agenda, although understandably the Archbishops refused my request, and I accept their Graces' decision, but I would ask the Business Committee in future to maybe look to develop a timetable of debates which align with important national issues.

Finally, we are ending early but I do wonder why we did not discuss important issues, such as the very limited time we had in the last debate, we did not discuss that in enough detail and I do not understand why we are finishing early when actually that could have come to this Synod. I would like to understand why it did not come to this Synod because we are cutting £2 million from the poorest in our parishes.

So lesson three, we have got to fight in order to make sure this place just does not rubberstamp issues, we have got to scrutinise things and we need time to do that. Thank you, Chair.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* Three very brief points. First, to thank the Business Committee for allowing Oxford and Birmingham dioceses to produce background papers and just to let you know that they are GS Misc 1113 and 1114. If you could possibly get a chance to read those before Monday you would find it most helpful.

Turning over to paragraph 70 of the Business Committee Report on page 11, Synod members may also wish to comment further on GS Misc 1094. I think it is a great shame that the proposal that there should be fewer days for Synod meetings in future has not been debated by Synod. It should not have been a GS Misc paper; it should have been a GS paper that was debated.

Thirdly, turning right over to the plan for February 2016 on page 12, possible report on Chaplaincy. Chaplaincy is one of the growth areas of the Church. The recent Theos report shows how there are more chaplains and more chaplains are doing more things. So much of the Church's Reform and Renewal programme is about the decline and reversing that. In Chaplaincy we do not need to reverse anything, we just need to keep our foot on the accelerator. It is extraordinary that reform and renewal has not yet mentioned Chaplaincy at all in any of its reports. Thank you.

*Mr Tom Sutcliffe (Southwark):* No doubt churchy stuff, worship and group work is what the people of England think Christians are all about, but I do not think prayer and the Bible will add much that matters to our very mundane Agenda this time. Parliament has prayers at the start of each day, but on the evidence I would say the Holy Spirit prefers not to be disturbed by most of our attempts to get things straight. Our Church shrinks in spite of women in Holy Orders and the added perceptions we hope they bring. Few show much interest in what the Church or General Synod does or thinks, except when they are happy to see the Church making a bit of 21<sup>st</sup> Century sense. Private piety is fine but communal, public, self-conscious piety could be overdone in Jesus' time and he spoke against it.

I will not attend group work about the environment. I do not need to know that some fellow members have different reasons for supporting or opposing carbon capture or appropriate taxes or misuse of subsidies. The Church has little locus and no power in these areas. The story of Noah is about animals surviving the Flood. Many creatures will not survive the current plague of excess humanity about which the Bible speaks with forked tongue.

I think the Bible does not tell us exactly what God must be assumed to want, any more than Shakespeare plays tell you what Shakespeare thought. The challenge of seeking and understanding is always fresh. Most Christians well understand what Church is about



without any complex theology at all. This is still called the General Synod but George Carey's reformed, top-down, centralised structure has had little impact on those who prefer to give the Church a miss. It is all geared to the converted. General Synod debates and our vanished autonomy are, I believe, a vital way to develop the kind of narrative that impresses and can involve the non and semi-Christian population around us all. That is why I dislike all our public relations exercises; these presentations aiming to get us into line.

The General Synod can be an effective tool of mission if it gets across to the people of England the sorts of discourse which show how the Church's mind is now working and can have real usefulness for everybody. We live in an age of public relations and bossiness. That should not be what General Synod is mostly about, but I fear it is.

The Synod is no longer at all user-friendly for lay people. That is what I conclude after 25 years. It has changed radically and not for the better. What has grown out of Archbishop Davidson's Church Assembly does not need to be more churchy. It needs to be more like life as it is understood out there in the highways and byways. The Church, I fear, is reflecting the worst aspects of contemporary life. It is all about leadership we are told but the communal leadership of parish life should be the model, not the so-called professionalism that fills acres of depressing advice to clergy at the grass roots. The pastoral is personal; Church is personal, or it is nothing.

*Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark):* Mr Chairman, I refer to paragraph 64 of GS 1988 which introduces GS Misc 1111 entitled 'Record of Business Done in 2010-2015 Quinquennium'. I am grateful to Business Committee for compiling this record. It goes some way to meeting the request I made in November 2013 and again in February 2014 and in associated correspondence with a reluctant Business Committee. My aim was that the accountability of the Archbishops' Council to General Synod could be enhanced by a systematic monitoring of actions requested by Synod and the responses that are made.

On the first page of GS Misc 1111, the Chair of the Business Committee poses a choice for the incoming Committee to consider. I believe that the right choice would be to maintain an ongoing list updated prior to each group of sessions and with the updates highlighted, rather than simply to produce another end of quinquennium report in 2020. Only that choice would assist Synod members in their scrutiny of action taken following Synod decisions. I further believe that this kind of reporting is too important to be left to the discretion of the Business Committee. I have made a suggestion to the Standing Orders Committee that SO 115(e) be amended to add a requirement for the Business Committee to report to the Synod at each group of sessions on the status of Synod decisions that have not yet been implemented in full. I ask this proposal be carried over for consideration by the incoming committees.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, can I make a motion for closure after the next speaker?

*The Chair:* You certainly can. Otherwise I will be in trouble. Mr Sugden, if you could be as brief as you can, that would be wonderful.

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* Chair, members of Synod, on a current matter of public interest, Charles Clarke and Linda Woodhead's report on *Religion and Belief in Schools* envisages a new centralised national syllabus to replace the myriad of locally agreed syllabuses. Syllabuses have in the past been locally determined because the appropriate content of religious education is contested, not least depending on the community context of the school. Those contested areas may be addressed by allowing significant choices within the syllabus, but the proposers feel able to recommend that the rights of parents to withdraw their children from the religious education part of this curriculum should be abolished.

This proposal would have something of a Kafkaesque feel if the centralised Government syllabus were to be highly prescriptive. It also conflicts with Catholic social teaching which sees the natural parents as the primary educators of their children, and especially so in the areas of faith, virtue and values. Their pamphlet refers to "British values" and recommends that all students are educated about religion as accurately as possible and in a way that reflects the overall values of our society, but what are these and who decides?

Helpful here are the Queen's words at Lambeth Palace on the celebration of the 50<sup>th</sup> year of her accession. She said: "... the [established] 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. Woven into the fabric of this country, the Church has helped to build a better society - more and more in active co-operation for the common good with those of other faiths."

Synod, religious freedom is the foundation of all freedoms. The state has no business telling the Church what it may teach (see Magna Carta) and no business curtailing the religious freedom of parents. An essential part of freedom is the right to be wrong. We should stand for this in religious education. Thank you, Chair.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

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

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

*The Chair:* I call on the Chair of the Business Committee to reply to the debate. You have until 4.40 since you said we had to finish by then.

*Revd Canon Susan Booy (Oxford):* This is definitely a sprint and not a marathon. Thank you, everyone, for your contributions. Mr Benfield, we were conscious about business on Sunday and we will do our best in future. Mr Margrave, I think our Agenda says that we are concerned about the environment and that is of concern to everybody. Mr Lee, Reform and Renewal is an ongoing process. Your comments will have been heard and there will be other places to make them. Mr Sutcliffe, we are going to miss you, but

meeting together for prayer and study and unfolding the Bible about the environment as we intend doing under the guidance of Paula Gooder on Monday morning is something that Christians have done since the earliest times and we believed it was the right thing to do. I am tempted to quit while I am ahead; it is still amber. So thank you for your comments, Ms Gnanadoss, about the record of business done. We do plan to update it regularly and we look forward to discussing your proposal made to the Standing Orders Committee further.

*The motion*

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

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

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 4.41 pm

### **Appointment to the Archbishops’ Council (GS 1989)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 5, the appointment of a new member to the Archbishops’ Council. Members will need GS 1989, a single sheet of A4, for this item. The text of the motion is given on the front of Order Paper I. The motion will be moved by the Archbishop of Canterbury and so I now call on His Grace to move the motion. He has up to ten minutes.

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

*‘That the appointment of Mr Matthew Frost for a term ending on 31 July 2020 be approved.’*

Thank you, Chairman. When the Synod was debating the legislation to establish the Archbishops’ Council in 1998, which many of you will remember well, it agreed that ten of the 19 places should be filled through Synodical elections. Three, the Archbishops and the First Church Estates Commissioner, should be *ex officio* and six should be for the Archbishops to appoint with the approval of the Synod. 17 individuals have served in these six appointed roles at different times since 1999, each of them bringing distinctive skills and experience to enrich the diversity of the Council.

The five present appointed members are: Mary Chapman, Philip Fletcher, Rosalyn Murphy, John Spence and Rebecca Swinson. We had hoped last year to fill the vacancy left by Professor John Craven, who had come to the end of his term of office in 2013, but decided against making an appointment at that time. After a new process, we have found the choice this time round altogether easier.

GS 1989 sets out Matthew Frost’s varied and interesting career in the private sector, in government and most recently as Chief Executive of Tearfund, from which he is shortly to step down. The Archbishop of York and I, and those who advised us on the

appointment, believe that we are fortunate to have secured someone with Matthew's skills, experience and deep Christian commitment for membership of the Archbishops' Council. He will be incisive, passionate, thoughtful; and seldom comfortable. As we continue through a period of significant change and development, his knowledge and wisdom will be invaluable resources. I commend the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, your Grace. Item 5 is now open for debate but I see no-one standing so I put the motion at Item 5 to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the appointment of Mr Matthew Frost for a term ending on 31 July 2020 be approved.'*

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

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Ven Karen Gorham (Oxford)* took the Chair at 3.44 pm

## **51<sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Orders Committee (GS 1991)**

*The Chair:* We come now to the next item on the Agenda but before we do that just a notice to say that the text of the Archbishop of York's address is available from the Information Desk should anyone like a copy.

We come now to the 51<sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Order Committee for which you will need paper GS 1991 and the First Notice Paper. This is the first of three items of business at this group of sessions relating to the Standing Orders. In this item the Synod will be asked to approve several changes relating to Standing Orders governing Question Time. If carried the proposed amendments will take effect immediately so as to apply to the Question Time to be held in our evening sitting.

There have been no amendments giving notice and no member has indicated that they wish to speak against one or more of the motions so I give my permission for the motions to be taken *en bloc*. I call therefore upon Mr Geoffrey Tattersall, Chair of the Standing Orders Committee, to move the motions for the amendments of the Standing Orders of Items 29 to 44 in the First Notice Paper.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester):* The Standing Orders Committee is but the servant of the Synod and its role is, as set out in the current Standing Order 117C, to keep under review the procedures and Standing Orders of Synod and to submit to the Synod such proposals for amendment as they may think fit and to report to the Synod on all such proposals. Unhappily for you, this is going to require me to come to this lectern three times, for which I apologise.

The first relates to Items 29 to 44 on the First Notice Paper relating to questions and it is obviously important that we deal with this before Question Time this evening. The

individual amendments may look formidable but in truth they are not. Synod will remember that at the February group of sessions we trialed a new format for Synod Questions in which the answers were no longer given orally, but the current Standing Orders required the person answering the question to refer to the question which had already been circulated before we moved on to the supplementaries. As Sue Booy said, you will remember the oft-repeated refrain of “I refer to my answer set out in the question paper”. The purpose of these amendments will avoid the need for the person answering a question to refer to the answer already circulated to members in the booklet containing questions and answers before they take any supplementary questions. This is something which the Business Committee believes will be hugely desirable, and so do we.

The Standing Orders Committee thus brings forward these amendments to the Standing Orders which will achieve that result by replacing the current arrangements with ones whereby a written reply to every question for answer at a group of sessions must be circulated in advance rather than being given orally. You will see that Item 32 requires the circulation of the questions and answers no later than one clear day before the Question Time.

In this way we hope that Question Time will be limited to the asking and answering of supplementary questions and might be better. Madam Chairman, with your leave, I beg to move that in respect of Items 29 to 44 on the Agenda the amendments of the Standing Orders shall be made with immediate effect.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate with a three-minute speech limit. I see no-one standing, so I put Items 29 to 44 to the vote.

*The motions (First Notice Paper) were put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* It is clearly carried and these amendments will be made with immediate effect. That ends this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 4.40 pm

## **Legislative Business: Amending Canon No 35 (GS 1964D)**

*The Chair:* I have just been told that this is a moment of great solemnity so please look suitably solemn. That was not good enough! We come now to the legislative business. We begin with the enactment of Amending Canon No. 35 which received final approval from the Synod at the February 2015 group of sessions. I have to report to the Synod that the Royal Assent and Licence to make, promulge and execute the Amending Canon has been given. Under Standing Order 66, once the Instrument of Enactment has been read to the Synod, the motion appearing in the Order Paper as Item 500 must be put to the Synod and voted on without debate. I therefore call upon the Registrar to read the Instrument of Enactment.

*The Registrar read the Instrument of Enactment.*

*The Chair:* I beg to move:

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 35” be made, promulgated and executed’.

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

*The Instrument of Enactment was signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.*

*The Chair:* The Canon will now be sent for proclamation in the diocesan synods in the usual way. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Michael Clarke (Worcester)* took the Chair at 4.55 pm

### **Legislative Business: Administration of Holy Communion Regulations (GS 1992)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 501 for which you will need GS 1992 and GS 1992X. First, the Bishop of Sodor and Man will move Item 501. This will provide an opportunity to make general comments about the regulations or to raise specific points which do not relate to the amendment at Item 513 on the Order Paper. We will then move to the amendment at Item 513. Members who do wish to comment on the amendment should not do so on Item 501; they should reserve their comments until this part of the business. I start, colleagues, by calling on the Bishop of Sodor and Man to move Item 501 standing in his name. You have ten minutes, Bishop.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* I beg to move:

‘That the Administration of Holy Communion Regulations be considered.’

Eight little words of considerable significance. We come now to discuss the Regulations. These draft Regulations give effect to the Diocesan Synod Motion from Southwell and Nottingham which was passed by the Synod in November 2012. In passing that motion the Synod agreed that it should be possible for authorization to be given to any regular communicant, including baptized but unconfirmed children admitted to Holy Communion, under the Regulations made by the Synod in 2006.

The Synod also agreed that the existing Regulation should be altered so that, provided the bishop agrees, decisions about who is authorized to distribute the sacrament can be taken locally by the incumbent, priest-in-charge (or during a vacancy the rural dean) with the support of the PCC. In the case of school Eucharists where it is desired to authorize a child to administer communion, the support of the head teacher rather than the PCC is required.

Regulations could not be brought forward to achieve this until an amendment had been made to Canon B 12 to enable Regulations to provide that authorization could be granted

by a person other than the bishop or his commissary. Since amending Canon No. 35, the eight significant words, has now been promulgated, it is possible for these Regulations to be considered. The draft Regulations before you make the changes to authorization to distribute the sacrament that were requested by the original Southwell and Nottingham Diocesan Synod Motion in 2012. These provisions are unchanged from the illustrative draft which was circulated to members of Synod with the Explanatory Memorandum to Amending Canon No. 35.

However, in addition to these changes, I should draw Synod members' attention to some additions which have been made in response to comments made by members of Synod on that illustrative draft. The first change is that Regulation 5 allows the bishop to impose conditions on an authorization or to specify the circumstances in which it might be used. This amendment was suggested to enable a bishop to ensure that incumbents should not make unreasonable use of their power to authorize appropriate people to distribute the sacrament.

The second change was occasioned by a comment pointing out that the illustrative draft Regulations made no provision for authorizing lay people to distribute the sacrament in cathedrals or in other non-parochial contexts such as guild churches. The Legal Office concluded that the absence of provision for cathedrals was an oversight in the original Regulations of 1969. However, the admission of baptized children to the Holy Communion Regulations of 2006 apply, by virtue of paragraph 11, to cathedrals as they apply to parishes. The draft Regulations therefore enable the dean of a cathedral with the consent of the chapter to authorize lay people to distribute the sacrament in the cathedral.

The 2006 Regulations do not apply to guild churches. Nevertheless, it seemed desirable to include provision for guild churches in these draft Regulations because in the absence of a provision it would not be possible for lay members of guild church congregations, whether they are adults or children, to be authorized to distribute the Holy Communion and there seems to be no justification for excluding guild churches from provision for lay participation.

The House of Bishops at its meeting in December agreed that the Regulation should not be extended any further because it is hard to see how there could be a guarantee of appropriate checks on the suitability of individuals for authorization beyond the settings provided for by the Regulations. For example, in the context of the bishop's mission order there is no equivalent of a parochial church council or guild church council to provide a check and balance on the leader of the mission order.

One further proposal for amendment was received, namely that only those who have been confirmed should be authorized to distribute the sacrament. This would have reverted to the existing provision under the 1969 Regulations and would have undermined the motion passed by the Synod in November 2012 and the views of the House of Bishops when the draft Regulations were discussed. Therefore, no change was made in response to that proposal.

Members will also have seen that there is an amendment to the Regulations on the Order Paper in the name of Mr Nick Harding. The amendment clarifies that confirmed children,

or children who are ready for confirmation, as well as those admitted under the 2006 Regulations, are also included in the class of those who are authorized to distribute the sacrament. I will be happy to accept the amendment when we come to that debate. I, therefore, move, "That the Administration of Holy Communion Regulations be considered".

*The Chair:* Thank you, Bishop. We are now open for debate on Item 501. Would those wishing to speak stand.

*Mr Adrian Vincent (Guildford):* The Business Committee report says that this item is about, "Regulations to allow the administration of Holy Communion by children." Superficially, that is what it is about, but theologically it is about regulations to allow the administration of Holy Communion by those who have not been confirmed. This change is the logical consequence of the decision of Synod ten years ago that permitted a change in the traditional order of the journey of Christian initiation of Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist to instead allow a different order of Baptism, Eucharist, Confirmation.

This is not an order of events I personally feel theologically comfortable with, but we are a big Church and it is an honourable order. Dorothy, my wife, is a Roman Catholic and last month I proudly walked behind our then 7 year-old son, Peter (he turned 8 this week) down the aisle of the church as he received his first Holy Communion in the Catholic Church. In that church the role of administering the Eucharist is given the title of "Eucharistic Minister". It is quite a good description of the role. By this Synod voting to enable those baptized but not confirmed to take this official role in the Church, we are indicating that baptism and Eucharist are full initiation. With each such step we take, the question, "What is the point of confirmation?", becomes increasingly difficult to answer.

*Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities):* When I complete marriage registers I have an unenviable task of trying to fit in the extra parochial place of Durham Castle in the "in the parish of" bit in the top of the register. For those of us who minister in college chapels, school chapels and other such contexts, many of us are without the usual parish structures. I do not have very many children in my college chapel but I do have a number of people who in different ways regularly join in with administering communion. Some of them are confirmed, some of them are confirmed in other churches and some of them are not confirmed. We encourage them all. While we are sorting out regulations and guidelines here, would there be possibility for amendment that would include those of us who are in such contexts and our liturgical practice, please? Thank you.

*Mr Elliot Swatridge (Church of England Youth Council):* When Jesus instituted the first celebration of the Eucharist during the Last Supper, his words were simple, "Do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22: 19). "Do this" includes the whole act of communion, both the giving and receiving. In this characteristically simple statement he instructed the entire body of his disciples to participate in not only the receipt but also the administration of communion. Note that Jesus did not state, "Do this but never administer it unless you have been ordained". Neither did he state, "Do this but only if you are over 18 years of age". He did not even state, "Do this but only when you have got a bishop's approval". The entirety of the teaching on Holy Communion in the New Testament gives no specific limitations about who can conduct the sacrament, simply that it must be done with



recognition and respect. There is no evidence in the Bible that a person who is not ordained is not able to respect the magnitude and significance of the Eucharist. As such, I welcome wholeheartedly the recent developments in past Synod sessions and the present sitting which provide more flexibility for the administration of communion to be participated in by a wider audience and notably by children. It is again Jesus who rebuked the disciples for turning children away, instead commending them especially highly, saying, "The Kingdom of God belongs to such as these". If the Kingdom belongs especially to children, then surely they are most qualified out of everyone for ministry. It removes obstacles that are not biblically justifiable or, more precisely, not even spoken about in the Bible.

Such obstacles often result in communion becoming more of a spoken ritual, guided by intensely strict principles than a meaningful encounter with the living God. It also gives additional hope to parishes with vacancies that the lack of an ordained minister does not need to signify complete loss of the communion service or a lengthy and complicated process of authorization. As such, I support the spirit of the Administration of the Holy Communion Regulations 2015 and I urge Synod to continue its laudable support of these reformations which make the administration of the most communal of sacraments genuinely accessible to all, as I strongly believe Jesus intended. Thank you.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes

*Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells)*: I am rejoiced to see this here today. Those of you with long memories will know that I have been banging on about this sympathetically ever since it first appeared from the Diocese of Southwell and Nottingham, and it was particularly concerned with children at that point. What we have now is something wider and I commend entirely the gentleman before last, whose name I did not catch - I apologise to you, Sir -- who said our theology of confirmation is a bit of a mess, or words to that effect, because it is. However, we are where we are. We are fighting our way through a lot of trees and we are currently dealing with who can administer the sacrament in a parish church.

I want to simply ask a question to which there may not yet be an answer, but the Bishop may be able to give us one. When these devolved powers (which is effectively what they are) are given to incumbents or archdeacons or whoever it is who is the person whom has authority, is there going to be any paperwork? I ask that question simply as a Bishop's chaplain we spend a lot of time in bishops' offices, receiving requests from parishes, preparing certificates for people to administer the sacrament in parishes. I think it is a waste of time. I have said so several times in this Synod and I am jolly glad we are getting rid of it. But if the incumbent or the archdeacon or, in some cases, a rural dean, is going to give permission, with the PCC's assent, to Mrs Bloggs or Mr Smith to administer the sacrament either in one parish or across a benefice or whatever, who is going to know what is going to be the equivalent of that rather nice certificate stuck up on the vestry wall, which at the moment is what we have? So I am all in favour of this. It is just a little administrative detail that might need some guidance from the House of Bishops at some point. Thank you.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London)*: I just wanted to attempt an answer to Mr Vincent's question, which suggests that somehow by admitting unconfirmed children to communion or

allowing them to administer the sacrament undermines the need or importance of confirmation. I want to suggest there are three vital roles for confirmation that have nothing whatever to do with it being the gateway to communion.

The first is that it is vital that those who have been baptized as infants should have an opportunity publicly to affirm their commitment to Christ before the whole Church and before the Bishop as the embodiment of the wider Church. Secondly, it is essential, it seems to me, to give an opportunity for every Christian, either at the beginning of their adult lifetime or when they have recently become Christians, to have prayer for what confirmation really means, which is making strong, prayer for the empowerment of the Holy Spirit. Again, the role of the bishop in praying for the Spirit's power on lay people seems to be a very important part of the affirmation of lay ministry. Thirdly, connected with that, the value of confirmation as a form of commissioning for lay ministry, for the taking of responsibility, so that we all are able not only to do the things which God has prepared for us to do (which is what Paul tells the Ephesians he has done), but also to have the Church's authority to do it.

So three very important roles for confirmation, I suggest, which fully justify its continuation, perhaps with an older average clientele than it has historically had but which, as I say, has nothing to do with the important access of children both to receive and to administer the sacrament.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

*The Chair:* That has my approval, does it have the approval of Synod?

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

*The Chair:* Bishop, I am not going to give you a number but I would ask you to be as brief as possible.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* Mr Chairman, I had a friend, he is dead now, who was a vicar who used to put his watch on the edge of the pulpit and his children called that, "Dad's most meaningless gesture". Adrian Vincent raised the issue about the distribution of Holy Communion by those who were unconfirmed and raised the whole issue of the Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist pattern, as fully discussed before the Regulations were enacted in 2006.

I simply want to say that I believe that the admission of children to communion before confirmation is theologically strong, educationally wise and practically helpful. Confirmation entirely depends on baptism. There is no meaning to confirmation unless there is baptism. Clive Scowen, I thank you very much for the explanation of confirmation both in its Reformed and Catholic senses and I do not need then to say anything about that. Hannah Cleugh, referring to the college chapel and a possible amendment for ecumenical contexts, firstly the Regulations already significantly extend the circumstances in which lay people can be authorized to distribute Holy Communion. Secondly, the issue with college chapels in particular has already been mentioned. There

is no equivalent of a PCC to provide a check or a balance. Essentially, this is in the hands of the college chaplain. If you are in any doubt refer to Canons B 44 and 44A and you might get some wisdom out of that, or not.

Elliot Swatridge, I have got a lot of sympathy with some of the things you said, but a national Church requires order and discipline. There is a lot in the New Testament which does not provide us with practical details of how to run a church, otherwise the Church would have had nothing to argue about for the last 2000 years. Perhaps we do have too many regulations and I would be very sympathetic with that and I think probably most bishops would too, but we are not going in this debate into the whole question of lay presidency. That is possibly for another time and another place.

Stephen Lynas, thank you, about the devolved powers and the paperwork. We are assuming that incumbents will keep a proper record of who is allowed to distribute Holy Communion and there will be circumstances in which the bishops should know. That is, for instance, when that action is delegated to the head-teacher or the archdeacon or the rural dean in the absence of the incumbent or in place of the incumbent.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 501 to the vote.

*The motion*

*‘That the Administration of Holy Communion Regulations be considered.’*

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

*The Chair:* It having been carried, we now move to the amendment at Item 513 and I call upon Mr Nick Harding to move that amendment which is in his name. He has no more than five minutes.

*Mr Nick Harding (Southwell and Nottingham):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In regulation 4, leave out paragraph (3) and insert “(3) The reference in paragraph (1) to a person who is a regular communicant includes a reference to a child who is neither confirmed nor ready and desirous of being confirmed but is admitted to Holy Communion in accordance with the Admission of Baptised Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006.”’

Thank you, Chair. Members of Synod, this is a minor amendment intended to clarify a small point in the Regulations. As they currently stand, Regulation 4(3) provides that a child may not be authorized unless the child has been admitted to Holy Communion in accordance with the Admission of Baptized Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006. I am absolutely sure, along with my former Bishop who was with us when we started this one and our new bishop, both of them are sitting right in front of me, that was not the intention of the original proposal from Southwell and Nottingham. However, that could be the effect. We could have very strange effects, where children who are confirmed or young people who are confirmed cannot assist at communion. This could lead to that curious outcome if we do not change this legislation.

I am, therefore, proposing this amendment to put the point beyond doubt. The amendment would replace paragraph 4(3) of the Regulations with an alternative paragraph. The new version retains the reference to children admitted under those 2006 Regulations so that it is completely clear that these Regulations apply to them as well as to children who are confirmed. This reflects the original intention of the Diocesan Synod Motion which was passed in 2012 by this Synod and we are grateful for its smooth passage so far. However, it also refers in this amendment to children who are confirmed already and desirous of being confirmed in terms that make it clear that they also are included in the expression, "Regular communicant". The amendment, therefore, ensures that those who may be authorized to administer the chalice at communion include all our young people who are regular communicants. I beg to move this amendment.

*The Chair:* Bishop, you have already given us an indication of your reaction but I need to ask you to do it formally.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* Mr Chairman, I believe this is an important clarification and it is entirely in sympathy with the purposes of what we are doing today.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The debate now continues. Any other contribution? Since I see no member of this Synod standing, I put Item 513 to the vote.

*This amendment was put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* The Regulations now stand referred to the House of Bishops under Article 7 of the Constitution of the General Synod. That, thus, concludes the item of business. Thank you very much indeed.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallet (Southwark)* took the Chair at 5.24 pm

## **Presentation on behalf of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and the National Investing Bodies**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 6, the presentation on behalf of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and the National Investing Bodies. After the presentation, if there is sufficient time, we will take some questions, of course allowing time for the panel to respond. I call now upon Mr James Featherby, the Revd Canon Professor BurrIDGE and Dr Jonathan Spencer to make their presentations.

*Mr James Featherby (Chair, Ethical Investment Advisory Group):* Good afternoon and thank you very much indeed for inviting us to present our climate policy to Synod.

The image you see on the screen is from the cover of this year's EIAG Annual Review that was sent to Synod members along with a full copy of our policy. It is a striking image, as indeed is the quote from Psalm 24: 1-2. In my remarks this afternoon as Chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group I would like to address our policy development process and its key recommendations, including some comments on the debate between divestment and engagement.

The Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige, Dean of King's College London, and Deputy Chair of the EIAG, will address the biblical and theological thinking that has underpinned our policy. Dr Jonathan Spencer, Chairman of the Pensions Board, will describe how the National Investing Bodies are already implementing it. Then, assuming we stick to script, we should have around 30 minutes for questions.

As you may know, the role of the EIAG is to provide Christian ethical advice consistent with the mission and witness of the Church to help inform and shape the investment decisions of the Church's National Investing Bodies.

As Synod members will be aware, the EIAG does not provide financial advice to the investing bodies. Instead in developing the climate policy we had three different starting points. First of all, we reflected in depth on the biblical and theological position. Our second starting point was evidential – what does the science say? Thirdly, a pragmatic starting point – in an imperfect world, what is the best ethical response for the National Investing Bodies with their ability to act and speak both as part of the witness and mission of the Church, and as significant institutional investors?

We consulted widely as part of our policy development process, including many voices from all sides within the Church, as well as leading economic and environmental experts outside the Church. We were grateful to those such as Lord Stern who were willing to speak with us and who reinforced our own understanding that climate change and global poverty are dual priorities that must be evaluated and tackled together. The connections are spiritual and social and not just political and economic.

We reached three conclusions that served to guide the development of our specific policy recommendations. The first was that the key task is an urgent but orderly transition to a low carbon economy. However, it is essential that we do not in the process make poverty alleviation and sustainable development impossible for the hundreds of millions who still have inadequate access to energy. Fossil fuels are not tobacco we concluded. We do not need tobacco but we do need energy, and it is not helpful, or frankly ethical, to ask the world to turn off its supply of gas tomorrow morning. Low income countries will not give support in Paris if we do not support their needs for economic growth.

Secondly, whilst it is right to disinvest from coal and oil sands as the most polluting fuels, the most significant additional ethical contribution the NIBs could make as Church investors is to engage with major fossil fuel producers and users, but to do so with a clear option to disinvest in due course if companies are not responsive to the need to transition. Just as importantly, of course, engagement does not stop with the companies. It also requires engagement with public policy makers.

Thirdly, we concluded we needed a flexible policy. The policy needed to set a clear direction of travel but be flexible enough to be responsive to changing facts on the ground. We concluded it would be a mistake to be overly-prescriptive. This is particularly important given the need to leverage our voice by working with others as national and international norms and benchmarks are developed.

I have summarised on the slide the key points of our policy. You have the full details in your Synod materials. I believe they strike the right balance between aspiration and practical action.

I would like to focus my closing comments on the two issues of divestment and engagement.

We concluded that immediate divestment from all fossil fuel companies was not the best ethical response for the NIBs. This was for two reasons. First of all, there is no simple one to one correlation between our divestment and a low carbon economy. Secondly, divestment would leave the NIBs with no voice in the debate. We concluded that that was a wasted opportunity, especially given the particular voice of the Church and its potential to work with other responsible shareholders.

On engagement, why do we think that it may bear fruit? Our policy is not produced in a vacuum. We are now feeding into a very different and evolving political environment with a huge weight of opinion and regulatory support for making the kind of transition that we are all looking for. I would like to make a slightly broader point here too. It is a mistake in my view to get locked into a debate about whether it is divestment versus engagement or even about the effectiveness of engagement. There is no argument about the seriousness and the urgency of the problem, but to focus on these two issues alone runs the risk of diverting all of us from the many other solutions that need to be brought to bear by society at large. To name but a few: investment in R&D, better energy efficiency, improved urban design, affordable energy for the poor, and a willingness amongst all of us to pay a price for the carbon that is implicit in all of our consumption.

It is the whole of our economy, and the social priorities of all of us, that need re-engineering. An over-focus on the speed of divestment and the effectiveness of engagement, good though those things may be, would lead to poor policy making because they are not the only important issues.

In summary, I believe we have the right ethical policy for the National Investing Bodies. I believe it makes a strong moral statement, and I believe it supports the National Investing Bodies well in their determination to be at the forefront of institutional investors addressing the challenge of the transition to a low carbon economy.

Following the launch of the policy there was considerable coverage and comment. The overwhelming consensus has been that the right balance has been struck, that this is a thoughtful policy and that the real work starts now in implementing it. I would now like to ask Richard to address the biblical and theological reflections that underpinned the policy.

*Revd Canon Prof. Richard BurrIDGE (Universities):* Thank you very much indeed, James. Members of Synod know that I like to refer to papers and I am talking to GS Misc 1110, the policy and the supporting document, if you do not have it, you can look it up later. But I am going to try to explain to you something of the biblical and theological reflections which we took part in for about two years and which were the drivers behind our work.

What we did was to try to look at the key doctrines of the Christian faith as evidenced in scripture. I begin though with a quotation from the policy that humankind has a divinely

mandated responsibility for the physical world itself, for its creatures and for one another, the weakest and the least. I hope you will see that those concerns drive everything that we are doing. I am summarising GS Misc 1110 sections 2 and 3, the biblical and theological reflections.

Therefore, we must begin, as Christian faith and the Bible begins, with the doctrine of Creation. We looked extensively at the beginning of the Book of Genesis. God saw all that he had made and behold it was very good, and that he placed human beings to till it and to keep it, and the story of the naming of the animals as an example of the stewardship of human beings to care for the Creation. I was fortunate to go to Malawi recently along with the Bishop of Salisbury, courtesy of Christian Aid, to look at the way in which climate change was impacting upon some of the poorest there.

This is a picture looking across Chikwawa province coming down from the Shire Mountains. I think it is a beautiful picture of God's creation. But you can also see what happens to mountains when there are no trees in the foreground with a very large plain that sweeps away to Mozambique. Genesis 2: 1 and 2 takes us into Genesis 3, human sin and the abuse of Creation, the story of the Fall. Of course, there is a great debate among biblical scholars about the words used for "dominion" and "subdue" in the beginning of Genesis and the important article in 1967 by White laid the roots of the ecological crisis at the biblical understanding of dominion or domination. I am very glad that Dr Gooder's notes for the Bible study on Monday have raised the question of those Hebrew verbs.

This is just a step back from where I took the previous picture and it shows the way in which human sin and the abuse of Creation functions at a number of levels. Our industrial development and climate change have changed the rainfall pattern so the rains no longer fall at the same time every year that they used to. That is a historical consequence of the industrial development. On the other hand, the Government of Malawi has given logging contracts which have taken away a lot of the forests on the high ground, and those who are poor and have no heat and light cut down trees and turn them into charcoal. Here, you can see these charcoal bags, they will keep you going for about a month and cost you less than a pound. An entire tree will only raise something in the order of £6. Without those trees, the topsoil will not survive. When the rains come, they wash all the topsoil away and then the flooding down on the plains is extraordinary.

That is structural sin, governmental sin and ordinary human sin and the abuse of Creation. But the story does not end there, the biblical story takes us into election, incarnation and atonement. It is a story where God does not give up on his world. We have, of course, the story of him saving people from the flood in Noah, the whole of the history of the call and election of a chosen people, Israel, to bring God's light to the world. Then finally, the ultimate step where God enters into our world in the incarnation of Jesus Christ, of course beautifully described as the Word of God in John 1. St Paul talks of the way in which in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself. If anyone is in Christ there is a new *Ktisis*, a new Creation, all things have passed away and He has passed the ministry of reconciliation on to us.

In the hospital chapel in Lilongwe we found this extraordinary crucifix of the crucified Jesus hanging on the arms of the risen Lord, the recognition that the path to resurrection

leads through suffering and crucifixion. Therefore, we live between the times. The whole basis of Christian ethics is that we are living between the resurrection of Christ on the one hand and the final judgment of all. Of course, the pot and the fire are often symbols throughout the prophets of the judgment of God. St Paul talks of the eager longing and groaning of Creation for consummation in Romans 8 (another passage we will be looking at on Monday morning) and the time to wake from sleep in Romans 13. If we are to live between the times we need on the one hand to recognise we are in the real world where we need to mitigate damage and also to enable the poor and the vulnerable to develop. So instead of people cutting down trees and having an open fire which gets through huge amounts of firewood, Christian Aid has helped them develop these stoves which, as you can see, use a very limited amount of fuel. It is still burning wood. It is burning a lot less fuel and it feeds a lot more people. It is an example of trying to mitigate the damage and move things forward, an example of what it means to live between the times.

We also spent quite a bit of time looking at the biblical and theological understandings of stewardship, business and creativity. In our report we looked at the call to simpler lifestyles throughout the Christian Church, obviously St Francis and the religious orders. We looked at the doctrines of what it means to be co-creators with God and how creativity has a role to play in development, particularly in the shift to low carbon economy, and James referred just now to R&D. We are looking for renewable energy sources. One of the extraordinary things that we found in many villages were these small solar panels. They are being used to charge mobile phones. Mobile phones have been issued to the main leaders in many villages. In fact, the majority of the headmen of the villages we found were actually women, and certainly 85% of those in the village banking system were women, I thought that was a very interesting lesson for us. But on those mobile phones they can now be sent messages from the rain gauges up in the hills: "There has been rain; there is good water; now is a good time to plant your crops" or, "Actually, there is quite a lot of water coming, you better move back", or "Run like hell, the floods are coming". Without any electricity, without any National Grid, the only way they can charge the mobile phones, of course, is with things like these solar panels. This is a superb example of the leapfrogging that we will need to see in a low carbon economy. But they need the energy at night and the sun shines during the day, and until we can really crack how you can store this and the battery issue, there are going to continue to be enormous problems.

There is a calling to us in stewardship and creativity to work alongside God in doing that. That means we will just need everybody and it is all hands to the pump - and the Bishop of Salisbury is not looking at this point. We had a look at a system for pumping irrigation water out of the river and Bishop Nick showed himself to be sterling pumping away at all hands to the pump, but it does require us all to play our part.

Lastly, of course, no consideration of Christian theology would be finished without the Christian eschatological hope. The whole basis of Christian ethics, and an area of my own writing, is how do we keep to the high demands of Jesus' teaching while following his open example, how do we live in the inevitable tension between the now and the not yet. It is that mixture of the now and the not yet between the high aspirations and living in the real world that is driving our recommendations of a mixture of disinvestment from the worst polluting and engagement with the companies with the threat of further



disinvestment if they will not do anything, but I was attracted by this wonderful roadside barbershop that just reminded us “God can do anything”.

*Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio):* Thank you, James and Richard, and thank you too to the Ethical Investment Advisory Committee for a lot of hard work in developing this updated climate change policy for the National Investing Bodies. I am speaking this evening on behalf of all three of the National Investing Bodies (NIBs), that is the Pensions Board, which I chair, the Church Commissioners and the CBF Church of England Funds.

The NIBs ambition is clear: to be “at the forefront of institutional investors... addressing the challenge of the transition to a low carbon economy” and it details a series of commitments by which this ambition will be fulfilled. We do not make these commitments lightly. Following James’ and Richard’s remarks, I shall focus now on the steps we are already taking to implement the updated policy.

Our commitment, our starting point is recognition of our responsibility to do what we can, as church investors, informed by the witness and mission of the Church, to support the transition to a low carbon world. As custodians of the funds and stewards of endowments we have a responsibility to take a long-term view, in keeping with our fiduciary responsibilities to our various beneficiaries.

The new NIBs policy provides us with four levers to pull. These are: disinvestment; investment; engagement with companies; and engagement with policymakers. This is an ambitious policy and it requires us to pull all four of those levers.

The first lever - disinvestment. Following the adoption of the policy, announced on 1 May, our first action was to implement the commitment to disinvest from the most polluting fossil fuel companies that derive more than 10% of their revenues from thermal coal and oil sands. We therefore announced on the same day the immediate disinvestment of £12 million worth of shares from companies of this type. This disinvestment has sent a strong signal on the moral imperative of an energy transition, while retaining the Church’s ability to engage with the companies we want to see playing their role in the transition to a low carbon future. We have the option to make further disinvestments from companies that do not respond to engagement. The record shows that we are not afraid to do this when necessary.

The second lever is investment. This commitment is both exciting and challenging. Since the adoption of the policy, the NIBs have been considering separately how we may further develop our existing low carbon investments.

For the Pensions Board, as Chairman of the Board I can tell Synod that this is an issue that the Pensions Board see as a strategic priority for the coming year. While the Board does not have at present an explicit low carbon investment mandate, it is open to their consideration as such investments develop and become mainstream. The Board has committed to invest 6% - that is about £90 million - of its growth assets in core, socially useful infrastructure projects. These may include renewable energy projects and investments in networks to make them suitable for locally produced, renewable energy: see Richard’s example of the small solar panels.

For the Church Commissioners, this is also a strategic priority for the first Church Estates Commissioner. At the recent Commissioners AGM he spoke extensively about the opportunities that the Commissioners are seeking to develop. The Commissioners already have some significant low carbon investments, almost £300 million worth of the Commissioners' investment portfolio (just under 5%) qualifies for inclusion in the Low Carbon Investment Registry, and includes investments such as the £250 million of sustainably certified forestry portfolio and the £29 million investment in two green office buildings in Singapore. In addition to the qualifying low carbon investments, the Commissioners have one of their largest mandates, currently valued at £312 million, with Generation Investment Management, which was originally co-founded by the former Vice-President Al Gore, all of whose investments must meet sustainability criteria.

For the CBF Church of England Investment Fund, 2.5% of the capital value is dedicated to investments in renewable energy infrastructure, energy efficiency initiatives, and sustainable timber.

In short, all three NIBs are seriously committed to future low carbon investments and are actively working on how we can do more.

The third lever is engagement with companies. As has already been said, the overall policy is a careful ethical judgment between disinvestment and engagement and a variety of other means. James has already spoken to the underpinning rationale and Richard to the theology. It is clear that we are uniquely placed as the Church of England NIBs to seek to influence the way companies respond to climate change. To achieve this we engage, using the moral power the Church gives us, together with the entry ticket our shareholdings give us.

I want to be clear with Synod, engagement is not the easy option. The easy option is pure disinvestment - do it in a day and walk away, but without further influence over those that will be critical to determining the path to a low carbon future. The harder option is to roll up our sleeves and shift corporate thinking. It is a considerable undertaking that will require additional resource and commitment of time, both of which all three of us gladly make.

The BP and Shell shareholder resolutions co-filed by the Commissioners, ourselves and CBF Funds earlier this year are illustrations of the intensive and firm engagement that will be pursued under the new policy. The resolutions were approved in the event by 98% of shareholders and set a new standard in climate change reporting for major oil and gas companies. As a result, they are now legally required to be much more explicit about the strategic direction of their businesses in the light of climate change, and it is worth noting that shortly after the resolutions were passed, BP and Shell were among the six European oil and gas majors who publicly called for carbon pricing.

These shareholder resolutions are an important step and will form the basis for the next phase of our engagement as we develop a robust engagement framework that will set our engagement aims and objectives. These will build on the success of the Aiming for A shareholder resolutions that I have spoken to. This framework will continue to prioritise our existing partnerships, such as the ecumenical Church Investors' Group, of which the Commissioners, the Pensions Board and CBF are all active members. This is an area

where we gain more leverage by working collaboratively with others rather than just simply seeking to go it alone. It is important to note that this third strand of policy combines the access our shareholdings provide us, with the threat of further disinvestments if those that we engage with do not respond.

The fourth lever is engagement with policymakers. The most effective and efficient way of mitigating climate change is through internationally coordinated public policy working on the demand side as well as the supply side for carbon. As the motion on Monday states, it is essential that we see tangible progress in Paris later this year but also across Europe as well as within the UK. Action that will support the low carbon transition through an effective framework of regulation and taxation, and action too that will support a significant increase in publicly funded R&D aimed at reducing the cost of low carbon energy production below that of fossil fuels, that will then get everyone preferring renewable energy to fossil fuels.

As the National Investing Bodies of the Church of England, and working with our parliamentary representation, we have an obligation to engage in the public policy debate, alongside the other National Church Institutions. We can also help to ensure that the business and investing debate is not unbalanced. It was for this reason that we have already implemented our commitment to finance a new position at the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change. This is the body that represents the views of the investor community and has been a key force that has sought to counter those that still lobby for business as usual.

To conclude, I would like to echo some of what James said at the start. We have, I believe, constructed a serious, carefully balanced and thoughtful approach for the NIBs on climate change that avoids grandstanding - the issue is too important for that. It seeks to play to the particular strengths of the Church of England's ethical position, and in particular our ability to get access and then to get our voice heard in government, in business, and among other investing institutions. We have begun a journey of critical importance, and we look forward to getting the full-hearted support over the next few days of Synod for this ambitious programme of work. Thank you.

*The Chair:* The floor is now open for questions. I am going to take them in groups of three and then give the panel the chance to respond.

*Mr Peter Collard (Derby):* I was just wondering if you have given any thought to the idea that when we buy goods, if they have come from abroad from a high carbon producing country it does not actually help the world. What we should be doing is trying to get goods produced in low carbon producing countries or encouraging those high carbon producing countries to switch their means of production of energy. This could be done possibly by putting taxes on to imports from high carbon producing countries. I was just wondering if any thought has been given to anything of this nature?

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* Migration and climate change. The report, which I have to say I really applaud, I think it is an excellent piece of work, does chart the longer term effects on things like sea level rise and acidity of the seas, but I wonder what analysis has been done on migration of peoples as a result of climate change. For example, current migration from North Africa to Europe is clearly driven by violence and anarchy in those

countries, but as countries become less habitable people will move, so should the analysis not be more prominent, particularly bearing in mind the political sensitivities of unconstrained migration?

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* Thank you again for a superb piece of research and for a very excellent presentation. A particular question to James Featherby. I understand that you have had a career in financial advice and investment advice. Speaking as an investment adviser, and in view of what Sir Mark Carney of the Bank of England said about the risks of stranded assets, would you actually be advising people to invest in oil companies now?

*Mr James Featherby:* Thank you very much. If I may I will answer the last question first. I am afraid I was only a humble lawyer; I never reached the dizzy heights of a financial adviser.

The EIAG has deliberately avoided getting into the discussion of stranded assets. Of course, we are very much aware of that as a background set of arguments but it is not our position to advise the National Investing Bodies on those financial issues.

Turning, if I may, to the other two questions around the problem of us effectively exporting our carbon emissions to other countries and the growing problem of migration, those two issues are an extremely good example of why this is such a complicated issue and why international co-operation and international agreement at Paris is so vital. I am extraordinarily grateful for Synod members raising these sorts of issues and very grateful to receive more of those sorts of issues so that we can feed them into the process of engaging with public policy processes.

One of the most powerful presentations we had when we were consulting was from a retired Minister of the Environment of Benin who showed us a very powerful map, actually very similar to the map that we started with, of the effective desertification on Sub-Saharan Africa and the issue of migration and the problems that caused were very much on our minds.

*Dr Jonathan Spencer:* I would just like to add a quick gloss on Hugh Lee's question about stranded assets. This is obviously something that the Investing Bodies will need to give consideration to. There is not a straightforward answer at the moment and this is revealed very well in a recent report by Mercer, the investment consultants, who are our investment advisers, and they have done a big study on this sort of question with us and with a number of other of their clients. What you get from them is that there are risks for any investment strategy in the face of climate change over the next several decades. If you think that public policy measures will be taken that are strong enough to keep the rise in temperature down to two degrees or less, then eventually there will be significant stranded assets on the part of the major energy extractive industries.

If we are not successful internationally in getting to that sort of policy, then the fuel companies do very nicely and the investments that fail are in agriculture and forestry. The problem that we have at the moment as an investor is one of uncertainty, which is why it is very important that we get to good conclusions in Paris at the end of this year and if they do not go the whole way, which I suspect they may not, then we will need to keep the pressure up to develop that policy further.

*The Chair:* Another group of three questions.

*Mr Peter Hart (Chester):* I am actually going to ask a question that is almost on stranded assets but is the mirror image, because the question is, have renewable investments become very risky investments? The reason I say that is two-fold.

One is that in the Budget that has just been passed - and it is a very local issue here - the green renewable companies have had the Climate Change Levy exemption removed from them and there have been considerable expressions of concern, some of them describing themselves as an already fragile sector. Locally, the largest plc in Yorkshire is Drax. It is a power station that used to use coal and has been transferring over to use wood pellets and they are the standby resource for energy when the sun is not shining and the wind is not blowing. Drax shares as a result of this one policy decision, and I notice that you got £253 million in forestry, went down by 28% overnight. When you put that alongside the fact that the German economy, worried about gas supplies from Russia, have now committed themselves in the long-term to 40% coal-fired electricity, and when you know that in the United States of America the Congress have already indicated that they are not prepared to continue subsidies for these types of industries, is it not in fact the case when you have got to pay clergy pensions, and a lot of other things, it is some of these renewable companies that will have to come under considerable scrutiny as to whether they have the viability and the capacity to achieve the purpose for which you have fiduciary duties?

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Can I add my congratulations to those that we have already had about the policy. There was a huge sense of relief actually amongst those of us who were working in the faith in climate world when the policy came out and we walked a little bit taller, those of us who are members of the Church of England, so thank you very much for that.

The question of the relationship between these issues and the poor has been raised a couple of times. I think I would like to ask James really, given that fossil fuel is currently a relatively cheap form of energy, how can the little that can still be safely burned be reserved for the poor of the world?

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I was intrigued by the concept of “threat” of disinvestment. I just wonder what sort of threat that is. Would not the loss of awkward activist shareholders, like our Investing Bodies, leave most company CEOs and boards singing in their baths? How does it advance our ethical aims to cash in our shares, even in coal and tar sand companies, and so allow our ethical engagement and voice to be removed and replaced by shareholders who are more than happy just to receive the dividends and say and do nothing about the company’s policies and the way it goes about its business? I would be grateful for an indication of why it is thought that the prospect of us selling our shares in any company, however many we hold, given that there is an obvious market for such shares, is any sort of threat.

*Dr Jonathan Spencer:* I am going to have a go at Peter Hart’s question about renewables being too risky. Obviously when any of us make an investment in renewables, as in anything else, we have to make an assessment of both the risk and the reward and see whether the balance is in the right sort of place.

At present, many of the renewable forms of energy generation are expensive compared with fossil fuels and therefore have to be subsidised. In the Drax case it would appear that that subsidy was not locked in effectively enough by the producer in question, but in general subsidy regimes are long-term and they are contractual and the investor therefore takes comfort from that.

The expectation is that over time some, at least, of the renewable technologies will mature in such a way that their costs no longer need subsidy. The judgment that you have to make as an investor is, is the profile of the subsidy (a) sufficiently firm and contractual and (b) of an appropriate duration to the period for which a subsidy will be needed. Yes, there is a risk there, there is a risk with any investment, and we have to apply the usual tools and techniques to assess it.

*Revd Canon Professor Richard Burridge:* I would like to say a few words back to Mr Scowen's very interesting question about the "threat" of disinvestment. I would prefer to use the words "last resort" drawing upon, of course, just war theology that one does everything one can to avoid the sanction first.

By way of example, Clive, to take two of the disinvestments we have done in recent years, it was the case that when we felt that we were getting absolutely nowhere with News Corporation we disinvested from that and, as far as I can tell, Rupert Murdoch has not lost any sleep or any shares as a result. On the other hand, at the same time we were working with Advanta, an Indian extraction company, and getting nowhere in our engagement and then when we disinvested lots of others followed and a substantial portion of the value of that company was wiped off the Stock Exchange. Subsequent to that, they have been in dialogue with us again about cleaning up their act and have tried to get the Church back to invest.

The NIBs have very substantial assets in the investment world, but actually I think it is the case that we have a very moral authority working ecumenically across so many of our other partners. It is more that actually we want to engage with the companies, we wish to see them developing as in the recent shareholder. It was very significant that a number of companies' chief executives contacted us immediately after the publication of the policy and asked to come and talk to us about it and it is our way of trying to help those companies move. That is why we are not going straight to disinvestment because, as you say, that would just leave them alone. The last resort is that if they are not prepared to move then it will become inappropriate for the Church to continue to invest in them.

*Mr James Featherby:* I am going to try to address Giles Goddard's question. First of all, Giles, may we say a huge thank to you for all the work that you have done. This is not meant to be a mutual congratulation society but we are very grateful for the effort that you have put in and the guidance that you have shared with us.

You raise a very, very good question: the remaining fossil fuels that are around and possibly burnable, how do we make sure that the poor are the ones who benefit from that? I would like to answer that question in two parts, one international and one national.

Internationally, we need to make the point very strongly to public policymakers that low income countries need to have equitable access to sustainable energy. That is kind of

close to saying, “We’ve had our turn, now it’s yours”, but of course it is more complicated than that, but the underlying point is allowing low income countries to have good access to sustainable energy.

Nationally, in the UK I think we are going to have to accept that those of us who can afford it are going to have to pay higher prices for energy based on carbon and that we are going to have to pay as well to subsidise those who are struggling to pay for that access, so I am afraid a double-cost for us. This is one of the reasons why, again, this is such a broadly based problem, not one solvable entirely by the National Investing Bodies but a problem that we all need to face up to and address.

*The Chair:* We have time for three more questions.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells):* Again, thank you for the report. Regarding the fourth mechanism of engagement with policy people and the encouragement to R&D, what is being done to ensure that we pre-empt any unintended consequences of new, cleaner technologies? For example, what can we do to prevent any pastoral problems concerning employment and economies in the highly indebted poor countries by the move to higher technology solutions?

*Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough):* A question for the NIBs really. It seems to me that progress will not really be made until green energy becomes cheaper than fossil energy, that is the way the markets work; people will always look for the cheapest energy and, if it is fossil energy, they will go for fossil energy. That is not something that we can influence so directly but I wonder whether we could use at least part of our investments, perhaps even just a small proportion, in a prophetic manner by investing in research and development start-ups that might otherwise not receive investment by investing in such projects in places like Africa where there is nobody to invest and demonstrating our financial commitment in a prophetic way which often speaks much louder than words.

*Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds):* I would like to welcome all the work that went into the report, I think it is a very good report. I will comment on one of the last questions that companies do listen to what the Church of England says in my experience. They might not do anything but they do talk about it and they do take it into account in their boardrooms.

I want to just labour the point that was made about public policy, in particular the Climate Change Levy with reference to the Budget which took place on Wednesday and which effectively imposed that levy on green energy. One of the things as the Church of England that we are meant to be doing is talking to people about public policy in government and I wonder just what conversation we can have about the effect of levying Climate Change Levy on the green.

The other thought, just in passing, is that all of us are actually investors. When we use, we are investors. When our churches use, they are investors. Green electric is now very much the same price as brown electric. Are we investing as people and as churches in green electric?

*Mr James Featherby:* Thank you very much for that first question about the law of unintended consequences. Yes, they do tend to apply. One of the reasons why we want

to make sure that we have a flexible policy that is adaptive to situations as they develop. Clearly we need good, clever science and we need prudential, cautious regulation. One of the issues where clearly we got things as a society slightly wrong was on biofuels; we thought we had a solution and then we discovered that we were creating other problems. Although the task is urgent, we still need to be wise and sensible about the sorts of solutions that we bring to bear and not lose our critical faculties in the rush to solve the problem. We need good science and we need good policy.

*Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige:* I am getting “hurry up” signals from the Chair, so I am going to go back to Burrige gabbling. If I can just try and say a quick word or two to both Ian Fletcher and Stephen Trott’s questions.

Stephen, you are absolutely right, and you agree with Andreas Whittam Smith when he said in his recent speech, “The answer to the question as to how to make clean energy cheaper so that coal, gas and oil stay in the ground is do the research” and that is where all the pressure is coming on universities, like King’s College London. We do not have the big investments but we are doing a lot of the research and we actually need partnership between major investors like the Church with R&D. I am pleased with what the Church Commissioners are already doing. It is down to people like you to persuade them that their fiduciary duty will allow them to put their money behind these sorts of projects, so all power to you and please answer your own question.

To Mr Fletcher, the Ethical Investment Advisory Group is only one prong of it. We have got Bishop Nick and the Environmental Working Group, we have got the excellent work that is done by Malcolm Brown and Mission and Public Affairs working very closely with government and it is at that side of the public dialogue that this has to take place because, to go back to what James was saying right at the start, unlike any of the other issues we deal with in ethical investment where we are just talking about one sector, this is right across the piece and we have to work in research and development, in public policy and with the companies if we are going to find a way out of this.

*The Chair:* I would like to thank the panel for their presentation and this concludes this item of business. Please do remain in the Chamber as worship begins in a few minutes.

*The Revd Sister Rosemary Howarth CHN (Religious Communities)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 8.30 pm

## Questions

*The Chair:* We move now to Item 7, Questions. For this item we shall need the A5 yellow booklet. Following the change to Standing Orders made by the Synod earlier this afternoon, we shall, for the first time, be adopting the new simplified procedure for questions. I shall announce each question. The answers which are now set out in the question booklet and were circulated prior to the Synod will not be read out. We shall therefore move immediately to supplementary questions if there are any. It would be helpful if those answering questions could make their way to the lectern as promptly as



possible when we reach their question and if those who may be thinking of asking a supplementary question would ensure that they are seated close to one of the two fixed microphones. We can then hope to maintain a proper pace and make good progress through the 84 questions and answers before us this evening.

May I remind members that the key to a supplementary question is in the term: it must be supplementary, which under our Standing Orders means that it must be strictly relevant to the original question and the answer given, and it must be a question. This is not an opportunity for members to make points or speeches. I should also remind members that a question must not contain any argument or imputation or ask for any expression of opinion. Finally, I have been asked to remind members to give their name, diocese and Synod number in the usual way when asking supplementary questions.

The first set of questions has been grouped by theme and relate to the Reform and Renewal proposals. Questions 1 to 3 are to the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council and are to be answered by Canon John Spence.

### **Reform and Renewal**

1. *Dr Phillip Rice (London)* asked the President of the Archbishops' Council: Can the Council provide the Synod with an update on any material deliberations with the Church Commissioners on inter-generational equity since their presentation on GS 1981 in February 2015, and, specifically, is it possible to respond on how the assessment of the case for urgency in releasing additional funds for sustainable mission has been progressed?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio)* replied: Since the February General Synod, there has been an extensive programme of consultation and engagement with dioceses and other bodies about the Reform and Renewal proposals. In the light of this, the Council considered in May the need for additional, time limited Church Commissioner funding to secure maximum impact during the transitional period under the Resourcing the Future programme. The Council will be considering at its September meeting a formal approach to the Commissioners. In addition it will take stock of work to quantify the possible need for Commissioner support to help resource an increase in ordinands. It is envisaged that a report on these plans, and the discussions with the Commissioners, will be included in what is brought to the Synod for scrutiny in February. In the meantime there is good informal dialogue with the Church Commissioners.

*Dr Phillip Rice (London)*: I rise to ask about the case for urgency in the timetable that has been set out. Yes, this is essentially friendly. I am essentially welcoming the direction of travel of this but I am not sure that we are saying enough about the need for working at a faster pace during this transitional period. There is a balance between investment now -  
--

*The Chair*: So your question is urgency, Dr Rice.

*Canon John Spence*: Ladies and gentlemen, and members of the Youth Team, good evening. The Chairman, Aiden, has threatened to rule me out of order if I try to be humorous in any way, but he is only young so I am not going to take any notice. Is it not

great when power goes to their heads? Yvonne will always tell you that attempts at discipline of that sort I view as a dare.

It is a great question and I can assure you that we are operating with all urgency but also with professionalism. We cannot go to the Church Commissioners with anything other than a very good business case or else they will throw us out, to be honest, so we are working very carefully on the Resourcing the Future work. We are very close to having the final proposition and Order which will go in September. We will have our formal approach to the Church Commissioners in November. I need to have all the funding in place early next year so that we can announce it in the 2017 budgets. We want to open the opportunities for dioceses to start putting in for funds from 2017. We want to open the first round of that in April 2016. So you will see we are operating with full urgency. The Resourcing of Ministerial Education is very complex and it will take a little bit longer, but I would expect us to be ready to go to the Church Commissioners in Quarter 1 2016.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* In view of this somewhat more relaxed timetable, why was my proposal to adjourn the debate in February so that we had time to consult our dioceses about whether this was a good thing to do, to spend our capital now and not let future generations have it, why was that opposed from the platform?

*Canon John Spence:* Because if we had done so we would not have had the mandate to go out on the consultation and engagement exercise we have been involved across dioceses with over the last four months. I myself have done nine engagements. I know there are 30 that have been undertaken by the Archbishops' Council. We have learnt a great deal from that. We have had a lot of feedback from you which has been fed into developing the business case for the Church Commissioners. I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, I have no sense that we have slowed down at all. It is just we have to get it absolutely right. The worst thing that could happen is that we make a business case that is less than perfect.

2. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In seeking the release of capital from the Church Commissioners to train a significant number of additional ordained ministers, what consideration has been given to the potential for dioceses to have adequate future funds to pay their stipends?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio)* replied: The proposed 50% increase in ordinands reflected what dioceses said they needed to prevent a significant fall in the number of stipendiary clergy given the retirement bulge over the next decade. It does not mean a net increase in numbers in post. Overall, dioceses will not, therefore, face an increase in the stipend bill, though the pattern may vary depending on the balance that each diocese strikes between stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministry. They do, however, for a period face a potentially steep increase in training costs. The current consultations suggest that many dioceses are developing plans for future deployment and for the financial provision to support it. But the Archbishops' Council will be assessing carefully what level of additional time-limited distributions to request from the Commissioners to support dioceses whether for recruitment, training or stipend costs.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I am grateful for the answer from Canon Spence, particularly the interesting comment about the possible return to the Commissioners for

further funding. But if I am a Church Commissioner, I want to know that my £100 million is going to be a good investment; if I am an ordinand, I want to know that the Church will honour my response to God's call providing me with a stipend for the years of my ministry. In order to provide a compelling case to Commissioners and to ordinands, will the Archbishops' Council seek the necessary financial planning information from the dioceses. We have got a vision but we need to be hard-headed about the financial realities that the dioceses are facing.

*Canon John Spence:* It is a great question, thank you, and only last week we had a meeting. We have created a financial planning group under the aegis of the Archbishops' Council involving diocesan representatives and Church Commissioners and we are working very hard to get the modelling now of exactly how this looks to make sure that we can understand exactly how it will work.

The first thing we have got to do, of course, is to attract more ordinand candidates in the first place, and I have to say that on 2016 projections there is no sign of that coming. So the first piece for me, and Bishop Steven from Sheffield will know – I nag him about this constantly – is that we really find the things that are going to unlock the growth in ordinands. We can then make sure that we are working out the finances. I do take the point that it has got to be attractive not just to the Church but to the ordinands as well, so it is a great question.

3. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As work progresses under the Reform and Renewal Programme what work is being done, over and above having women on each group, to ensure that proposals are gender proofed, so that any differing impact on men and women will be acknowledged and addressed?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio)* replied: Gender specific issues are most likely to arise in relation to Resourcing Ministerial Education and Discerning and Nurturing Senior Leaders though it is the responsibility of all those leading the various work-streams, including me, to ensure that proposals and impact are not discriminatory. I am sure that Synod, in its scrutinising role, will wish to hold us to account for that.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* If I take this answer as an invitation to Synod to assume responsibility for scrutinising the work of Reform and Renewal in this respect, may I ask you to invite the Business Committee to find a way of expediting this scrutiny perhaps by setting up a group to report to Synod?

*Canon John Spence:* I am absolutely committed to scrutiny, April, as you know and I am also very committed [not just] to the gender issue but to all issues around diversity. If I might just say on a slightly light-hearted note, having printed answers might be great for you but it is not much fun for me.

The Business Committee were asked if we could have a debate during this Synod and they felt, very understandably, that the weight of legislative business meant that they could not accommodate a debate on the floor of the Synod this time. I would have much enjoyed it. I appreciate, ladies and gentlemen, that that meant, because we had to wait for the decision of the Business Committee, that the creation of the two fringe meetings

tomorrow lunchtime and Monday lunchtime came after many of you had committed to go to other things. I am sorry about that. I remain open to everybody and I know that my colleagues in the Archbishops' Council are very ready to engage with groups. If we do need a formal group, April, let us think about it, but our commitment is to come back. We will have full induction sessions around November and we will certainly have very great clarity for members of Synod about the ask being made of the Commissioners and about the Reform and Renewal programme in total during the next Synod sessions.

*Revd Rosalind Rutherford (Winchester):* Returning to the actual answer and question, has any consideration been given then to ensuring that a named individual on each Committee or Working Group has a specific responsibility for equalities and noting any issues related to that and as this is good practice, if not, could such consideration be given?

*Canon John Spence:* We have not considered it, to be honest, and I am nervous about suggesting that it should be the responsibility of one individual rather than the whole of the group operating on each topic. Archbishops' Council feels so seriously about the whole topic of the Reform and Renewal Agenda that they have declined to delegate any powers to any sub-group so the entire Archbishops' Council is taking collegiate responsibility around this piece and I think we all understand that we have some wonderful champions for diversity on Archbishops' Council. I would rather take a collective responsibility than absolve my own in favour of somebody else.

*The Chair:* Questions 4 to 10 are to be answered by the Bishop of Sheffield as Chair of the Ministry Council.

## **Ministry Council**

4. *Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What plans does the Ministry Council have to share the outcome of the consultation about the *Resourcing Ministerial Education* proposals, and when will this be available?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The Ministry Council will receive a report on the consultations with dioceses and TEs at its September meeting. Subject to the Council's agreement, this will be made available publicly as soon as possible thereafter.

5. *Mr Colin Slater (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Is the Ministry Council aware of concerns on the part of some TEs that, notwithstanding the recent round of consultations on the proposals for Resourcing Ministerial Education, there is a real risk of a loss of momentum in the implementation of these proposals; and the fact that further consultations are not scheduled until October and November does little, if anything, to allay such concerns?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The Council is very aware of the impact on theological colleges and courses of the uncertainty created by the Resourcing Ministerial Education (RME) proposals and is committed to resolving this as soon as possible. The Council is equally aware of the complexity of the issues and the need to gather the relevant information and hear the wide range of views being expressed. The

current round of consultations with dioceses ends in mid-July and the Council will receive a report on these and consider revised proposals at a meeting in early September. The Council will review the timetable at that meeting to ensure that no time is being wasted. Staff in the Division remain in contact with TEI Principals and are available to respond to their questions and concerns.

6. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: According to *Resourcing Ministerial Education (RME)*, 'The RME research ... findings show no distinction between college and course pathways in relation to effectiveness' (Para 31). However, there have been widespread challenges to the methodology of the research. Can we be reassured that a) further research will be commissioned by Ministry Council in the light of such challenges; and b) the final RME recommendations will acknowledge the danger of jumping to the conclusion that more expensive pathways do not add value and therefore do not represent value for money?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The Ministry Council has approved the commissioning of a research project to follow on from the initial RME research. This will be a longitudinal study which follows ministers and their development over a ten year period. This will allow a broader range of factors to be considered in establishing what value has been added through training and further experience. I can assure the Synod that the final recommendations will be solidly based in their judgment of value, as was the original report in acknowledging that each form of training has its own excellence and its particular contribution and value.

7. *Revd Preb David Houlding (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Can the Council provide a demonstrable indicator of the Church of England's commitment to *full-time, residential* training in the future of its ordained Ministry?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: Yes, the Council can provide several such indicators. The Resourcing Ministerial Education (RME) proposals assume that full-time, residential training will be an essential part of future ministerial education and are largely concerned with financing this form of training. This includes continuing financial provision for higher-cost pathways and research degrees, which is almost entirely directed to colleges. Responses from dioceses underline commitment to residential training as first choice for many candidates, especially younger ordinands. In the current cycle of inspections on behalf of the House of Bishops, colleges are consistently rated highly as providers of education. In 2016 64% of Vote 1 (£8.6m out of £13.5m) is given to residential training along with an estimated £4.8m in family maintenance. The commitment to a 50% increase in ordinand numbers and emphasising younger candidates means that all TEIs, including those offering full-time, residential training, are expected to develop higher capacity to meet demand.

8. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: In the light of the vision set out in GS 1979, to seek a cohort of candidates who are younger, more diverse and with a wider range of gifts to serve God's mission, what strategies are being employed to discern the vocation of such candidates, and how many candidates who fit this visionary cohort have:

- (a) attended a Bishop's Advisory Panel; and
- (b) been recommended for training?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The vision and the proposals for Resourcing Ministerial Education set out in GS1979 have not yet been finally endorsed by the Synod and the additional resources for encouraging the increase in candidates have not yet been agreed or applied. However, there are existing strategies in place for encouraging younger candidates and candidates from minority ethnic backgrounds. In the case of younger candidates these strategies include establishing a network of Young Vocations champions across the dioceses and the promotion of the Church of England Ministry Experience Scheme (CEMES). In the case of candidates from minority ethnic backgrounds Ministry Division is working closely with the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (CMEAC) on communications to attract such candidates and events in collaboration with particular dioceses. If the RME proposals are finally endorsed, some of these strategies will be scaled up and key performance indicators will be used to assess progress.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)*: Thank you very much for that answer. I had not appreciated that these imaginative strategies still awaited resources; I should have done. But it is good to know about the existing ones and I wondered if it was possible to know how many Young Vocation champions there are in the network, how many dioceses are promoting the Ministry Experience Scheme and how many dioceses are in collaboration with the Ministry Division and the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns?

*The Bishop of Sheffield*: Thank you, Anne. Those are excellent supplementary questions. It is nice to be able to speak as well. I do not have those figures to hand but they are easily available and we will put them on the notice board as soon as possible during the Synod.

*Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)*: In regard to the question, it refers to a “cohort of candidates who are more diverse”, and we do have Disability and Jesus who have a stand here today. I just wondered in regard to diversity, and especially people who are disabled or indeed from more deprived backgrounds, what was being done to support or encourage candidates from those groups to come forward if they have a vocation?

*The Bishop of Sheffield*: I think we would make a distinction. I think we are hoping that out of the Vocations Working Group we will make significant progress in engaging with candidates from poorer and disadvantaged backgrounds with less formal education. That remains a major challenge for us as a Church. I think our present policy in terms of candidates who are disabled is one of support to those who are coming into the training process and supporting discerning vocation rather than seeking particularly to look for vocations there, but we are open to becoming more proactive there and I note and applaud the presence of Disability and Jesus in the Synod this week.

9. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given that the main beneficiaries of the renewed emphasis on developing whole-life and mission focussed discipleship are lay people living their lives ‘in the world’ and given the acknowledged clericalised nature of the Church of England, what plans are there to further involve lay people, at all levels, in the development, promotion and implementation of the vision of the Church as a ‘community of missionary disciples’ where the nature of discipleship is seen as ‘*the primary and foundational calling before any other vocation to*

roles or authorized ministries' (GS Misc 1116 page 13, para 1)?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft) replied:* Following the February Synod debate on Developing Discipleship, preparations have been made for a theological conversation at the September College of Bishops on discipleship, ministry and leadership, for which the paper has been written by a leading lay theologian and in which lay theologians will participate alongside the bishops. The appointment in May 2015 of a lay person as Head of Discipleship and Vocation in the Ministry Division will provide leadership for the process of using the Developing Discipleship paper to stimulate reflection and action in dioceses. In this process, the importance of engaging lay people to lead reflection in dioceses will be stressed. A Vocations Working Group is being established by the Ministry Council. Care will be taken to ensure that its membership reflects fully the lay interest and its terms of reference are based on full appreciation of lay vocation and the complementary relationship between lay and ordained.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* Thank you, Bishop Steven, for this reply. In conducting the theological conversations around the vision for the Church as a community of missionary disciples, would the House of Bishops be especially mindful that most of the witness of Christian lay people takes place in the world? Christian missioning takes place when Christians engage in the world and the main focus for developing disciples must be, in my view, developing disciples to be in the world.

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you, Adrian. I think that all of us involved would support that. I think we recognise that in the language and debate around discipleship and ministry terms are not yet used in precise ways; there is often overlap. There is a constant pull in the conversation towards ministry within the Church and then accountable, quite rightly, towards supporting discipleship in the world. The team that have been doing the diocesan consultations have worked out some interesting new tools and language to use which I think we will trial a little at the fringe presentations tomorrow and Monday, but we are actively concerned about that.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* Is the Chairman of the Council and the Council aware of the amount of work that has already been done on these subjects by the Standing Committee of the House of Laity and diocesan lay chairs over recent years? If he is not, and he now is, would he please take the opportunity to engage with those groups of people so that the expertise and information that they have, actually to mobilise lay people, can be taken into these important discussions?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Yes, I am aware of that and there has been engagement by the Director of Ministry and we would look to increase and deepen that engagement in the coming years.

10. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Having regard to what is written in GS Misc 1116 page 15/16 and given the acknowledged clericalised nature of the Church of England, what plans are there to further involve existing and emerging lay leaders in the development, promotion and implementation of the vision to facilitate lay leadership at all levels of the Church (page 15, para 3) and to bring about the desired 'change of culture' (page 16, para 4 – second bullet point)?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The Ministry Council proposes to

continue consultations with dioceses on Resourcing Ministerial Education, including questions about the requirements of dioceses for lay leadership. Dioceses have been asked to ensure that there is a significant lay voice in these consultations. The Council has also proposed the establishment of a working group on lay leadership and lay ministry chaired jointly by a senior lay person and a bishop and with a membership which reflects the interests of both lay and ordained. The Council is pleased to note that of the four senior appointments made recently in the Ministry Division, three of these have been taken by lay people. The Council is under no illusions about the difficulty of culture change but will remain attentive to the need to ensure that lay leaders are fully involved and enabled to contribute to the changes which are needed.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* Thank you, Bishop Steven, for your reply. As well as the Ministry Division, is the House of Bishops equally under no illusions about the difficulty of changing the current clerical culture of the Church? Will the House of Bishops tackle this issue head on in their theological conversations in September?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* I think expressing a view about the illusions under which my colleagues are would be an opinion and beyond my capacity. I do detect a seriousness about engaging with this issue and I can confirm that we have 24 hours set aside at the College of Bishops with a group of lay and ordained theologians joining the College and I can confirm that we will be engaging with this subject in small groups and in plenary and through theological reflection, and I hope that we will spur one another to greater intentional action.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* Has consideration been given to including someone with lay workplace ministry experience in the conversations in the College of Bishops and indeed on the Vocations Working Group?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you, Hugh. We are in the process of forming the Vocations Working Group so that is a very timely suggestion. In terms of the conversations in September, yes, I think it is true to say that we will have someone with workplace experience in that conversation, certainly in terms of the list of people we have invited. We have not yet heard from everybody.

*The Chair:* Questions 11 to 24 are to the Chair of the House of Bishops. Questions 11 and 12 are to be answered by the Bishop of Willesden.

## House of Bishops

11. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the statement in the Record of Business Done in 2010-2015 quinquennium (GS Misc 111) that “Canon B8 will be examined by the Simplification Task Group in Phase II of their work in 2016”, what criteria are used to determine that something is a simplification matter?

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent)* replied: The Simplification Task Group was initially charged with ‘bringing forward options for simplification and deregulation in response to concerns about legislative constraints to mission and growth’. In July 2013 the Synod voted to request the Business Committee to bring forward



legislation on Canon B8. The House of Bishops' Standing Committee has therefore requested that the Simplification Task Group consider the options for introducing legislation to Synod to amend Canon B8 as part of its next phase of work which will begin in early 2016. The Task Group hopes to report back to Synod on progress on this and other areas of the Phase 2 Simplification work as early as possible in the new quinquennium.

*The Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* This is not a hostile question at all. What reasons did the House of Bishops Standing Committee have for the Simplification Task Group taking forward the revision of Canon B 8 rather than a Steering Committee and a Revision Committee of this House?

*The Bishop of Willesden:* I am tempted to say, "I will refer you to the answer I gave earlier", but I am not allowed to do that any more. I think it is neatness really. Let us step back a bit. If we are going to do this simplification stuff, there are going to be a number of things which are already worked through and worked out, and we have one such example coming to Synod tomorrow which is the revision of terms of service. There are a number of other things which were reported to Synod in February which relate to proposals that have been worked through quite a lot. I think Mr Hobbs' proposal on Canon B 8 falls into the category of something where we have actually done some work already and it seemed a simpler solution to put that alongside some of the other things that are already in train. It is not rocket science. In the end, we are going to have to do a lot of work over the next quinquennium in terms of revision of the Canons, revision of various Measures, revision of various Instruments. That is going to be very complex. There will be an interesting discussion with the Business Committee as to how much Synodical time we can give to all of this. What I can do is give Mr Hobbs an assurance that since we are dealing with this already, and it is part way through its Synodical progress, we clearly cannot park it; it will have to be dealt with in the lifetime of the Synod. I think that is what probably lies behind his question. It is important to recognise there are things we need to deal with. We cannot do it in this series of sessions because it is a two-stage process.

12. *Revd Canon Karen Hutchinson (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Paragraph 40 of the report of the Simplification Task Group (GS 1980) recognises "that impediments to change lie not only in legal processes but also arise because the Church is not able to deal comfortably with conflict". Which part of the Church of England is picking up this issue of enabling more constructive engagement with conflict?

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent)* replied: Many of the proposals in the Simplification Task Group Report are aimed at streamlining decision-making processes in order to make tough but necessary choices to support mission. Other areas of the Church are also finding different ways to manage conflict better. The Business Committee is working to encourage a culture of 'good disagreement' through the scheduling of group work at recent Synods. The Archbishop of Canterbury's Reconciliation ministry is focused in three areas. These are: strengthening relationships in the Church of England and enhancing our capacity to transform conflicts involving deeply-held differences, **engaging** with the Anglican Communion to encourage new approaches to renewing relationships and our commitment to shared life and witness and **exploring** how Anglicans understand and practice reconciliation so we can better help transform conflict and end violence between communities and among peoples where we find it around the

world.

*Revd Canon Karen Hutchinson (Guildford):* Thank you very much for your response. I welcome that really important work of the Reconciliation Ministry that operates in the areas that you have mentioned. But I wonder what specific training and support are being encouraged for clergy and lay people who are making the sort of tough choices you referred to at parish and diocesan level. Has any thought been given at a national level to commissioning high-quality training by specialists in the field for all involved in church and diocesan leadership so that the conflicts involved in taking forward the Reform and Renewal agenda can be handled positively and creatively?

*The Bishop of Willesden:* I am tempted to say that the Senior Leadership Programme will deal with that very adequately, but to be serious, I do think that these are matters which if we are going to take both the Senior Leadership Programme and RME seriously – it is not my particular agenda, it is part of the programme as a whole – we need to include elements of those questions which have been very fertile in terms of training clergy in leadership at all sorts of levels in whatever programme we deliver. I do not think it is rocket science again to say, “This is something that needs to be dealt with and needs to be on the Agenda”. I know the archdeacons and others are already involved in programmes where they work together with others to train people in these areas. In our own diocese in London we have a comprehensive programme to help people with conflict resolution and with other things through Bridge Builders; other dioceses do the same. The balance will be how much is delivered at diocesan level and how much is part of a more national programme.

13. *Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige (Universities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the reactions and debate to the Green Report on “talent management for future leaders and leadership development”, particularly with regard to the report’s treatment of theology, what plans are there to ensure wide circulation of the recent report from the Faith and Order Commission entitled ‘*Senior Church Leadership: A Resource for Reflection*’, which included Biblical, theological, and historical reflections, especially from Professor Loveday Alexander and Professor Mike Higton?

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth)* replied: FAOC’s report has been available on the Church of England’s website since January. The College of Bishops continues to engage with the process and the report is already being drawn on in a range of contexts, while the proposed print publication could also make a significant contribution to its continuing impact. In the implementation of ‘Discerning and Nurturing Senior Leaders’ (GS 1982), it is expected that it will be used as a resource for study both in the new Learning Community and in the new leadership development programme for bishops. The concept of ‘faithful improvisation’ as developed in the report is proving to be a particularly helpful locus for reflection in this work.

*Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige (Universities):* Thank you for that answer and I am delighted to hear that this important report on Senior Church Leadership will continue in the process going forward, but may I ask since it has been in production since 2009 was the work in it made available to the Green Working Party as part of their deliberations and, if not, why not?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Thank you for your supplementary and your kind words about the report. They were two different processes but they did elide at various points and my cover note to the debate tomorrow does refer to a few of those points at which there was some sort of contact between the two processes.

*Mr John Ward (London):* Is that “No”?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* The two processes were different but they elided. There was contact between them. I think one informed the other, but they were different and FAOC did not write the Green Report and were not members of it, although I think we would say that we felt our work was complementary to it, that we were working towards the same end of deepening and developing the leadership of the church, but they were two different processes and in somewhat different languages.

*The Chair:* Questions 14 to 24 are to be answered by the Bishop of Truro. Question 14 from Fr Thomas Seville CR.

14. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What theological resources, if any, were used, and at what junctures in the understanding of the role of the bishop in the making of the Green report?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The detail of the report consciously focuses on the practical outworking of ministry in its spiritual and theological context and paragraphs 11 to 24 and 32 set out a range of references. The act of theology lies in the interpretation and application of ideas and these paragraphs also set out a frame for the rest of the report.

As the design work has evolved, conversations have been held with many different people to inform course content – some have been supportive of this work and others not. From each we learn. And in each programme we have theologians in the room who tap into their wells of theological tradition as they work through their calling to be priests, prophets, theologians and apostles, but also stewards of Christ’s Church.

*Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities):* Thank you very much for the answer and I must address that to you standing in for the Bishop of Ely. In the light of what may seem to some, certainly including me, an admission of a lack of substantial theological resource underlying the Green Report, would the Bishop of Truro be so kind as to name the theologians in the room?

*The Bishop of Truro:* If I may just begin with an apology or two, firstly to Father Seville himself. I did do this personally but some of your Order Papers may say “The Revd Thomas Seville” and I do apologise, it should say “Fr Thomas Seville”. Can I also apologise that I am not the Bishop of Ely. More seriously, Bishop Stephen is ill. He has labyrinthitis so please can you pray for him. He is not at all well. Can you pray for him and also those people who are having to try and work with him and stop him from working too hard at the moment. By the way, I thought the answer to the last question was “Yes” and not “No” but never mind.

*The Chair:* You are here, Bishop, to answer question 14.

*The Bishop of Truro:* I have not done this before; give me a break. I have noticed that previous people keep saying that the questions are all excellent. I think some of my questions might not be excellent but that is another matter. Among the theologians in the room were Lee Rayfield, Jonathan Frost, James Langstaff, Stephen Conway, Tim Thornton, James Newcombe, Justin Welby, John Sentamu, among them I said.

15. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The terms of reference of the Archbishops' Review Group, which was formed to oversee the implementation of recommendations for leadership development for bishops and deans, state that the group shall be chaired by 'a representative from business'. Why was a representative from business specifically required to chair this group; and who now are the chair and the other members of the group?

*The Bishop of Truro:* A business chair brings a perspective that most bishops and clergy do not have. The Archbishops want to ensure that this critical piece of work remains open to robust challenge and is stretched in its "critical appropriation" of ideas and good practice. Lord Stephen Green, who is the chair of the Archbishops' Review Group, is a business leader who is also a priest and therefore bridges both the Church and business. The full membership of the Group will be published on the Noticeboard.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* Given that this is a review group rather than an implementation group, why was the normal convention disregarded that a group is not reviewed by the same person who has chaired the group itself?

*The Bishop of Truro:* I think I can say that Lord Green is chairing the group. There are plenty of other people who have been brought on to the group to add to that and there are people therefore who are understanding where the process came from but also other people now are working with them to review the process going forward.

*Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark):* Were the problems at HSBC under the chairmanship of Lord Green taken into account when he was appointed to chair the Archbishops Review Group?

*The Chair:* I think, Ms Gnanadoss, that goes beyond the remit of the original question. I am sorry.

16. *Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Of the £2m approved for expenditure between 2014-2016 on funding the recommendations in the report *Talent Management for Future Leaders and Leadership Development for Bishops and Deans*, roughly what proportion has been spent on the following:

- Fees paid to the providers of the training
- Induction of new bishops
- The Talent Pool
- Staff costs for new posts within the Wash House
- Other?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: As at the end of June 2015,

the proportion of the £2m expenditure spent so far can be broken down as follows:

- Bishops' and Deans' development programmes: 11%
- Learning Communities: 7%
- Staff costs of new posts: 4%
- Induction of new bishops: <1%
- Other: <1%

*Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (Guildford):* I wonder what the rationale is for calling the talent pool or the talent pipeline “learning communities” and later on “the learning community” when some of us in the room would think that there are colleges, universities, courses, congregations, cell groups who are Christian learning communities and why should these 57 people hijack that title for themselves?

*The Bishop of Truro:* Thank you. I think that is a very fair point. They are a learning community; they should not be *the* learning community.

17. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can the Synod be provided with a full account of how INSEAD and Judge School of Management were chosen to provide senior leadership development for the Church of England? What criteria were used and what are the academic credentials of those who came to this decision on our behalf?

18. *Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can Synod be assured that an open and fair tendering process – similar to that for Common Awards – preceded the award of contracts to INSEAD and Judge School of Management to provide senior leadership development for the Church of England? Was appropriate time and opportunity given for University Schools of Management, Business Schools, and other educational and training providers to consider tendering?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: I shall with permission answer questions 17 and 18 together.

Early in the project a decision was taken to partner with business schools in light of their strategic and leadership capabilities.

Five institutions were formally considered. Each presented to a panel comprising bishops, and qualified senior Learning & Development professionals. This brought together theological understanding with expertise in engaging external leadership development providers.

The panel assessed each supplier's proposal for their track record in equipping senior leaders in organisations, and the value for money offered, as well as how well the suppliers were able to respect, understand and embrace leadership centred on following a crucified Redeemer.

Following this process, Judge Business School and two professors associated with INSEAD (not INSEAD itself) were invited to partner with us.

*Revd Hannah Cleugh (Universities):* Given that an open tendering process means advertising and inviting tenders, as happened with Common Awards, can the Bishop confirm that the answer to my question is, in fact, no?

*The Bishop of Truro:* No.

19. *Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The report ‘Talent Management for Future Leaders and Leadership Development for Bishops and Deans’ notes that “the Church will retain intellectual property rights to all bespoke material designed for the programmes”. Following the completion of the so-called ‘mini MBA’ for Deans, how should Dioceses wishing to make use of any of this learning and training material access it for inclusion in their own leadership development programmes?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The Church has retained the Intellectual Property (IP) rights to bespoke materials. As with most education programmes, a mix of material – both bespoke and other resources that are the IP of individual professors or the school – were used. In addition to the contractual arrangements we have to retain the IP for the bespoke materials, the provider has been generous in giving programme participants access to all materials used, and permission for use with their teams.

The programme materials have not been developed as stand-alone content to be used “off the shelf”. They are teaching aids for the programme faculty and as such do not lend themselves to being cut and pasted for other programmes. We will however be looking to reuse material initially developed for one programme for modules on other senior leadership programmes where this may be appropriate.

*Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury):* It worries me that we are going to spend £2 million and not end up with any identifiably bespoke resources that belong to the Church. Will the Archbishops’ Review Group re-examine how this money is being expended to ensure that we produce some learning for leadership resources that the Church can actually keep and use because, at the moment, we seem to be putting it into the pockets of business schools who are going to walk away with it in 18 months’ time.

*The Bishop of Truro:* Thank you, Jane. I do not actually agree with you, of course, because I think the learning is being done by the people in the room and they take away with them what they learn from that. I can tell you that my own suffragan colleague who was on the first leadership programme of the bishops has already come back to the diocese and told me about some things that we are going to do as a result of his learning on that. So the learning will be disseminated right across the Church.

*Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury):* Supplementary: as well as the disseminated learning, will there, in fact, be any bespoke resources?

*The Chair:* Sorry, your question and you are just allowed one supplementary to the question, thank you. Two supplementaries, one from the person who asked it.

20. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What are

the learning outcomes for the so-called ‘mini-MBA’ which potential and actual senior leaders are now undertaking?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The objective of this programme is to equip cathedral deans to oversee the complex business operations of cathedrals, so that they may flourish in their mission and ministry.

In the initial learning needs analysis, Deans reported that they needed to be better equipped in their understanding of key management issues to enable effective oversight of their Cathedral, in constructive questioning of others (including professional specialists) and in holding them to account.

The specific learning outcomes of the programme are to build skills and deepen confidence in:

- Understanding of strategic planning processes in social purpose organisations;
- Analysis of Cathedral accounts to diagnose weaknesses, understand exposure to risk and understand the tensions between financial performance and social responsibility;
- Project management of complex projects, including effective stakeholder management;
- Effective leadership of complex teams;
- Understanding fundamental concepts, strategies and ideas involve in managing marketing activities.

*Revd Charles Read (Norwich)*: Given that these very good learning outcomes could apply to anything apart from the single mention of the word “cathedral”, what theological resources are the deans being given to enable them to reflect theologically on the matters covered by the learning outcomes?

*The Bishop of Truro*: They were given a lot of theological resources and, again, as I said earlier, the theologians were in the room. The deans themselves were taking part in that. I was actually chairing the work stream that designed this programme in the first place. All I can tell you is that this was a very specific bespoke – to use that word – piece of work, which rightly or wrongly bore this title “mini-MBA” because when I was listening to the deans in our consultation process they told us that they wanted exactly this kind of work. That does not say there is not a lot more work they could do, but this was very specific, hitting these particular targets.

*Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Could members of Synod be advised:

- how many people entered the selection process for the ‘Talent Pipeline’;
- how many were accepted;
- what the gender balance is; and
- what the age profile is?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: Synod members can find the data requested in Paragraph 7 on page 19 of GS Misc 1116: “79 candidates were nominated for consideration for the Learning Community, 57 of whom have been invited

to participate. Of these 44 (77%) are male and 13 (23%) female (compared to 24% female stipendiary clergy). 91% are White British, and 9% are of other ethnic and racial origin, including 7% Black or Asian. The pool includes a broad spectrum of church tradition, including Traditional Catholics and Conservative Evangelicals. The youngest is 36 years, the oldest 56 years and the median age is 44 years.”

*Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead (Guildford):* We have just heard from John Spence that the whole of the Archbishops’ Council is taking responsibility for checking on gender imbalance, and if we believe that the national Church needs senior leaders who reflect humanity in all its diversity and one of the aims of the original talent pool was to encourage this, what consideration is being given to redress the imbalance in diversity in future years?

*The Bishop of Truro:* Thank you. I think I can say that we all take this very seriously indeed. Clearly this was the first year and we are obviously at the mercy of the bishops who put the names forward. We have done the analysis and the figures are there before you and we are now thinking about how we can help it going forward to do various things. For example, the “Turning up the Volume” work is carrying on and as bishops we are being asked to think about these matters. So I think I can give you an assurance that we will take this very seriously. Clearly, we are at the mercy of the names put forward by bishops and dioceses.

*The Dean of Portsmouth (Very Revd David Brindley) (Canterbury):* As many women begin their ordained life in self-supporting ministry for a variety of reasons, and not because they are inferior or less talented than stipendiary colleagues, are bishops being encouraged to put forward SSMs into the VA Learning Community?

*The Bishop of Truro:* Thank you. They are certainly part of the broader picture. As it happens, my episcopal colleague started his life as a self-supporting minister before he then went on and has now been made a bishop. So there are examples already around of that, but certainly that is one of the factors that we certainly put into the picture.

22. *Mrs Mary Johnson (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the “talent pool” is intended to be a more open and transparent arrangement than the “preferment list” which it replaces, when will a list of those who have been selected for the “talent pool” be in the public domain, so that the Church can pray for its future leaders?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The names of those participating in the learning community will not be published. It is important that individuals have a safe space for their development and formation, and are able to seek God’s guidance about their future away from public attention. To make the names of the participants public would risk placing unfair expectations on them, and destabilising the communities where they currently serve. Individuals are free to share their own participation when and with whom they feel it appropriate.

Nonetheless, I would ask and encourage Synod to pray for all those who minister, including participants of the learning community and all others those who are, or might be, called to positions of wider responsibility.



*Mrs Mary Johnston (London):* If, basically, the selected individuals and the bishop know about clergy persons' participation, how is the new system more open and transparent than the situation with the 'preferment list' which it replaces?

*The Bishop of Truro:* I would say in a couple of ways. I know of cases in the old system where the people who were named on the 'preferment list' did not themselves know that they were named on the 'preferment list', so the individuals did not know. In this system it is not only the bishop but the bishop's staff who are consulted. It is entirely up to the individuals who come into this process, if they wish to tell the people, they can do so. So there will over time be a much wider process being put forward.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has consideration been given to how priests committed to exercising rural ministry can be considered when identifying future leaders since the criteria for joining the 'talent pool', referred to in Appendix 3 of GS 1982, are not necessarily evidenced in rural work?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The discernment framework outlined in GS 1982 focus around spiritual and theological depth, leadership skills, and 'Growth Factors' as indicators of future potential as well as performance in current role. These criteria can be evidenced by priests in any context, including those serving in rural communities.

Clergy from a wide variety of ministries have been invited to participate in the learning community, including those serving in multi-parish benefices, large urban and inner-city parishes, Cathedrals, chaplaincy and pioneer ministry. Rural ministry was not included on the monitoring form so it isn't possible to give precise numbers but I am confident that the rural voice will be represented in learning and discussion.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter):* Thank you very much indeed, and especially for the confidence expressed by the Bishop of Ely that the rural voice will be represented in learning and discussion, but could consideration be given to including rural ministry either in the monitoring form or alongside the other ministries that are identified in paragraph 52 of the Green Report so that the confidence expressed by the Bishop of Ely may be more easily shared by those with an interest and concern for rural ministry.

*The Bishop of Truro:* Thank you very much indeed. I think I can say that, as Bishop of Truro, I too have an interest in rural ministry. I would therefore be very keen to reinforce what you are saying. There are already rural ministers who are in this learning community and I am certainly keen myself to see that that does happen.

24. *Canon Christine McMullen (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the Church of England website still lists Karen West, who left over a year ago, as the Archbishops' Advisor on Bishops' Ministry, when will the website be updated with the names of those who have taken over responsibility for nurturing senior leaders, including a short biography of each person and a brief description of their role, so that Synod members can know who is being employed to undertake these important responsibilities on behalf of the Church?

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton)* replied: The information about the role

of the Archbishops' Adviser on Bishops' Ministry was removed from the website at the end of June, and I will arrange for it to be updated.

For information, Lisa Adams took up the role of Head of Senior Leadership Development in January this year. Prior to joining the Church, she spent most of her working life to date in senior Learning and Development roles in a consultancy firm, and more recently, led the leadership development functions of two financial services organisations.

Brad Cook, the Appointments & Development Adviser, joined in January 2014, having previously worked in a range of HR and learning & development roles in the Civil Service.

Caroline Boddington, the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments, joined the Church in 2004 from the Oil & Gas sector, where one of her roles had been leading the Learning and Development team.

*The Chair:* We move to Questions 25 to 29 to the National Society Council to be answered by Mrs Susan Witts.

### **National Society Council**

25. *Revd John Cook (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Was the National Society Council consulted by Charles Clarke and Professor Linda Woodhead about the settlement discussed in their pamphlet *A New Settlement, Religion and Belief in Schools*?

*Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn)* replied: The National Society was not consulted about the content of *A New Settlement, Religion and Belief in Schools*. The pamphlet quotes the former Chair of the Council giving his personal view about collective worship in schools, and it also quotes an article by the chief education officer with regard to admissions, but there was no attempt made to engage with the National Society or the Church of England Education Office about the content of the report and it does not refer to our own report about RE in Church of England schools that was published by the National Society in September 2014.

*Mrs Kathy Playle (Chelmsford):* Given the pressures of secular humanists and others now on the RE Council, will those representing the Church of England in discussions on the future of religious education do everything possible to ensure that adequate time is reserved for teaching about the Christian faith?

*Mrs Susan Witts:* Yes. Just to add a little bit more to that because, you can see I am a rabbit in the headlights tonight, I would like to say that we find it surprising that the report was produced without making reference to such things as the Catholic Church and the Church of England working together and we are continuing those discussions so that we engage formally.

26. *Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Which, if any, of the recommendations of the report *A New Settlement, Religion and Belief in Schools* does the National Society support?

*Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn)* replied: The pamphlet makes a strong case for improving the quality of RE and the National Society is happy to support work to achieve that goal, but we have a number of reservations about some of the recommendations for RE and would not support those which, in our view, would lead to the downgrading of RE in schools.

We welcome the recognition that children of families of faith should where possible be able to attend schools of that faith, and that their current right to be given priority in the admissions process should not be removed. We also welcome the call for all schools to be more transparent about the values and worldview that they work within.

We do not support the recommendations on Collective Worship.

The National Society will be considering this report at its next meeting. However, following the publication of the pamphlet the Chief Education Officer wrote a short blog outlining some initial thoughts which can be found here:

<http://cofecomms.tumblr.com/post/121659734982/re-must-not-be-downgraded>

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford)*: Thank you for the answer. Will those representing the Church of England in future negotiations uphold the priorities formally recognised in Catholic social teaching that in matters of conscience the parents of children should be seen as their primary educators?

*Mrs Susan Witts*: I am going to refer you to the blog that was in the answer that you were given from the Chief Education Officer. It was part of his initial thoughts and, of course, the National Society will be giving some further response in the future.

27. *Revd Stephen Coles (London)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: What is the current policy of the Church of England towards making all aspects of Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) a mandatory part of the National Curriculum, particularly with regard to the partial parental right of withdrawal from Sex and Relationship Education, and have any representations been made recently to the Government about this?

*Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn)* replied: The Education Office made a submission to the Education Select Committee in June 2014 supporting mandatory provision for PSHE but recognising that a school's governing body was best placed to work with parents to ensure the development of an appropriate policy and curriculum.

PSHE education has a central role in ensuring that schools provide an education which supports children as they develop in every way, not only in academic attainment, supporting pupils as they build a framework on which to make key decisions about themselves, their lives, their relationships and the way they engage with the world around them. This is a vital part of their moral and spiritual development. In Church of England schools this framework is formed by the Christian narrative so any mandatory provision for PSHE must recognise and specifically affirm the need for schools with a religious character to teach the whole subject within the context of the school's religious foundation.

*Revd Stephen Coles (London):* I am encouraged by that reply but would ask Mrs Witts to clarify what action she and the National Society would recommend. Should the governing body working with parents allow parents to remove their children from any part of the PSHE curriculum concerned with sex and relationship education?

*Mrs Susan Witts:* Again, we will continue to work with that and discuss those guidelines with parishes and with the dioceses, so that they support the churches who are working with the families and their governing bodies.

28. *Revd Nigel Irons (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: The Lichfield Diocesan Board of Education has taken the view that if a church school which is an Academy enters into a Multi Academy Trust which contains a majority of non-church schools this jeopardises the church control of the school because the MAT board would legally become responsible for the appointment of all school governors within the MAT and could for example eliminate the Church of England majority governorship of a Church of England VA school if it so chose. As it seems that other diocesan boards of education have taken different views, has the National Society considered whether it is in fact legally possible to maintain the Christian integrity and church control of a Church of England Academy within a Multi Academy Trust which contains a majority of non-church schools, either by an appropriate framing of the Articles of Agreement or by some other means?

*Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn)* replied: It is the responsibility of every Diocesan Board of Education (DBE) to ensure the effectiveness and safeguard the Christian character of its Church of England schools. The complexity of some contexts and circumstances require DBEs to develop specific solutions that build a strong family of Church schools whilst being sensitive to individual local needs. The Education Office is always willing to offer advice and support in these circumstances, but it is for the DBE to determine the most appropriate course locally.

At national level we have worked with the DfE to ensure that the Articles for any Academy Trust involving CofE schools build as many safeguards in as possible, but experience shows that without genuine commitment amongst multi-academy trust personnel to working constructively with the relevant Diocese these safeguards can be ignored and the Church of England character is therefore at risk. The surest way to safeguard the Christian character in perpetuity is for the DBE to appoint the majority of members and directors to the academy trust.

*Revd Nigel Irons (Lichfield):* Thank you for your reply. Is the National Society currently engaged in any negotiations with the Secretary of State for Education to try and find a way forward which would allow church academies to join multi-academy trusts which may have a majority of non-church schools while at the same time protecting their Christian ethos and identity? If not, given its national role in promoting religious education, will it give consideration to being more proactive in addressing this situation on behalf of church academies and giving national advice rather than leaving individual dioceses to address the issue on a case by case basis?

*Mrs Susan Witts:* I think that is the situation at present. Because of the local nature of the original question, we ask you to talk to the Chief Education Officer or your own diocesan board of education to deal with those problems.

29. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: “1277” exists to develop and implement a National Strategy to support church-based toddler groups and their associated activities. Its vision is to see universal access to excellent, safe, Christian toddler groups which are demonstrating God’s love at the heart of their communities. Was the National Society aware that June was 1277’s month of prayer for toddler groups?

*Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn)* replied: The Church of England was one of the founding members when *1277 Make them Count* was formed in 2009, and continues to be actively involved in this initiative which focuses on church based toddler groups. The 1277 website offers a range of ideas and resources to support this, and the 1277 Facebook page offers a lively exchange of ideas and suggestions for those involved with early years.

The National Society would encourage all parishes to consider their engagement with *Early Years* initiatives, including church based toddler groups, and to continue to pray for the vital work of church-based toddler groups.

*Mrs Mary Judkins (Leeds)*: Just a quick correction. The CofE was not a founding member, although it has been involved from the beginning. So the question: how can or does the National Society encourage [and] facilitate this engagement and parishes pray without sufficient information? My question was about the month of prayer and I do have leaflets about 1277 from our Under-Fives Adviser from the Diocese of West Yorkshire and the Dales.

*Mrs Susan Witts*: The leaflets were obviously passed to you, so there is information going out. Thank you for raising the profile. It is really good work that they are doing with toddlers and early years. We are as a Council going to be discussing that with the Children and Young People’s Development Group at the next session. Just to note that we have got numerous references on our bulletins and newsletters to our diocesan advisers about the day of prayer, so there is plenty going out there.

### **Council for Christian Unity**

30. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: What progress has been made on the Anglican Methodist Covenant since the debate at the November group of sessions, and has the matter now been discussed formally at the Archbishops’ Council?

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister)* replied: Developments since November are summarised by the Bishop of Liverpool in his report, ‘Joint Covenant Advocacy and Monitoring Group’, GS Misc 1118. As his report makes clear, we remain at an early stage in implementing the recommendations agreed in November. The Archbishops’ Council has not formally discussed progress since then but would expect the Council for Christian Unity to be responsible for continuing to support and monitor that.

*Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)*: Thank you for your response. Does the Archbishops’ Council plan to actually timetable this for discussion within the next 12 months? Will the General Synod receive regular updates on the progress? Are we really so early in the

process that has been going on since the beginning of the last decade?

*The Bishop of Peterborough:* Setting up groups to do this sort of discussion takes time and setting up dates for the groups to meet takes time. I expect that the Joint Covenant Monitoring and Advocacy Group will be reporting to General Synod next year. Realistically, I think the earliest date we are likely to have something back to Synod for initial consideration is going to be summer 2017. That is the earliest. Quite a lot of detail needs to be discussed by this group.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* Is the Bishop aware that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the Archbishops' Council has not discussed the Anglican Methodist Covenant since either was invented? Can he offer from CCU an explanation of why the CCU has not brought the whole question of the Covenant and its emphasis on national decision-making to the Archbishops' Council?

*The Bishop of Peterborough:* I was not aware the Archbishops' Council had not discussed it, though in some senses the CCU acts as a body serving the Archbishops' Council. My understanding is that the Archbishops' Council is normally involved in these matters when there is an issue of policy or resource that needs to be discussed. The question of the Anglican Methodist Covenant has been discussed in other fora, certainly including the Archbishop, regular meetings with the Archbishop and the Methodist presidency but I did not know it had not been to the Archbishops' Council. It is up to the Archbishops' Council what they put on their agenda.

## Ministry Council

31. *Revd Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many ministers in secular employment and workplace chaplains (full-time and part-time, and ordained and lay) are there in the Church of England; and what has the Ministry Division been doing to encourage and to increase their ministry (including vocations) and to obtain internal and external funding for workplace chaplains?

32. *Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many Non Stipendiary Ministers (or Self Supporting) are identified as being Ministers in Secular Employment and/or workplace chaplains, whether full or part time, and how is the Ministry Council identifying, encouraging and resourcing vocations to workplace ministry?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: With permission I will answer questions 31 and 32 together.

In May the Ministry Division hosted a national consultation on Self-Supporting Ministry (SSM) to help resource diocesan work in this area. Representatives from dioceses with a specific SSM remit were joined by individual SSMs, including Ministers in Secular Employment and delegates from CHRISM and other organisations active in SSM. Details of the consultation are at:

[http://www.ministrydevelopment.org.uk/self\\_supporting\\_ministry](http://www.ministrydevelopment.org.uk/self_supporting_ministry)

The Division does not have a remit to fund particular ministries. However, the learning

from this consultation, along with research on chaplaincy commissioned by MPA, will feed into the work of the recently announced Vocations Working Group which has been set up in response to the desire of dioceses to see a sustained increase in vocations as a whole.

National statistics for ministry indicate that there are 1020 chaplains employed by institutions e.g. in education, healthcare and the Armed Forces. In addition there are 320 further MSEs with permission to officiate.

*Revd Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* Given the diversity of SSM ministry, how do you propose that this will be represented in the Vocations Working Group?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you, good question, and I do not immediately have an answer, except to say that it is not, of course, absolutely necessary to be exercising a particular ministry in order to encourage vocations to that ministry, but we would look for the group as a whole to reflect a range of different experiences and gifts.

*Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool):* Can I ask for a little more specificity about what is actually being done by the Ministry Council to encourage self-supporting ministry?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you. The Ministry Council has held two consultations at national level, one this year and one two years ago. The Ministry Council regularly raises questions that come from training or DDOs or dioceses about self-supporting ministry and is proactive in encouraging vocations to that ministry. But the majority of work of encouraging vocations to self-supporting ministry and chaplaincy, as well as stipendiary ministry, of course, happens within dioceses rather than at national level.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* At very end of your answer you say, "And there are 320 further MSEs with permission to officiate". I do not understand really what you mean there. MSEs are not chaplains, which you were referring to earlier, and I would expect most MSEs to have licences not PTOs. Please, could you elucidate?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you very much, Hugh, and I will write to you on that count and clarify what is meant exactly there, thank you.

33. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Does having a disability, being a benefit claimant or being from a poor and disadvantaged community have a negative impact on assessment of vocation or provide a reason for preventing someone from training for ordination; what consideration has been given to attracting ordination candidates of these kinds (including changes that could be made to the vocations process or criteria); is there any target figure for them; and what are the figures (in percentage terms) for candidates of these kinds attending and passing a BAP in the last 12 months?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft)* replied: The Ministry Division does not keep statistics of this kind about candidates. In the registration process candidates are asked to self-identify as disabled and to say what additional support they need in order to participate in the Bishops' Advisory Panel. This information is not used in the selection process. A recent professional review of the BAP process was conducted by external consultants and found the process to be fair across the range of candidates, including

those with disabilities and from differing socio-economic groups. However, the Council will keep the issues of fairness and access under scrutiny, particularly in the proposed review of selection criteria and procedures. This review will include consideration of the ethos of the selection process in order to make it as widely accessible as possible.

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* Will the group investigating those who face significant challenges to pursuing their vocation to ordained ministry also please investigate the position of those who have been treated unjustly in the justice system, served a full custodial term, protested their innocence, come to faith in Jesus Christ through prison ministry and received a vocation for ordained ministry? If we can receive for ordination training those who have pleaded guilty, can your group investigate and receive those who have been framed or mistakenly convicted?

*The Bishop of Sheffield:* Thank you. That seems to fall slightly outside the scope of the original question but we will certainly give some thought to that if issues are brought before us as a group and as a Council.

### **Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee**

34. *Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: What is the average cost (i.e. costs of housing etc.) of supporting Non Stipendiary Ministers in House for Duty posts and their average expected time commitment to their ministry under their working agreements, and how do those measures compare with the cost and time commitment of Stipendiary Ministers?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* replied: Based on the national stipend benchmark, a full-time stipendiary incumbent costs around £33,000 more than a 'house for duty' one, because of additional costs of stipend, pension and National Insurance. The cost of providing an SSM's training, housing, MDR, CMD and expenses should, in principle, be no different from those for a stipendiary minister in the same role.

In 2012, of a total of 7007 stipendiary clergy, 429 (6.1%) were part-time. There were 2941 NSMs (Self Supporting Ministers). We do not have figures for the time commitment of SSMs, or distinct data for House for Duty but as many SSMs have other jobs, we suspect more of them will be part-time. RACSC guidance on House for Duty appointments (2012) does not recommend a time commitment, but emphasises the importance of not treating house for duty clergy differently from other parochial clergy, particularly over rights and responsibilities under common tenure.

*Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool):* Thank you, Bishop David, for answering lots of questions that I did not actually ask. Quite bluntly though, it is a simple maths question that I would like an answer to that I am sure you can handle. So may I rephrase: acknowledging the need to estimate and average housing costs both between and within dioceses, please can you tell me what is the cost of supporting NSM House for Duty ministers, including their housing costs, as a percentage of the same cost for a full-time stipendiary minister?

*The Bishop of Manchester:* Thank you. I am very happy as a mathematician to deal with questions with numbers but I am not doing mental arithmetic on the floor of Synod tonight,



so I will see that you are written to with the answer as soon as possible.

35. *Revd Canon Dr Mike Parsons (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: In the light of the increase of the age for receiving a state pension to 67, the increasing life expectation of the population, and the need to put in forty years of full time service to obtain a full clergy pension (which for many clergy is unattainable before compulsory retirement), what steps are being taken to review the mandatory retirement age of 70 in the Ecclesiastical Offices (Age Limit) Measure 1975?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* replied: The effect of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Age Limit) Measure 1975 is that no-one can continue as incumbent beyond 70 (apart from a temporary extension in certain circumstances). Clergy over 70 may hold office as assistant curate or priest-in-charge, only on a fixed term basis under Regulation 29 of the Terms of Service Regulations 2009. They can continue to receive a stipend and accrue pensionable service, unless already receiving a pension (See: Appendix III, Supporting the Ministry of Retired Clergy).

These arrangements enable clergy to continue to fulfil their vocation up to and after 70 where there is an appropriate place for them to use their talents and further the Church's mission. If there is a groundswell of support for looking into the mandatory retirement age, now that Common Tenure has settled down, it can be placed on a future RACSC agenda and reported to Synod.

*Revd Canon Michael Parsons (Gloucester):* Does the Bishop not think that the calculations that went into the framing of the Measure of 1975 might be a trifle out of date in 2015?

*The Chair:* I am afraid asking the Bishop what he does or does not think is asking him for an expression of his opinion. Sorry, Canon Parsons.

*Revd Canon Michael Parsons (Gloucester):* Are they out of date?

*The Bishop of Manchester:* I think, as the Chair has said, that is asking me for an expression of opinion. I could not possibly comment.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I do not think this is asking for an expression of opinion. The Bishop says that if there is a groundswell of support for looking into the mandatory retirement age it can be placed on the future RACSC agenda. What constitutes a groundswell of opinion and how will you judge whether one has arisen?

*The Bishop of Manchester:* I think if a number of people come up to me during the course of this Synod, and I shall be around until the end of things on Monday, and say this is a matter that they think would merit some consideration, I would be very glad to take that to RACSC. I think there will come a time, and whether it is immediately now or in the not too distant future, where we do need to look at this again, we cannot simply rely on the settlement at the time when common tenure came into being for ever and a day. But we do have other urgent stuff. As members of the Synod will be aware, the impact of the Budget this week does mean that quite a number of clergy households who have been reliant on the tax credits are going potentially to see quite significant reductions in their

household income. We have got other items on our Agenda, but if enough people can find me in the bar and say that this is a matter that they would like us to take up, then I will report that to the Committee and I hope we will get back not too long.

### **Mission and Public Affairs Council**

36. *Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: How closely, and on which areas of work, does MPA work with the Joint Public Issues Team of the Baptists, Methodists, URC and Church of Scotland?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: MPA and Parliamentary Unit staff meet with their ecumenical counterparts, including the Joint Public Issues Team (JPIT) each month to review the Parliamentary agenda and ensure that all are aware of what each other is doing. The Director of MPA and the JPIT Team Leader meet regularly to share information and think through common issues. At the recent General Election, JPIT coordinated a study document covering a variety of political, economic and social issues and, at their invitation, MPA staff contributed a number of sections. There are many informal contacts between individual staff of both teams, both one-to-one and through shared membership of a number of specialist bodies such as the Churches' Refugee Network and the Community Liaison Group for the Gambling Commission.

*Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds)*: In a time of limited resources and in view of MPA's relationship with JPIT, will it be possible for MPA to explore a more integrated and ecumenical approach to issues of social justice?

*Mr Philip Fletcher*: I believe that MPA and the Church of England does pursue an ecumenical approach. Of course, JPIT is primarily the free churches. We also have relations with the Roman Catholics for one example. We each have our distinctive role and our distinctive governance which means that trying to do a sort of three legged race would have the usual problems of looking rather inelegant and perhaps progressing rather slowly. I suggest to my namesake that we can make progress together, working quite closely together, without actually coming up with identical views.

37. *Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Can the Mission and Public Affairs Council please report on the findings of any further research on the 'bedroom tax' which has come to its attention since the February group of sessions, and whether it suggests any new grounds for supporting or opposing the removal of the so-called 'spare room subsidy'?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: Reducing the main reports to headlines is never easy. The data is a year or two old and we await the DWP's major review of the policy, expected this year. However, the research broadly agrees that:

The Bedroom Tax is reducing housing benefit expenditure (though perhaps less than projected), some tenants are downsizing, making room for larger households, and some have responded by finding additional paid employment as was intended.

Housing associations and other providers have faced additional costs, and Discretionary Housing Payments have been needed to mitigate the cost for some tenants.

To the extent that the aims are being achieved, it is at high human cost, including reduced spending on essentials, greater indebtedness, increased stress and disrupted relationships. The effects are being felt unevenly across the country. There are particular concerns about affected households with at least one disabled tenant, and the long term impact on landlords' finances.

*Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds):* In view of the perceived high human cost, including reduced spending on essentials, greater indebtedness, increased stress and disrupted relationships, what action will this Synod and MPA take next in urging the Government to review the place of bedroom tax?

*Mr Philip Fletcher:* I think the bedroom tax where we are awaiting, as my answer indicates, further research and are watching closely the research that is coming out, which tends to demonstrate real problems with how that tax is working, need to be related to the much wider issues around benefits, around tax credits (as the Bishop of Manchester was just indicating), around the general drive for productivity; in fact a whole host of issues raised by the Chancellor's Budget a couple of days ago. MPAC will be taking a very close interest, as clearly will the House of Bishops (note their pastoral letter before the Election) in how these various issues fit together and make representations as appropriate.

*Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry):* In regard to your answer, you refer to research. Basically, the research I understand is by the DWP. It is a bit like students marking their own exam paper. I just wondered what research the Church was undertaking to measure the impact on our communities because we know our communities very well?

*Mr Philip Fletcher:* The various pieces of research that I referred to collectively in my answer include, for example, some from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation; some from the National Housing Federation; a particular group in the North East; York University for a group of social landlords. We are still awaiting – and I hope it is not significant that it seems to be taking a while – the Department of Work and Pension's own assessment of how well it is working in practice. The signs are that it is not working as well as it was intended with all sorts of consequences. Now I absolutely take the point that each of us at our own parish level may well have experience of how well or less well it is working, but I do not think there is a lot of point in the Church of England embarking on a particular piece of research if we can sensibly draw on what is already in the pipeline and coming through to us, and which we will continue to watch very closely.

38. *Revd Canon Richard Hibbert (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What preparations are the Mission and Public Affairs Council making to offer a Christian opinion in the forthcoming European Referendum?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: I would be very surprised if there were a single "Christian opinion" on the European Referendum and MPA is not intending to propose a stance one way or the other. We will be guided in part by the Bishops' Pastoral Letter at the General Election which noted the immense contribution made by the churches to the post-War reconstruction and to deepening understanding between the European nations, but which noted that this was not an argument for the current structures of the EU.

MPA's contribution to this is the creation of a blog, *Reimagining Europe: Our Shared*

*Futures*, for airing and debating differing opinions from around and beyond the church. Already, some 22 contributors, with backgrounds in theology, politics, cultural life and other arenas, have agreed to contribute. MPA will launch the blog in September.

*Revd Canon Richard Hibbert (St Albans):* Grateful [as] I am to hear that the Mission and Public Affairs Council are beginning to get a blog together on the European topic and referendum; can we be advised how the Mission and Public Affairs Council, and the national church institutions are hoping to broadcast this? What steps are they taking to ensure wide understanding of this blog will be available?

*Mr Philip Fletcher:* The blog steals some clothes from the Church of Scotland which set up a blog providing a safe space through the referendum without itself taking a view on what the answer to the referendum on Scottish independence should be. We are hoping that the blog that we are establishing will follow much the same course. It will include people who are strongly in favour of remaining members of the European Union. It will also include those who are more sceptical. I cannot give a list at the moment, but it will be coming through from September. I have his permission to say the current Chair of the House of Laity will be one of the contributors to the blog.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* While I take the point that there might not be a single Christian opinion on this matter, it may be the case that the MPA might like to consider making a statement about what might not be a Christian opinion that is worth holding when the referendum approaches, given the risk of xenophobic responses that we have seen in Scotland and in Greece and in other places recently?

*Mr Philip Fletcher:* I hope that the blog will be one means of helping to present moral, ethical issues properly. Yes, there may well be scope for continuing, as the House of Bishops and others have done (it is not just the MPA Council) to take a position which makes clear what is particularly out of court, if you like, from a Christian perspective. But we will have to see as the whole debate develops.

39. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In February the Church of England was widely reported to be against legislation permitting “three parent embryos” to combat mitochondrial disease. Dr Brendan McCarthy, the Church’s national advisor on medical ethics, said that the law should not be changed “until there has been further scientific study and informed debate into the ethics, safety and efficacy of mitochondrial replacement therapy”. Dr Lee Rayfield, Bishop of Swindon and a member of the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority, admitted he was more positive and that the Church hadn’t communicated well. After MPs voted in favour he said people who have concerns about mitochondrial replacement can be confident in the UK’s regulatory system. One bishop also voted in favour in the House of Lords. What are the mechanisms to form and communicate ‘The Church of England’s position’ on such contentious ethical and legal questions and are there any plans to review or improve them?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: MPA has well-established processes for positioning on public issues, ensuring consistency with doctrine, Synod resolutions, and previous statements, and consulting with stakeholders and experts. MPA staff brief the bishops although they vote according to their consciences. MPA, working with the bishops of

Carlisle and Swindon, responded to DH and HFEA consultations on Mitochondrial Replacement Therapy in 2012 and 2014, agreeing with the proposals in principle but arguing that proposed safeguards must be met. The issue returned to Parliament in February without significant change in circumstances. MPA wished Parliament to effect regulations after safeguards were met: the Bishop of Swindon argued that this could be entrusted to the HFEA. The media exaggerated this difference. The bishop and Dr McCarthy wrote jointly on MRT, agreeing on all but this nuance. Earlier liaison might have prevented unhelpful media comment. I am satisfied that MPA has taken all reasonable precautions to prevent a recurrence.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Thank you very much for that answer. There seemed to be with Mitochondrial DNA therapy problems with liaison and consultation, problems with the media and the media presentation and problems with the Bishops in the House of Lords. I, therefore, wonder whether you are planning to consult not only with leading experts like Bishop Rayfield but also with experts in media presentation and with Bishops in the House of Lords who actually have to vote, given that this is the position of the Church of England, episcopally led. Thank you.

*Mr Philip Fletcher:* One of the points that my answer firmly brings out is that the Lords Spiritual – thank God, and I mean that – will follow their own conscience in voting and in their other actions in the House of Lords, which may sometimes, as on the debate relating to Mitochondria, lead them to take up contrary positions. It does actually happen if you look at the voting record quite often, and so it should, in my humble lay opinion. What the MPA needs to do, working closely with Comms, is to try and ensure that this really quite rare event, where on a relatively minor issue, which was about just how safeguards should be applied to the use of mitochondria, led to the impression of a variance within the wider Church of England, which is not the case. Our position has always been, yes, one should be able to proceed on this line with caution and with appropriate safeguards and we have learnt lessons from what was in this case a glitch.

### **Appointments Committee**

40. *Revd Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Appointments Committee: Does the Appointments Committee specifically consider the representation of SSMs and Chaplains on the bodies to which it makes appointments, and does it review how far all aspects of diversity have been achieved in representation on all such bodies, and for all of the above, if not, why not and, if so, how successful does it consider itself to have been?

*Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool)* replied: The Appointments Committee's Guidelines (GS Misc 963) state that the right mix of skills, expertise and aptitude is essential to making successful appointments. The question of balances comes after that. The Appointments Committee decides in each case which balances are most relevant.

The Committee can only be as good as the information members provide. Where the Committee has information that members are SSMs or chaplains (lay or ordained) and where it is relevant to the appointment to be made, it weighs that information against the other criteria and necessary skills.

The Committee takes diversity very seriously and strives to reflect the diversity of the Synod and the Church in its appointments. However, it is often appointing a small number of people, not all of whom necessarily accept appointment, and it is impossible to achieve every balance in those circumstances.

*Revd Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* Thank you for your answer. Given that the statistics show that nearly 30% of ordained clergy in the Church of England are now SSM and that the recent national consultation identified the range of skills and ministries exercised by SSMs, will the Appointments Committee in the future take this into consideration when making appointments to the boards and councils of this Synod?

*Canon Margaret Swinson:* The Appointments Committee when it meets and takes into consideration matters for appointments relies on a number of things. One is the information which members give us, and a number of members of Synod do not give us information about what they do. Another is that we do now offer the opportunity for members to either suggest people to us, which has only I think happened twice, and I would explain why those would be particularly suitable people for appointments, or to offer themselves. That process is developing but we are absolutely committed to taking into account people's particular expertise and we have done so with appointments of SSMs, certainly during my tenure, but we are reliant on people giving us the information upon which we can make those decisions. Can I just encourage members, please, to tell us what you are good at and when we are asking for suggestions for appointments, please do not just think about you wanting to do the job, think about who you know on Synod who would be really good, and let us know why and absolutely we will be committed to doing that.

## **Business Committee**

41. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: The General Synod often calls on other bodies to act, e.g. the November 2013 motion on intentional evangelism made a call to Diocesan Synods and others. When asked about reviewing the effectiveness of such calls in February 2015, the Chair of the Business Committee suggested that a review of Synod's effectiveness was not the role of the committee, but later kindly supplied a survey by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Advisor for Evangelism and Witness on the effectiveness of the November 2013 motion. The survey reported that five dioceses didn't even know about the call, 23 dioceses had not responded to the survey, and eight had not yet focussed a meeting on evangelism, mission and growth, while others had done something but not directly as a result of the call. In the light of this evidence, will the Business Committee consider the possibility of initiating a review so that Synod can evaluate and increase the effectiveness of its calls?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)* replied: GS Misc 111 sets out on behalf of the Business Committee a full record of legislative and non-legislative business passed by General Synod in this quinquennium, including any follow-up activities. GS Misc 111 notes that the Evangelism Task Group established by the November 2013 Motion is due to report back to Synod later this year on progress made since then. The 2013 Motion was primarily addressed to dioceses and parishes. It is for Synod members themselves to ensure the effectiveness of its calls by encouraging their dioceses to follow up on the recommended actions at local level.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Thank you so much for your answer, thank you so much for that report and thank you to all those who I understand put in the hard hours, I can see they are discussing now and not taking the glory, but thank you for that, it really is helpful at the beginning of a review process. Thank you also for your support for Vasantha Gnanadoss' proposals to review.

*The Chair:* It is very good of you to be grateful, Dr Richmond, if you could come to your question.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* I am very grateful, Chair, for your indulgence as well because the question is given that dioceses are so important and the evidence is that they are not hearing clearly, not responding clearly, and in some cases, sadly, not putting into practice what we are doing here in Synod, would the Business Committee and the future one be interested in exploring ways of clarifying what it is we have asked dioceses to do and clarifying to members of Synod what we are to argue for?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy:* Dr Richmond, we are glad that you like the work that we have done so far. We do not believe that we have an executive function to chase up dioceses or, indeed, other bodies, but, as you have alluded to Ms Gnanadoss, perhaps you would like to help her test this view that we take. Thank you.

*Mr Peter Haddock (Southwark):* My supplementary question is how then do the National Church Institutions communicate decisions of General Synod and its bodies given your answer? You are looking at me quizzically. Is it that we simply pass motions and that is it, it is up to members to let dioceses know? Does no communication go to diocesan secretaries, for example?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy:* I believe such communication goes regularly to diocesan secretaries and I would reiterate my written answer to Dr Richmond that I think we all, as members of Synod, have a responsibility to do a certain amount of chasing up.

### **Crown Nominations Commission**

42. *Mr Malcolm Halliday (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In a statement made to Synod on Tuesday 9 February 2010 regarding changes to the conduct of the Crown Nominations Commission, including the introduction of interviews (Report of Proceedings page 98), the Archbishop of York stated that "the central members will make a report to Synod in two years' time with an evaluation of this new step in the process." No such report has yet been despite the elapse of five years.

In view of the delays and difficulties that the Commission appears to have had in proposing names for some vacant sees during the period since that promise was made, can a comprehensive report now be made please?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* replied: The then Central Members reviewed the interview process at the end of 2011 as preparation for the Synod report. This was not shared with Synod given the ongoing nomination process of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 2012 and election of new central members. In essence the report concluded that interviews should continue, as they have since then. The

Commission continues to look at ways of refining and developing the ways in which interviews are conducted. I am sure that the current Commission would be very happy to review the process and I suggest that we make a report in 2016.

*Mr Malcolm Halliday (Leeds):* Thank you, your Grace, for the reply. As well as involving central members and the secretariat, could this next review draw upon the experiences and views of the various diocesan members who have served since 2011 so as to be a fully comprehensive report?

*The Archbishop of York:* The Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments and the Prime Minister's Appointment Secretary always consult the diocesan secretaries once the actual nomination has come through, what was their experience, what would they want to do more, and often that actually is fed back into the next Crown nominations in order to improve our processes and our papers. I am quite sure that what you are suggesting is going to be taken up pretty seriously because it is already happening in some ways. I must apologise to you that it has taken five years to come back to you but, as you know, in my answer, circumstances were beyond my powers of control. I have always wanted to say "yes" and "no" but unfortunately on this occasion, no matter how much I wanted to say, I apologise to you that we did not actually do it, but the circumstances meant we had to wait. You will get it in 2016, unless of course some other circumstances come and prevent it.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* In evaluating this process, can the Commission consider not only the efficacy of interviewing but also the impact of the time taken by interviews on the equally important process of consensus building conversation?

*The Archbishop of York:* Everything will be brought to the table and you will be told.

43. *Archdeacon of Buckingham (Ven Karen Gorham)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In view of a twelve month delay in the CNC being able to give further consideration to the vacancy in the See of Oxford, what plans are there to review the current appointment process of diocesan bishops in order to create a more flexible and efficient system reflective of good practice, as evident in the appointment of a new Secretary General?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* replied: The nomination of a Diocesan Bishop is an electoral process rather than an appointment process of an employee and the process of discernment involves much more extensive consultation. It would be wrong to comment on a particular CNC but the general point is that with the CNC, as with other selection and discernment processes, there will sometimes be occasions when more time than expected is needed to find the right candidate. That is not a failure of process though it is clearly unwelcome at a time when the large number of vacancies has meant that the CNC has not been able to work through them as quickly as we would all have wanted. The Archbishops and Central Members regularly review how the Commission is operating within the present framework established by the Synod.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* While I would like to pay tribute to the excellent work as caretaker that Bishop Colin is doing in the diocese of Oxford, it is a fact that the laity and the clergy in the diocese will have to wait an extra 12 months. Will the Crown Nominations



Commission provide a short summary of what has gone wrong, to the extent that they are able to do so within all the bounds of secrecy and all the rest of it, so that the people of the diocese of Oxford can actually look forward to getting a bishop?

*The Archbishop of York:* Chair, if I may take you into a room, the Crown Nominations Commission is meeting, there is a quadruple lock and their words are sealed. You are trying to fish and I will not allow you.

44. *Mr John Ward (London)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In the light of the answer the Archbishop of Canterbury gave to question 15 at the February group of sessions, and in particular his statement that when candidates are being considered for a particular See their teaching on a range of issues, including (by implication) human sexuality, is among the many considerations that may properly be taken into account when considering their relative merits for that appointment, can it be confirmed whether any guidance to that effect has been provided to the CNC and, if it has, will that guidance be published?

*Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby)* replied: The current version of the guidance material provided to CNC members is something which accurately reflects what I said to the Synod in February. Like previous versions of the guidance it has been shared with the Crown Nominations Commission and Bishops who are making appointments to suffragan sees. I shall want to consult the House of Bishops on whether it should be made more widely available.

*Mr John Ward (London):* I think what the Chairman is saying is that simply saying that the Church's teaching on human sexuality is wrong is enough to prevent you from being appointed as a bishop. Given this is rather shocking doctrinal discrimination, and given that bishops who will not ordain women cannot always be a focus for unity for everyone but are very properly given a special place in the Church, will you give a special place in the Church for a bishop who thinks that the Church's teaching on human sexuality is double-speak?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I do not accept your presupposition.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* If the effective requirement to be heterosexual is not in the person spec, what is the mechanism by which it can fairly emerge later in the process?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I am sorry, I do not understand the question.

*Mrs April Alexander:* If the effective requirement to be heterosexual does not appear in the person spec for the post, what is the mechanism by which it can fairly emerge later in the process?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* Mrs Alexander, I heard the words, I do not understand the question.

*The Chair:* I think we will need to move on.

## Dioceses Commission

45. *Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Dioceses Commission: What is the procedure for initiating a review of the boundary between the two Provinces of the Church of England?

*Canon Professor Michael Clarke (Worcester)* replied: There are two possible routes. Either the diocesan bishops of the dioceses affected (after consulting their diocesan synods) can submit proposals to the Commission; or the Commission can (after consulting interested parties, including the diocesan bishops and synods) prepare a draft scheme.

Given the pivotal role that the diocesan bishop would have in advocating any change of province affecting his or her own diocese, the Commission – encouraged by the Archbishops – decided to test the mind of the House of Bishops on a proposal to bring about a more equal balance between the provinces earlier this year, prior to preparing any draft scheme to bring this about. The House did not support such a proposal, given other more pressing priorities at the present time.

*Dr Edmund Marshall (St Albans):* As section 3 of the Dioceses Pastoral and Mission Measure of 2007 places an ongoing duty on the Dioceses Commission to keep under review the size, boundaries and number of provinces, will the Commission now be pleased to receive, irrespective of the views of bishops, representations on these matters from other members of General Synod, particularly in the House of Laity?

*Canon Professor Michael Clarke:* We shall be pleased to receive any such suggestions. Our concern, however, will be to make sure we do not waste our scarce resources chasing ones that look to be a non-runner.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* In view of the vast burden on the Archbishop of Canterbury of leading both the Anglican communion and a large province, and given the known support of both Archbishops for an adjustment in the provincial boundary, I wonder if the Commission would now consult the Archbishops again and bring to this Synod proposals or options for transferring between four and ten dioceses from the southern province to the northern and invite the House of Bishops to reconsider the leadership being offered by the Archbishops?

*Canon Professor Michael Clarke:* Thank you, Mr Scowen. An important question. There are ways other than redrawing provincial boundaries which would enable the loads on the two Archbishops to be adjusted. The result of our conversation with the House of Bishops was that the House of Bishops Standing Committee would continue to have that as a matter of concern.

46. *Revd Christopher Hobbs (London)* asked the Chair of the Dioceses Commission: As the bishoprics of Berwick, Marlborough and Whalley are still in abeyance, when can we expect them to be filled?

*Canon Professor Michael Clarke* replied: The process for filling these Sees is the same as that for filling any suffragan see on the retirement or translation of the current bishop.

The diocesan bishop would, after consulting the diocesan synod (or in cases of urgency, the bishop's council) present a fully worked up proposal to the Dioceses Commission and notify the relevant archbishop. Further details of the process can be found on the Commission's pages on the Church of England website.

We have not received any proposals to fill the Sees mentioned. Any such proposal would be considered on its merits.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* Could the Dioceses Commission give a clear undertaking that should there be nominations or volunteers for the post of Whalley Bishop they will be taken seriously?

*Canon Professor Michael Clarke:* We have given serious consideration, and shall continue to give serious consideration, to the translation of the Bishop of Willesden to Whalley.

### **Liturgical Commission**

47. *Revd Canon William Croft (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: In the light of growing numbers of people living with dementia and the opportunities to minister to such people, what thought, if any, has the Liturgical Commission given to worship resources and good liturgical practice to support those ministering in such contexts?

*The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell)* replied: To a large extent the work of the Commission is dependent on the Synod and House of Bishops commissioning liturgical material to be prepared for authorization. Looking forward to the next quinquennium, in response to various requests the Commission is minded to produce a range of material for commendation to mark various life-stages and events as a resource to discipleship. This will certainly include prayers for those living with or caring for those with dementia.

*Revd Canon William Croft (Peterborough):* Thank you very much for the answer to the question. In addition to the promise of prayers for those living with or caring for those with dementia, could I also ask would the Liturgical Commission also give consideration to good liturgical practice in this area because experience suggests that this is so important in this area of ministering to those with dementia?

*The Bishop of Exeter:* Thank you for your supplementary. That is really important. I think there is a whole body of medical evidence, and indeed anecdotal evidence, from things like the memory cafés which are actually initiatives done by all sorts of parishes, which I have seen in my own diocese. For example, what really helps people who are living with dementia is not necessarily words but, for example, music; music is often the thing that unlocks the closed gates of memory. That is why I think hymnody, for example, is a really important vehicle when helping worship with people living with dementia. That is why certainly on the Liturgical Commission we are very grateful that we have a representative of the Royal School of Church Music and, indeed, Praxis working in partnership with us. I think in terms of promoting good practice, it is in that dialogue with them as we go forward in partnership which is how I would seek to take things forward.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* Can the Bishop also assure us that the Commission will take into account the importance of ingrained familiarity when dealing with liturgy for people who have dementia, and particularly in that context the particular role and importance of the words of the Book of Common Prayer?

*The Bishop of Exeter:* 150% I could say that because certainly when one is dealing with older people it is often that reservoir inside them which has come from the Book of Common Prayer which is there, and they are familiar words which just release people to pray, so most certainly.

48. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: In framing its response to the Transformations Group regarding gender inclusive language, was the Commission aware of the policy outlined in GS 1115 'Language and the Worship of the Church', namely that *Common Worship* was supposed to draw on a broader range of images for God, drawn from scripture and tradition, than had hitherto been the case?

*The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell)* replied: The Commission is well aware of 'Language and the Worship of the Church' as a starting-point for drafting texts, written as it was by a previous Liturgical Commission. Representatives of the Transformations Group attended a Commission meeting in October 2014 during which it was noted that work needs to be done to raise awareness of already-existing resources, including texts already published in *Common Worship*. It was also noted that questions of inclusivity need to be broader than gender, including for example race-, disability- and age-appropriateness – rather than being uniformly neutral. The Church of England continues to be rooted and nourished by the Trinitarian picture of God, but its repertoire of prayer has been enriched by use of a wider range of imagery, much of which celebrates the tenderness and nurturing love of God. This counterbalances what might be perceived as an assertively masculine and dominant picture of God in prayers which typically refer to power, lordship and mastery. Liturgical vocabulary should be rich in both female and male registers.

*Revd Charles Read (Norwich):* Bishop, thank you for this very full, helpful and honest answer. You refer in the middle to some texts already published in *Common Worship*, which people may not be aware of because they are quite well-hidden in *Common Worship*. What plans does the Commission have, or what could it do to help people know that these texts are there and become more familiar with them?

*The Bishop of Exeter:* Actually a preliminary list has already been made and it is going to be put on the Church of England website.

## **Church Commissioners**

49. *Ms Susan Cooper (London)* asked the Church Commissioners: What were the legal costs involved in supporting Bishop Inwood when giving his evidence to the Employment Tribunal concerning the non-granting of a licence to the Revd Canon Jeremy Pemberton?

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner)* replied: This case is *sub judice* and information about costs is commercially sensitive. Indeed, as the tribunal is part-way

through its consideration of the issues, any comment at all on the case would be inappropriate.

*Ms Susan Cooper:* I understand you cannot give any answers on the specific case, but what advice is given to bishops regarding legal and reputational costs when they are making decisions that may prove controversial?

*Mr Andrew Mackie:* I do not think it is for the Church Commissioners to give advice to the bishops in relation to that issue; I am sure that bishops will come to their own conclusions.

50. *Canon Zahida Mallard (Leeds)* asked the Church Commissioners: How many minority ethnic (ME) members, in addition to the Archbishop of York, are there on the Board of Governors, and what action has been taken since the debate on the 2002 report 'Called to Act Justly' to encourage ME participation on the Board and its Committees and to address the recommendations in that report which were overwhelmingly endorsed by the Synod?

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner)* replied: There are no other ME members of the Board. It should be noted that over half of the Board members are either ex officio members or are elected by other bodies. These include eleven elected by General Synod itself. Regarding the twelve members appointed or nominated (either by the Crown or the Archbishops), and appointments to committees of the Commissioners which are within our control, we ensure that any advertisement or 'headhunter' encourages applications from under-represented groups, including ME.

*Canon Zahida Mallard (Leeds):* As previous efforts appear to have failed in this regard, does the Board have any plans to take positive action in order to reverse this as the House of Bishops did with women's equality?

*Mr Andrew Mackie:* Thank you very much. There are no plans to go beyond the very active steps that are taken in relation to the appointments within the control of the Board, which are only a portion of them, to go beyond the efforts, as we have said in the written answer to the question, that currently encourages as much response as possible from under-represented groups.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* Has the Commission considered consulting CMEAC about finding a suitable range of members – the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns.

*Mr Andrew Mackie:* I am not aware that there has been specific consultation with that body but we can write to you on that if there is further information I am not aware of.

51. *Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: Why has the Church Commissioners' Pastoral Committee not been renamed the 'Mission and Pastoral Committee' in line with the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011; what are its annual costs in full and part-time staff and travelling expenses, meals etc for its members; what steps have been taken to achieve diversity in its membership (including lay/ ordained/ SSMs/ chaplains) after consulting the Appointments Committee; and does it evaluate the outturn of its decisions three to five years afterwards?

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner)* replied: The Committee considered such a name change unnecessary because there is a statutory duty on all exercising functions under the Measure to have regard to the furtherance of the mission of the Church.

In 2014 the Committee cost £3,917 for room hire, catering and reimbursement of expenses. The Pastoral team that supports the Committee's work and also, rather than the Committee, deals with the majority of cases and Scheme drafting cost £216,402.

We do not consult the Appointments Committee; apart from the RACSC nominee, members are appointed by our Board. There is a laity/clergy balance and we encourage applicants from under-represented groups. There is a spread of clergy and we seek a good geographical spread.

A retired archdeacon has reviewed the impact of past decisions and we will repeat this every five years or so. Our decisions have been shown to be generally well regarded.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford)*: What were your reasons for not changing the name and what are your reasons for not consulting the Appointments Committee, and how do you encourage applicants? Where do you advertise?

*Mr Andrew Mackie*: I think the reason for not changing the name was that the Committee did not see a compelling reason to change the name. The important thing in the Committee's mind, I think, was the work that the Committee has to do and its remit. It is clear from the Measure that the remit of the Committee must have regard to the furtherance of the mission of the Church. I think it is not so much that there were compelling reasons not to change the name; it is just that there did not seem compelling reasons to do so.

As to where advertisements appear, I am afraid I do not have the detail of that so we can write to you on that. As to the consultation, I think the important thing, as we said in the written answer, is that there is a balance between the laity and the clergy and that there is real encouragement given to under-represented groups to apply, but we are very keen to ensure that, to the extent we can, there is a good spread.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London)*: Were the Commissioners aware that this Synod was similarly advised that it did not need to change the name of the Diocesan Pastoral Committees when it was considering the Mission and Pastoral Measure, or indeed the title of the Measure, but decided in both cases to do so in order to send a very clear message about the priority of mission? If the Commissioners were not aware of that, I wonder if they would now reconsider their decision so that in their own clear naming of their committees they themselves make it clear that they are aware that the mission of the Church is the absolute priority to which we are working.

*Mr Andrew Mackie*: I could not possibly quarrel with the premise of the question and I am happy to take the point that has been made in the question back to the Committee.

## Pensions Board

52. *Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: How many minority ethnic members does the Board have and what action has been taken since the debate on the 2002 report 'Called to Act Justly' to encourage ME participation on the Board and its Committees?

*Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio)* replied: There are currently no minority ethnic members of the Pensions Board. 16 out of the 20 members of the Board are elected – by a house of the General Synod or by the members and employers of the pension schemes. We publicise forthcoming elections and appointments to the Board, with publicity material stating that we would particularly encourage women, people from minority ethnic and younger people to stand for election.

We have elections at the end of this year by the House of Laity and House of Clergy, and encourage members to nominate minority ethnic people to stand for election.

*Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds)*: Thank you for your answer. Considering the successful work which the Church has previously done in relation to addressing under-representation in other areas of the Church, what will the Board do to describe the failure described in the answer in relation to the implementation of guidelines to improve representation of minority groups?

*Dr Jonathan Spencer*: As the main answer indicates, most of the positions on the Pensions Board are not directly in our hands, we are subject to the views of the various electorates, which includes this General Synod but also includes employers and employees of some of the schemes. As we have made clear, we will encourage all those electing groups to look for diversity of all kinds – BME as you say, gender has been an issue for us as well – but we also require to hit two targets: one is the diversity issue that we are on at the moment; we also need appropriate expertise in an increasingly regulated area of the economy.

## Corporation of the Church House

*Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Corporation of the Church House: Does the Corporation of Church House take into consideration the advice of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group when accepting bookings for the Church House Conference Centre, and if so what was its advice concerning the booking for the RUSI Land Warfare Conference 2015?

*Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth)* replied: The Church House Conference Centre (CHCC) is a trading subsidiary of the Corporation of the Church House; it is thus responsible for its own bookings policy. In formulating this policy CHCC takes into account the guidance provided by the Ethical Investment Advisory Group. CHCC does not accept bookings from arms companies, nor does it from companies breaching EIAG guidance on alcohol, pornography or gambling. For certain bookings advice may also be sought from a variety of sources, including the Corporation, the NCIs and others.

In the specific case of the Royal United Services Institute series of strategic defence conferences, which have been held at Church House since 2012, guidance was sought from several sources including the EIAG. All agreed that RUSI was a world leading body for the discussion of strategic Foreign Policy, Defence and Security issues and that it is entirely appropriate for CHCC to accept bookings from them.

*Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough):* Is the Corporation of Church House aware that the RUSI Conferences booked for July are both sponsored by major arms manufacturers, including Lockheed Martin, MBDA Missile Systems, General Atomics and Northrop Grumman?

*Canon Lucy Docherty:* You are referring, I think, to the RUSI Conference that has just been held. I think the answer that has been given already makes it very clear that the sponsorship does not apply to the whole conference but to a very small part of it, to the refreshments only.

*Mr Elliot Swatridge (Church of England Youth Council):* How would the Corporation of the Church House respond to the over 2,800 people who have signed a petition for Church House to change its policy on allowing organisations sponsored in any way by arms dealers and also the vigil that was recently held outside has been done on numerous occasions when similar conferences have been held?

*Canon Lucy Docherty:* RUSI is not sponsored, as it says in the answer given already, by arms dealers but I will take your comments back to the Corporation and to the Church House Conference Centre and we will review and come back to you if you so wish.

*A Speaker:* A point of order, Chair, can we request an extension to the session.

*The Chair:* I have heard your request. I did give some consideration earlier but I am not minded to suggest an extension of the sitting.

### **Ethical Investment Advisory Group**

54. *Canon Linda Ali (York)* asked the Chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group: Has the EIAG considered the ethical implications of investment in GLENCORE XSTRATA, from the point of view of the continuing poverty in Africa and the wider consequences that has (including trafficking across the Mediterranean)?

*Revd Canon Professor Richard Burrige (Universities)* replied: As a result of holdings in Glencore the EIAG has undertaken engagement with the company on a range of environmental, social and governance issues (ESG). Our engagement encouraged Glencore's membership of the International Council on Mining and Metals, which requires members to adhere to 10 principles for sustainable development. Glencore has since become a member. The EIAG also raised sulphur dioxide pollution from the Mopani Mines smelter in Mufulira, Zambia. We were pleased to note that Glencore brought forward their investment in the smelter upgrade by two years. Whilst we maintain contact on a number of issues our current engagement relates to Aiming for A as part of a coalition of shareholders pressing the company to take greater action to address climate change. In support of this the Church Commissioner's representative recently spoke at the



AGM. The EIAG regularly reviews its engagement and will continue to monitor the response of the Company.

*Canon Linda Ali:* Thank you for your response to my question, Professor Burridge, but I wonder if you could enlarge, please, on the ten principles of sustainable development mentioned in your answer. Do they include Glencore ploughing back a sizeable amount of its excessive profits into the wellbeing of the suffering people of Mopani in Zambia where acid from the copper mines is polluting their water and their land, preventing them from growing food? Thank you.

*Revd Professor Richard Burridge:* Thank you for the question and the supplementary, Canon Ali. As I detailed in my answer there, our engagement with Glencore has enabled a number of significant things to happen. I am not sure I have got all the detail on your specific point there but I do know that Glencore in recent years has ploughed a significant amount of money back, particularly over \$500 million into Zambia in their recent smelter upgrade, over 100 million in taxes and royalties back into Zambia, as well as the various tens of thousands of jobs and social and health programmes that they are working with. We are continuing to work closely with the company and I am sure that we can take your other point into consideration in our continuing engagement with them.

55. *Dr Paula Gooder (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group: What are the latest developments regarding the engagement undertaken by the EIAG concerning the National Investing Bodies' holding in SOCO International, a UK listed oil and gas exploration company which has been criticised for its involvement in the Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of Congo, and following the statement issued by the Commissioners and Pensions Board at the company's AGM calling for the Board of SOCO to consider the position of the Chairman?

*Revd Canon Professor Richard Burridge (Universities)* replied: The EIAG has raised concerns with SOCO since November 2013, with engagement intensifying in December 2014. Concerns have addressed four main areas: 1) need for a wide ranging and transparent independent enquiry addressing the allegations of bribery, corruption and human rights abuses, 2) lack of independent and effective corporate governance, 3) adoption of best practice, internationally recognised, environmental and social standards and 4) unequivocal respect for park boundaries within a World Heritage Site.

The EIAG were deeply concerned about the failure of SOCO to properly and fully address our concerns, in particular to ensure an open and transparent enquiry into the allegations of corruption and human rights abuses. The EIAG recommend full disinvestment to the Church Commissioners and for the company to be placed on the restricted list. In a statement made by the Commissioners on the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 the Commissioner's announced their disinvestment of their £1.6 million holding.

*Dr Paula Gooder (Birmingham):* Given that the engagement from the EIAG led to the Church Commissioners disposing of their investment in SOCO and that the climate change policy to be debated on Monday recommends further engagement with energy companies and others contributing to carbon emissions, might we expect such engagement to lead to further divestment from the National Investing Bodies?

*Revd Professor Richard Burrige:* Thank you very much indeed, Dr Gooder. Your question, of course, anticipated the announcement of the Church Commissioners' disinvestment of their £1.6 million holding. The EIAG has been involved in very close engagement with SOCO over a substantive period of time and we got to the point where it was just clear that that was no longer productive and, therefore, the only thing we could do was disinvest. This is entirely consonant with recent disinvestments from News Corporation and from Vedanta, and this will be the model we will be using in our ongoing engagement with energy companies over the next several years, working to change where we can and then disinvest as a last resort when we cannot.

*The Chair:* I am going to show my age by recalling that there was a programme where a beep went and the host said, "I've started so I'll finish". I think we can squeeze one more question in. We will finish where we started with a question to be answered by Canon Spence from the Revd Richard Poole.

### **Archbishops' Council**

56. *Revd Richard Poole (Chichester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Could more information please be given as to who are the individuals receiving pension contributions amounting to £787,500 under the heading "Mission Agencies Clergy Pension Contributions" (2016 Budget GS 2002 page 35)? Of these people, who are those working abroad and who are working here in the UK?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio)* replied: These arrangements are the result of a decision made by the General Synod at the time of the Pensions Measure 1997. The pension contributions for clergy working for ten Anglican mission agencies are paid from Vote 4.

In the first quarter of 2015 these arrangements applied to 49 clergy who were overseas and 38.5 full time equivalent clergy working in this country

57. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: With one million people already using food banks up and down the country and five more years of austerity ahead for the poorest in society, what assessment has the Archbishops' Council made of the implications for its stated goal "particularly at a time of economic hardship in society, [of] enhancing the capacity and commitment of the Church to stand alongside people facing unemployment and financial insecurity" of decisions by Church institutions that will cut £2 million from Church budgets which support ministry for the poorest, appointing a new Secretary General paid more than the Prime Minister and higher than many Charity CEOs, increased expenditure on bishops and cathedrals and the creation of another new bishopric with its attendant costs and the continuing cost of Bishops housing?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio)* replied: The Archbishops' Council supports initiatives to address a wide range of social justice issues related to poverty and debt. The new arrangements coming out of the Resourcing the Future report will improve the targeting of funds on the most deprived communities.

The money due to be spent by the Commissioners on diocesan bishops' housing in this

three year period is a third less than in the last. Block grants to support bishops and cathedral ministry are rising at the same annual percentage in this three year period as the grants made by formulae for parish ministry.

As to the Secretary General and other senior staff, salaries are set after benchmarking against comparable roles in the voluntary and other sectors.

58. *Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How many minority ethnic members does the Council have in addition to the Archbishop of York, and what action has the Council taken to encourage ME participation in framing the groups taking forward the Reform and Renewal agenda?

*Revd Dr Rosalyn Murphy (ex officio)* replied: Of the 18 members of the Archbishops' Council there are three, including the Archbishop of York, who identify as being Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic or from a BAME background. The Archbishop is, of course, *ex officio*, the other two are appointed members, which is perhaps a pointer to wider issues associated with elections that only electors can address.

The responsibility for taking forward the Reform and Renewal agenda now rests with the Council and other member level bodies such as the Ministry Council. Those who make appointments to those bodies and to any other short term groups that may be established are expected to follow the Appointments Committee's guidelines, which stress the desirability of ensuring as diverse a membership as possible. There is some movement, but there is still a long way to go.

59. *Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What measures are in place to ensure that a "Church of England statement" – such as those recently issued concerning mitochondrial DNA (30/01/15), collective worship (15/06/15) and the Nottingham Employment Tribunal (17/06/15) – conveys an accurate reflection of the mind of the Church (including the range of views currently held), particularly when addressing a sensitive subject of public interest?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: There is a comprehensive process for shaping positions on public policy issues. This ensures consistency with doctrine, Canon Law, Synod resolutions and papers, and previous statements, and involves consultation with key stakeholders and experts. There is often a lead bishop on the subject who will play a key role. The Secretary General is involved on new issues and, on especially sensitive matters, the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops will make a final judgement.

On many issues, this procedure leads to a clear and consistent position. Where doctrine and precedent offer no guidance, the existence of diverse views within the Church will be highlighted in any public statement. Where there is an established position, the existence of dissenting views among the diverse membership of the Church does not affect the public position, unless or until a decisive change of stance has been expressed through the Church's decision-making bodies.

60. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How many funeral services were conducted by clergy in the most recent statistics (1) at crematoria and cemeteries; and

in churches and churchyards?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: In 2013, the most recent year for which figures are available –

- 73,198 funeral services were conducted by clergy at crematoria and cemeteries; and
- 86,292 in churches and churchyards.

These statistics are derived from annual church returns of their occasional offices.

61. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: How many dioceses have joined the Fair Funerals Campaign, and what action is the Council taking to support this initiative?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: The Fair Funerals Campaign was launched by Quaker Social Action in 2014 as a response to rising concern about the 1 in 7 who are reported as being unable to pay for a funeral. Funeral Directors are encouraged to sign the "fair funerals pledge" committing to making affordable funerals available and costs clearly communicated. Within the Church of England, Lichfield Diocese have been working on supporting this initiative, and during last month's national conference on funerals ministry a workshop was held exploring this issue and all 200 delegates, representing 38 dioceses, were given information. In addition, the ecumenical Churches' Funerals Group's stand at the National Funerals Exhibition also promoted the campaign.

Copies of the Fair Funerals Pledge information postcard are available in the Concourse.

62. *Revd Nigel Irons (Lichfield)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As churches are increasingly being asked to provide information about the age profiles of their congregations for the purpose of missional analysis could consideration be given to including a request for a person's Date of Birth on the Application Form for Enrolment on the Church Electoral Roll?

*Mr Philip Fletcher (ex officio)* replied: The Application Form for Enrolment on a Church Electoral roll is specified in Appendix I to the Church Representation Rules. Changing it would therefore require legislation, in the form of a Resolution contained in a statutory instrument approved by the Synod by a two-thirds majority in all three Houses. The Business Committee has previously exercised the option to set up a review group after each quinquennial election. Should they do so again, that would offer an opportunity to study the merits of Mr Irons' proposal. Amongst the factors they would no doubt consider would be whether such legislation, which adds to the information required of those seeking to have their name entered on the roll of a particular parish, is appropriate at a time when the Church is seeking to simplify its procedures.

## House of Bishops

63. *Mr Malcolm Halliday (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In its Annual Report for 2014 (GS Misc 1095) the Dioceses Commission explained that it had been "encouraged by both Archbishops to review the boundary between the two provinces so

as to create a more balanced” workload and intended to canvas the views of the House of Bishops. In its Report (GS Misc 1120) just received, that House has reported without giving reasons that it has “considered particular options” and was “not in favour of taking these further”. Can the House please provide Synod with a more detailed explanation for the House’s decision on this important matter which affects the whole Church of England and its missionary interface with a society which is already significantly southern biased in its focus?

64. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the enormous disparity in the sizes of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, exacerbated by the recent reduction in the number of dioceses in the latter, what were the House of Bishops’ reasons for rejecting all the options for a review of provincial boundaries?

65. *Dr Peter Capon (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given rapid population increases concentrated in the south of England and the consequential widening population disparity between the Provinces, why did the House of Bishops not favour any further consideration of change to Provincial Boundaries?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster)* replied: I shall with permission answer questions 63, 64 and 65 together.

The House did indeed consider a paper from the Dioceses Commission at its last meeting, which explored and sought a steer on the pros and cons of a possible major redrawing of the provincial boundary. The boundary has remained largely unchanged since the Norman Conquest and redrawing it would require formal consultation with every diocesan synod of the dioceses affected and the approval of General Synod.

The House did not regard that the status quo as a sufficient impediment to mission to warrant embarking on such a change at the present time. It was also concerned that the process of consideration that would be needed would be a time consuming distraction from more pressing challenges of Reform and Renewal.

66. *Revd Stephen Pratt (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Synod’s resolution of November 2013 on ‘Intentional Evangelism’ supported the formation of an Archbishops’ Task Group on Evangelism, with the terms of reference and timetable set out in GS 1917, and went on to call on PCCs and diocesan and deanery Synods to spend the bulk of one meeting annually and some part of every meeting focusing on sharing experiences and initiatives for making new disciples. Is the Archbishops’ Task Group keeping up with the proposed timetable set out in GS 1917; and is there evidence from the dioceses that the call for the diocesan and deanery Synods and PCCs to devote time to evangelism is being followed?

*The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes)* replied: GS 1917 gave the support of Synod to the formation by the Archbishops of their Evangelism Task Group. The Archbishops want the Group to enable, encourage and provoke the sharing of faith in every church community so that many would begin new life as disciples of Jesus Christ. The Group is trying to do this, as GS Misc 1105 indicates. Discussing these matters in the councils of the Church at every level is a helpful contribution to this priority. But as Synod well knows, there is no mechanism for mandating or evaluating discussions at

PCC, deanery and diocesan level on experiences and initiatives for making new disciples. The Evangelism Task Group has received anecdotal evidence that this is being done, but does not intend as a priority to gather such data systematically. The main thing in evangelism remains that Christian people should share their faith with those they meet and know.

67. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What plans are being made for the Church of England to mark the 500th Anniversary of the publication of Martin Luther's *95 Theses* in 2017?

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister)* replied: A number of churches and church organizations have already been engaged for some time in preparations for the Reformation Anniversary in 2017. These would include some with whom the Church of England has strong ties, notably the Evangelical Church in Germany (through the Meissen Agreement) and the Lutheran churches within the Porvoo Communion of Churches. The Council for Christian Unity has set up a planning group to coordinate our involvement with different initiatives and seek to ensure we are able to address the significant opportunities arising from it. The group is being chaired by the Bishop of Coventry and further information will be made available in the coming year. Particular events will include participation in the Europe-wide initiative, 'Way Stations of the Reformation', which for England will focus on Cambridge, and the Meissen Theological Conference on the theme 'Reformation then and now'.

68. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the Transformation Steering Group's statements regarding language about God, can the House of Bishops, as guardians of the Church's faith, reaffirm the biblical teaching about God as Father of believers and King of the Kingdom of God?

*The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell)* replied: The work produced by the Transformations Group appears on the Church of England's website (under the section on Ministry). It does not at this point include a statement about theological language, although this is an area the Group continues to explore as part of its remit. Some members met with the Liturgical Commission for a preliminary discussion last year and others will make a presentation to the Faith and Order Commission in the autumn. Any report arising from that process would be likely to be presented for consideration by the House of Bishops. In the meantime, members of the Group are of course at liberty to comment in an individual capacity on related questions. In its authorized liturgies, the Church of England speaks of God as Father and King, alongside a wide range of other terms drawn from Scripture, and there are no plans to change that.

69. *Mrs Mary Judkins (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is the House aware of a sudden rise in Masonic services in our cathedrals recently?

*The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell)* replied: The House of Bishops is not aware of such a rise. Data regarding frequency of services linked to specific outside organisations is not routinely collected and monitored centrally by the Church of England.

70. *Dr Charles Hanson (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Nine years

ago one-third of Readers surveyed by the Central Readers' Council said that they were underused. More than three-quarters felt Readers would be of greater value to the Church were they more easily able to transfer to ordained ministry. Might the House of Bishops look with urgency at the best use of this large pool of available trained talent, especially as numbers of licensed ministers are forecast rapidly to diminish?

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson)* replied: Within our reformed catholic understanding of church, some ministers are in holy orders and some are not. In Anglican polity there is no progression from lay ministry to ordained ministry, nor should there be some process of transfer other than through selection processes designed for the purpose.

The new working group on lay leadership in the church will undoubtedly tackle this issue.

Reader ministry is of equal value with all other forms of commissioned and accountable ministry – lay and ordained – but there are proper and important distinctions. Readers have the supreme advantage of being lay and therefore of being able to bring God into the conversation with many who are fearful or suspicious of those they view as 'professionals'.

Undoubtedly some Readers would like to be ordained but many more rejoice in the layness of their ministry.

71. *Mrs Anne Bloor (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Excluding the PEV Sees and the Bishopric of Fulham, in 2013 there were six Area or Suffragan Bishops who were Traditionalist Catholics. In 2015, there are only two. Bearing in mind the assurance in the Five Guiding Principles that we are committed to enabling all to flourish within the life and structures of the Church, what positive steps are being taken to encourage the appointment of Traditionalists to vacant Area and Suffragan Sees?

*The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff)* replied: The responsibility for making nominations for a suffragan see to the Crown lies with the relevant Diocesan Bishop. He or she has to consider a range of criteria, and are very aware of the Five Guiding Principles and their implications.

A key issue is that of sustaining a good supply of people of all traditions who have potential for episcopal and other leadership roles. The Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments and I had a useful meeting last December with Traditional Catholic bishops. We noted among other things the importance of PEVs and Diocesan Bishops working closely together to ensure that Traditionalists who may have potential for episcopal ministry receive relevant development and support, and gain the kind of ministerial experience which might prepare them for such ministry.

72. *Dr Paula Gooder (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the length of time taken to complete the Church's safeguarding-related procedures following the decision to take no criminal proceedings against the former Bishop of Gloucester, have the procedures been reviewed with a view to establishing whether there is scope for improvement, in the light of the apparent tension between a proper concern to take allegations seriously and a proper concern to be fair to persons against whom

allegations are made?

73. *Revd Canon Michael Parsons (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the Church's investigation into allegations of abuse made against the former Bishop of Gloucester took significantly longer to complete than did the police investigation, will there be a review of the process for such investigations and, if so, when might that review be complete?

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler)* replied: With permission I shall answer questions 72 and 73 together.

I am not able to comment on specific cases. However, the House of Bishops recently published a revised practice guidance in respect of responding to serious safeguarding situations related to church officers and risk assessments, which takes account of learning from case experience and best practice in the statutory sector to assist dioceses, parishes and the National Church Institutions with responding to safeguarding concerns and allegations, including those involving senior individuals. As with all safeguarding cases, the Church is often not in control of the timescale it takes for investigations to take place, as these are dictated by the Police and other statutory authorities who lead investigations. We do our best to handle cases as swiftly as possible within these constraints and the need to be thorough and to follow best practice. The guidance includes the expectation of conducting learning lessons reviews, and both pieces of practice guidance will be further reviewed by the House of Bishops in December 2015, taking account of additional learning.

74. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the concerns expressed by MACSAS and others about clergy convicted of serious offences continuing to maintain their clerical style and dress, will the House of Bishops consider bringing forward proposals to restore the canonical penalty of deposition from Holy Orders, in order that the Church may more clearly repudiate from its ministry those who have seriously betrayed the trust placed in them?

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler)* replied: There are two issues here. Firstly, with regard to the wearing of clerical dress – including clerical collars – taking power to prevent prohibited clergy from wearing clerical dress would be problematic, not least since it would be unenforceable in practice. With regard to exercising ministry, prohibition for life already exists as the most severe penalty under the Clergy Discipline Measure and may be invoked in the case of serious safeguarding offences. When the draft Clergy Discipline Measure was being considered in 2000 the Synod decided not to include deposition in the range of penalties available under the Measure.

I intend to invite the House of Bishops to reconsider whether that decision was wise but amending the CDM to allow deposition would require a Measure, so change would take some considerable time.

75. *Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: When will there be an announcement of the composition of the working party to review the purpose and effect of the unrepealed proviso to Canon 113 of the Canons of 1603, as was set out in GS Misc 1085 published 22 October last year?



76. *Revd Preb David Houlding (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Further to the commitment made in GS Misc 1085, has a group yet been appointed to review the law regarding confidentiality and the seal of the Confessional, as set out in the unrepealed Canon of 1604, in the context of the 'Ministry of Absolution'? If so, by whom, and after what consultation was it agreed?

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler)* replied: With permission I shall answer questions 75 and 76 together.

The Archbishops both agreed the membership and Terms of Reference of the Advisory Group on the Confessional after discussion with myself and other colleagues. The first meeting of the group took place on 9 June where the Terms of Reference were confirmed. The membership and Terms of Reference are now available on the Safeguarding Web Page of the Church of England website. It includes a survivor representative, representatives of other churches and of a range of traditions within the Church of England. The meeting of the 9 June has agreed a draft work plan which involves three key strands of activity – legal, theological and practice review.

77. *Revd Canon Richard Hibbert (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: As the 'Who is my Neighbour' pastoral letter of February 2015 sparked interest and comment from the media, what responses and preparations are being made by the House of Bishops to offer pastoral guidance in regard to the forthcoming European Referendum?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: The Bishops' letter noted the Churches' immense contribution to the rebuilding of Europe after 1945 and the need to focus on what Europeans share rather than what divides us. It added that this is not an argument for the structures and institutions of the European Union as they now exist.

We do not know the precise question that the referendum will address, nor what the political climate of Europe will be like. I would be surprised, however, if a single authentic Christian position emerged. What we most need is serious debate, not superficial exchanges of slogans and myths.

MPA's contribution to this is the creation of a blog, Reimagining Europe: Our Shared Futures, for airing and debating differing opinions from around and beyond the church. Already, some 22 contributors, with backgrounds in theology, politics, cultural life and other arenas, have agreed to contribute. MPA will launch the blog in September.

78. *Mr John Ward (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the need, recognised by the Archbishop of York, to issue a lengthy statement following comments made by a clergyman in his Diocese about the inclusive words spoken on behalf of the Dean and Minster community in relation to Gay Pride in York, would the House now prepare and publish a report which examines whether the Church's teaching on homosexuality provides succour to homophobia?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: The House of Bishops commissioned the Pilling Report, which includes a sensitive and nuanced chapter on homophobia at pages 54 to 59, and includes a particularly relevant section headed 'using words with care'. The resource materials prepared for the current process of

conversations are also tellingly entitled 'grace and disagreement'. While the conversations continue I suspect that we need rather more listening and rather fewer words.

79. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following clergy entering same-sex marriage, can the House of Bishops confirm its policy regarding discipline in such matters?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: The House of Bishops' policy in relation to the clergy and same sex marriage was set out in the pastoral guidance issued in February 2014. Disciplinary matters, whether on this or any other issue are for each diocesan bishop to resolve on a case by case basis.

80. *Canon Linda Ali (York)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House considered whether the Church's response to same sex marriage needs to change in order to take account of what Jesus said in John 16.12 ("I have much more to tell you, but now it would be too much for you to bear"), recognising that Jesus is speaking to us through the actions and voices of the people and of younger people in particular?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: In their covering letter to the pastoral guidance from the House of Bishops in February last year the Archbishops committed the Church of England to 'profound reflection on the meaning, interpretation and application of scripture to which we all seek to be faithful.' By that they were, I think, referring to the whole of scripture. In addition they said that the Church would pay 'particular attention to the lived experience of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people.' The conversations now going on around the Church are the best way of continuing that process of reflection.

81. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House considered on what canonical basis, if any, it is permissible for clergy to bless events which celebrate lifestyles and behaviours which, according to the Scriptures and the established teaching of the Church of England, fall short of the life to which God calls us in Christ and so call for repentance? If so, what conclusion was reached, and, if not, will the House now do so?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: The issue was explored in paragraphs 379 to 399 of the Pilling report, which the House of Bishops had commissioned. It is one of the many issues that are the subject of the present process of conversations. The College of Bishops engaged with the whole range of issues on sexuality in facilitated conversations in September 2014. The House of Bishops has received regular updates on the progress of the regional Shared Conversations since then and will return to these issues once that process is concluded.

82. *Revd Stephen Pratt (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How are the facilitated discussions on Human Sexuality being funded and what is the overall cost likely to be?

83. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What assurance can be given that the cost of the Regional Shared Conversations will have no

impact on parish share?

*The Bishop of Norwich (Rt Revd Graham James)* replied: I shall with permission answer questions 82 and 83 together.

The Church Commissioners approved a request from the House of Bishops in 2014 that £300,000 of the Commissioners' rent relief from the Corporation of Church House in 2015 should be used to meet the costs of the shared conversations. This was precisely to relieve what would otherwise have been a major call on diocesan funds and the parish share. In addition a further £60,000 is being funded by a direct charge to dioceses for the expected 600 participants.

### **Secretary General**

84. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Secretary General: Two of the women elected to attend the House of Bishops as participant observers have been appointed to bishoprics, one Diocesan and one Suffragan. Are they to be replaced and, if so, what will be the process for selecting replacements?

*Mr William Fittall (Secretary General)* replied: The Bishop of Stockport is eligible to continue to serve as a regional representative until the end of her three year term in November 2016. The Bishop of Gloucester has now become a member of the House and there will be therefore be a by election, in accordance with the rules agreed by the House in 2013, to replace her as one of the 8 regional representatives. More generally, the House agreed in May that it would need to review the 2013 rules before the mandate of the existing representatives ends in 2016 in the light of the rapidly changing situation. A consultation exercise will be starting soon.

*The Chair:* I think it is time to draw stumps. Synod, that concludes this item of business.

I am asked to give a reminder that there will be a meeting of the House of Bishops tomorrow morning at 8.15 in James Hall. I now call upon His Grace the Archbishop of York to dismiss the Synod with his blessing.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* dismissed the Synod with the blessing.

## **FULL SYNOD: SECOND DAY SATURDAY 11 JULY 2015**

THE CHAIR: *Canon Ann Turner (Europe)* took the Chair at 9.33 am.

*The Revd Dr Rowan Clare Williams (York)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

*The Chair:* Good morning, Synod. Before we begin our business I have been asked to say that there is substantial legislation to get through today. The order is as printed in Order Paper II. Please note that legislative business will be taken after Item 9 on your Order Paper, as indicated in the Agenda.

For the next items of business, 503 to 506, members will need the report of the Steering Committee, GS 1952-3Z, the draft Measure GS 1952B, the draft amending Canon GS 1953B and the draft Petition GS 1953C. I would draw members' attention to the financial statement on the Tenth Notice Paper.

### **Legislative Business:**

#### **Draft Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure (GS 1952B) and draft Amending Canon No. 34 (GS 1953B)**

*The Chair:* I call upon the Bishop of Durham, Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 503, "That the Synod do take note of this report". You have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* I beg to move:

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

Thank you, Madam Chair. Synod will recall the positive tone of our debates last February when we completed the revision stages for both the Measure and the Amending Canon. Since February, careful thought has been given to both instruments and some drafting amendments have been identified which will clarify any uncertainties and improve the drafting. The proposed drafting amendments are explained in GS 1952-3Z.

Annex A to the report deals with drafting amendments to the Measure and Annex B is concerned with drafting amendments to the Amending Canon. The amendments do not change the substance of either the Measure or the Amending Canon which were both subject to major revision at Revision Committee stage, but they do improve the language and text.

With regard to amendments 4, 5, 11 and 12 in Annex A relating to the Measure, and amendments 7, 8, 13 and 14 in Annex B for the Amending Canon, I would like to record my thanks to Clive Scowen for drawing our attention to the need to clarify the provisions in question. These particular amendments will make clear that suspensions may be renewed more than once. As you can see from the report, we are not proposing any special amendments. Members of Synod, I invite you to take note of the Steering Committee's report.

*The Chair:* Item 503 is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes and I would invite members to confine their comments to matters addressed in the report of the Steering Committee. You will be able to speak generally to the Measure and the amending Canon in the course of the debate on Items 504 and 505. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put Item 503 to the vote. I remind members that under Standing Order 59(c), upon consideration of the report of the Steering Committee, the drafting amendments to both the draft Measure and the draft Amending Canon are deemed to have been made without being moved. I, therefore, put Item 503 to the vote.

*The motion*

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

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

*The Chair:* There are no special amendments being moved by the Steering Committee, so that completes the final drafting stage in respect of both the draft Measure and the draft Amending Canon. We come now to final approval stage for the Measure. I call upon the Bishop of Durham to move Item 504. You may speak for up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* I beg to move:

*'That the Measure entitled "Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure" be finally approved.'*

We all want every single one of our churches and institutions to be safer places and communities for all people, notably for children and adults at times of risk and harm, whether that be long or short-term. We have a long journey still ahead of us in developing ever safer churches. Alongside having to recognise, apologise for and face up to the consequences of past failures, we also have to acknowledge that we do not always get it right in the present.

Individuals determined to abuse will groom leaders and whole congregations in order to work their way into an abusive situation. Our emphasis has to be on prevention; so high quality training, safe recruiting at every level of church life and effective quality assurance are all high on the list of work being undertaken nationally and needing to be implemented at every level of church life. We have to be primarily about developing a culture in our churches that recognises safeguarding is a Gospel issue because it is about human well-being and wholeness.

We have to develop a culture that is both welcoming of all and in such a way that it is safe for all. This has to be about our day-to-day, week by week practice in our parishes and other institutions. Awareness, vigilance and care are all required. It is within this wider context that our legislation matters. This Measure is intended to both strengthen the Church's safeguarding framework and enhance our ability to deal effectively with allegations of misconduct by its ministers against children and vulnerable adults. By itself, legislation cannot create a safer Church, but it is an essential part of helping create it.

The provisions of the Measure mainly fall into seven areas. Under section 1, on the basis

of information supplied by the police or a local authority a bishop will be able to suspend a priest or deacon who presents a significant risk of harm. Before imposing such a suspension, the bishop will be required to consult the diocesan safeguarding adviser and any other persons the bishop considers appropriate.

Section 1 fills a lacuna in the provisions of the CDM 2003. Under this a bishop cannot suspend a cleric who is being investigated by the police or local authority in respect of criminal offences against children or vulnerable adults unless there is an arrest. Section 1 will rectify that. Any suspension, unless revoked, will expire after three months, but it will be renewable for further periods of three months at a time.

Section 3(6) of the CDM will apply so that the suspended cleric will be able to appeal to the President of Tribunals against the suspension. The right to appeal will protect clerics from being suspended unfairly and section 1(9) of the Measure will amend the Church of England Legal Aid Measure 1994 so that legal aid will be available for legal representation and advice for the purposes of such an appeal, subject to the usual discretion.

Secondly, where a complaint alleges misconduct of a sexual nature towards a child or vulnerable adult, section 7 will remove the one year limitation period under the CDM for bringing the complaint. Under the existing provision, such complaints can be made after one year has lapsed only if the President of Tribunals, upon application, grants permission to make the complaint out of time.

The one year limitation period has been criticised for inhibiting victims and survivors of abuse from making complaints since it often takes many years before they are ready and able to come forward. Under the current law, when they do come forward there is a barrier in their way which must be cleared before a complaint can be presented. The new provision will, therefore, apply in respect of relevant misconduct committed before the Measure comes into force even if the limitation period of one year has meanwhile lapsed.

Churchwardens and PCCs play an important part at parish level in the life and mission of the Church and, therefore, in the implementation of the Church's safeguarding policies. They occupy positions of responsibility where they are trusted and respected by others. The Church, therefore, needs to be able to stop those who are unsuitable from a safeguarding perspective from serving as churchwardens or on PCCs. Sections 2 and 3 will do that.

Any person who is on a barred list under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 will be disqualified from holding office as churchwarden or serving on a PCC or being appointed PCC secretary or treasurer. Furthermore, under section 3 of the Measure, members, secretaries and treasurers of PCCs will be disqualified if convicted of an offence listed in schedule 1 to the Children and Young Person's Act 1933. Those grounds for disqualification already apply to churchwardens under the Churchwardens' Measure.

In each of these cases the bishop will be able to waive a disqualification, but only after he or she has consulted the diocesan safeguarding adviser and such other persons as appropriate. The Measure will enable a bishop to suspend on certain safeguarding grounds churchwardens and members, treasurers and secretaries of PCCs. This will be if they are arrested on suspicion of committing an offence listed in schedule 1 to the

Children and Young Person's Act 1933 or charged with such an offence, or if the bishop receives information from the police or a local authority that they present a significant risk of harm towards a child or vulnerable adult. There will be a right to appeal against suspension to the President of Tribunals.

There will be a duty on all relevant persons within the Church of England to have due regard to safeguarding guidance issued by the House of Bishops. There is currently no such general duty on officeholders. Section 5 will place the new duty on all ordained clergy who are authorized by a bishop to exercise ministry and all licensed Readers and lay workers, churchwardens and PCCs.

In respect of PCCs, the duty will be on them in their corporate capacity. Section 5(4) will amend the Church Representation Rules so that a PCC's annual report must include a statement as to whether the council has complied with the duty. Section 5(3) will amend the CDM to make it explicit it will be misconduct for a clerk in Holy Orders to fail to comply with the duty to have due regard to the House of Bishops' Safeguarding Guidance.

The rationale for making the position explicit in section 5(3) is the Church needs to put in place and to be seen to put in place effective methods for dealing with safeguarding issues so that victims and survivors and the public can be reassured the Church takes such matters seriously. Making the position explicit will help achieve that aim and will also provide greater clarity about the role of clergy, all of whom are expected to play their part in helping to implement the Church's safeguarding policies. Section 5(1) will give the House of Bishops' guidance some force.

In accordance with usual legal principles in relation to duties of this kind, section 5(1) will require those to whom the duty applies to acquaint themselves with the guidance, to take it into account in decision-making where it is relevant and to depart from it only where they have cogent reasons for doing so.

A bishop currently has no power under the CDM to suspend a cleric when application is made to the President of Tribunals for permission to make a complaint out of time regardless of the seriousness of the allegations. Section 8 will correct this omission and will apply not only to complaints in respect of sexual misconduct but also to complaints alleging other misconduct.

The new power of suspension will be subject to certain conditions. The bishop will have to be satisfied that the suspension of a priest or deacon is necessary and before the bishop imposes a suspension he or she will have to seek advice from the diocesan registrar on whether the complainant has a proper interest, whether there is sufficient substance to the complaint and whether a suspension is necessary in all the circumstances of the case.

Section 8 is important because it will enable the bishop to suspend straightaway when necessary instead of having to wait until after the application to the President has been dealt with and a complaint subsequently made.

Lastly, the Measure will make certain technical amendments to the CDM, such as enabling the two registrars of tribunals to be able to delegate their functions to others.

Synod, I commend the Measure to you.

*The Chair:* The motion at Item 504 is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 61(a) the motion for closure, the speech limit or next business are not in order in this debate but I retain a discretion under Standing Order 21(c) to alter the normal speech limit of five minutes.

*Revd Brian Llewellyn (Europe):* Merely to say, those people who might find this Measure onerous or difficult only have to look across the Channel to see what it is like to live in a country where the church does not have these measures in place, not only in terms of the risk to children and vulnerable adults but to the reputation of the whole church. It has been a shock living in Belgium to see the reputation of the Catholic Church torn to shreds over this issue. Thank you.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* Just a small point of clarification. We have used the term “significant” in terms of a “significant complaint”. Would I be right in assuming that this will change with however the law in other fields develops as to what “significance” may mean because from time to time the courts have had to go back and decide whether “significance” was more than 50% or such as a reasonable person would not put to one side. I do not think we have definitions of that, I think it would be unhelpful to have it, but I think we ought to say that as the law develops in the other spheres presumably that will be interpreted in such a way.

*Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford):* As a member of the Clergy Discipline working parties, I have watched this come through with great support and interest.

Two issues. Laying of information, it seems to me it takes many years now for people to be prepared to come forward; normally because someone else is brave, others eventually come forward. I just want the reassurance that when they do lay that information it will never be ruled out of time. Whilst I do not want us to go round harvesting trying to get many people to make such complaints, there is no doubt about it under the Jimmy Saville case, Yewtree and other issues like that, people are now being very brave and we have got to encourage that braveness and to support them through very difficult times.

The second issue is the appointment of a replacement registrar. I am just wondering in what circumstances a new registrar would be appointed. Would it be a one-off? Would it be a regular case? What kind of qualifications would be needed? I know they come from a particular province, do we have a list of such people and are they appropriately qualified? Either way, I certainly support this amended legislation.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* I rise to commend these amendments and the work that the Committee has done, and particularly the Bishop of Durham because in a small way I suppose I have been a bit of a thorn in his side and I think they have worked hard and we need structures that are robust and command the confidence of everybody in the Church in terms of what we are trying to do in re-establishing our reputation of being an organisation that people can trust.

My one concern is this: I think in the fullness of time we are going to have to have a completely independent organisation to do this because we are placing various key



people in difficult positions in being both responsible for pastoral care and at the same time being the prosecutors of those who have done wrong. It would be good if we had a completely independent service that could build up experience and expertise and then when a complaint is made against somebody in authority in a diocese the whole process of investigation will be handed out and the pastoral care of all involved in the parish, or wherever it takes place, could then be handled by the diocese appropriately and properly.

Nonetheless, we are where we are, we should endorse this enthusiastically, we should all work hard to make it work and hope that we do not have to go to the scenario that I have just outlined but, nonetheless, I feel in my heart of hearts eventually that is where we will go. Thank you.

*Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester):* Really just a point in terms of how the implementation will work for churchwardens and PCCs who are unsuitable. I think in the earlier presentation it talked about whether they are on the barred list. That presumably will mean that anyone who stands for PCC or churchwarden will have to have a DBS to disclose that in the same way as taking on any other role that will have to be done before they can actually take up those appointments. I would be interested for some clarification on that. Thank you.

*Mr David Kemp (Canterbury):* Can I just back up Jonathan Alderton-Ford's comment about pastoral care and safeguarding. I think as we get more experienced, certainly in the diocese of Canterbury, where I am the Chair of the Safeguarding Management Group, we are beginning to understand how blurred the line can be between safeguarding and pastoral care. We have excellent safeguarding advisers in Canterbury, they are experienced social workers, they are good people and they are naturally carers. We are having to work quite hard to understand where safeguarding stops in a particular case and pastoral care takes over. I think we are at early stages in this but I just want to highlight this particular issue which we think will develop as our understanding of safeguarding increases.

*Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester):* A very quick question. I am the safeguarding officer for vulnerable adults for our church and have been writing our safeguarding policy. I will be interested to know if there is actually a working definition of what a vulnerable adult is because any adult can be deemed to be vulnerable.

*The Chair:* I now see no one standing. I therefore call upon the Bishop to reply. You have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* Thank you to everyone who has spoken. Brian Llewellyn, thank you for pointing us to the difficulties in other countries and that is why we need the stuff, I absolutely agree.

Martin Sewell, it is actually about significant risk rather than significant complaint, is the wording. There is a degree to which that is, of course, a matter of judgment but you are absolutely right that as the law develops and as cases unfold, the judgment will be made in the light of all of that.

Peter Bruinvels, thank you for your comment. That is why we are taking away the one year rule because on average research suggests it is up to 20 years before people come

forward. It is not a replacement registrar, it is a delegated registrar in the case where the registrar might be professionally embarrassed or compromised and therefore needs to delegate it. Someone they delegate it to must be approved by the President of Tribunals.

Jonathan Alderton-Ford, you have never been a thorn in my side. I am always grateful for people who ask awkward questions because that is what helps us get it better. Your comments about long-term independent service, that is a view, it is partially expressed in the Cahill Report. It is something that we examined but at present we do not think that is the way to go. It would be such a major upheaval in changing how dioceses had their own role but we will have to watch and see. Thank you for your overall enthusiastic endorsement.

Jacob Vince, wardens and PCC members, no they will not need a DBS beforehand, there will be a system of self-disclosure required on the forms and so on, and then if there was some reason we would seek it afterwards. That is how it will be dealt with.

David Kemp, yes, there are questions around some of the blurring of lines between safeguarding and pastoral care and it is one of the areas in which we think safeguarding advisers may need more help and support to know when to say actually, "I am the safeguarding officer, I am not the pastoral carer" and liaise with others in the diocese about pastoral care.

Can I at this point turn round? Most of you have not met this man yet, this is our new National Safeguarding Adviser, Graham Tilby, and one of the things that Graham is working on is upping the level of support and advice and encouragement to diocesan safeguarding advisers around issues like that.

Angela Scott, there is a definition of "vulnerable adult" in the Measure itself, already there.

I move the motion in my name.

*The Chair:* Synod, under Standing Order 36(a) the vote on the final approval of a Measure must be taken on a division by Houses unless I give permission and the Synod gives leave to dispense with that requirement. It is important to have accurate figures for the voting in each House on the final approval of a Measure so that the figures may be made available to the Ecclesiastical Committee and both Houses of Parliament. I therefore order a division by Houses.

*The motion*

*'That the Measure entitled "Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure" be finally approved.'*

*was carried after a division by Houses. The voting was as follows:*

	<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>AGAINST</i>
<i>Bishops</i>	28	0
<i>Clergy</i>	145	0
<i>Laity</i>	149	0

*No abstentions were recorded.*

*The Chair:* The Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee.

We now come to the final approval stage for the draft Amending Canon. I call upon the Bishop of Durham to move Item 505. The Bishop may speak for up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* I beg to move:

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 34” be finally approved.’

As I noted in presenting the Measure, we are on a journey of changing our culture in relation to safeguarding. We increasingly want to be about prevention whilst still having to respond well, which we do not always achieved, to past failures. It is therefore important to highlight that, like the draft Measure, most of the proposals in the Amending Canon are actually preventative and protective. Their aim is to prevent or avoid situations where there might otherwise be a risk of abuse, whether committed by clergy or by lay officers of the Church.

The Amending Canon will introduce a new Canon C 30 relating solely to matters of safeguarding. All dioceses presently have access to safeguarding advisers but there is some divergence in the roles they take on and about who actually provides safeguarding advice. Some differences may be justifiable in relation to local circumstances, but there is currently no mechanism for the Church to impose any national requirements.

The new Canon C 30 will therefore require every diocesan bishop to appoint a safeguarding adviser to advise the bishop on matters relating to the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults. The House of Bishops will be empowered to make provision to regulate who is eligible for appointment and what the safeguarding adviser’s functions are to be. This will facilitate consistency across the dioceses and ensure certain national standards are achieved. It will need to be matched by adequate resources being allocated to this provision by each and every diocese.

At present, there is no power for a bishop to direct a priest or deacon to undergo a risk assessment. The new Canon C 30 will remedy this. A diocesan bishop will be able to direct a priest or deacon who has authority to officiate in the diocese to undergo a risk assessment when the bishop is satisfied that the direction is justified in all the circumstances of the case. This will apply to clergy whether they are freehold, on common tenure or have permission to officiate. A failure to comply with a direction for a risk assessment without reasonable excuse will be regarded as misconduct under section 8(1) of the CDM. To protect clergy, this new power will be subject to the President of Tribunals being able to overturn a bishop’s direction where the bishop is plainly wrong. To achieve consistency across the dioceses and minimum standards of good practice, the House of Bishops will be under a duty to make provision by regulations about the carrying out of risk assessments, in particular as to (a) the persons who may carry out a risk assessment, (b) the procedure for carrying out a risk assessment, and (c) the procedure for challenging the outcome of a risk assessment. Any such regulations will be laid before the General Synod and will not come into force unless and until they have

been approved by the General Synod. Synod will therefore have the last word on such regulations.

The purpose of risk assessments will be to give the diocese as much information as possible about a priest or deacon who may present a safeguarding risk and to enable the diocese to manage that risk. Where an assessment concludes there is a significant safeguarding risk, the diocese can consult other bodies as appropriate, for example, local authority designated officers, and consider referring the risk assessment with all other relevant evidence to the secular national Disclosure and Barring Service. The DBS has a specific statutory role to assess whether a person should be entered on a barred list under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006. If a priest or deacon were entered on a barred list, it would in due course lead to removal from office under the existing provisions of section 30 of the CDM.

It is important that all those in ministry, whether ordained or lay, should receive appropriate training in relation to safeguarding. This is not just in the interests of children and vulnerable adults but it is also in the interests of the clergy and laity who serve them. The Amending Canon will therefore amend Canon C 8 so that all ordained clergy with authority to officiate will have to participate in arrangements of safeguarding training approved by the diocesan bishop. At present, only clergy with common tenure can be required to undertake safeguarding training.

Furthermore, Canons E 6 and E 8 will be amended so that the diocesan bishop may not license a lay Reader or license a lay worker unless that person has undergone suitable safeguarding training, and after they are licensed the bishop will have to ensure that suitable training continues to be made available. As with the provision of safeguarding advisers, the provision of training cannot be done on the cheap and adequate provision will be needed.

The Amending Canon will amend Canon E 6 and Canon E 8 so that similar disqualification provisions will apply to licensed Readers and lay workers as those that will apply in respect of churchwardens and PCC members. Consequently, a person will be disqualified from exercising the office of Reader or lay worker if included in a barred list under the Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 or convicted of an offence mentioned in Schedule 1 to the Children and Young Persons Act 1933. The diocesan bishop will also have power to suspend a licensed Reader or lay worker who is arrested for or charged with an offence mentioned in Schedule 1 to the 1933 Act or if the bishop is satisfied on the basis of information provided by the police or a local authority that the Reader presents a significant risk of harm.

These provisions likewise are similar to those that will apply to churchwardens and PCC members under the measure, so there will be a right of appeal to the President of Tribunals against a suspension. The diocesan bishop will also have power to suspend a Reader's or lay worker's licence pending a decision on whether or not to revoke the licence. Any Reader or lay worker whose licence is revoked or suspended will not be permitted to vest during a service.

Canon C 8 will be amended so that (a) only clergy of the Church of England with authority to officiate will be permitted by a minister with the cure of souls to minister in his or her

church and (b) clergy who have no authority to officiate, or who are prohibited or suspended under the CDM will not be permitted to vest during divine service. So if clergy wish to officiate in our church in whatever capacity, or vest, then they will have to get permission from a diocesan bishop. That will not impose unduly harsh requirements but it will be an important part of our safeguarding procedures.

Furthermore, to give these new provisions teeth, a minister with the cure of souls who knowingly permits a person to officiate or vest when that person has no authority to do so will commit misconduct under the CDM.

Lastly, Canon B 43 will be tightened up in respect of the Church's relations with other churches. An incumbent will be able to invite a minister or lay person from another church to perform certain duties at services only if the incumbent is satisfied, having made appropriate enquiries, that the person is of good standing.

Members of Synod, as a Church we must work together, listen to those who have suffered and help to provide protection for those who cannot protect themselves. I trust you will agree that these provisions are necessary and proportionate measures that we need to take in the interests of the most vulnerable in our Church and society.

*The Chair:* Synod, the motion at Item 505 is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 61(a) the motion for closure, the speech limit or next business are not in order in this debate, but I retain a discretion under Standing Order 21(c) to alter the normal speech limit of five minutes.

*Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford):* I welcome draft Amending Canon No. 34 but I do have a couple of points, one in support and one major question. I think it is only right that we do have a diocesan safeguarding adviser in every diocese. I hope they will be fully supported with the correct kind of backroom staff and that their relationship with the police, the social services and other local agencies will be encouraged, but always recognising it is very confidential work.

My query particularly is over the risk assessment. I am looking at 2(3); it is really important, "A risk assessment. in relation to an archbishop, bishop, priest or deacon, is an assessment of whether there is a significant risk that the archbishop, bishop, priest or deacon may (a) harm a child ... (b) cause a child ... to be harmed (c) put a child or vulnerable adult at risk of harm", et cetera. That is all very good but that is only at one moment in time when that risk assessment is carried out. I am seeking reassurance as to how the information, once gathered, is stored. Where does it go to? Who else is involved?

It talks later on in 3 about the persons who may carry out such a risk assessment, the procedure for carrying out that risk assessment, the procedure for challenging that outcome, and - my concern for natural justice - obviously there must be the opportunity for the person who has had the complaint made against them, or is subject to the risk assessment, to be able to protect him or herself. There is similarly the issue about when that person moves on, is this passed on to another diocese? The Archbishop of York, later on I know you are calling, in some background papers to the Committee it says about the Lambeth and the York list and my concern here is that that person moves down. Paul

Butler mentioned very carefully that there is this opportunity to talk to the central barring system. What about the central system of the dioceses with our new safeguarding officer, is that going to go there as well? How long does a risk assessment stay in force? Is there an opportunity for it to be removed? Is there an opportunity for it to be done again? I think these are very practical issues but that person's future is at risk forever and I think it is very important that we get that reassurance, which we know already on the preferment list, on the debarred list and others, they are properly kept and maintained. In principle, of course, I support the draft Amending Canon.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Madam Chair, there is a concern which I raised with the Steering Committee. First of all, to thank them; they have been very thorough. Everything that is in that Amending Canon has been long overdue, so I want to congratulate them for an amazing piece of work that they have done. It comes with clarity. However, when you are making legislation certain things come up which were not at the time canvassed or you did not think would arise. There is a real problem. People who actually have been prohibited under CDM from ministry and they are on the Archbishop's list, and the time of prohibition comes to an end, they want to come back to ministry and you have not got the power to request a risk assessment because they are not in ministry, they are not authorized, they are not under Canon Law, as it were, you cannot do anything about it. They want to come back to ministry and you may say, "I want you to go through a risk assessment", and this is true, we have had two cases where that happened. The two priests had moved from the diocese where they were, retired in another and because they were not under canon authority you could not get their blue files at all. They can only come if you are going to give them a PTO and because they have not got a PTO anywhere else, they come and request a PTO and then you say, "I want to have a risk assessment made and I want to get hold of your papers," and they say "No." This went on for quite a long time and was actually very costly in terms of money trying to defend the way the decision was and really the reasons which were being given had nothing to do with either prejudice or attitudes; it was simply that you could not have a way of getting hold of the file. When it eventually was agreed and it came, it was very clear why they were prohibited in the other diocese and the risk assessments were very clear they should not actually be allowed to come back to ministry, but they could have easily have been given a PTO without that background being known.

So although Bishop Paul has written and said that the Archbishops can use the power of persuasion or coercion by informing the priest that either he or she will undergo a risk assessment or remain out of ministry, my friends, we are in a litigious place; they will give you reasons why you are being XYZ, you know what I mean? I still think that the power of Archbishops should be really within the Canon so that when people have been prohibited from ministry, there has been an assessment that they can go back to ministry but you have got no way of actually ever asking them to do a risk assessment. I wrote to Bishop Paul and unfortunately under Standing Order 59, the amendment could only be done by the Steering Committee in the time required. The Archbishop of Canterbury was in China at the time and therefore I needed his authority to agree that both of us are writing, and we ran out of time in the sense that the papers had to come out in June when he was still in China. I have listened to the argument which has come from both Stephen Slack and the Bishop of Durham; friends, I am not persuaded. I still think that when you, as the Archbishop, have the list which you review from time to time and the priest's

prohibition comes to an end, and you have not got their blue file from the diocese where they were prohibited, you still need a risk assessment. I still think that the Archbishops have the power to do this and if it is not statutory, believe me or not, people may not believe this - we have no power either of persuasion or coercion; it does not exist. You would be challenged and challenged and challenged.

So, friends, this may delay the Canon coming through but I still believe that if this power is not put on the statute Archbishops cannot quite legitimately review it. Of course, they are telling me you can still do it providing it is reasonable and you provide reasons. I am telling you, friends, that the two cases took more time and then my provincial registrar, who was assisting me in defining the legalities of all of this, actually is of the same view, so is my adviser on CDM, Dr Daphne Green.

I am sorry, Bishop Paul, I have listened to the arguments. Members of Synod, I think if this is not done you are going to get people back into ministry without a risk assessment and we may back in the same difficulty we are trying to remedy now.

*Mrs Anne Martin (Guildford):* I apologise if I have missed something but what I cannot pick up anywhere is the repeating of safeguarding training. As a peripatetic instrumental teacher who is on my own with a child I am required, quite rightly, to keep regularly updating my safeguarding training. I have to produce documentation every two years, and that is right. I think that often people who do not understand say, "Well, I have done the training once; why have I got to do it again?" That costs money and I think it has to be built in to anything we say that people must regularly update their safeguarding training.

*The Bishop of Dover (Rt Revd Trevor Willmott):* I welcome the Canon. I want to make two comments on the safeguarding officers and then upon the risk assessment process. On Thursday of this last week I had a long conversation with the resident judge of one of our crown courts, who was reflecting with me the emotional pressure now on judges who are spending an inordinate amount of their time hearing such cases, as I am sure Bishop Paul is handling almost every day. The resident judge said to me that the emotional pressure is such that he has now written seeking for assurance that those who exercise that role will be well supported. I think that is very true about safeguarding officers. This is not about helping them to be effective but actually offering them external support for the amount of emotional work - and I can speak from experience - they are already beginning to handle. I do not believe that is a role for the risk advisory group in a diocese. It needs some external support and it needs to be in place before we get much further into this work.

The second point I make about risk assessment too in fact, and again I speak from personal experience at the moment. First of all, and I hesitate to say it in this chamber, there is the cost of risk assessments to the diocese. I am already facing quite substantial bills where we are actually now seeking for the risk assessment of the right quality. I think that first of all needs to be noted. The second point I would like to raise is I hope that we might get further guidance in terms of what actually a risk assessment may be required and be asked to do. I welcome the sense in which it is significant, but, again, I think that needs some definition.

At the moment in a couple of cases where the priest has agreed voluntarily to the risk assessment, their first response having provided them with legal assistance, is, "Will you please define for us what actually is going to be done in the risk assessment?" I think that is quite an important issue that needs some further reflection upon.

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* Of course in welcoming the Canon, I think it should be said that legal and disciplinary matters are not our only concern as a Christian church in this field. We have to recognise that these are matters of spiritual realities where someone called by God to particular ministry as an ambassador of Jesus Christ engages in behaviour which is recognised both in the Church and beyond as sinful and evil. Where such abuse takes place in churches consecrated to sacred worship or buildings devoted to Christian service, we should be alive to the need for ministries and indeed liturgies and prayer for repentance, restoration and cleansing. As a sacramental Church we need to say that such liturgies and ministries are an important part of giving visible form to our repentance and concern for restoration and renewal. I hope that all dioceses and their safeguarding teams will have regard to this concern.

*Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells):* I was rather glad to hear the Bishop of Dover talking about the cost of risk assessments because I wanted to say something to reinforce what Bishop Paul said about putting our money where our mouth is on this matter. Whenever we have a vote by Houses in this Synod, it is usually the case that there are one or two recalcitrants who abstain and one or two recalcitrants who vote against, so it was really rather significant that on the vote we took half an hour ago there were no abstentions and no votes against. We have all voted for this but Bishop Paul has reminded us that it will cost some money.

I think it was a year ago I asked at this Synod in a hopefully helpful, constructive, sympathetic way whether the National Safeguarding Team had the money and resources they required to do the job and I got a bit of a nudge and a wink answer that it would be all right on the night but they were not there yet. If you look at some point before the Archbishops' Council budget session you will find in the Executive Summary, paragraph 2 (do not bother to look at it now, I will read it out): "A major factor in the budget has been the significant extra resource that the Archbishops' Council needs to allocate to national safeguarding work. In 2014 the Council budgeted to spend £44,500. This has increased more than twelvefold to £557,000 in 2016."

We may all feel that is a pretty horrible amount of money but we have to put our money where our mouth is, and it may be that in dioceses too when cases come up, when risks assessments have to be done, DBFs have to dig into their pocket to find significant sums of money. I am glad about that extra expense. Graham, the new National Safeguarding Adviser, is already getting round the dioceses. He came to see us a couple of weeks ago but let us not go home saying we have all voted in favour of better safeguarding unless we say to our DBFs, our secretaries, our bishops, our bishops' councils and our common fund payers that it will actually cost a bit.

*The Chair* imposed a limit of three minutes.

*Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford):* I was not expecting to speak in this debate but I have an opportunity to raise a concern which our getting our house in order seems to



suggest as an opportunity. I am grateful that the Church is under pressure to get its act together and put our house in order and to allow no-one to opt out of the process; no-one to decline, for example, a risk assessment. I am deeply grateful for that and I am deeply grateful for the fact that we are all recognising the need for that and there were no abstentions on this sort of thing.

However, in defining a 'vulnerable adult', I think all of us would agree that bereavement is one of the obvious occasions when any adult could be found in a vulnerable state and therefore they need support and protection, but that is an area where I think most of us would know that independent funeral celebrants are on a massive increase. In our area, two of the independent celebrants were defrocked Anglican clergy of many years ago but they have resurfaced in independent ministry. I wonder whether the Church that has been under pressure to put our house in order, and we have been concentrating on our own, and it is interesting schools are under that pressure, rightly so, whether we have the opportunity gently to push back and invite the Houses of Parliament perhaps or the law as it applies in other areas to consider whether those who are entirely self-selected and become independent ministers, independent funeral celebrants, whether they too should somehow be brought under this sort of scrutiny, this sort of responsibility/accountability legislation? I know locally it is a serious concern that they are so independent that there is no risk assessment at all, and what handle have we got on that? Thank you for the opportunity.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* I had not thought of speaking on this particular point but colleagues have raised the question of risk assessments, and they are complex and they are costly. What I do wonder is whether pro forma letters which every professional has for this sort of thing might be of use. I wonder whether you might consider liaising with people who have experience in drafting this, as many of us have on many occasions, knowing what documents to assemble, what questions to ask can take a long time but everybody who actually does this sort of thing has pro formas and I just wonder whether it might be useful to have them and offer them to people so at least it gets to direct their minds as to the sorts of things they should be putting together when they come to these risk assessments.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* A word of explanation. Reference has been made to the Archbishops' Council budget for next year and I will be saying next year that you should not assume the twelvefold increase is sufficient. We have no doubt at the Archbishops' Council that the central safeguarding function must be capable firstly of providing enough guidance, advice and reference for dioceses as they undertake their work; secondly, setting standards that can be applied across the Church and, in the words of protection and prevention, ensuring that we can see issues which may be emerging where a diocese may be having trouble in meeting our criteria; thirdly, there needs to be an escalation process where if there are such concerns we can work with the House of Bishops and Archbishops accordingly.

We have therefore asked Graham now that he is in place as our National Safeguarding Officer to undertake an urgent review of that resource that will be required going forward. I regret - do I regret - I believe that it is likely to involve a still further increase in the national resource required in order that we can meet the standards that you wish.

There will therefore be that element of independence that some have talked to and I think we should add into his terms of reference the possibility that we provide a means and mechanism of providing a service in risk assessments to dioceses. Thank you very much.

*Revd Paul Hutchinson (York):* This feels a very small point in the context of the much bigger issues that are before us this morning but it occurs to me that in those three places in the draft Canons where a prohibition on vesting is referred to, I am not sure there is proper definition of what vesting is anywhere in the canons. If there is any implication to be taken out of Canon C 8 about vesture of ministers, it clearly means something different to the apparel of ministers which could mean, for example, that someone who is under a prohibition from vesting can nonetheless turn up for church in clerical collar and perhaps even in cassock in order to be seen and identified as someone who is practising in ministry.

Speaking as someone whose contribution to church life before ordination was principally in the organ loft, I wonder whether or not an organist may or may not put on a surplice if that person is a minister under a ban at the time.

*Ven Dr John Applegate (Manchester):* I want to give a warm welcome to the Measure, the Canon and its inclusivity. It is a helpful embodiment of our biblical and theological understanding of the dignity and potential of human beings made in the image of God. In support of Bishop Trevor, support for people handling these issues is really important. It is one of the most isolating experiences of my ministry in having to deal with some of these things.

My main point though is that training is rightly highlighted as crucial and the training institutions stand ready to play their not insubstantial role. At the All Saints Centre for Mission and Ministry, our recent consultation with partner dioceses showed a range of mutually exclusive expectations about what we would provide in training Readers and ordinands. The draft Canon imposes a duty on bishops and training institutions but the training requirements and resources are not yet available and how we might pay for this is as yet unclear. Speaking for the training institution which I lead, we are eagerly waiting for the Church's guidance. We will be working with safeguarding professionals but if the duty is imposed when will the guidance be available please?

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes

*Mr David Kemp (Canterbury):* A very interesting point from David Banting about funeral ministry. I want to ask whether that is care for bereaved people and therefore is pastoral care or whether it is protection of bereaved people and therefore it is safeguarding? I think it is really difficult for the Church to be seen to be saying "no, this is not safeguarding, it is something else" and I think we do have to work quite hard at it. I do not disagree that there ought to be some kind of protection/care for bereaved people, et cetera, but I am anxious about the tentacles of safeguarding spreading to places where they really ought not to be and diluting our resources to do safeguarding properly.

*The Chair:* I call upon the Bishop to reply to the debate. He has five minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* Thank you all very much for all your

different comments. There were several about risk assessments. A lot of the questions and points raised will be dealt with in the regulations when they come out which, as I mentioned, will actually be laid before Synod, and all the stuff around pro formas and so on that is already there in the drafts which are around at the moment which are being reviewed by the House of Bishops again in December.

They are very costly and the issue around money has been raised. John Spence did not say this so I will: the Church Commissioners have made very clear their willingness to support increased funding to the Archbishops' Council. They have equally made it very clear this is not to replace dioceses fulfilling their responsibilities and the national team is there to support not to replace what dioceses do.

Chris Sugden and spiritual realities: absolutely, there are some helpful materials already which people use from Common Worship and other sources around liturgies and prayer but thank you for the reminder and encouragement. It might be an area where we need to do some more work. The support of DSAs, absolutely. They all should have external professional supervision; if they do not, they are not going to be able to do their job properly, and that does cost a bit in the whole range of things.

Vesting: a cassock is vesting, plus anything else. We cannot do anything else about the wearing of the clerical collar. It is raised regularly with us, but anybody can walk into Wippells, or one of the other suppliers, buy a clerical shirt like this and go out in the street and they are not breaking the law and we cannot do anything around that. John Applegate: the training institutions stand ready to play their role. There is a consultation document coming out at the end of July specifically around the training institutions and their role. Funeral ministry, it is a very good point, David Banting and obviously it is not directly to do with the Amending Canon but we need to try and pursue that, probably it has to be done at a local level. I think that has covered everything except the Archbishop of York's comment but thank you, first, for all your commendations.

The Steering Committee looked extremely carefully at the concerns. We remain convinced that actually the power does exist in law because, very simply, if a person wants to return to ministry they have to fulfil all that is required of them by the archbishops and the relevant diocesan bishop. If we require a risk assessment, and they refuse, then we simply will not give them PTO and will not license them. They can only challenge it if there are not good grounds. If they have been barred from ministry because of poor behaviour then there are almost certainly good grounds for asking for one anyway. They may not have PTO, they may not have a licence; if they are still in Holy Orders, they are still subject to our rules and regulations. It would be a serious error, I believe, at this stage for this Synod not to approve the Amending Canon. I therefore request that we do so.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* This is a point of personal explanation. I think I should have said that certainly the Canon should be approved but the Steering Committee should be clear that at some points we may want to bring in under some particular miscellaneous provision for that particular bit to be allowed. Personally, I want it to go ahead, I want it voted through but I am putting down a marker that this bit of legislation the group has to look at it some time in the future. Not to pass this particular thing at this particular point in time will not be right because 99% is there and I do not want it to fall down on the 1%.

*The Chair:* Synod, under Standing Order 36C, the vote on the final approval of a Canon must be taken on a division by Houses unless I give permission and the Synod gives leave to dispense with that requirement. It is important to have accurate figures for the voting in each House on the final approval of a Canon. I therefore order a division by Houses

*The motion*

*'That the Canon entitled "Amending Canon No. 34" be finally approved.'*

*was carried after a division by Houses. The voting was as follows:*

	<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>AGAINST</i>
<i>Bishops</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Clergy</i>	<i>152</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Laity</i>	<i>155</i>	<i>0</i>

*1 abstention was recorded in the House of Clergy.*

*The Chair:* Finally, we come to Item 506. I call upon the Bishop of Durham to move this item.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* I beg to move:

*"That the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence (GS 1953C) be adopted".*

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put Item 506 to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence (GS 1953C) be adopted.'*

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

*The Chair:* The petition will, accordingly, be presented to Her Majesty. This concludes these items of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 11.05 am

**Legislative Business:**  
**Draft Diocesan Stipends Funds (Amendment) Measure (GS 1969A)**

*The Chair:* Synod, we come now to Items 514, 515 and 508 that concern the Draft Diocesan Stipends Funds (Amendment) Measure. You will need for this the mercifully brief GS 1969A. We also want to refer to the Tenth Notice Paper for any financial implications of this. As reported in the Second Notice Paper, there were no proposals for amendment received and no other matters for the Revision Committee to report, so there was not actually a Revision Committee report and so we can move directly now to the revision stage.

Members will see the motions to be moved on behalf of the Steering Committee are set out on the Order Paper. Again, no notice of any amendments has been given and no member has given notice of a desire to speak against any of the clauses of the draft Measure and so I have given my permission under Standing Order 55(c) for them to be moved *en bloc*. To do that, I am going to call on Mr John Booth, the Chair of the Steering Committee, to move Item 514, "That Clauses 1-2 stand part of the Measure". After any debate and Mr Booth's reply, we will we then put that to the vote. Mr Booth.

*Mr John Booth (Chichester):* Thank you, Chairman. Inspired by Bishop Paul's last speech, I beg to move *en bloc*:

'That Clauses 1-2 stand part of the Measure.'

*The Chair:* Thank you. This is now open for debate. I see nobody standing. I, therefore, put Item 514 to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That Clauses 1-2 stand part of the Measure.'*

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

*The Chair:* This brings us then to Item 515, that the Long Title stand part of the Measure. Mr Booth, persuade us of this.

*Mr John Booth (Chichester):* Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Long Title stand part of the Measure".

*The Chair:* Thank you. This is now open for debate. Again, I see nobody standing and, therefore, I put Item 515 to the vote.

*The motion*

*‘That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.’*

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

*The Chair:* That completes the revision stage for the draft Measure. We, accordingly, come to the final approval stage for this draft Measure. Since the Steering Committee has given notice in the Second Notice Paper that it considers a final drafting stage to be unnecessary and the original 507 that was in the Agenda is not being moved, we are now going straight to Item 508 and I call upon Mr Booth to move this item. He may speak for not more than ten minutes.

*Mr John Booth (Chichester):* I beg to move:

*‘That the Measure entitled “Diocesan Stipends Funds (amendment) Measure” be finally approved.’*

Chairman, thank you. I am aware that this item has induced in some members the need for a cup of coffee and I think just a short speech at this point to remind you that the draft Measure was welcomed by Synod at First Consideration in November and, as you have heard, there are no proposals for amendment received by the Revision Committee, nor are there any final drafting amendments. So the text is unchanged from the text that was before us at First Consideration.

As I said in November, it is a short technical draft Measure updating the Diocesan Stipends Funds Measure of 1953 to ensure that the DBFs have the same powers to make decisions about the balance of investments in the Diocesan Stipends Fund that they have in relation to other charitable property. Charities in general now have the power to invest on a total return basis if the trustees think that it is in the interests of the charity to do so. A charity that passes an appropriate resolution under the Charities Act is freed from the normal requirements to maintain a balance between income and capital returns. The trustees may, therefore, decide freely whether to allocate returns on investment for expenditure or for reinvestment.

However, the power to pass such a resolution is available only when there is no express or implied statutory restriction which prevents the trustees of a charity from doing so. The Diocesan Stipends Funds Measure 1953 imposes stringent requirements on the use of the capital account of the Diocesan Stipends Fund and this has the effect that capital gains cannot be allocated to the Incomes Account for the Fund for expenditure on stipends. Therefore, only income returns on investment may be used for payment of stipends, so dioceses may find that they are locked into an unhelpfully restrictive investment policy because of the need to generate income returns to preserve the ability to make stipend payments. This is particularly problematic at a time when income returns on investments are, broadly speaking, low and seeking a high income return could lead to choosing risky investments.

The draft Measure would not alter the purposes for which Diocesan Stipends Funds could be used, but it would permit DBFs, like any other charity, to pass a total return resolution

and allocate returns to the income fund and the capital fund at their discretion. This would free the DBF to invest more flexibly and potentially for higher overall returns over the long term. It would also enable a DBF to make use of some of the historic capital which has accrued in the stipends fund to the extent that the capital gains exceed the original value of the fund, indexed for inflation.

Having said that, it is not a licence for DBFs to spend their stipends funds now at the expense of future generations. As charity trustees, they will still be subject to the requirement to strike a balance between the interests of present and future beneficiaries, so decisions must be taken in a way that preserves the real value of the stipends fund for the future. No DBF will be compelled to exercise this new power. It is permissive, but it should provide a valuable additional tool for DBFs in the proper management of their stipends funds and it could, for some dioceses, be transformational. Its value was reflected in the unanimous approval given to these proposals by the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum last year, and I am happy to commend the Measure to Synod.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Mr Booth. This item is now open for debate. I need to remind you that under Standing Order 61(a), because it is a final approval, motions for closure, speech limits and next business are not in order. I, of course, retain a discretion under 21(c) to alter the normal speech limit, which for now will be five minutes.

The debate is open. I see nobody standing, so I presume Mr Booth does not need to reply to that lack of debate. All that stuff you had a few minutes ago about why at final approval we need to have a Division by Houses so that Parliament can get the message, all that still applies and so I am, therefore, going to order now a Division by Houses.

*The motion*

*'That the Measure entitled "Diocesan Stipends Funds (amendment) Measure" be finally approved.'*

*was carried after a division by Houses. The voting was as follows:*

	<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>AGAINST</i>
<i>Bishops</i>	18	0
<i>Clergy</i>	88	0
<i>Laity</i>	90	1

*No abstentions were recorded.*

The Measure now stands automatically committed to the Legislative Committee, and that concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Ven Karen Gorham (Oxford)* took the Chair at 11.19 am

**Legislative Business:**

**Draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (GS 1993)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Items 509A and 509B, the Draft Ecclesiastical Office (Terms of Service) Amendment Regulations 2015, for which members will need the draft Regulations GS 1993 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 1993X. This debate will come in two halves. Firstly, to consider the Regulations; then, I shall ask Fr Benfield to come and move his amendment. There will be a debate on that amendment before we have a further debate on the whole Regulations for their approval. I now call upon the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 509A and you may speak for up to ten minutes.

*Mr Peter Haddock (Southwark):* Point of Order. Chair, are we quorate in the House of Bishops?

*The Chair:* Could I ask members of the House of Bishops to stand, please? I see ten standing. There are 11, I am assured. They are quorate. I now call upon the Bishop of Willesden.

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

‘That the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (Amendment) Regulations be considered.’

Chair, this is the first fruits of the Simplification Programme and it is a reform we are proposing to the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations. Slightly odd and recondite, but actually one of the things that dioceses asked for when we consulted them. Broadly speaking, simplification is seeking to address matters where we have been over-elaborate in our drafting and provision, over-prescriptive in how we have done things and where there is not sufficient flexibility.

This particular proposal before Synod today is a good example of where, with a bit of tweaking, we can make things a lot easier for all concerned without undermining the principles that were enshrined in the original legislation. Terms of service were based on a desire to be in conformity with what Government wanted us to do for officeholders. In particular, it addressed the question that there were some people who were priests who were second class citizens because they only had five year tenure in their particular place. They were not on contracts; they were on priests in charge designations.

Common tenure came in and said, actually, the level playing field will provide that everybody who is a priest has common tenure in perpetuity until they resign or retire, but that left us with the fact that there are some circumstances where one might not want to go that route. Our major task in this particular set of proposals is to try to give some flexibility without undermining the full principle of common tenure.

Jane is a curate. She has completed her three year title post, but she has not yet found



the right place to go. Both she and her bishop know that she has got real potential to go and run a parish, but nothing has come up yet. The only way that she can continue beyond the buffers of 30 June is either to be given common tenure in perpetuity or to be told, 'You have not got a stipend until you find something else'. That is not satisfactory.

Eric was a much-loved and eccentric parish priest who was in place for 40 years. He eventually died in office leaving the parish with a certain amount of thinking about what their mission and ministry was without Eric. It was thought by the archdeacon that it would be sensible to put somebody in to try and turn the parish round and to try and give the parish a chance to reflect on what they might do; what we call interim ministry. Again, that could not be done without either putting the priest on a contract, up to the diocese, very unsatisfactory, or to give them common tenure. In fact, what the bishop did in this case was to give them a general licence and take the risk that they would carry on having a general licence after the time of the interim ministry, but again not satisfactory.

It is those kinds of cases that the main part of these proposals is seeking to address. The dioceses said, 'Do not undermine common tenure completely but let us find some ways in which we can make things more flexible'.

If members would like to look at what is in the paper GS 1993, you will see there is a bit of a rag-bag but they are actually all trying to do sensible things. Regulation 2 addresses the question of sick notes. One of the things we did when we drafted common tenure was we made SSMS have equivalent terms of service in their draft statement of particulars to those who are stipendiary. That made quite a nonsense of bishops' offices and archdeacons' offices drafting a SoP and trying to lay down a whole series of things about holidays and other things which really did not apply to SSMS and we got a huge kick-back from some self-supporting minister, saying, 'Look, I have got all those things from my place of work, I do not need you telling me what my holiday entitlements are'.

We have dealt with most of that by producing, without having to come to Synod, a much simplified series of SoPs for self-supporting ministers. But one aspect of it needs addressing in the Regulations. Regulation 27 at the moment provides that all ministers who are off sick have to provide a sick note, in common parlance. What this suggests is that actually we should not lay a rigorous requirement on SSMS to do that and all they should do is exercise best endeavours to indicate that they are off work because they are sick.

Regulation 3 gives you some ways in which we will seek to deal with interim posts. We are saying, if you want to put an interim post in there will be a series of circumstances in which this is the case, and there is some draft guidance attached to GS 1993X which tells you the ways in which we think interim ministry might work. Of course, that is subject to revision without coming back to Synod. Broadly speaking, what we are saying is, if there are circumstances where someone needs to be in post as an interim minister, they can be given a series of three years subject to agreement by the post-holder themselves and by the mission and pastoral committee of the diocese, and then that can be extended but only once.

This is not a mandate for every diocese being run in perpetuity by interim ministers. That would be a crazy way of operating. This is to say, parishes might take more than three

years to come into being ready to receive a permanent appointment, so once and then again would be the way to do it. The normal circumstances in which this would operate would be a place where the benefice is suspended and where the patron would be informed it was happening and there would be some of the usual kind of consultation that goes on with patrons in suspended benefices, or should do. That would proceed, though there might just be other circumstance, which are addressed in the guidance note, of other sorts of interim ministry that might be applied.

You will find that Regulation 3 just gives you the capacity to do that. You will also notice that Mr Benfield has an amendment down to 7F, which he will explain when he moves it. It actually clarifies our drafting and we are very happy to accept his amendment when it comes up.

Regulation 4 gives you the capacity to extend a title post in the circumstances I was outlining earlier. It is not about people who have not completed their training properly. Common tenure and the Regulations already allow you not to send somebody on to a post of responsibility if they have not satisfactorily completed their training. This is about someone who has done their curacy and, because of the limited number of posts that are available in some dioceses or across the country, they might just want to hang on to find the right place for them and the extension can take place for up to one year.

The final thing that we are putting in place is about locally supported ministry. Locally supported ministry is not something used in every diocese. It basically means it is somewhere where the parish or PCC, or somebody else, decides to pay for a post which would not be on the normal diocesan way of operating and is not part of the normal establishment, but where there is an agreement between the bishop and the parish an LSM can be in place.

That already exists as something which is permitted under Regulation 29. The reason it is under Regulation 29 is because if the parish are paying and they pick up, the diocese does not pick up the tab. It has got to be something which the parish agree to fund and, when they stop, they give due notice. This just extends the possibility whereby somebody could be an LSM in a parish not as the priest in charge or the incumbent thereof, but as somebody who is operating in perhaps a daughter church or a church in a multi-parish benefice where they are being funded locally. This would have permitted that which is not permitted at the moment because it is mainly applied only to assistant curates. It is a bit of a rag-bag. It gives the flexibility that was asked for. I hope that this Synod will give a fair wind to these amendments. I move 509A.

*The Chair:* Item 509A is now open for debate.

*Revd Canon Martin Wood (Chelmsford):* I wish to speak in favour of this motion and particularly speak about the proposal for interim priests. At the moment, Chelmsford Diocese has quite a major project, well-funded by a good grant, called the 'Turnaround Project'. The idea of the project is to try to help parishes that have not flourished for a very significant period of time to flourish.

Needless to say, the reasons that parishes do not flourish are quite complicated: Reasons often of leadership; of governance; of buildings; maybe of finance; of pastoral;

of lots of things, and so the strategies to turn around parishes are quite complex as well. But one of our strategies is that of interim ministry.

Interim ministry can be in one of two ways; either for a parish where there are needs of support and the incumbent is still in place for a self-supporting minister to go in and give pastoral help; but, also, for where a parish is in vacancy, for a priest to be appointed on a short-term basis to put in the groundwork that will then allow a good appointment to be made and the solid foundations to be in place.

We have at the moment one such post advertised on our website if you are interested, [Chelmsford.anglican.org/vacancies](http://Chelmsford.anglican.org/vacancies), called the Bradwell Area Turnaround Minister. But for reasons that have already been outlined, in order to do that, and it will be a good post, we are having to work around the situation as it currently stands. What is proposed today will certainly make that very much easier and will be of benefit to the parishes that will benefit from that ministry.

Can I also commend the guidelines that are in the annex of 1993X when interim priests will be appropriate and when they will not. I think that is an extremely helpful set of guidelines and I would wish to commend them and commend this motion to the Synod. Thank you.

*Ven Clive Mansell (Rochester):* I too support these proposals and I am grateful for them. I just want to try and tease out one or two issues around the interim ministry for the incumbent level posts. I am looking at page 4 of GS 1993X and I am picking up some passing words from the Bishop of Willesden in his opening speech there. My understanding is that interim ministers at incumbency level are likely, in most cases at the very least, if not indeed all cases, to be where the patron's presentation rights have been suspended. That would seem to be logical. Presumably, therefore, to suspend the patron's presentation rights, an appropriate ground would be to introduce an interim minister in accordance with these regulations and for no other particular purpose. Also, presumably the guidance should direct that the bishop should obviously consult the patron as normal for a suspension situation but also consult the patron over the appointment of the priest in charge.

The wording on page 4 under "Incumbents" appears to suggest the possibility that there could be an interim incumbency as an incumbency and I am not quite sure that is legally possible, I would like some clarification on that. It talks about the patron's consent, is the patron able to give consent in those situations. Indeed is there to be an incumbency level interim post with the implication that incumbency will necessarily come to an end at the end of three years subject to the further three year renewal under these arrangements. Thank you.

*Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Guildford):* I speak as a member of the Simplification Group whose recommendation this change is, and can I say how great it was to serve on the group under Bishop Pete's chairmanship and to hear such creative suggestions from across the Church about how barriers and obstacles to mission could be removed. However, I support this motion not just because of my serving on the group but because I see it as supporting mission in the local deanery where I serve as rural dean.

Let me outline what I mean. In our deanery there are three parishes serving a community of 20,000 people in the northern part of our deanery. In one parish there is a church plant under a BMO, another parish has just become vacant and a third parish will become so at Easter next year. Now, it is clear to many in the parishes and the wider deanery that while maintaining the *status quo* is an option, there are also some more creative and imaginative possibilities which will enable God's mission to flourish more fully in the area, yet these opportunities will take time to explore, not least until the third parish becomes vacant next year.

In the meantime, the parish currently vacant will struggle without a priest in charge which will only set the mission of that church back, but this new regulatory change opens up another way. Indeed, a former curate of the vacant church has offered to come back from August this year for 18 months to serve as interim priest in charge. This is a great solution for her because she is not looking for a permanent post at this stage, it is a great solution for the parish because they are offered leadership and ministry at an important time, and it is a great solution for the deanery because it creates the space in which really creative possibilities can be considered, but it does require us to pass this motion today.

I know in some contexts, as we heard from Chelmsford, interim posts are being entered into on an informal basis, but these amended regulations allow this to happen in a way that is above board and fair to all parties involved. With these new regulations, priests, parishes and deaneries can all be clear about where they stand, so I urge us to pass this motion and enlarge the space in which mission can flourish in our parishes and deaneries.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* I welcome these proposals and the flexibility that they show. I would just like to make some comments on the guidance and what it, to me, does not contain which could be helpful.

Drawing on experience in the university world, where what were delicately called "short-term appointments" were a growing phenomenon following a shortage of funds - that is not the case here I trust - that experience did show the importance and the challenges of supporting those who held those posts and looking at what in university terms we call their "career development". The material I read here suggests to me that the tasks for these interim ministries will actually be particularly challenging. If you describe a post as "interim" you create the situation of a declared interregnum of a kind in which everyone is busily waiting for what comes after.

The material says it should be clearly prepared in advance what the particular benefits are of this form of appointment. That is excellent. During the period of the appointment though there seemed to me to be a need for some oversight and care of whether the trajectory of the post and the parish and the context are moving in that direction, whether additional support may be needed, and how the person holding that post can be supported and in terms of their future ministry. We might think through the implications of people doing a series of these interim appointments. There may be good reasons for that and it may be appropriate in context, but it seemed to me it would be helpful if the guidance included some material about how to review and support those who are exercising these kinds of ministries.

*Revd Dr Guli Francis-Deqani (Peterborough):* Thank you, Madam Chair. I welcome these amendments to the terms of service and I will be voting in favour, but I do not think that they go quite far enough and I would just like to make a general point.

I speak in my capacity as a diocesan curate training officer with responsibility for IME Phase 2 and I am speaking in particular in relation to when it is appropriate to offer time-limited posts with temporary common tenure.

In the diocese of Peterborough, as in other dioceses I am sure, we are working quite hard to increase the number of young vocations, and we are having a degree of success though sadly not so much yet with younger women. I am concerned, however, that while many of our young curates are gifted and able, we are not serving them as well as we might. They are signed off after only two and a half years, at which point we expect them to be ready for incumbency, often incumbency in very different settings to the context of their curacy. For a number, leading up to ordination their lives have often been in a state of transition and settling into ministry in the early years of formation can throw up all kinds of issues which impact on home life and vocational patterns.

If we want them to serve the Church for many years with long and fulfilled ministries, then we would do well to better prepare them by offering those who need it and would benefit from it a three to four year assistant priest or associate priest post rather like a second curacy, dare I say it; a post that would give them more responsibility with the safety net still in place.

I do understand that this somehow cuts across the intentions of common tenure and that I am unlikely to be successful in persuading many people at this stage, nonetheless I do want to make the point that Synod should consider this matter carefully. If we do not think realistically about what some of our young clergy need in the short term to prepare them for incumbency, I fear we might be storing up long-term problems for ourselves.

This is not just something that affects Peterborough. At a recent meeting with regional training partners, I consulted my IME Phase 2 colleagues, all of whom shared my concerns and had stories of their own. What we do not want is clergy succumbing to pressures that they might have been better placed to deal with if they had had a little more support in the early years of their ministry and formation. Thank you.

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

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I want to support this proposal. I want to say I think it is good but it could go a lot further. I have a friend who is a priest in the Episcopal Church in North America. There they have a longstanding history of specialist interim ministers and the role that he plays allows him to go into situations and to help in difficult vacancies after situations, as the report says, where the past has been difficult and to offer a presence that offers healing and the possibility of the parish moving on. I think that we could do more in the Church of England along those lines. Perhaps we ought to be looking at a provincial level at providing a pool of people who can act in that way in particular situations. Let us be a little bit bolder about that.

I have got one or two concerns about the guidance, particularly about what is not appropriate, in situations where the past has been difficult or possibly where a parish situation has become toxic or dysfunctional. People look for all sorts of reasons as to why they are being put into interim turnaround situations and it can easily be blamed on the character of the senior clergy, the parish tradition, they are being punished or something like that. I think there needs to be very clear articulation and an agreed method of making it clear in a concrete way about why an interim post is being created and why it might be helpful.

The third thing wanted to say, which is slightly cheeky, is in the light of the difficulties that we know that the CNC are experiencing, I wonder whether there might be the possibility of interim bishops as well.

*Revd Janet Appleby (Newcastle):* I am asking this question in my role as the ecumenical officer for my diocese and it is with particular reference to a question I was asked only very recently by the Staffing Advisory Group of a Local Ecumenical Partnership that happens to be in vacancy at the moment. They asked me whether it would be possible to have a fixed-term appointment in order to allow for the possibility of rotating ministry, that is someone who is a Methodist or United Reformed minister in the future, which is not possible at the moment because those churches have made it clear that they cannot offer someone at the moment so it will have to be an Anglican. I was going to just say “no” because of common tenure until I saw this legislation, and so I am wondering whether this legislation might in time come to be used as the default in Local Ecumenical Partnerships in order to allow for such a possibility of rotating ministry. I have not had a lot of time to think about this yet, I am not sure if that would be a good idea or not, but I could not see anything in the legislation that covered this possibility at all or even dealt with it or considered it. I wondered if it had been considered and if it has not already been considered whether perhaps it might be considered by those drafting such legislation and consider how you might best deal with this issue. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I see no one further standing. I then ask the Bishop of Willesden to reply, please. You may speak for up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* Chair, thank you to all those who have contributed to the debate. I note that it has universal support, which is very good news. Thank you for some very good points being made. I am wondering whether we ought to ask for the recreation of the bishopric of Whalley so he can be the interim bishop.

Martin Wood gave us the very good example of Chelmsford and their turnaround ministry. They have had to be very creative in finding ways of doing this and I hope that they will be able to adopt this framework we are putting forward in the regulation which will now serve them in a more sensible way than having to put people on contracts and all kinds of slightly devious things in order to achieve the interim ministry that they are excellently delivering there.

Clive Mansell, I think you are right, I cannot see any circumstances where this could trump the Patronage (Benefices) Measure and I think, therefore, we will tweak the guidance and take out any reference to incumbent posts without them being suspended for priest in charge, because it seems to me as soon as an incumbent post becomes vacant which

has not been suspended Form 30 kicks in and you are forced to either appoint or lapse and then the Archbishop of Canterbury or York has to appoint. It will not work, so I think we will just tweak the guidance and take that bit out.

Thank you to Philip Plyming for his participation in the Simplification Group. We have had great fun together and I hope if you give us a life in the next Synod and we are still around we will continue to have great fun because this stuff is creative, it solves problems.

Philip Giddings, there is a story behind all this. When the first lot of guidance was drafted, which of course is not part of the regulation, it was about three times longer and then the Archbishops' Council filleted it and took out all the things you are suggesting. I think we have got to think about what we put in the guidance which will help, I agree with you entirely.

The predication on an interim post is that it will be supported by interim work and there is a lot of work going on in dioceses at the moment where you do work with the parish to talk about their mission, you get people in who do reconciliation work where there have been difficulties, all those kinds of things. I think we assume that what we are saying, how we help parishes understand what is going on, is quite an important thing. The target is there; the trajectory of where you are going is there as well.

Guli Francis-Deqani, yes, whenever old clergy get together they all moan about the fact there are no longer second curacies, it is what happens. I think the only creative answer I can suggest on this is actually you can still extend somebody under Regulation 29 if you think they need more training, so you could possibly work it whereby you seconded someone to another curacy on the basis they had not yet finished their curacy under Regulation 29 and that would suffice for a second curacy; it is a creative way of doing it. I do not want to go to the principle of common tenure being undermined by suggesting that you should have second curacies that are time limited, but thank you for raising that and I think there is an issue which we need to address. We need to find creative ways of doing it. We have certainly done a few secondments while I have been Bishop of Edmonton over the past months.

Simon Butler, I am not sure about specialist interim ministers. They do exist but I think we have got to work out what we want from that. There are people who might have those specialisms but I would not want to extend the ministry when we actually need parochial clergy on the ground, but that is just me, I am old-fashioned.

Janet Appleby, I think what she is suggesting ecumenically would again undermine common tenure; I would not want to go there. What you might do is appoint the Anglican as a Methodist because they can do limited term contracts, can they not? Just a thought! I move 509A.

*The motion*

*'That the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (amendment) Regulations be considered.'*

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

*The Chair:* I invite Mr Benfield to move his amendment, Item 516. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

*Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In regulation 3(2), in the inserted paragraph (7F), *leave out* “an appointment may not be made to an office designated as such” and *insert* “an office may not be designated as an interim post”.’

Thank you, Madam Chair. This is simply a drafting amendment concerning paragraph 7F which will be inserted into the regulations. As drafted, it is a little unclear what might happen in a certain situation. The intention is that an interim post can be created for three years and one further three year term, a total of six years. As drafted, it was not clear to me what might happen if by accident or design a bishop sought to go onto a third interim post. I raised this with the Legal Office, who agreed it was not very clearly drafted and Standing Counsel has come up with this amendment which is in my name. I understand the Bishop of Willesden is going to accept it, so I do not think I need to say any more; it simply clarifies what the intention is.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I invite the Bishop of Willesden to speak in reply.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* I agree with Fr Paul. Thank you very much for spotting it, it does make it clearer and we accept the amendment.

*The Chair:* Item 516 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 516 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* I then call on the Bishop of Willesden to move Item 509B. You may speak for up to ten minutes.

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

‘That the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (amendment) Regulations 2015 as amended be approved.’

That is it!

*The Chair:* Item 509B is now open for debate.

*Ven Clive Mansell (Rochester):* Just to ask what the timetable is likely to be for these regulations coming into effect. We have already heard that bizarrely some places have interim ministers in operation already, adverts are out and so forth. It would be helpful to know when we are putting these things into effect, please. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing so I invite the Bishop of Willesden to reply.



*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* Regulation 1 says 1 November 2015, that is when.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 509B to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (amendment) Regulations 2015 as amended be approved.'*

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

*The Chair:* The regulations are accordingly approved and will now be laid before Parliament. That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark)* took the Chair at 11.55 am

## **Legislative Business: Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (GS 1995)**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 510A, for which members will need GS 1995 and GS 1995X. First, the Dean of the Arches and Auditor will move Item 510A, the preliminary motion that the Rules be considered. This will provide an opportunity to make general comments about the Rules or to raise specific points which do not relate to the amendments on the Order Paper. If the preliminary motion is carried, we will then move to the amendments. Members who wish to comment on an amendment should not do so on the preliminary motion but should reserve their comments for the debate on the amendment in question.

May I also draw your attention to the financial information on Notice Paper 10. I now call upon the Dean of the Arches and Auditor to move Item 510A "That the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 be considered", and the Dean may speak for not more than ten minutes.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I beg to move:

*'That the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 be considered.'*

These Rules stand in a respectable, historical and theological tradition of simplification and avoidance of unnecessary procedures. When the Archangel Michael made his celebrated three appearances on the mountain hinterland of the Italian Gargano peninsula in the 490s AD, some of you may recall that not merely did he work various wonders but he left his footprint in the rock in a grotto and he erected a primitive altar.

When Bishop Laurence of Siponto was preparing to consecrate the grotto, the Archangel appeared again and told the Bishop that he himself had already consecrated the grotto so that no more legal steps were necessary. Now that is a very good Episcopal putdown.

Following on from the recommendations of the report on simplification of the faculty process in September 2012, considerable progress has already been made. In approximately half our dioceses faculty petitions can now be submitted online, with more to follow by the end of the year, and most chancellors have attended induction courses and I myself am going to be enjoying next Saturday morning one such course at Church House.

The key next stage in the simplification process is the introduction of the new Lists A and B, which you will find in Schedule 1 of the new Rules, and I will turn to that in a moment, where a wide range of matters will be removed from normal faculty procedures and subject to a standardised and expedited process.

An ordered Church must have rules to govern the way its churches and churchyards are dealt with, and if there are to be ecclesiastical courts how these are to operate. The important thing is to try to keep it simple and to avoid unnecessary procedures which detract from worship and mission.

Behind these new Rules there are two basic principles. First, to try to make things simpler, and thus faster, for all those who have to operate them and principally for the parishes. Secondly, to ensure that the language used in the Rules and in the prescribed forms and lists is readily comprehensible.

The 2015 Rules, which are before you, have built on the 2013 Rules taking the opportunity to make a number of changes to the wording in the light of experience. Now you would not want me, or expect me I am sure, to repeat the detailed commentary contained in the Explanatory Memorandum, but I take the opportunity to thank the draftsmen of the new Rules and of the Explanatory Memorandum for the exemplary way in which the exercise has been carried out.

There are two matters to which I should draw your specific attention. The first is the incorporation of the Appeal Rules into these new Rules. Prior to the approval of the 2013 Rules, there were four sets of Faculty Rules, three of these were consolidated in 2013 and now the Appeal Rules have been brought in also. Unsurprisingly, this means that the 2015 Rules, at 126 pages, are a bit longer than the 2013 Rules, which were 95 pages. To have them all in one document should make things simpler for everyone.

So far as the content of the new Appeal Rules, various previous anomalies and duplications have been ironed out, for example the curious position that currently prevails, that where someone makes a further appeal from the Court of Arches to the Privy Council – and there is one such appeal currently outstanding – there is at present no requirement even to inform the provincial registrar that the further appeal has been brought. That is remedied in these Rules.

More important is the incorporation into the Rules of the test for permission to appeal, clarification of the scope for imposing terms on permission to appeal, new express provision for a written representations procedure on appeal and provision for automatic stays on appeal.

The second matter which I need to draw to your attention, and by far the most important

element of the new Rules, is Part 3, Matters not requiring a faculty, and the detailed specification of such matters in Lists A and B in Schedule 1 as provided by Section 5 of the new Measure which came into force earlier this year.

I want to make four comments relating to both lists and then a few comments relating to the two lists separately.

So first, four general comments. First, the aim has been to remove as much as reasonably can be removed from the formal strictures of a full faculty petition, from the onerous requirement for full DAC advice, formal public notification, involvement of diocesan registrars and chancellors and the possibility of consistory court proceedings.

The second matter is that this has to be done in recognition that the ecclesiastical exemption from secular listed building controls can never be taken for granted, and indeed is currently challenged by the Victorian Society in proceedings before the Privy Council. Accordingly, the new Measure expressly provided that the new lists should exclude any works which involve alterations to or the extensions of a listed building to such an extent as would be likely to affect its character.

Thirdly, even in the case of non-listed churches, they do not exist just for the present generation of worshipers and irreversible damage can be done even with the best intentions. Thus there cannot be a free-for-all.

Fourthly, there is no absolutely right or wrong way of identifying matters for the two lists. What I can say is that there has been literally a vast amount of consultation over several years relating to their contents. Each item in the lists has also been subject to intense scrutiny in the Rule Committee at its several meetings. What is now before you has the unanimous support of the Committee and that Committee covers a very wide range of backgrounds, as you will see from the names listed at page 53.

So far as List A, this is a completely revised, systematized and, for the most part, extended version of what has previously been contained in individual diocesan minor matters lists. These are routine works which can be carried out by an authorized person without any need for consultation outside the parish, but subject to complying with the conditions specified in the right-hand column on page 54 and following. That is all I need say on List A.

So far as List B, I have two comments. The first is that the items in List B represent an extension of the matters which previously fell under the archdeacons' faculty jurisdiction. These matters can now be carried out by an authorized person without the need to petition for a faculty, subject to the conditions specified in the right-hand column at page 58, provided first of all there is written consent of the archdeacon, second, the conditions are complied with and, thirdly, provided the archdeacon has first sought the advice of the DAC or such of its members or officers as the archdeacon thinks fit. Archdeacons will know or have the means of knowing who they should approach.

The second matter is that undoubtedly List B will impose additional burdens on archdeacons just as it should reduce the burden on others, but I am grateful to archdeacons for the enthusiasm they have shown for the new system and their

attendance rate at a variety of road shows which are continuing, to make sure that the new system will work. It will always be open to an archdeacon to refuse consent whether because the proposal is unmeritorious or because it is considered more suitable for resolution through the full faculty procedures. I commend the new Rules to you.

*The Chair:* Item 510A is now open for debate.

*Canon Timothy Allen (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* Madam Chair, there have been two main themes in what I have tried to say to Synod from time to time when calling for reform during the last 15 years. The first has been the need to support and encourage mission in small rural parishes. The second has been the need to simplify the faculty system. These two themes, help for small rural parishes and support for mission through the faculty system, reflect my own background as a member of small village communities for most of my life and as a DAC chair for the last 15 years or so. Both these themes happily come together now in my last General Synod meeting in the warm support I want to give to the new Faculty Jurisdiction Rules. There is, as Charles George has told us, a great deal of useful reform and simplification in these new Rules. He, Anne Sloman, James Halsall and all the other members of the Rule Committee have done a good job.

The most useful of these reforms for hard-pressed parishes which are struggling to maintain and develop their church buildings is the way in which repairs to the fabric of a church identified as necessary in the quinquennial inspection are treated. At present, most such repairs are subject to the full weight of the faculty system: bureaucracy, fees, involvement of the outside conservation bodies, formal notices, delays and so on. In future, once the new Rules are in place, such repairs can be approved in a much simpler way by the archdeacon after he or she has consulted the DAC. Since the archdeacon is required to consult the DAC experts before giving his or her approval, there will still be proper safeguards to ensure that the repair work is done properly. There will be no additional risk to the precious ancient fabric of our churches; just a great saving of time, effort and money for the hard-pressed parishes.

So these new Rules are most welcome. They are an important supplement to the wider and much needed simplification exercise which Bishop Pete is leading to clear passageways through the bramble patch of Church of England law. I look forward, if I may say so, to applauding from outside Synod the reforms to ecclesiastical legislation which I trust Bishop Pete will push through the new Synod to be elected this autumn. I urge Bishop Pete to give special attention to the needs of small rural parishes and multi-parish benefices.

Finally, Madam Chair, may I say that the effectiveness of these rules in helping parishes to promote their mission will depend on the attitude of DACs. After 15 years or so as a DAC chair in Suffolk and as a long-serving member of the Church Buildings Council, having closely observed the behaviour of DACs in other dioceses, it seems to me that there is scope for DACs to be more proactive and positive in helping parishes to make changes to their church buildings in order to promote mission and growth. Given that the legislation requires DACs to take proper account of the needs of the living Church, there is, I suggest, no need for DACs to regard themselves or to be regarded as detached, free-standing ivory towers separate from the main body of the diocesan Church. Looked at from the point of view of many rural parishes, the three great banes which hold back more

effective use of church buildings as an instrument of mission and growth are the following: blocked gutters, bats and the Victorian Society. Blocked gutters because they lead to damp, rot and expensive repair; bats because their excessive statutory protection and disgusting excretions drive out congregations; and the Victorian Society because its frequently unreasonable objection to the removal of even inferior Victorian pews inhibits mission, growth and community involvement. More needs to be done, Madam Chair, in several ways to free parishes from these three baneful impediments to growth: blocked gutters, bats and the unreasonableness of the Victorian Society.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* I would like to add my welcome to the previous welcome for this proposed simplification of the Faculty Rules. I am currently locked in a rather complicated series of conversations with Historic England and in light of the letter that I received from them on Thursday I am minded to propose an amendment removing them as statutory consultees, but I suspect that may be a step too far! That is with my vicar's hat on.

With my environmental hat on, I particularly welcome paragraph 4.2(f) which is the one about environmental impacts. It is a studiedly neutral phrase and I wonder if Shrinking the Footprint might be asked to produce some accompanying guidance to go with these policies and procedures to help churches think through the environmental implications of what they are planning to do. I also particularly want to welcome the inclusion of trees in List A and List B in churchyards because I think that will greatly simplify the management of churchyards and I think that is a very good thing indeed.

*Mr Robin Back (Norwich):* Can I echo earlier support for this wonderful piece of work. Bats, yes; trees, yes, I can tick all of the boxes. We have found in Norwich that the most important element is flexibility within the DAC and within the structures with which rural parishes have to deal. That flexibility has allowed us at Guestwick, which is one of the smaller parishes, to replace four tonnes of lead nicked by the ungodly last September with lead supported by a CCTV system which nobody has put into a church recently, at least in a rural church, as it were to act as a guinea pig in seeing that installation installed and working and indeed hopefully deterring future losses of lead. We have still got another 15 tonnes to go.

The other thing I would like to say about bats is particularly in rural churches, as was said earlier, that the damage that they do and the driving away of congregations, the smell that they leave and everything else is the subject of much interest in a number of rural churches.

Guestwick formed recently part of a survey by the University of Bristol funded by Defra which Anne Sloman was instrumental in setting up some years ago. The students and the experts studied furiously our bats and, for anybody who is interested, we have pipistrelles, we have long-eared, we have natterers and one or two others which we cannot identify. However, when the researchers had gone and taken their mist nets away and so on and so forth, the bats came back again, so this is an ongoing problem we have yet to resolve, but I would heartily endorse this process and thank very much the work of all those behind the scenes who have achieved this wonderful document.

*Ven Andrew Piggott (Bath and Wells):* I thought it was about time, Madam Chairman,

that you heard from an archdeacon. I had not planned to speak but I thought it was important for Synod to hear that although we recognise what the Dean of the Arches said in terms of the extra work that will come our way, whilst I would hesitate to speak for all of my colleagues, I think in broad terms this is a good thing and one which I hope Synod will commend.

There is a certain irony that a simplification process should be described in one of the longest documents that Synod has actually seen, but there is some really important material here and I hope Synod will lend its support to what is proposed.

Whilst speaking, I also want to pay tribute to the registrars and chancellors across our Church who certainly from our perspective in Bath and Wells provide us with superb support, excellent advice and simply we could not do our work without them. There was when I first was appointed an element of “groan” as a relatively inexperienced archdeacon whenever DAC meetings appeared in my diary. I cannot say that I ever looked forward to them but I have learned to discover that at the heart of our DAC in Bath and Wells is a real concern for God’s mission. The culture is changing. The work we do is incredibly valuable and this piece of proposed legislation will be a great support to us not only in our work but in furthering the cause of the Kingdom, so I warmly support what is proposed.

*Revd Tony Redman (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* I would just like to point out that the Victorian Society was formed in the first place because certain people thought that the Church of England were not looking after their buildings appropriately. I would just hope that in a 21<sup>st</sup> century society they think that now with the result of the Rules Measure we will be actually be looking after our buildings in a far better way than we have in the past. I would also like some assurance that perhaps the professional involvement which makes the churches what they are today would still be in place regardless of this wonderful simplification Measure.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing and therefore call upon the Dean to respond to the debate.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I am grateful to those who have spoken and that the Rules appear to have received a generally warm welcome. To Tim Allen, I particularly welcome the support he has given because he brings huge experience in a variety of areas and so far as the matters he has identified, I hope it will help with the blocked gutters. Bats, mentioned by him and also by Robin Back, that is a matter which is still being pursued at a very high level with meetings with ministers, who unfortunately change from time to time, with high level people from Natural England. I think we are moving forward but there is no promise of an end yet.

Charles Goddard, thank you for your welcome to Rule 4.2(f) and that is also mirrored in Rule 5.5(3), references to the environmental documentation, and now added to the petition form itself. It was considered inappropriate that every parish should have to make a statement that it had taken into account environmental matters, but I hope we are moving in that direction. Trees, I am grateful for your welcome. They were a very difficult area to resolve. There are more tree groups than I knew existed but I hope we have achieved a reasonable solution on that. I have already referred to Mr Back’s comments. So far as the Archdeacon of Bath, I am grateful for his comments and that he, like other

archdeacons, is supportive of the direction.

So far as Tony Redman is concerned, yes, there will still be a full professional impact. Many of these works will flow from the quinquennial reports which of necessity are drawn up by experts. The archdeacon will be consulting DACs or officers of the DAC or particular DAC experts. There will be no lack of such consultation.

So far as the Victorian Society, I do not think we should simply criticise them. They do have an important interest at heart. The important thing is that they should be able to have their say and that DACs and chancellors should then take into account their views as part of the balance. It cannot be decisive but it is right that their views should be heard and I would not want an anti-Victorian Society message to go out. They have their place but it is only a place.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 510A to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 be considered.'*

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

*The Chair:* We now come to the amendments at Items 517 to 523. The 40-member procedure applies to each amendment. That means that the mover of an amendment will have not more than five minutes to speak to it. I will then call the Dean to speak for not more than five minutes in reply. If the Dean does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places to indicate that they wish the debate to continue. Therefore, if the Dean indicates that he does not support the amendment, I shall ask whether there are 40 members who do wish the debate to continue. If there are, we will continue with any further debate there may be on the amendment and then vote on it, otherwise the amendment will lapse.

*The Chair:* I now call upon Mr Scowen to move his amendment Item 517 and he has no more than five minutes to speak in support of that amendment.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 11, rule 3.4–

- (a) at the end of paragraph (2)(c)(ii), *leave out* “and”;
- (b) at the end of paragraph (2)(c)(iii) *insert* “; and”;
- (c) after paragraph (2)(c)(iii) *insert* “(iv) the minister and churchwardens of every parish to which the order applies”;

and

- (d) after paragraph (2) *insert* “(3) Any churchwardens who are sent a copy of an additional matters order (or order that varies or revokes an additional matters order) by the registrar of the diocese must keep it with the

inventory, and insert a copy in the log book, maintained by them under section 4(1) of the Measure.”

A chancellor has power to make an order adding to the freedoms in Lists A and B to undertake works in his or her diocese without a faculty and this amendment is concerned with how such an order should be publicised in the diocese. In addition to being put on the diocesan website, the amendment would require the minister and wardens of all affected parishes to be sent a copy of the order and require the wardens to keep that copy in the parish log. This will replicate the requirement that is there in Rule 3.6 to send a copy of a chancellor’s order excluding matters which would otherwise be in Lists A and B and could be done without a faculty, to ministers and wardens and the requirement at 3.6 to keep such an order in the log.

I accept that it is obviously more important to have such a procedure where freedoms are being cut down rather than where they are being added to. Nevertheless, I believe that when a chancellor extends the classes of case where a faculty is not required, it should be proactively publicised within the diocese and not just left for people to discover on the website. It should not be assumed that clergy and wardens will use the diocesan website to discover what is permitted under Lists A and B. If they go elsewhere for that information, they will not there discover the additional freedoms which the chancellor may have granted unless they have been specifically notified.

Since the notifications that I am proposing can be achieved very easily by attaching a copy of the order to a round-robin email I do not believe that it would be unduly onerous to require that to be done. I ask Synod to make this minor improvement to how chancellor’s additional matters orders can be brought to the attention of all those who are affected by them.

*The Chair:* I call upon the Dean to speak for not more than five minutes in reply to the amendment.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* The Rule Committee has carefully considered this amendment and we do not support it. We believe it runs contrary to the basic aim of simplification which lies behind these reforms. In the vast majority of cases where an additional matters order is made, it will apply throughout a diocese and it would not, we think, be appropriate that the Registrar should have to send a communication to all the parishes in the diocese. It is some 300 or more additional bits of paper. We have taken the advice of the two diocesan registrars who are on the Committee and they both tell us that their present systems do not enable them simply to press a button and communicate to every parish within the particular diocese. It is, we would say, wholly unnecessary. Most parishes will look at the website. If they use the on-line faculty system, it will inform them that there may be an additional matters order. If they raise the matter with their archdeacon or the DAC secretary that they are considering make a faculty for a particular matter and that matter is already on the additional matters list, they will immediately be told that that is the position, and therefore it is quite unnecessary to have this additional amount of paper. Nor is it appropriate that such paper should then be logged as would be provided for by this amendment. It is over lawyerly, if I may put it that way.



*The Chair:* As the Dean does not support the amendment, I need to ask Synod whether there are 40 members standing who wish the debate on the amendment to continue. There are not 40 members standing and therefore I declare the amendment to have lapsed.

I now call on Prebendary Cawdell to move his first amendment, Item 518

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 61, after item B4(7) in the first and second columns, respectively, insert–  
“( ) The relocation within a church of–  
(a) Royal coats of arms  
(b) hatchments or other heraldic achievements  
(c) boards commemorating benefactions  
(d) pictures”

“No article of historic or artistic interest is removed from public view”

Madam Chair, members of Synod, not in my worst nightmare did I think that at some point in this quinquennium I would be standing before you to present six amendments on the Rules to Faculty jurisdiction. However, you will, I am sure, understand my magnanimity in doing so when you know that I have had personal experience in ministry of each of these issues, all clearly at the core of my ministry and which is equally clearly too much pleasure for one lifetime.

I am given to understand that some of my amendments may be accepted and others not so in this turn I intend to address a couple of general principles underlying all of them before turning to the specific detail of this amendment and then subsequently I will be able to be, I am sure you will agree, mercifully brief in outlining the technical detail of each of them.

I too am grateful to the Rule Committee in general for the work they have done in seeking to simplify the overall procedure, and to the Legal Office working with me as my amendments have evolved through the previous fortnight. My amendments simply relate to issues where either something has been overlooked or where there has been a failure of nerve.

Members of Synod, they and we are working together to create a system that has integrity and enables our mission with all its history, buildings, architecture and art to go forward in good order. Herein lies the first issue. As you look at each of these amendments, you need to remember that the law at its deepest level requires a measure of consent and that rules that are regarded as pointless or over burdensome will be ignored up and down the land mostly without harm except to the integrity of this system which we are endorsing today.

Coming from Hereford, my parishes are a long way from London and far more than once I have faced issues of well-meaning parishioners simply getting on with small stuff and that they have not in general been put off by threats of dire sanctions from the diocesan chancellor even if he has the opportunity and judgment as in a neighbouring diocese to

describe them as “really, really stupid”. We do not have any such people in Hereford of course.

It is not simply at parish level either that we encounter such insouciance. More than once in my ministry I have encountered a deaf archdeacon muttering ever so quietly “Just do it”. Law requires consent.

On that note, let us turn to the first amendment before us. On telling people that in order to move a painting, a coat of arms, a hatchment or a benefaction board somewhere from one wall to another wall in the church requires a full faculty, I am usually met with utter incredulity. I have lots of these in various churches in varying states of listing. They are, indeed, interesting historical artefacts.

To that end, my motion is clear that whilst I think that moving them should require only the local procedure envisaged in List B permission to move them from the archdeacon, it should always be subject to the fact that they remain on display in church. That is part of its character. It would enable a church wanting to move a couple of items, perhaps to create space for temporary displays or enhanced worship, or even, as I have experienced, to better place them for tourist interpretation, simply to make a common sense proposal to the archdeacon who on advice from an appropriate DAC member could give authority. I believe it to be straightforward and clear simplification.

I understand, however, that there is some concern that this could be used to alter the character of the building without public notice. The example given to me was of a 300 year-old coat of arms which has always been over the chancel arch. Well, members of Synod, I do get that; but, if I get it, well, then, so would the archdeacon who has the power under the Rules to direct a full faculty be applied for under Rule 3.3(5).

Even if it is felt in hindsight that, having moved something under the local procedure was a mistake, well, what is the worst to happen? In the tiny percentage of cases that that would be so, just put it back. You take it off one wall, you walk it around then you stick it back again; you dust off the cobwebs from its old position and replace it. Just do it.

Synod, talk about rearranging deck chairs, it now appears that we need permission to rearrange pictures in the salon. How the world must laugh at us.

Synod, my second general principle is simply this: in February we set out on a journey of Reform and Renewal. If we cannot make headway on simple issues like this and these I am putting before you and send a clear signal of our intent for real simplification, we are instead on a journey from mission to monument

*The Chair:* I call upon the Dean to respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* The Rule Committee opposes this amendment, and it would not be right to say, ‘Oh, well, it can just be ordered to be put back’. If it has been done under Rule B, that is it, there is no longer any power to make a restoration order to put it back.

Members, there are six reasons why this change should not be made. First, a number of

these items are fixtures in the church. They are, therefore, part of the fabric of the church and the inclusion of this matter in List B in a number of cases would offend the ecclesiastical exemption.

Secondly, whenever one is relocating an item the question arises as to where it is to be located to, and that could be a significant matter. It ought to be formally notified under the procedures for a full faculty. Thirdly, in almost all these cases a question of how it is to be affixed in the new location will arise, particularly in the case of coats of arms and hatchments. That requires detailed consideration. In a number of cases there is likely to be some damage during the relocation. If you have a historic coat of arms or hatchment, it is only too likely that a part of the frame will break off or a part of the item itself breaks. These matters require care and specifications.

Fifthly, many of these items are items of special historical or artistic interest. If a faculty involves such a matter, it has to be notified to the CBC and there is no reason why we should simply here disapply the role of the CBC in the case of coats of arms and the like. Lastly, many of these items are, in fact, in private ownership; a private owner has arranged for them to be put up. He has not parted with ownership and it is only through the notification procedure that one discovers this matter. One does not always discover it but one does on some occasions.

It is the unanimous view of the Rule Committee that this amendment should not be included.

*The Chair:* As the Dean does not support the amendment, I need to ask whether there are 40 members who wish to debate on the amendment to continue. I can see there are not 40 standing and, therefore, the amendment lapses. I now call Prebendary Cawdell to move his second amendment, Item 519.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 61, after item B4(7) in the first column insert “( ) The restoration (including temporary removal from the church for that purpose) of–

- (a) Royal coats of arms
- (b) hatchments or other heraldic achievements
- (c) boards commemorating benefactions”

I will tempt you with another one. This amendment is very simply about enabling a responsible church to make appropriate restoration to those delightful, mouldering benefaction boards, coats of arms and hatchments which adorn our churches. The eagle-eyed amongst you will have spotted the fact that the List does not include paintings. The first draft I wrote in did, but I woke in a cold sweat thinking of the well-meaning churchwarden with a bottle of acetone and a Goya. In general, these remaining items were painted from the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century by the local signwriter or coachbuilder; a worthy artisan no doubt and a fine upstanding citizen but Constable, Turner or Stubbs, not.

This amendment will allow the archdeacon, on advice from appropriate DAC members, to allow the work to go ahead expeditiously and the reference to the archdeacon under List B will act as a check to ensure that the work is not undertaken recklessly. No one suggests that a matter of principle is at stake but I understand that there is concern over the expertise of DACs to advise on this. Synod, that is an argument about resourcing DACs adequately, not for preventing good and appropriate work to be undertaken expeditiously; and, in any case, the archdeacon retains the power to decline an application under Rule 3.3(5).

*The Chair:* I now call upon the Dean to respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* You will not be surprised that the Rule Committee does not support this proposal. It is all very well to say that the matter should not be undertaken recklessly. The restoration of royal coats of arms, hatchments and others need to be undertaken by specially qualified people. It may be that it was originally done by a local person, but the fact remains that now in most cases these are historic items and they are worthy of the full faculty procedure. The idea that a parish can have this matter simply dealt with on the say-so of an archdeacon following a telephone conversation with someone at the DAC, seems to us to be wholly inappropriate in a number of cases where there will also arise questions of insurance whilst the item is being restored.

*The Chair:* As the Dean does not support the amendment, once again I need to ask whether there are 40 members who wish the debate on the amendment to continue. I can see there are not 40 members standing and, therefore, the amendment lapses. I now call upon Preb Cawdell to move his third amendment.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 61, after item B4(7) in the first and second columns, respectively, insert “( ) The disposal of free-standing chairs” and “No chair of historic or artistic interest is disposed of”

Members of Synod, we move to some amendments which I hope now might be accepted. Madam Chair, this one to allow the disposal of free-standing chairs is very straightforward. You know those annoying infants’ chairs given second-hand from primary school clear-outs in the 1960s or the rickety ones from the 1920s where the wood has begun to decay. Just ask the Archdeacon and dump them. I know that we like things to sharpen our worship but I have never found much help from splinters in my bottom.

*The Chair:* The Dean will respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* The Rule Committee is perfectly happy to have this amendment. In the case of the rickety chair, it would always have been an entirely *de minimis* matter in any event.

*The Chair:* As the Dean has consented to that amendment, are there any members who wish to debate?

*Ven Clive Mansell (Rochester):* I am sorry, I have not dug too deeply into the papers here but disposal of free-standing chairs, how many? We have free-standing chairs here. If you disposed of all the free-standing chairs here, you would change the character of the front of this hall. If your church has free-standing chairs only, and I can think of some that have many free-standing chairs only, whether they have splintery bottoms or not, to remove the whole lot would change the character. An archdeacon's temporary licence will allow you to do some minor reordering; but we could not remove all the chairs of a church under an archdeacon's temporary licence, as there was not a minor reordering. I am just wondering how far this particular permission is intended to extend?

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing and so I now put Item 520 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* I now call upon Preb Cawdell to move his fourth amendment.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 61, after item B4(7) in the first and second columns, respectively, insert—  
“( ) The replacement of a grand piano with another grand piano and the disposal of the original grand piano” and “No piano of historic or artistic interest is disposed of”

Madam Chair, I must ask your ruling on this. Learned gentlemen have been advising me that it would be helpful if I moved this amendment in a different form to that on the Notice Paper, using Standing Order 26(b)(ii). Accordingly, I request your permission to adjust the wording to the amendment so that the first column reads, “The replacement of a grand piano with another grand piano and the disposal of the original grand piano”.

*The Chair:* I have considered this and it has my permission.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Unlike Stradivarius violins, pianos deteriorate over time and their replacement clearly is not a matter of principle. A common sense application to the archdeacon should do it.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I am glad to hear that the Rule Committee is content with this amendment in its revised form and I draw attention to the condition that no piano of historic or artistic interest is disposed of.

*Revd David Brooke (Durham):* I am unsure about the inclusion of the word “grand”. There are plenty of historic pianos which are not grand in the sense that most of us understand it, and there are upright grands. I am really unsure why we have the word “grand” here, although I support the general gist of Simon's amendment.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* If I can intervene on a matter of clarification. The question of pianos other than grand pianos is dealt with on page 55 in item A2(1); and pianos, ordinary pianos, can be introduced or disposed without even asking the archdeacon, subject to a condition about historic pianos.

*Revd David Brooke (Durham):* I think there was some misunderstanding of the point that I was making.

*The Chair:* I think we will move on at this point, as no one else is standing, and I will put Item 521 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* I now call Prebendary Cawdell to move his fifth amendment, Item 522.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 61, item B5(3), in the second column–

(a) in the first condition leave out “or is separately listed as a building of special architectural or historic interest under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990”;

(b) after the first condition insert– “The works are identified as routine items of maintenance in the most recent report prepared in respect of the church pursuant to section 1(2) of the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 (commonly known as the “quinquennial inspection report”) or in subsequent written advice from a person registered under the Architects Act 1997 or a member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors qualified as a chartered building surveyor. Details of any materials to be used are submitted to the archdeacon when the archdeacon is consulted on the proposal to undertake the matter”

and

(c) after the condition “The works do not involve any new disturbance below ground level” insert– “The parochial church council’s insurers are notified if external scaffolding is to be erected”

My fifth and sixth amendments seek to bring consistency to List B applications. The text proposes that works to a church, even in a Grade 1 church, that are listed in a quinquennial report may be undertaken by application to the archdeacon with appropriate safeguards in place. Rather bizarrely, even though separately listed structures in the churchyard like walls and lychgates come under ecclesiastical exemption, you would still need a full faculty to undertake quinquennial works to these items.

This fifth amendment here enables works to churchyard walls listed in the quinquennial to be undertaken by List B procedure without need of a faculty in the same way that routine works to your church would be covered. I have deleted the reference to separately listed buildings requiring a faculty and imported all of the safeguards regarding works to churches which you can find under B1(1) on page 58.

*The Chair:* I call upon the Dean to respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I hope the Rule as at presently worded is not bizarre but, come what may, we are content to accept this amendment.

*The Chair:* This item is now open to debate. I see no one standing and, therefore, I put Item 522 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* I call upon Preb Cawdell to move his sixth amendment, Item 523.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“Page 62, item B5(4), in the second column–

(a) leave out the condition; and

(b) insert– “The works are identified as routine items of maintenance in the most recent report prepared in respect of the church pursuant to section 1(2) of the Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 (commonly known as the “quinquennial inspection report”) or in subsequent written advice from a person registered under the Architects Act 1997 or a member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors qualified as a chartered building surveyor. Details of any materials to be used are submitted to the archdeacon when the archdeacon is consulted on the proposal to undertake the matter. The works do not involve any new disturbance below ground level. The parochial church council’s insurers are notified if external scaffolding is to be erected”

My final amendment is the same as the last, excepting that it applies to lychgates. I understand that there is some concern about this but on the basis of consistency and also that if works to Grade 1 listed churches are permitted in this way, then I cannot begin to imagine that work with the self-same safeguards to lychgates cannot go ahead on the same basis.

*The Chair:* I call upon the Dean to respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* The Rule Committee has given this proposal very careful consideration. We do not recommend it to Synod. It seems to us that lychgates present a particular problem. In most cases, they are wooden structures and if they are listed wooden structures then the removal of part of them can very easily lead to the collapse of the rest. Furthermore, a detailed specification would be required in the case of a listed lychgate so far as the replacement, both how it is to be replaced and the materials. Those are matters which, frankly, are not suitable for archdeacons to determine and there ought to be full involvement of the DAC which requires, I am afraid, a full faculty.

*The Chair:* As the Dean does not support that amendment, I need to ask Synod whether there are 40 members who wish the debate on the amendment to continue. There are not 40 members standing and, therefore, the amendment lapses. I now call on the Dean to move Item 510B.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I beg to move:

‘That the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 as amended be approved.’

*The Chair:* The amended item is now open to debate.

*Ven Jan McFarlane (Norwich):* Pianos versus grand pianos, when is a chair not a chair? You see now just how fascinating is the life of an archdeacon. But the archdeacons *en masse* are immensely grateful for this simplification of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, even though it may in some cases slightly increase our workloads. The reason I think is because it will help those often unsung heroes of the Church of England, the churchwardens.

I think in my six years as an archdeacon my admiration for our churchwardens has grown beyond measure. They voluntarily shoulder an increasingly heavy legal and administrative burden, usually with great commitment, good humour and a huge dollop of grace. This simplification of the Rules will go some way to ease that load and may even go some way to stop that gentle decline in those who are willing to stand as churchwardens. For that reason, we are immensely grateful to those who have put a huge amount of work into this and I do hope we will vote for it with gusto.

*Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool):* I am very grateful for all the work that you have done. It is absolutely brilliant. I have just got one query which I hope might come up somewhere in the debate. One of our concerns has been the theft of metal and one of the things we have had to seek approval for is cutting back trees for security, both for people going to our garden of remembrance, which is very secluded, and for the sake of the metal on our roofs. It has been a problem. I would like to know from the Dean if this is something that that was considered. But I am totally in favour of this legislation. I vote for it wholeheartedly as a churchwarden and as a DAC member. Thank you for all your hard work.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing and so I call upon the Dean to respond.

*Right Worshipful Charles George QC (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I am grateful to the Archdeacon of Norwich for her comments which underline the fundamental point that the Faculty Jurisdiction and these Rules is intended not to be an undue burden on parishes but rather, so far as is possible, to assist them in their task. So far as the comment of Paul Hancock, I can assure him that works to trees, short of felling the tree, is now covered on page 62 in B6(3) and, therefore, it is merely necessary to consult the archdeacon. Of course, if the trees are in a conservation area or are subject to a tree preservation order then separate secular controls apply. I ask you to support these Rules.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 510B to the vote.

*The motion*

*‘That the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 as amended be approved.’*

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

*The Chair:* I now declare that the Rules, as amended, will now be laid before both Houses of Parliament pursuant to the Statutory Instruments Act 1946. May I just say to Synod that we will begin again this afternoon with a debate on Item 9 and then we will follow that



with Item 511A.

THE CHAIR *The Ven Karen Gorham (Oxford)* took the Chair at 2.32 pm

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. Before we come to our next item of business, I have a couple of things to say. First of all, to report that neither the House of Laity nor the Convocations have called for References to outstanding item of Article 7 business and, therefore, the business of this evening will proceed as on our Agenda.

Before we come to our next item, we heard earlier today sadly that the Revd Joyce Bennett died this morning. Joyce was the first English woman priest in the Anglican Communion, being ordained in Hong Kong in 1971. Although very much a pioneer, Joyce lived very quietly in retirement in Buckinghamshire with her daughter, Mary. So as we begin our afternoon session let us remember Joyce in our prayers, remember Mary, as we pray together.

*The Chair led the Synod in prayer.*

## **Farewell**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 8 on our Agenda and I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to give the farewell.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* We come now to a farewell that has been delayed, but I am delighted to say that Michael Perham is with us so that we can acknowledge formally here in Synod his distinguished ministry not only in the wider Church but of course particularly here where he was Chairman of the Business Committee.

Michael is one of those people whose manifest ability has been remarked on throughout his life. I do not know whether he ever got to see the letter of reference he received from the Warden of Keble as he offered for ordination, but it was full of unstinting praise for an undergraduate who had contributed so much to the life of Keble College and from whom he expected great achievements.

It is very easy in one way to outline the sort of *Crockford's* entry for someone, but we all know there is more to the story than a series of appointments. After Keble College, where Michael read theology, he trained at Ripon College, Cuddesdon, and was ordained in 1976 in Canterbury Cathedral as part of Canterbury diocese. He was then Assistant Curate of St Mary's, Addington, in Croydon, in the days when the empire was larger. There then followed a spell of being chaplain to the great Bishop John Taylor of Winchester and then rector of the Oakdale Team Ministry in Poole. He was Canon Precentor and Vice Dean of Norwich Cathedral, a notable one especially. I remember it was at that time that his name began to be most well-known nationally as an exceptional and extraordinarily gifted liturgist. He was later Dean of Derby Cathedral. He was ordained as Bishop of Gloucester at St Paul's in 2004.

In all of those appointments, Michael brought his distinctive ability of organisation and prayerful and thoughtful innovation, but also humour and charm. His care of Bishop John Taylor of Winchester in his days as his chaplain, to make sure that everything was at hand, and for someone with failing eyesight in a font and size easily able to be read in public, spoke of a thoughtfulness and care and characteristic attention to detail.

Michael has mixed his appointments with clear parish experience in Dorset, but his particular love for the liturgy of the Church of England made him a highly suitable Precentor for one of the major cathedrals and that mix of liturgical expertise, theological understanding of the place of a cathedral and basic parish experience made him an ideal provost and Dean of Derby. It is worth saying that the period at Derby was in the run-up to the great change in cathedral ministry and Michael was very involved in that, as at Norwich, and in one sense, for those of us who followed him, set a standard of what it is to be a dean that has been hard to match.

As well as working hard in those posts, Michael found time to be Secretary of the Doctrine Commission at a very busy time for that body, and of course a distinguished member of the Liturgical Commission. Membership does not quite describe his activities. He had enormous influence and his sheer hard work made him a major player in the completion of the Common Worship project. The Church of England defines itself very often as much by its liturgy as by other means, in fact probably more often than any other way, and so the importance of what was done cannot be over-emphasised. The best liturgical practice has long been a point of expertise for Michael. I may say, when he was a Dean there was something of a legend about what it was like to be his Precentor; it was essentially very good training. Being the first Chair of Praxis is just one manifestation of that.

If some future scholar is to research the influence of people on Common Worship, some of the essential elements would turn out to have their authorship with Michael. They include the Eucharistic liturgy, the funeral service and most of the post-communion prayers. As well as that, Michael was an early member of the Archbishops' Council and, as I have already mentioned, Chair of the Business Committee of General Synod.

He went to Gloucester in 2004 and brought to that diocese his wealth of experience in parish, cathedral ministry and in the wider councils of the Church. There were organisational changes that Michael brought, not least in the deanery structure, but also in the wider sense of collegiality he brought to the whole diocese both in the extended bishop staff meeting but also in the calling together the priests of the diocese at ordination to encourage that sense of welcoming clergy into the college of priests. It was very noticeable on my first visit for an overnight stay in Gloucester with Michael and his colleagues that that sense of collegiality was very, very clear and deeply established.

He contributed so much to the life of the county, took on responsibilities in the University of Gloucester, and indeed encouraged the link to the Church by his presence on the governing council. But he was also careful with his wider partnerships in India, Sweden, Tanzania and the USA, and indeed his three-way conversation involving Tanzania and the USA was a model of the courteous conversations we are seeking to establish as the pattern within the Church of England and the Anglican Communion. He was truly a forerunner in that area.

With all this responsibility, he still took on national work. He was Chair of SPCK and of the Hospital Chaplaincy Council, both at times when they needed attention, hard work and reform. He maintained his interest in the formation of future clergy by chairing the governing body of Ripon College but also of those with long service when he became President of the Retired Clergy Association. He was President of Affirming Catholicism and until December 2014 he was Bishop Protector of the Society of St Francis, which reflects another of the great influences in his life. He remains President of the Alcuin Club and Vice-Chair of WATCH, and it is good to know that the University of Gloucester honoured him with an honorary doctor of philosophy. He is also an honorary fellow of the Royal School of Church Music and a freeman of the City of Gloucester, signs of a full recognition of the contribution that he makes to organisations where he is never just a name on the headed paper.

All of this, you would have thought, was enough to occupy someone fully, but throughout his time as Bishop, Michael continued to write books on areas of theology, liturgy and spirituality. He is one of those people who actually finds the work of writing to be therapeutic and relaxing. We can only hope and pray that in retirement he does not become so relaxed that he feels the need to stop relaxing by writing. We need his thoughts and work to continue to be of influence in the Church.

In all of this, Michael has had the unstinting support of Alison, his wife, who in the busyness of Michael's life has continued her career as a doctor and together they have been blessed with four daughters who have all the creativity and energy of their parents. Michael has particularly had to undergo, with Alison and the family, a very difficult time over the last 11 months. I am especially glad for a number of reasons that we are in a position today, after all the inquiries and investigations, to be full of praise and thanksgiving for his ministry without hesitation. I think that is really important.

I want to add a personal note, which is not in my script either, which is that – I do not think I am breaching anything in particular – Michael was one of those who was sitting on the Crown Nominations Commission for Canterbury three years back, so in one sense or another I owe him something. He was, in that utterly terrifying experience, one of those whose pastoral care, interest and capacity to see the human through the system shone out, and I think that goes very deeply to who Michael is.

So today we offer him our gratitude for his remarkable contribution not only to this body, to the General Synod, and to the diocese of Gloucester but to the Church of England as a whole and we pray that his retirement is fulfilling and a blessing to him and Alison. Now please acknowledge how much we owe him.

*The Chair:* That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester)* took the Chair at 2.44 pm

### **Private Member's Motion: Senior Leadership (GS 1999A and GS 1999B)**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 9 on our Agenda, a debate on senior leadership. There are, surprise, surprise, a large number of people who want to speak in this debate and there is one proposed amendment. What I propose to do is, after calling the mover of the motion, Fr Killwick, to speak for up to ten minutes, I will call two speakers to speak for up to five minutes, and thereafter I will reduce the speech limit to three minutes, but then when I call the mover of the amendment I think, as a matter of courtesy, I will increase the speech limit to five minutes but then go back down to three minutes. That is the format that we will adopt. I call Fr Killwick to propose the motion standing in his name. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

*Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester):* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod do take note of the report of the Faith and Order Commission  
*Senior Church Leadership: a resource for reflection.*’

Thank you, Chair. I would like to thank everyone who signed my Private Member's Motion so quickly in February that it reached 115 signatures in just two days. I would also like to thank the Business Committee for agreeing to schedule this debate today.

We can all be really grateful to FAOC for their report, aptly described in advance by Preb Stephen Lynas as a rather interesting cricket ball. I would say it has turned out to be a very interesting cricket ball and I am really glad that it is back in play after being thrown somewhere beyond the boundary.

The best part of the report is its major treatment of leadership in the New Testament. The triangular model of leadership, which begins with the action of God in calling both the people to himself and leaders to lead his people, neatly avoids the difficulties of approaches which either begin with leadership and then have difficulty in giving a proper account of the ministry of the laity or they begin with the ministry of the laity and have difficulty in giving a proper account of ordained leadership.

The report also identifies another triangular model of leadership in the New Testament which picks out different types of leadership, some of which is local and some of which is trans-local. The travelling apostles provided essential links between the local churches so they had a proper sense of being part of the whole. Catholicity, or connectedness, is there from the very beginning and is essential to the Church.

The New Testament is very cautious in its use of the language of leadership, very rarely using the normal secular words for leaders. In fact, in one of the very few passages in which such a word is used it is radically redefined. When the disciples quarrel after the Last Supper over who should be the greatest, Jesus says: “The one who is greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the one who leads like the one who serves”. The New Testament deliberately avoids secular language of leadership and thereby avoids buying into a secular leadership culture.

We could compare this approach with the way that Jesus avoided the title of 'Messiah' for much of his ministry. He was not the kind of Messiah that people were expecting, so he avoided using the word because of the overtones it carried. In the end, he radically redefined the word to be the kind of Messiah that he was. We see a similar radical redefining of the concept of leadership in the New Testament.

The FAOC report then turns to a more historical and descriptive section in which we can see that there has often been the temptation to lead as the world leads in a secular leadership style, and it is a particular temptation in an established church and therefore one we need to constantly guard against. We need to make sure that establishment serves mission, not the other way around. The reawakening of the ministry of the laity is described in this historical section. It is a pity that it is not referenced back to the New Testament section and the triangular relationship between God, people and leaders. The whole area of the ministry of the laity and leadership really needs further exploration and analysis.

The report refers to particular prominent lay leaders like William Wilberforce, which of course points up that leadership may not always be ordained. What is the relationship between lay leaders and ordained leaders?

The re-emergence of the laity is also linked to the emergence of PCCs and Synods. Again, the relationship between the ministry of the laity and ordained leadership needs more discussion and evaluation. We are very clear in our dialogues with ecumenical partners that the participation of the laity in decision-making and governance is a key part of our Anglican identity, yet the Bishop for simplification was recently quoted referring to synodical government rather dismissively as a 1970s experiment. Just as FAOC say that the language of leadership is not going to go away any time soon, I would say that the participation of the laity in decision-making is not going to go away any time soon either and I hope that members of the House of Laity will play a full part in today's debate.

It is a pity that the ecumenical dimension was not explored in the report despite a request being made by Canon Simon Butler when the report was requested by Synod. As well as assisting in the quest for unity, it would help to discern what is essential in the exercise of leadership and episcopacy as opposed to what is merely customary. We share episcopacy with the Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Lutheran Churches. Their theory and practice of episcopacy may fruitfully help to shape our own. We are looking for Methodists to take episcopacy into their system and this requires us to look radically at our own practice of episcopacy, for we need to share the essence of episcopacy with our Methodist brothers and sisters rather than simply trying to impose our own current practice.

Of course, FAOC is not the only report around on senior church leadership, there is also the Green Report on discerning and nurturing senior leaders, which is a plan for action where FAOC is a resource for reflection. I think that the Green Report has been somewhat misunderstood partly because of the kind of language that it uses but also in the way that it has been introduced. The Green Report itself mentions in its paragraph 80 the need for good communication with the wider Church as to why changes to leadership development and talent management are required at this point in time, but there seems to have been very little attempt at communicating and certainly no attempt

to carry the support of Synod. This has resulted in a textbook failure to carry people with what is being proposed.

As FAOC say in paragraph 114 of their report, "Effective leadership depends on co-operation between leaders and led". This failure is compounded by the previous decision not to bring the FAOC report to Synod either. So it is good that we have the opportunity to put this right today and I hope that this debate will contribute towards greater co-operation between leaders and those who are led.

Another important insight in the FAOC report is that of faithful improvisation, which can be compared to musical improvisation. I know from my own fascination with the French school of organist improvisers that successful improvisation requires great skill and training in musical form and harmony, and of course in performance. That said, the model of French organist composers is not the best one as they are generally very individualistic and, of course, perform generally on their own. Perhaps the model of a jazz band improvising together, sparking off each other, better captures the collegial dimension of leaders working together and with others. There is a nice, joyful vision for the Church and the House of Bishops.

I hope we will have a good debate about the FAOC report drawing out further the material that is in it and that we will vote to take note of it as it is an important resource for our Church. Thank you.

*The Chair:* So the main motion is open for debate. The Bishop of Coventry followed by Christina Rees, both of whom have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Thank you, Chair, for calling me. As Chairman of FAOC I would like to thank Fr Simon Killwick for securing this debate and for his generous introduction and for points well made. I do not think it is for me at this point to seek to respond to those in particular or to defend the report; I am very interested to hear what people will say about it.

I thought what would be most helpful is to talk about the method in the report, the way it provides, I think, a good example of a classical Anglican exploration of a theme. It takes the theme of leadership and it tries to consider the grammar, or the Canons as it calls it, the principles or rule of leadership as we might say, and it digs deeply into scripture, that is how it establishes what that Canon is. It uses the skills and gifts of spirit informed reason to do that, and I would like to thank Professor Loveday Alexander particularly for her work there, and then it notices how the grammar of leadership shown in scripture is expressed in the language of changing context of the Church's life and how it evolves and adapts, asking what is abiding, what needs to be held onto because it has got hold of something that is of great significance and belongs to the life of the Church, and what is variable and needs to be discarded or developed.

Then, as Fr Killwick says, it offers an ecclesial practice, and I think his jazz analogy is a very good one. It talks about how we can take part in this evolving story through the practice of faithful improvisation and in so doing it avoids trying to give a sort of definitive improvisation because that would defeat the very point of it. It recognises that faithful improvisation in this sense, to use a genuinely pastoral word, requires a "hefting", the sort

of hefting that a shepherd would have to the environment, to the hills and to the valleys; it is very much rooted in that particular environment and situation.

I hope the report is a good example of the learning from scripture, applying the tradition that it sets in motion and the careful, sensitive, painstaking analysis and application in the pastoral and missionary situations in which we find ourselves. Now whether it proves to be generative of that sort of faithful, imaginative practice and further and even better theological thought about the Church and its leadership, well only time will tell and this debate will be one of those tests. I think I would say that what I have seen of these ideas in action it has proved to be generative and that is where I would hope it would feed into the work in terms of leadership training courses, that is what here will be generative of further thought and faithful practice.

Just to illustrate that, I thought I might say something about how I found rereading the report a helpful and generative thing for my own understanding of what I am up to and thoughts on leadership and episcopacy in particular. That thinking has been largely around the fundamental point that the report makes about leadership being a gift; a gift that is given by God to the Church. What more might be said about this gift that God gives to the life of the Church and, to be more specific, let me call it the *charism* here, particularly of a bishop, although I take Simon's very well made points about leadership of course not being only episcopal but, nevertheless, four thoughts come to my mind.

Firstly, the seeing that comes with episcopal ministry, the overseeing, if you will; the seeing beyond the immediate and the proximate; seeing parishes in relation to parishes and in relation to other churches, to schools, to civic life and to other religious life. Then the suffering that comes from seeing; suffering the pains of parishes and communities that are going through hard and difficult times. Of course, it is not only bishops who suffer the suffering of others, but there is something that comes with the *charism* that calls us to bear its burden and to carry its responsibility for addressing it. Then that leads to the *charism* that accompanies or needs to accompany the life of a bishop, which is strategic missionary thought and action; listening to what the Spirit is saying to the churches and then acting upon it. That leads me to the fourth which is implicit in all the others. Love is at the heart of the *charism* of the bishop. We are all called to love and be devoted to the Lord but the ring that the bishop wears is a sign of the undying love that the bishop is called to have with the Church for the Church and that is what any form of education in the life of leadership need to involve.

*Mrs Christina Rees (St Albans):* I am really glad we are discussing this. This is a take note motion and I hope that we will commend this report to be discussed much, much more widely in our churches and dioceses and at every level. It really bears so much reading and rereading and further discussion. In his covering note, the Bishop of Coventry talked about the Reform and Renewal projects and some of the work going on in the House of Bishops and this report has been intersecting projects, distinct but complementary, and I would like to think that the theology in this report would really inform the work that comes after this and in fact the work we are involved in. I think it will add so much richness and it gives a theological basis to some of the more practical training and resourcing.

One of the insights I appreciated was between those led and their leaders. Any leader,

not just senior leaders in the Church, but any parent or teacher will recognise that dual sense of both responsibility and privilege and how being in the position of a leader is a huge gift, but it is enormously important to hold that trust well, to be entrusted, and that sense of a relationship, that dynamic, between those led and a leader. I think it is particularly important that we passed the draft safeguarding legislation this morning. I am really glad that happened this morning on the same day we are discussing this.

Another insight about the privilege and responsibility of leaders and holding trust, it also made me think of as for individuals, so that is partly the role that the Church of England as the established church holds in this country. I would like to think more around that, how some of things that have been written about leadership, the role that our Church plays in our country; implications for the institution as well.

There was a wonderful Jesuit called Herbert Alphonso who wrote just a small booklet on our vocation in Christ and it is about our unique vocation, how each of us has a unique view and sight and insight into Christ. I mention that because I think this report helps to avoid any mechanistic approach to leadership in any way. We do not want production line leaders in our Church. With that individual unique look, each senior leader or any leader will exercise their leadership in an absolutely unique way because before they were leaders they were first Christians. I think that is really important so that we don't get to have a one-size-fits-all; this is what leaders look like. I think it is these are those who are called to follow Christ; what is their unique call as members of the Body of Christ and then what does their unique leadership look like with their absolutely unique understanding of Christ.

I would just like to end by saying that of course with all this talk about leadership, I think it is really important to be reminded that first and foremost we are all followers and we are all followers of our leader, Jesus Christ, and I really do commend this report for wider reading.

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

*Revd Dr Roger Walton (Ecumenical Representative):* As an ecumenical observer, I welcome this report and I want to thank those who have created it for it is a resource for churches other than the Church of England. I believe its reading of the Scriptures from the hermeneutic provided by the question of leadership is refreshing, illuminating and insightful. I particularly value the notion of the triangular dynamic in which Christian leadership emerges and is exercised and the discussion at the end which leans into the growing diversity of the Church coming to us through fresh expressions, migration and the emergence of new churches.

I have however three slight disappointments. The first is that whilst I find most of the New Testament analysis persuasive, there is occasionally a tendency to claim too much for trans-local leadership. In paragraph 93, the claim is that the fundamental apostolic task is to be witnesses using Acts 1:7 and Matthew 28. This is associated with trans-local leadership; I think this narrows the calling. For years now we have been recovering the reading of these two texts, especially Matthew, as linked to the call of all Christians to be witnesses; witnesses where they are placed and live and work. It is not about leadership but about the fundamental apostolic calling of all followers of Jesus to witness to Christ



and make disciples. The use of the participle form for the word “to go” in Matthew 28 is at least evocative of making disciples as you make ordinary everyday journeys in life. If it is a leadership calling it is only so in that it reminds and empowers all to be witnesses.

My second disappointment is that there was no engagement, as Simon Killwick said, with Methodism. As an 18<sup>th</sup> century fresh expression growing within the Church of England, an exploration of faithful improvisation might have been an alternative way, and might still be an alternative way into our renewed conversations following the JIC Report. Alongside the Archbishop of York's call to an ecumenism of holiness, it might be fruitful to examine faithful improvisation in relation to our shared and separated history, just as the report implies that it might in relation to 21<sup>st</sup> century expressions of fresh expressions. Of course the answer might be that we should do this together.

My third reservation is that I have a worry in the New Testament explorations and the historical examples that is there a neglect of team approaches to leadership. Where leadership is genuinely shared and held together, the sending out of the disciples in twos is worthy of more reflection. Those who joined in the penning of the apostolic letters of Paul may be more than just his staff team. This in my mind is more than collegiality, although that is part of it. Rather, there are examples of leadership which are held in teams and groups which are hallmarked by equality and mutual accountability which is exercised together. I wonder if more could be explored in the sphere of team leadership as well as individual leadership. With these comments, I commend this report.

*Mrs Carol Wolstenholme (Newcastle):* I would like to make two points. The first is that as a person who in my own diocese has regularly heard criticisms and questions about the theological and biblical perspectives on leadership within the Church, I really do appreciate the clarity and detail within the report on these issues. It will be a very welcome resource within the leadership discussions, I am sure, in all dioceses.

My second point is I welcome in the report that the inclusion of the new patterns of ministry require a sharing of leadership between bishops, clergy and laity. It is heartening to have acknowledged that lay leadership is important, and my hope is that through the Reform and Renewal programme lay leadership will be urgently recognised, explored and developed so that there are more senior lay leaders enabling the church to reform and be renewed. We know, as we say in Newcastle, that we lay people are willing and able to “get on with it”.

*Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester):* Simon, thank you very much indeed for bringing this to Synod. I think it is really helpful to this look at this report. I also find myself agreeing with I think everything that Christina Rees said. Thank you very much indeed.

Just a few things to say. The language of leadership in the New Testament varies but the vocabulary of the character of the leader is remarkably unified and seems to be of at least as much significance as the various tasks themselves, so whilst leadership is rising up the agenda, which it should and must, we must also give clear and unequivocal witness to the balance of the New Testament focus on Christ-likeness, humility, self-control, faithfulness and all those other things. We want leadership which reflects and refracts the character of the Good Shepherd who led by laying down his life for the flock.

A second point, I think there is an ambiguity within the report about the central role of the teaching of the Word of God. In paragraphs 133 and 134, we are at the end of the first century and it says: "Thus the apostolic task of teaching came to assume an increasingly central place in the role of the bishop ...", but my reading is that right at the heart of the very earliest forms of Christian leadership that it was happening through the preaching of the Word of God and if we look at the very earliest New Testament documents, that will support that contention. Of course that is embedded in our Anglican tradition within the Ordinal and the readings that happen at the consecration of bishops; the priority of teaching the truth and refuting error from Acts 20.

My third area is just a slight hesitancy about this word "improvisation". I recognise of course the issue as we face new challenges. I see the safeguards. It has got to be faithful improvisation, but it has serious potential to cause problems if it becomes all a matter of interpretation and it becomes very subjective. So we constantly need to make sure that that improvisation is firmly rooted in the authoritative word in the Scriptures itself.

*Mrs Sarah Finch (London):* Many of us will feel very grateful to Simon Killwick for bringing this PMM and making it possible to debate the FAOC report on senior church leadership. We are also very grateful to the members of that body for their substantial, thoughtful and detailed report.

There are three things in this report that as a lay woman I am particularly glad about. First, the emphasis on the fact that bishops should be teachers. Hooray. In paragraph 43, bullet point 3: "[Bishops will] be teachers, whose task it is to 'uphold sound and wholesome doctrine, and to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange opinions' so as to 'hand on entire' the Christian faith." Canon C18 and the Ordinal, quoted here, are, of course, only following St Paul's instruction to Timothy that an overseer should be able to teach and his instruction to Titus that an overseer should hold firmly to the trustworthy message so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it.

Secondly the report emphasises the higher allegiance that any church leader owes to God. Paragraph 66 points us to the instruction in Hebrews 13:17: "Obey your leaders... They keep watch over you as men who must give account."

Thirdly, the report insists that episcopal leadership is essentially collegial. In paragraph 115 it asserts that leadership is 'never a solitary privilege' and that church leadership in the New Testament was inherently collegial. Both apostles and local leaders function as groups or teams rather than individuals. This report should comfort and reassure the whole Church of England. It is taking us back to Scripture and to the culture of leadership we find in the New Testament. It will be of particular comfort though to some young lay Anglicans I know who have been experiencing intense dismay in recent months. One young lawyer aged under 30 described a recent set of events as "disgraceful" and said "If the Clergy Discipline Measure and ecclesiastical law held any credence" and here I paraphrase "there would have been a defrocking months ago."

So, Simon, thank you for encouraging us to pay attention to this excellent report.

*The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson):* Mr Chairman, I too am very grateful

to Simon Killwick for drawing our attention to the excellent FAOC report, not least as I start work as Chair of the soon to be formed Vocations Working Group. The focus of this report is on senior Church leadership but, as Simon's paper makes clear, most of it is relevant to Church leadership as a whole except that, as the report makes clear, we have to handle the 'L' word with care.

There is another 'L' word lying behind the witness of the Gospels of course, the word "learner" or "disciple", and while the ideas of leadership and learnership seem to occupy rather different worlds, the truth is that you cannot safely have one without the other. Indeed, the more senior the leadership the more senior the need for learnership. St Paul himself writes: "Follow me as I follow the example of Christ". In other words "Let me be your leader insofar as I am first Christ's learner." Even Jesus is portrayed in the Gospels as a disciple first. He is led by the Spirit into the wilderness. He only does what he sees the Father doing. He only speaks what he hears the Father speaking. Right at the front of this grand, improvisatory game of follow my leader is the presence of Almighty God himself; a presence that Jesus in his incarnate learnership makes visible to us.

Back to some of my own improvisations for the Vocations Working Group with its ambition to increase the number of ordained leader learners by 50% and on to page 41 of the FAOC report because the whole emphasis of section 3.5 is quite properly on God's call to "follow me". Human agency, in paragraph 101, has a part to play in discerning that call but ultimately the initiative belongs with God; no argument there. Such an understanding though begs a practical question: why is it that God seems to call a steady stream of men and women into ordained leadership from some churches and virtually none from others?

Here I would like to commend an approach that I first picked up as a vicar and have continued to deploy as a bishop. It is something I learnt from those mission movements that used to crisscross the nation with their compelling vision of a world in mortal need of the light of Christ and their actively recruited workers to the Gospel cause; my own grandparents included. It is an approach loosely based on the call narrative of Isaiah which starts not with a command "Follow me" but with a question "Whom shall I send and who will go for us?" to which the prophet famously responds: "Here am I; send me."

In Twickenham I held occasional ordination evenings where people like Gordon Kuhrt and Margaret Sentamu were let loose on my congregation and where 25 people – 11 women and 14 men – were ordained over a 12-year period. In Birmingham too a similar evening resulted in ten enquiries of whom five are now training for ordained ministry. That seems to me like a good evening's work.

Thank you for this excellent report. Let us get praying for discerning, recruiting and training the learner leaders including the senior learner leaders of tomorrow. There is no time to lose.

*The Revd Prof Richard Burrige (Universities):* I recently was leading the retreat of ordinands at Launde Abbey for the diocese of Peterborough. We spent a fair bit of time studying the ordination liturgy, so I am delighted to see in this report the relationship between the Bible and the liturgy. I have a sense of déjà vu about it. It was not that long ago I was lamenting in the discussions leading up to the Pilling Report the absence of theology in biblical studies and I commended the work of Loveday Alexander to the

Bishop of Sheffield who then took it on board and is now including it in the conversations.

While I was away in America growing my beard and getting on with my writing, something happened at the February Synod to do with a report by Lord Green and so on where people again said about the absence of theology in the liturgy and then along again comes a report with Professor Alexander. I am delighted to have played a small role in accompanying and fostering her vocation through countless biblical conferences.

I asked last night if these two reports had been available to one another and I got an answer I did not understand but John Ward thought it meant "No". I am glad that the answer said that the FAOC report is going to play a part of faithful improvisation in the ongoing work. That section of the report, particularly paragraph 196, page 82, talks about improvisation based upon a deep musical tradition of 'scales and harmonies, of rhythms and melodies' and so on.

I was glad that my good friend and colleague, the Bishop of Truro, listed the theologians in the room as being basically all of the Bishops. When I asked him for his definition of "theologian" he told me it was those who pray, and as an academic I can give you the reference for that. It is Evagrius Ponticus in his book on prayer, chapter 60. The fact is that bishops are very, very busy people who do not get the time to write the books that they need and the same goes for those in our theological training institutions. I did not even have time to shave when I was trying to write my book. We still will need academics like Professor Alexander, who will be able to give us the footnotes and who do need to play a part in that. That is why this report is so good and that is why this report needs to play a full part in the implementation of the ongoing work and so on. Academic studies even of business schools, King's is setting up a front-line business school shortly.

Please let me commend this report whether or not it was available when they were writing the Green Report to the ongoing work of the selection and leadership of those who have the *charism* to lead and pastor and teach in our Church.

*The Chair:* We have had 45 minutes on the general debate so far and I am going to ask Canon Charman to speak to and to move her amendment and then we will debate the amendment for a while and then we will come back to the motion, either amended or unamended. As I said initially, Canon Charman, you have five minutes.

*Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury):* I beg to move as an amendment:

'At the end insert – "and, in the light of widespread misunderstanding and concern about the new arrangements for discerning and nurturing senior leaders that have recently been introduced, following the report from the Lord Green Steering Group, invite:

- (a) the House of Bishops to bring for scrutiny by Synod a report assessing the effectiveness of those arrangements and setting out what is intended from January 2017; and
- (b) the Business Committee to schedule that report for debate not later than July 2016.'

I want to add my thanks to those of others to Fr Simon Killwick, whose Private Member's Motion has given Synod this opportunity to engage with and take note of the excellent FAOC report. At the end of his background paper, Fr Killwick comments that it would be good to have a follow-up report to evaluate the current practice of episcopacy in the light of the tradition together, with proposals for the future.

My amendment takes the form of an invitation to the House of Bishops and the Business Committee to bring such a follow-up report to Synod. In recent years, Synod has debated a number of reports on senior church leadership, including *Working with the Spirit*, *Choosing Diocesan Bishops* and *Talent and Calling*, which reviewed the process for appointing suffragan bishops, deans, archdeacons and residential canons.

Synod has always played a legitimate part in these matters. Last November and again in February Synod was therefore surprised and disappointed to discover that although discerning and nurturing senior leaders is a highly topical issue and a key element of the Reform and Renewal agenda there was to be no opportunity to engage with it beyond receiving updates.

It is not the role of Synod to formally approve the new leadership development arrangements nor to determine the spending decision; that rests with the Church Commissioners, but it is absolutely the role of Synod to express a view on this matter and to exercise the right of scrutiny, and those who are responsible for helping us find our way through synodical process will tell you that this is so.

Generally speaking, the scrutiny of Synod is welcomed by those seeking to implement changes. It ensures that the best possible spread of advice is available; it helps gauge how new developments are being perceived and received and it enables Synod members to gain a full understanding of what is being proposed so that they in turn can inform the understanding of those whom they represent.

Seeking to clarify how the Body of Christ discerns its leaders, the FAOC report points us towards Acts 6: the apostles need to appoint more people to share in their ministry of oversight. They consult with the whole community of the disciples. The community then identifies suitable people and invites the apostles to lay hands on them so that the Church can continue to grow. Of course the apostles in this text are not identical with the bishops of the Church of England nor the community of the disciples with the members of this Synod. Nevertheless, we find here a foundational understanding of the way in which the Body of Christ calls out people to serve in oversight roles, with all the members of the body taking counsel together under the Holy Spirit. If the Body of Christ now loses its proper share in that discernment, with its role being entirely taken over by secular professionals and those from outside the household of faith, that would be a very worrying development for the Church and I suggest a most unfaithful improvisation.

Synod can be a frustrating institution, probably most of us have felt that at one time, but we are episcopally led and synodically governed. That is our Anglican polity. If Synod is in need of reform then let us reform it, but it is not the right thing to do to marginalise Synod or attempt to move around it.

This is not the moment to say anything about the merits or demerits of the new

arrangements. I simply observe that they have caused an unusual amount of tension and disquiet not only in this Synod but in the wider Church and this has not helped us in a good process of reflection of the kind that the FAOC report was written to enable. Possibly it has not helped the reception of the wider Reform and Renewal agenda either, and if so that is a pity. Yesterday evening, a question was asked about the relationship between the Green and FAOC reports answered by the Bishop of Coventry. We heard that the two processes had, to some extent, elided but that there had not been an opportunity for a full dialogue or interconnection between them.

A further report would enable that joining up to happen and would fulfil Fr Killwick's aim. This would, in turn, provide a context and some tools for Synod to scrutinise the new arrangements in a well-informed and positive way. It would be good to put this in hand in time for the new quinquennium and so I offer this amendment to the Synod. I beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I call on Simon Killwick to comment on the amendment.

*Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester):* I would like to thank Jane very much for her amendment. This has been such a good debate so far that, surely, to have another one this time next year can only be a good thing, can it not? More seriously though, both the Bishop of Coventry and Christina Rees in their speeches have referred to the need for the theology in the FAOC reports to be generative in terms of the work that follows or, indeed, to inform the work that follows.

If we were to have a report and a further debate next year, we could see exactly how the theology that is in the FAOC report was being informative and generative in terms of the work that is going on. It would also enable the conversation to continue between leaders and those who are led, so there is a proper spirit of co-operation. A number of speakers have spoken in the debate about team leadership, group leadership, going back to the New Testament. In that spirit as well it does seem that it would be a really good thing if we touched base with each other this time next year in terms of the on-going work. As I say, I am grateful to Jane for her amendment and would be inclined to accept it.

*The Chair:* Indeed, you can see on the screens the effect of the amendment.

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

*The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton):* Thank you very much, indeed, to Fr Killwick for this motion and thank you to Jane Charman for the amendment. I think it is vital for us all to understand what we are doing when we take part in leadership. It would seem to me that all of us, whatever we particularly do or do not do, have aspects of our lives which are involved in leadership. I am also quite intrigued to hear this talk about laity and ordained, I think we are all supposed to be all part of the *laos*, and it might be helpful if we thought a bit more about how that works in some ways.

As I said last night, I do think that bishops are theologians. They are many things. Bishops are many things, they are also those charged with some degree of leadership. I personally see no conflict at all between the report that FAOC have produced and the work that I have been involved in as part of the Development and Appointments Group

that led to the *Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders* report.

Now I am well aware that there has been much criticism about all that work. Can I just say, for the avoidance of doubt, and sorry about the elision or otherwise last night, that I personally was sent a draft copy of the FAOC report. I do not think it was to me only, I think all members of DAG were sent it. It did, therefore, inform our early work; but our processes were different, the timetables were different and the purposes were different. It is, therefore, the case that as a bishop I can tell you myself that when I was first made a bishop (can you believe it, 14 years ago now), my induction and training, shall we say, left a lot to be desired.

I do think we need to understand that our roles as bishops, as indeed Fr Killwick and others have alluded to, are complex and manifold and we do need the help that we can get from many other different walks of life. Yes, of course, we need to carry on being the theologians we are called to be. I, for one, am reading at the moment a book called, *John in the Company of Poets*, written by Thomas Gardner, which was commended to us by Gordon Mursell in some wonderful addresses he gave the diocesan bishops in April. I am as well as doing that, of course, trying to understand what it means to be a leader and manage and organise myself.

I can just tell you that the FAOC and our own work is coming together. Within the learning community that we have set up, a work stream about theology is being brought together by Jeremy Worthen, who himself is the secretary of FAOC. I do think the idea of having another debate, as Jane Charman says, is a very good idea. I personally will be voting in favour of this amendment and I encourage you to do the same thing.

These two things do come together. We made mistakes in the early days of the work that we did in our report. I accept that and I accept my part of responsibility for doing that, but I do think that we now need to understand that our work is different but along the same lines. We can all learn from each other. None of us has either all the right answers or the perfect answer, but we are all set about the work of proclaiming the Gospel, and in that we all need to understand and be helped from wherever we can get help to be the best leaders that we can be. Thank you.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby):* We should all be very grateful to FAOC for the work they have done in this report and to Jane Charman for the amendment, which, like the Bishop of Truro, I strongly support. Like all words, 'leadership' comes to us with a lot of baggage that sets for us the framework in which we hear or see the concept of leading. We inherit models of leadership that were for centuries authoritarian, ignoring the poor and the voiceless.

The question the report addresses is how leadership is continually redefined into a model that is truly Christ-like. How we develop and prepare some of those who have wide responsibilities in leadership is both demanding and also potentially prophetic as regards the world around. Our interest is in discerning and developing God's gifts and graces to his people. Let me just say, given a couple of the questions that came up last night, which I handled badly for which I apologise to the questioners and also to the Synod, that we are committed to nurturing the vocation across the whole of God's people regardless of sexuality and regardless of lay or ordained.

The FAOC report shows that leadership needs preparation in prayer, in theology, in the skills of everyday matters, in collaborative working, in interpreting the times in safeguarding, in how to ensure overall that what the Church discerns as necessary the Church does. We must have a system that is pastorally sensitive for those being formed, self-consciously inclusive of those we too easily exclude, and ensures that those being considered for appointments in posts of wide responsibility are from all areas of the Church and are diverse, especially in the areas of major weakness such as, for example, BAME people, gender balance, disability and others.

Our theology and practice must challenge inherited or widely accepted bad models through prayer and also theological thinking. In supporting strongly this amended resolution, I am sure that theology and practice must go forward at the same time in dialogue and that, in all areas of development of leaders, we will always be continually adjusting what we do, not only as the context changes but also as our understanding develops.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Point of order. Mr Chair, in the mind of the sort of mood, I wonder whether we might need deal with the amendment and then I think we might pass it and then ---

*The Chair:* I was proposing to take one more speaker and then canvass a motion for closure.

*Mr Robert Key (Salisbury):* The happy diocese. *In arcadia sum.* the Archbishop agrees with the mover of the amendment to the motion that I support. What more could anyone ask? Well, just a little. 20 years ago, a bishop wrote to me – not my own bishop – and suggested I stood for the General Synod. I remember with some embarrassment writing back to say, “I didn’t really believe in Synods; I believed in bishops running the Church of England”. Ten years ago, Bishop David Stancliffe convinced me I was wrong and I stood and here I am, but on the eve of my departure I feel challenged by that same question.

What concerns me most now is that we allow ourselves to be episcopally led. If we can govern as well as a Synod and agree, so much the better, but I do beg this Synod particularly in the coming Synod not to shackle the Archbishops and the Bishops but to go ahead with progress, not to impede change and not to strangle new ideas at birth. I think the Church of England has got to decide where it wants to go. Is the Church of England part of the solution in our nation or is it going to be part of the problem? Are we a welcome partner or are we a tolerated sect only concerned with our own being? Are we a golden thread in the life of the nation or are we a thorn in the side to be rejected and discarded?

The Church of England is in very good heart at the moment. We are strongly led by an Archbishop and his team. It is going to be even stronger with more women in the House of Bishops and I am so happy about that. Of course, we must have good order and discipline and order our affairs properly and pass legislation like we spent this morning doing, but we must not stop things happening and moving forwards. Things have moved so fast for the Church of England in the last 100 years, they should not stop now. We just need to be very careful that we do not make that happen.



If I could just end with a prayer that my own Bishop, Nicholas Holtam, used at the end of a wonderful Magna Carta sermon in Salisbury just a moment ago, "From the arrogance that thinks it knows all truth, from the laziness that is content with half-truth, from the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, oh, God of truth, deliver us". Amen.

*Revd Preb Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Point of order. Motion for Item 51 to be put to the vote.

*The Chair:* You can obviously read my mind. That has my consent, does it have the consent of Synod? Those in favour please show.

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

*Revd Professor Richard Burrige (Universities):* Point of order. Forgive me, I must be getting demob happy. I do not have my Standing Orders with me, but I think it is 36(b), would you be willing to allow for a division of the whole Synod, picking up Bishop Tim's point about all being together, so we can have this vote recorded, please?

*The Chair:* Mr Burrige, I have a discretion apparently, which is good to know, and I am going to take a vote now on the amendment as it is and so we vote by a show of hands.

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

*The Chair:* We go back to debating the motion as amended and the motion remains open for debate.

*Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities):* I come from a community which is heavily influenced by today's patron, St Benedict. As some of you may know, the influence of Benedict in the religious life in the modern form took some while to be accepted in the Church of England and not least of all of because of fear of the power and role of the abbot, of the abbot as leader because the abbot stands in the place of Christ, and it is why my own order is not quite Benedictine. We do not quite have that. We almost do, a typical Anglican order.

The correlate of that is the Benedictine understanding of obedience which is anything but Prussian. It involves listening. It involves community. It involves deference. It involves suffering for the other and attention to each other's needs. A jolly good thing. You find it in church documents and on churches' *Communio*, it is all over the place. But what we do not have is leaders. There is a body called the Leaders Conference where heads of religious houses meet, but very few of them are actually called 'leaders', none to my knowledge, and certainly not in our tradition. One of the worries which I have about leadership may be simply a lack of familiarity because it is quite a recent concept in our Church. The activity of leading, a vital activity, essential to the Church, is there but the concept of leadership is quite new.

I have just one reservation about the report which I took part in, I should own up to that, and that is how we construe the relationship between the leader and the one to whom we refer and the one to whom we refer above all others out of the rule of Benedict, and that I think is really quite an important thing. I am very grateful to what the Bishop of Guildford

said about God being our leader.

I think especially with a polity like ours, and we argue about bishops, priests and deacons and all that kind of thing periodically, but with a polity which we have received like that with all of its disadvantages, with all its blessings and with all its eccentricities, we have a structure which allows us to understand the leadership of God in his Church expressed in institutional and constitutional forms. There is a systematic decentring of leadership in the very life of the Church.

I hope that in whatever future report we actually do look at something of that because I think the language of leadership, we are all aware, can get dangerously too big for its boots. I do not think we are in that position as yet, but I think the idea of leadership being constitutionally and institutionally decentred, because it is centred ultimately in Christ, it is vicarious, it is accountable to Him, would be faithful to our tradition and, may I also say, faithful to the rule of Benedict. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford):* I am very glad that the amendment has been passed. There is so much to like about the FAOC report. It is measured and, of course, long in its gestation. I may be the only person here but why do I feel so conflicted about this? I feel bad, I think, because of the way it has been or has not been understood and implemented by the Green Report.

There are two main areas psychologically I am worried about. It is to do with the nature of power which, despite all the right words, feels far more centralised today. We ought not to avoid the issue of how this came about. The very idea that the banks who, by their corrupt and self-serving methods brought the West to its knees, might possibly be the source of wisdom or model for the Church of Christ felt simply wrong. This was compounded by the fact that the Synod was then not allowed to debate the Green Report last February.

Secondly, the emphasis on spotting potential leaders who are then groomed for leadership speaks to me of an inner circle where the right sort of people are chosen to perpetuate a model which might to some of us not be totally ideal. I think you might also wonder what being seen as a future star might actually do to your character.

Thirdly, there is a pragmatic business and corporate tone which might be part but only part of the Church, a Church which also needs prophets and academics and musicians and even clowns.

The reason I left the church of my childhood and became an Anglican is because it did not have ascriptive control. I have been free to ask difficult and provocative questions. I truly have discovered that in Christ service is perfect freedom and I have been able to breathe and grow in all sorts of random and exciting ways. This leadership programme carries within it echoes, at least for me, of the old and, I have to say, paternalistic world.

The other aspect is theological. You feel entitled to run an organisation this way if you believe in a certain type of God, a 'big daddy' kind of God, the one who has a plan for your life, who is in control of everything and has opinion about everything. He is a God who allows people to say, 'I know this will cause you great pain but I have to do it because

that is what God requires'. Well, the Church I believe in is not like that at all and the God is not either. The point of the Church is not itself or even its growth; it is to be the agent that transforms the human race into the human family. The method to do that is to do just what Jesus did and become fully human. Please let us pursue this and keep our thinking antenna alert as we move forward.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter):* Like most of the other speakers, I am extremely grateful to Fr Killwick for his motion which enabled me to read for the first time, I have to say, the FAOC report. I read it with a great deal of care. It turned out to be fascinating and enlightening. It is great, is it not (or I think it is great) when reports like these hold out words that you want to just say 'Yes' to.

There were plenty of those like, as we have heard, the faithful improvisation with all its connotations of both deep formation and creativity, no space here for what is merely culturally customary; and management in the Church exists only for the sake of ministry and mission; the hallmark of the Spirit's work is variety, the diversified Christ-likeness, never twice the same, which surely chimes with, does it not, the Five Principles. I so enjoy it when I learn new things.

Having warmed to this report, I want to share with you how reading it made me go back to Green and re-read that. I re-read it and I found that my initial response had altered from a feeling of having been presented with a *fait accompli* to one more concerned with reading what was actually proposed. I think I had been guilty of reading and interpreting to my own way between the lines rather than focusing on the lines themselves.

Reading between the lines had made me think about an apparent lack of consultation and an emphasis on the managerial tasks as opposed to priestly ones. But re-reading it after I had read the FAOC report had me recognising some of the merits of the programme with goals, who could disagree with them, of more ministry not more bureaucracy, a need to develop leaders who embody and exemplify the generous diversity of the Church and the need for a Church more able to be adventurous in its readiness to choose potential leaders.

I do not underestimate the concerns which I think will be met by this amended motion, but I want to just share with you that a little while ago in *New Directions* there was an article by the then Archdeacon of Hackney, now the Bishop of Gloucester. She wrote about how working through the Five Principles enabled people to walk towards each other. In a similar way I think reflecting on FAOC enables people to walk towards all the best bits of the Green Report. This debate allows for the views to be heard and, who knows, in listening to each other and the future debate we will have, the Spirit's will for the Church and for the development of its leaders and those who are led might even be discerned. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order. Mr Chairman, after the next speakers, can I put forward a motion for closure on this item?

*The Chair:* I think I might just hear a couple more speakers but I might be receptive to you thereafter.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby):* Thank you, Chair, for calling me. Thanks also to the Faith and Order Commission for this excellent piece of work and to Simon Killwick for his PMM. There is a great deal to welcome in the report. The readings for morning prayer over the past few days have been taken from the Book of Esther, a young Jewish girl thrust into a leadership position based on criteria that amounted to nothing more than that the King fancies her, with no mention of God anywhere in the Book and, yet, Esther saves the whole people of God.

The Bible is full of surprising leaders who do not seem to meet any criteria and who have no position from which to lead. If there is a missing element to this excellent report it is the notion of surprise. Paragraph 99 speaks of biblical leaders greeting their call with surprise, which is undoubtedly true; but the biblical leaders are themselves surprising, Esther being but one example. As we move forward in our consideration of leadership in the Church, we need to look to be surprised by leadership that comes from surprising people.

Of course, it is not possible to create surprising leaders in the Church. God calls who God calls. What we can do is to be more alert for them when they surprise us and how might that be reflected in our discernment, in our listening, in our training. More, how might that be reflected here in Synod. One answer might be to drop our defensiveness, to work on lowering our barriers; the defensiveness of Synod or, indeed, our whole Church culture.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Truro, I think, have graciously demonstrated this during this debate and we have rightly applauded that. Paragraph 186 of the report calls for a culture that allows failure, that attends to it carefully and learns from it seriously but that does not condemn it. Surprising leadership needs such a culture. The first steps in this less defensive culture need to come from all of us who have leadership roles in the Church and that includes all of us in this Synod. While we are being defensive, we cannot and will not be surprised. Thank you, and I hope that Synod will strongly commend this report.

*Dr Elaine Storkey (Ely):* I want to add my thanks again to everyone else's. I heard what Rosie said earlier and I do think, actually, the report that we have in front of us pre-empts some of those decisions and some of those problems and presents us with a theology that bypasses a lot of the difficulties that we have been looking at. It offers an obvious challenge to leadership which minimises and bypasses the whole idea of medieval prince bishops. It was nearly 30 years ago since I was a member of Synod and, frankly, they were still around then. I came to Synod believing that we were in the world but not of it, and many of our bishops seemed of the world but not in it.

The report also offers us a challenge to the unconnected, hierarchical views of leadership, the CEO bishops, the bishop concept of CEO that leads to bad practice, because autocracy nearly always, in my experience, leads to defensiveness where the autocrat has to be right. Instead, we actually have a report where the theology offers a very deep biblical understanding and an improvised understanding and also a wide understanding of not just leadership, it goes beyond that, but to the whole idea of what it is to be a human person.

The theology in the report offers a critique, for example, of the concepts of human personhood which remain as both a legacy from the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, but also the fragmentation of post-modern ideas of what it is to be a 'self'. The autonomy of the human person is rejected right through the report in favour of a theology of our creatureliness, the creatureliness of every human being who lives before the face of God in whom we all have our being and live and move. We begin with God and ourselves as Christ's servants for Christ's sake in the report itself. It also takes us away from the independence of humanness of ourself and gives us, instead, inter-dependence, catholicity, connectedness. All of these are really important, not just for us but for our entire culture. If the Church could convey this sort of culture, that this is what leadership in the Church is about, this is what we are offering the world, we would be doing them an enormous service.

The primacy of greatness too I think is a wonderful note in the report. The theology of failure; we do not go round talking much about theology of failure, we actually brag about our successes. But we are not called to success. The scriptures and Jesus do not call us to success but simply to faithfulness, to following the path of obedience to the risen Christ in our day-by-day walk. In terms of language I think it is very important and I just wanted to raise one point. Language is developing, reshaping and it changes the way we see things. It used to be thought that language mirrored reality. It was a picture theory of meaning. Now it is generally thought that language creates reality. We have to be extremely careful about the concepts we are using because we are creating something that future generations will believe and grasp and follow through. My view is somewhere in between but I have not got time to expose it. The report itself exposes that but it falls into its own trap and I just wanted to leave you with this one point. This is my one criticism.

On page 14 it says, "New Testament authors seem consciously to have avoided the most obvious words for 'leader' in their culture, presumably because they wanted to avoid buying into the kinds of behaviour and organisation that were associated with that language". Then, they go on to say, "The language of leadership was not minted in the Church" Why use economic concepts there? At that vital point we actually almost gave the game away. So 2% sure, fewer than it should be but a good report otherwise.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* I too welcome this debate, this motion and the amendment, and since it commits us to further study and reflection on this perhaps I can just point out one area where we may fruitfully look at this area more deeply.

In the diocese of Chelmsford this year we will have ordained 64 new deacons and priests, which is a glorious thing and a big increase on where we were a few years ago. I have met with each one of those newly ordained people over the past year and I have asked them all the same question. I have reminded them in the Ordinal there are five words to describe the ministry of a priest, all of which have a rich biblical hinterland behind them. Those words are: servant, shepherd, messenger, sentinel, steward. I then say to them, "Of those five words, which one do you think is the most important for Christian ministry today?" and the answers are fascinating. Most people say "servant" or "shepherd", one or two say, "Oh well, the Bishop, he likes evangelism this bishop so we'd better say messenger", but so far nobody has said sentinel. It is the one thing also which I think was missing for me from the FAOC report. The other four words are referenced in some detail

but there in the Ordinal is this deeply uncomfortable word that a priest is called to be a sentinel.

Now being a sentinel is a very, very boring job. It involves standing on a tower and watching and watching and scanning the horizon and seeing what is coming and interpreting the world to the community and leading the rejoicing when there is victory and warning of danger. It brings us into that vital aspect of ordained ministry which is contemplative and prophetic. It is my strong view that – let us use the word “leaders” – the leaders of the Church need to be sentinels probably more than anything else in our day and I very much hope in the future work we will do in this area we will delve into that word that is sitting there in the Ordinal but so far, in my view, is the most neglected.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* Richard Higginson of Ridley College wrote, I believe, a fantastic book called *Transforming Leadership* back in the 1990s. When I first became a Church Commissioner in 1999 I asked that that book should be sent to the leaders of all the major businesses which we invested in, it is such a good description of the difference between basically leadership and management within very large corporates.

I believe there is a third type of leadership as well, not just corporate leadership, not management, but also entrepreneurial, risk-taking leadership. I do wonder if it is not that sort of entrepreneurial, risk-taking leadership that we need today. We speak to just 5% of the under-35s in this country; we need to speak to all. Our established nature of our Church, the nearly £7 billion which are held in the Church Commissioners and our traditions, makes us really quite complacent actually about our position for moving forward. I think that all makes us tend towards a sort of corporate model of leadership rather than a risk-taking, entrepreneurial leadership. I think we do need to take risks. I think we really need to accept that Christ led by taking risks himself. I think we should look and include within the models which we investigate over the next year, before this next report comes out, that model of entrepreneurial, risk-taking leadership. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

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

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

*The Chair:* I call upon Fr Killwick to reply to the debate on the motion as amended. You have up to five minutes.

*Revd Canon Simon Killwick (Manchester):* I thought you were going to say that, Chair, which makes my task rather difficult to try and reply after such a long and interesting debate. I think one thing that has certainly come very much over to me during the course of the debate is that in this debate many of us have stepped towards each other from different parts of the Synod or different places in the Synod and I think that has been a really good thing about the whole debate.

The Bishop of Coventry spoke, I felt, very movingly at the beginning about how the overseer sees beyond and how that can involve a suffering, a Christ-like suffering, and how that involves love as well. I thought that was something really important to be brought to the whole debate about the Christ-like nature of leadership in the Church.

Dr Roger Walton spoke about maybe in the FAOC report too much is claimed for trans-local leadership. Yes, Peter and Paul, for example, the travelling apostles, they preached the Gospel in all different places but they kept in touch afterwards, they wrote their letters to the Christian communities in all different places and therefore maintained the connection. I was grateful for the mention of how perhaps there is some neglect of the team approaches to leadership in the New Testament.

Carol Wolstenholme again took up that theme and brought in especially the need for lay leadership to be involved and developed particularly in the Reform and Renewal programme.

The Bishop of Guildford spoke very helpfully about how leaders are also learners and I was very taken by his idea of having occasional ordination evenings and, in the context of our target of trying to increase significantly the numbers of ordinands, that sounded a really helpful suggestion.

Professor Burridge referred to the involvement of Professor Loveday Alexander in the production of the FAOC report and that is really a good illustration of how you sometimes need to bring in a theologian from outside to stimulate, as it were, from the inside. I also take the point that obviously bishops are theologians but you also need, I think, professional theologians to be brought in from outside from time to time. Certainly Professor Alexander's involvement in the FAOC report has been extremely fruitful.

Fr Thomas Seville spoke about the Benedictine Rule and of course mentioned the role of the abbot and the concepts of both obedience and suffering. Of course, the Rule does very much provide for the abbot to consult often and regularly with the brethren of the community.

Rosie Harper mentioned, quite rightly, how the Church is not meant to be inward-looking, just concerned about its own self-preservation or development, but very much to be an agent of transformation in the world.

I think that may be much of what I want to say. Yes, one other thing was – I apologise to anybody that I have not mentioned who spoke – Elaine Storkey spoke about the time she could remember when bishops were of the world and not in it and the link between autocracy and defensiveness. Then she spoke as well about how the themes of interdependence, catholicity and connectedness is something really important as a message to take across into our culture and into the world that we live in which is so individualistic and autonomous. I hope very much that we will vote overwhelmingly for the motion as amended.

*The Chair:* Before the Synod is Item 9 as amended by Item 51.

*The motion as amended*

*'That this Synod do take note of the report of the Faith and Order Commission Senior Church Leadership: a resource for reflection and, in the light of widespread misunderstanding and concern about the new arrangements for discerning and nurturing senior leaders that have recently been introduced, following the report from the Lord Green Steering Group, invite:*

- a) the House of Bishops to bring for scrutiny by Synod a report assessing the effectiveness of those arrangements and setting out what is intended from January 2017; and*
- b) the Business Committee to schedule that report for debate not later than July 2016."*

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

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business. I think we are now going to move to Item 511A from this morning.

*THE CHAIR Canon Ann Turner (Europe)* took the Chair at 4.12 pm

### **Legislative Business:**

#### **Draft Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 (GS 1996)**

*The Chair:* Synod, we now come to Item 511A, the draft Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order. For this members will need the draft Order GS 1996 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 1996A. I invite Canon John Spence to move Item 511A. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

*A member:* Point of order. Are we quorate in all three Houses?

*The Chair:* I shall take advice. Could I ask the Bishops if they would stand, please? Yes, we are quorate. The House of Clergy and Laity are quorate, we are satisfied about that. Canon Spence, you have up to ten minutes.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I beg to move:

*'That the Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 be considered.'*

As I sat through the rich legislative feast this morning, as we progressed from safeguards to simplification to stipend funds and onto faculties, I was hoping that I could conclude the business with being a taramasalata just before you went to your lunch and instead I find myself now rather like a tired toasted teacake in mid-afternoon. It was quite clear that the lychgates and grand pianos and coats of arms took far too long to digest.



I must say I find it quite hard to get back to this. Do you know, I do not blame you all for going for a cup of tea because was that not a fabulous debate? I just thought really if ever I had understood how Synod, and those of us who are appointed to Synod, can best understand each other and learn from each other, you taught me a great deal in that debate, for which I am very grateful. I had better get down to the business. I have used three minutes now so you will be pleased to know we have only got seven left.

The Ecclesiastical Property Measure is now in force but to give full vent to its intentions it is necessary for the Archbishops' Council to pass an order setting the threshold below which it will not be necessary for Diocesan Board of Finance permission to be given for transactions being undertaken by PCCs or under the Incumbents and Churchwardens Measure 1964.

As we promised, we undertook consultation. We went to the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum and I am really grateful to those five dioceses who gave us full schedules of all recent transactions. In the light of that, and on the advice of the Finance Committee, the Archbishops' Council are recommending a two-fold test as to how this works. Firstly, we are recommending that parishes should have the power to undertake transactions where they fall below the level of the previous year's unrestricted income. Secondly, we are recommending that in the first instance we set a cap of £250,000 so that for those very few PCCs who have an unrestricted income above that number we do not at this stage enable them to undertake what might be seen as really quite major transactions.

We do have to have some exceptions, of course. It was pointed out to us that there are some cases where churches or places of worship are the property of the PCC or some group of trustees, so churches and places of worship are excluded from the Measure, as are graveyards and properties adjoining places of worship and graveyards as issues of access may be involved. Clearly, ladies and gentlemen, you would understand that this Measure will not be entitled to be used by parishes who have not submitted their accounts within ten months of the end of the previous financial year as we have no means of understanding what their unrestricted income is.

On that basis I commend the draft Order to the Synod.

*The Chair:* Item 511A is now open for debate. Could I remind you, please, that the debate should be directed to the general effect of the draft Order or to specific points of detail that are not related to the amendment but should not be directed to the amendment as that will be the subject of a separate debate.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent):* I think I am trying to get Synod to think carefully about legislation from a simplification point of view. If I start banging on about this it may be that it gets into our bloodstream. I think I really want to raise a question here which ought to be something that features in the deliberations of the next five years of Synod.

We have already suffered in the past from putting too much specifically on the face of legislation. I recognise why there is a particular clause, which I am not allowed to address because it is the subject of amendment, which sets a particular figure in there about the amount of money that may or may not be spent under this particular Order. Of course,

the fact is that everyone knows that will buy you a pretty bijou garage in Kensington but not much more.

There is a general point about how we draft and it is actually, even though it is an Order so it is slightly easier to amend than some other things, are we wise to put these kinds of stipulations on the face of legislation or not? I think we need to have a review of that. It may be I am throwing a ball to myself to catch if I get elected to the next quinquennium, but I do think there is a question about drafting, a question about habit, and this is one such example of many that we have put through Synod over the past years which then become otiose or obsolete. There was another one actually earlier on in what we were moving in the other legislation, which I am not meant to be speaking to, where we had the Archbishops' Council issuing guidance and I think there is a question about how you build in reviews to that sort of thing as well.

There is no easy answer to this. I can see why a figure has been written into the Order but with inflation, with changes, with a fast moving world, we have got to consider how our drafting takes place. I would love us just to make sure we pick that up as we try to make our legislation simpler in the future.

*Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn):* I just want to seek clarification on the last few words that Mr Spence said. He said if the parish have not sent in their accounts within ten months this cannot be used, but I cannot see how that applies because it just says, "according to the most recent financial statements that have been prepared for the council", it does not say anything about what they have done with them. Perhaps he could clarify how that works, please.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing, therefore I ask Canon Spence to respond to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Ladies and gentlemen, and I take the warning from Pete Broadbent, I am a natural simplifier and localiser. What we have done on this occasion is to start the process in terms of this draft Order. Actually, the words I was given were: "There will be a review of this in two years in the light of practical experience in order that we can understand how it can be further relaxed". That number that we have put in, Pete, was very much on the basis of consultations with DBF Chairs.

I am assured, Father, that the words are in the Order. It is, of course, a responsibility of any PCC to submit their accounts well within that ten month period; they are required to do so by the Charity Commissioners. I continue to commend the Order.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 511A to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 be considered.'*

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

*The Chair:* I now invite Mr Clive Scowen to move his amendment at Item 524. You may speak for up to five minutes.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“In Article 2, after paragraph (5) *insert—* “(6) An archdeacon may, with the consent of the diocesan authority, direct that, within his or her archdeaconry—

(a) the total of the unrestricted income referred to in paragraphs (1)(a) and (2)(a) shall be read as being such multiple of that amount as he or she may direct;

(b) or the sum specified in paragraphs (1)(b) and (2)(b) shall be read as being such greater sum as he or she may direct.”

Thank you, Chair. I come from London and, as the Bishop of Willesden has already pointed out, in many parts of that diocese £250,000 would buy you a small garage if you are lucky, so the freedom given by this Order will actually be of little practical value except perhaps where a PCC wants to sell a small garage. I suspect that the same will probably be true in a number of other south-eastern dioceses and maybe in other parts of the country too. Even if £250,000 were the current and appropriate figure, it will again, as the Bishop of Willesden has pointed out, require frequent updating each time requiring an amending Order to be brought to this Synod.

My amendment proposes a different approach. The Ecclesiastical Property Measure we passed last year made provision for an Order like this to “make different provision for different purposes, different cases or different areas”; it does not have to be one-size-fits-all. It also provides that in connection with the determination of an amount, the Order may confer a discretion on a person of a specified description. So amounts do not have to be specified on the face of the Order; the Order can instead provide for discretionary variation.

The amendment I am moving seeks to make use of those provisions and its effect would be that the amounts set out in the Order, which it does not seek to change, would become a national minimum but there will be local discretion to vary the amounts upwards. That local discretion would be exercised at diocesan and archdeaconry level. In some cases it might be appropriate for all the archdeacons in a diocese to get together and agree figures which would apply across the diocese and obviously to gain the consent of the diocesan authority to that, but in other cases different figures might be appropriate in different archdeaconries.

In either case the figure could only be raised from the national minimum if the diocesan authority gave its consent, but if the diocesan authority and the archdeacon can agree that in the particular circumstances of that diocese and that archdeaconry higher limits are required to enable the intention of the Ecclesiastical Property Measure to be fulfilled and to allow the freedom given by the Order to be of practical value, why should they not be permitted to vary the limits to meet local needs?

This approach also has the virtue that it should reduce or eliminate the need to bring amending Orders to this Synod to increase the £250,000 limit because any archdeacon,

with diocesan authority consent, could use his or her discretion to increase it locally and that could become a national habit.

I believe this amendment is entirely in line with the spirit and intention of the Ecclesiastical Property Measure with an instinct to simplify and localise and I invite the Synod to accept it.

*The Chair:* I invite Canon Spence to reply to Mr Scowen. You have up to five minutes.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Clive, thank you very much. I find myself in the difficult position of agreeing with you emotionally and, indeed, intellectually but asking you for your forbearance. I am going to resist the amendment simply because we need to learn a bit more, I believe, about time. You come from London, I come from Essex, the property prices are higher in London but they are still pretty big with us, I understand that the £250,000 restriction can feel low.

You, however, indicated just how complex an arrangement we could move into with so many different arrangements applying in different places and I am responding with integrity to the consultation which took place with the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum who ask that we proceed with caution in the first instance.

My commitment to Synod is that we will undertake a review no later than the end of 2016, thus bringing a revised Order here by July 2017 with a permanent solution but one in the light of experience so that we can understand what we have simplified and what we have not and that we can take on board such suggestions as Clive has made which are of a more radical nature than those that have been discussed to date.

Yes to simplification, yes to localism, just on this occasion, please, yes to a little bit of caution so that we can learn from experience and come back to you with a long-term, permanent and more radical solution.

*The Chair:* Canon Spence has indicated that he does not support the amendment and therefore the 40 Member Rule applies. Unless 40 or more members stand in their places to indicate they wish the debate to continue on this amendment or a vote to be taken the amendment will lapse. Are there 40 or more standing? There are not 40 members standing, this amendment therefore lapses.

I therefore invite Canon Spence to move Item 511B. You may speak for up to ten minutes.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I will take 30 seconds. I beg to move:

‘That the Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 be approved.’

*The Chair:* This Item is now open for debate. I see no-one standing, I therefore put Item 511B to the vote.

*The motion*

*‘That the Ecclesiastical Property (Exceptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 be approved.’*

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

*The Chair:* The Order is accordingly approved and will now be sealed by the Archbishops' Council and laid before both Houses of Parliament. This completes this item of business.

## **Legislative Business: Single Transferable Vote (amendment) Regulations 2015 (GS 1998)**

*The Chair:* So Synod, we now move to Item 512, the Single Transferable Vote (amendment) Regulations 2015. For this members will need the Regulation, GS 1998 and the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 1998x. I call on Canon Simon Butler to move on Item 512. You may speak for not more than ten minutes.

*The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I beg to move:

*‘That the Single Transferable Vote (amendment) Regulations 2015 be approved.’*

I think Canon Spence was a little unfair on himself. I felt that the last debate in the "rich feast" was more like a modest dessert in Synod's diet of legislation which makes this that which follows the dessert, namely the nightcap. This is the last item of legislative business in this quinquennium, you will be pleased to know, and it is one of the most minor but important. It is a piece of housekeeping and like all housekeeping you have to get rid of some things in order that other things can remain. It is particularly important in the conduct of elections, particularly for returning officers, that there is absolute clarity in the conduct of elections.

So what Synod is being asked to do is to make some small adjustments to the Single Transferable Vote Regulations in relation to the administration of elections to reflect the changes to the rules for the proctorial and House of Laity elections that the Synod agreed last July. The Single Transferable Vote Regulations make provision for the conduct of various kinds of elections to Church bodies, all of which are conducted by the method of the Single Transferable Vote. Among those are the elections to the Lower Houses of the Convocations and the House of Laity of the General Synod.

Stephen Slack describes the Single Transferable Vote Regulations as "eye-wateringly complex" but they do determine the way that votes are counted and so on. They make orders for administrative matters such as the display of results sheets, the notification of results of elections, the preservation of voting papers and the filling of casual vacancies.

The point is that provision is also made for these matters by the detailed rules that govern elections to the Lower Houses of the Convocations and the House of Laity. The instruments that we agreed last July to make various changes to those rules accordingly touched on these areas. The provisions that they made conflict in some way with that

made in the STV Regulations for these matters. In short, what this is about is simply removing the inconsistencies. The way we are proposing to do that is to alter the STV Regulations to bring them in line with the provisions we agreed last July, which are of course our most recent thinking on these matters.

So just the very briefest detail, Regulation 1 will repeal those parts of the STV Regulations that deal with the deposit, inspection and display of results sheets. Regulation 2 will do the same in relation to those parts of the STV Regulations that deal with the notification to candidates of the results of elections to the Convocations and the House of Laity. Regulation 3 will disapply the provision made by the Single Transferable Vote Regulations for the provision of voting papers in its effect on elections to the Convocations and the House of Laity. Regulation 4 will do the same in relation to elections to fill casual vacancies. You understand now why it is the night cap. Thus in each of these cases, the matters concerned will be governed by the Clergy Representation Rules and the Church Representation Rules alone in the form that they took as amended by the Synod last July.

I hope, members of Synod, that will provide you with all you need to understand what this small but necessary Instrument does and I invite you to give it your approval. I move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* This matter is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes. I see no-one standing. I therefore put Item 512 to the vote.

*The motion*

*'That the Single Transferable Vote (amendment) Regulations 2015 be approved.'*

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

*The Chair:* The regulations are accordingly approved and that completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith* took the Chair at 4.38 pm

## **51st Report of the Standing Orders Committee (GS 1991)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Items 45 to 49 which is the second bite at the 51st Report of Standing Orders Committee cherry. For this business members will need GS 1991, the Committee's Report, Order Paper II which contains the motion on page 8 and the First Notice Paper, which sets out Items 45 to 49 on pages 3 and 4. I now invite Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC and Chair of the Standing Orders Committee to move the motion at Item 45 to 49. He has up to ten minutes.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester):* I did say I would be back and here I am. Items 45 to 49 of the First Notice Paper represent a small number of miscellaneous amendments to the Standing Orders before we move on, on another occasion, to consolidate them. They cover three separate issues: Firstly, the length of notice for Questions. Item 45 brings forward the time for the giving of notice for Questions from 5.30 pm until 12 noon on the day on which notice has to be given, which is seven clear

days before the first day of the group of sessions. The purpose of doing this is simply to reduce the pressure on staff who have to work to an extremely tight timetable in relation to Synod Questions.

Secondly, the procedure for deeming. Currently Standing Order 69 only allows the procedure for deeming to apply to instruments made under Measures, but in fact Canons can also provide for the making of instruments, see for example draft Amending Canon No. 34 which contains a provision which assumes that the deeming provision will be available for regulations made under the new Canon 30 (C 30 relating to safeguarding). The Standing Orders Committee thus proposes that the deeming procedure should be capable of being used in relation to instruments made under Canon and to instruments made under a Measure where a Canon makes provision for that and that is achieved by Items 46 to 48.

Thirdly, the circulation of documents. Standing Order 130A allows for members to elect to receive Synod papers in electronic form in accordance with arrangements made by the Business Committee. At the moment the default position is that unless a member elects to receive papers in an electronic form a member will receive all papers in paper form. The Business Committee believes that the default position should be reversed so that members will receive Synod papers in electronic form unless they elect to receive them in paper form and Item 49 gives effect to such proposal. Each of these proposals will take effect from 14 July and will thus be in place when the new Synod meets in November. Although, as you will see from paragraph 14 of our report, the Standing Orders Committee had favoured a postponement of the date of the coming into force of Item 49, it deferred to the views of the Business Committee on this issue, but it does urge the Business Committee to ensure that members are provided with sufficient information about the circulation of documents so that particularly the new members will be able to make a properly informed choice.

I thus move that in respect of Items 45 to 49 on the Agenda on the First Notice Paper the amendments to the Standing Order should be made with effect from 14 July 2015.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Mr Tattersall. Members, I should have drawn your attention at the outset also to the Tenth Notice Paper and the Financial Statement contained in paragraph 6 and 7 relating to Standing Order 130A. The item is now open for debate.

*Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester):* Just a very brief point, I thought it was the appropriate time to bring it up rather than in the report of the Business Committee yesterday. In Item 49, paragraph 14, talking about the default position being electronic unless people opt for paper, I would like to make one other suggestion that I hope the Business Committee will consider which is simply to offer people the option of just sending out this, the Agenda, with perhaps a list of fringe meetings. I think that way you will actually get a higher take-up of people going for electronic rather than paper because at least if people actually have the Agenda it is something they can refer to and then go to the appropriate place to get the electronic documents. I hope that point will be considered. I think it is a very important one. I think it would improve the take-up electronically.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* I agree with going over to electronic, I think it is a very good idea. I think it should be the default position

with one exception: that is I think that the November Synod at the beginning of a quinquennium should always be a paper issue particularly for new members because they will not be fully informed of what is involved and therefore they can then choose to go over to electronic after that if they want to and the rest of us old lags who are coming back know the form. Nonetheless, I think for the first one it is good that it is in paper form for new members so they can understand what is involved.

*Revd Canon Susan Booy (Oxford):* I had hoped to spare you further of me this Synod, but in view of the last couple of speeches I thought perhaps I should rise to offer a couple of words of explanation. First of all, default means just that; it means anyone that would like to receive their papers by post on paper may do so.

Secondly, with respect to November, I always think in any situation it is really best to start as you mean to go on. I would also like to report a conversation which I had with a younger member of the clergy in my own diocese in the context of trying to encourage them to stand for Synod and the conversation went something like this: "I hear one of the huge disadvantages of Synod is that you get piles and piles of paper. Is there any way that I can receive it electronically?", so it is a neatly balanced thing and I would suggest to you that the combination of shrinking the footprint, cost to your dioceses and encouragement of a generation that is used to reading things electronically, suggests that this is the best way to go and to start right from the beginning of the quinquennium.

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* If we are to move to electronic not only as default but also as the common choice for most people for very good reasons, can we please try to improve the usability of our Synod documentation when it is presented electronically. It is one thing to get a two-page document electronically. To get a 100-page document which was set as a printed paper and is not rendered in a way that makes it easy to scroll through to search, to cross-reference does not help. There are techniques available using tabs, sections, indexes, et cetera, that could greatly improve the usability of papers presented in electronic form. The trick is to think of them as designed for electronic use.

*Ven Clive Mansell (Rochester):* Despite what Canon Booy said, I would support Jonathan Alderton-Ford's approach. We are all different, are we not. Personally, I find paper much easier to work with. I am just conscious that coming on to Synod for the first time yes, you get a lot of paper but you have a chance to work out just how much there is, there is different colour coding and so on and you begin to realise you have got to work your way through it. Electronic stuff you perhaps ignore some bits because you will move on down the page or you may even lose some along the way because your email slips down the screen a bit. I just feel it would help those coming on to Synod for the very first time, and it may just be if the very first people on Synod as opposed to those who are coming back, are particularly given the chance to see things in the physical form, that may help them to understand what they will be dealing with perhaps electronically thereafter.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I am Vice-Chair of the Business Committee. Just a couple of things really. I think the view of the Business Committee is really that at the beginning of the new quinquennium we should give people complete choice and what the Archdeacon is suggesting is not to do that so we prefer people to start where they would like to start rather than giving them one as a default position.



The other question I think is the point that Mr French has made about technology. The Business Committee has had some very early informal conversations with another legislative body not very far away who are already developing App-based technology that will improve and possibly find a solution in the years to come about the circulation of documents. I think it is still in the early stages in another place, but I am hopeful that we will get something in the next quinquennium that will be of great assistance to us.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* The matter that we are debating will not affect me, I will certainly not be a new member in November. I was initially strongly in favour of the allowing of a different default position for new members this time round, but I am now persuaded that we should not pursue that option for a very practical reason now: there is no amendment down so, as I understand it, the choice is we either do what is on the paper or we do not, in which case it will be all paper next time which I think would be a serious error.

So how do we tackle this? There clearly is merit in the need to enable newly elected members to make a sensible choice, so the answer lies in what is done in September and October in the lead-up to the new group of sessions to explain and to help new members to see what the load of paper is, what the electronic circulation will mean so that they can exercise their option. There is the safeguard that if any new member is in doubt they can opt for paper receipt, as I understand it. I have been reassured by what is now in front of us and I would suggest to Synod that this is, in the circumstances that we are in, the best way forward, so I urge the House to support the proposal from the Standing Orders Committee, of which I should say I am, or I was (perhaps I still am) a member.

*Revd Dr Robert Munro (Chester):* I am all in favour of greater electronic provision. Could some consideration be given both here and in London for greater electrical provision for the topping up of electronic devices should we run out because the number of power points being so small if we become dependent on it then it would be detrimental to the business? I mean plugs.

*The Chair:* We must not stray too far beyond the motion on the paper but Sister Anne I am sure you will stay within it.

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

*Sister Anne Williams (Durham):* I have been having some difficulties with my internet connection and my equipment and I managed to get it sorted out Wednesday just gone, by which time I think I had missed some stuff that was coming out to me. My concern is, yes, that is fine, if somebody says, "I want it electronically", but then they are having problems. I wonder if there could be a way that they do not have to necessarily write but could ring up and say, "I am having a difficulty, please can I have this in paper form just for this once until I can get things sorted out"? I know it is not likely to happen very often but it could do and I am just concerned. There was something said earlier this session that something had been emailed out to people. I had not got that because I was having difficulty with my machine, so I just wonder if that might be a thought that there could be someone who could receive a phone call and just for once send it out in paper format.

*The Chair:* As I see no-one standing I call on Mr Tattersall to respond to the debate. He

has up to five minutes.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC:* The debate has really only been about Item 49 and as to Item 49 you can see from the report that the Business Committee and the Standing Orders Committee initially had two different views. They are both respectable views. One is the Business Committee which says from the off we need to have a new system like we are going to have new Standing Orders, hopefully, and the Standing Orders Committee who are not saying we should stay with paper but saying that initially for the first group of sessions it might be better to have paper as a default position. Those are two responsible views. The Standing Orders Committee accepted the views of the Business Committee and that is why the motion is drafted the way it is. Nobody has actually sought to amend it and therefore it is a matter for you as to whether you vote in favour of it or not. The commonsense view, I would have thought, as per Dr Giddings, is to go with what the Business Committee believes. It is a matter though entirely for you, but given that there is no amendment and all the other matters raised about the Business Committee are really matters for the Business Committee and not for the Standing Orders Committee, I leave it in your capable hands.

*The Chair:* Items 45 to 49 have been moved *en bloc* so I put them to the vote.

*The motions (First Order Paper) were put and carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* That concludes this Item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett* took the Chair at 4.56 pm

### ***The Church: Towards a Common Vision: Report from the World Council of Churches (GS 1986A)***

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. We now come to Item 10 on the Agenda. For this item you will need GS 1986A. You will see from the Order Paper that there is one amendment, Item 52, and may I alert Synod that I will be taking the amendment quite early in our discussions as it will substantially alter Item 10. However more of that later on. I now call upon the Bishop of Peterborough, Chair of the Council for Christian Unity, to speak to this item. You have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister):* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod, welcoming the convergence text from the World Council of Churches’ Commission of Faith and Order, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*:

- a) endorse the response from the Council for Christian Unity and the Faith and Order Commission affirming the consonance of the text with the doctrine of the Church of England;
- b) commend the text for consideration at every level of the Church of England, wherever possible in dialogue with members of other Christian churches; and

- c) ask the Council for Christian Unity to work with Churches Together in England (CTE) to discern ways of building mutual understanding and enhancing partnership in the gospel across the growing range of Churches in this country in the light of the responses to the text from the diverse membership of CTE.

In 1982, the World Council of Churches Faith and Order Commission published *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, which proved hugely important in enabling different churches to come closer together, to discuss their beliefs and to co-operate in many ways. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* did not say much that was new, it was not meant to, but it clarified and laid out significant areas of belief and practice which churches held in common. It became something of a classic text. *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* from the same source, seeks to do the same. It is not trying to say anything new about the nature of the Church, her purpose or function. It is aiming to draw together and spell out what many different churches hold in common, to enable discussion and closer co-operation and to make possible a deeper level of trust and mutual understanding and a greater sense of our essential oneness as Church.

There is a potential difficulty straightaway. Baptism, Eucharist and ministry are very public and tangible. Each of them is relatively easy to describe, if not to define. We all know that they are important in practical ways. They are an easy starting point for discussion and for potential co-operation. On the other hand, the doctrine of the Church, what we believe church is and is for, can seem to be much more abstract and theoretical. Everyone can see the difference between infant baptism and adult baptism or between baptism by immersion and baptism by sprinkling, but when we start to think about the doctrine of the Church, then the differences between churches and the areas of disagreement are often more subtle, only noticed by specialist theologians or church historians. In practice, every local congregation and certainly every denomination or network of churches has to have some sort of understanding and policy concerning baptism and Eucharist and ministry. They do not need to, and many do not, have a thought-through doctrine of what the Church is and what it is for. That is precisely where this important new document comes in.

We do need to have a thought-through ecclesiology, a doctrine of the church. We talk about our individual self-understanding or self-awareness; what makes me tick, how I respond to other people or in different situations. We do various forms of personality profiling for clergy, ministry teams and job applicants. Understanding who I am helps me to function better, to relate to others more effectively, to accept and love myself as God accepts and loves me. It is the same for churches. If we as the Church of England are to relate well to the Methodist Church or if your parish is going to share with the local Pentecostal Church, we must first know who we are; then we can discover what we have in common and what divides us, whether difficulties or tensions might arise, whether suspicions or misunderstandings might appear.

This new text, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* enables us to do that. For those with no formal training in theology or ecclesiology, this text is a good starting point. For ordinary congregations wanting to think together with their non-Anglican neighbours, this along with the straightforward study resources which the Council for Christian Unity is

committed to providing, will, I believe, be a good tool. For theological and ministry students, this can provide the basis for group discussions, further reading and deeper understanding of our own Church and others.

The text starts at a fairly basic level. It does not assume knowledge of what the early Church fathers wrote about the Church or the scholars of the Middle Ages or the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries or the thinkers of the modern missionary and ecumenical movements. It used to be true that most churches in this country shared that heritage to a greater or less extent; but in recent years there have grown up many independent, Pentecostal and other New churches, sometimes described under the general heading of 'Restorationist', which aim to look straight back to the Bible without much consciousness of or dependence on the riches of church history or historical theology.

That is why *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* can be so valuable to us. It is a text which we can read and study alongside historical denominations and new churches, alongside traditional Roman Catholics or modern Pentecostals. In the CCU, taking our lead from Archbishop Rowan and now Archbishop Justin, we are prioritising and working hard on growing relationships with the New churches, the Black Majority churches, the Independent Fellowships and the Pentecostals. In many places these churches are strong and growing. Increasingly, they want fellowship, good relations and practical co-operation with us. This text will, I believe, help us to build those relationships on solid ground.

One of the ecumenical encouragements of our generation is the way that so many of the New Churches have in recent years joined Churches Together in England. That is a helpful forum for discussion and for planning different ways of working together. CCU works in partnership with CTE already. What the motion is proposing in its final paragraph will not be a burden or a new thing but a continuation and an extension of what we are doing already, but it will help us to have a theological undergirding for that work.

In your papers you will find the formal response of our Faith and Order Commission towards this WCC text. In places that response is necessarily quite technical. It includes a number of acronyms describing various inter-church bodies and conversations. It is not an easy read unless you are into the language and culture of today's ecumenicism, but its overall message is quite clear. The CCU and FAOC both believe that this text, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*, is consonant with our Church of England teaching. We are happy for it to be used as a basis and a building block for exploring further who we are, who other churches are and how together we can worship God, make Jesus known and seek his Kingdom. I am glad to move the motion standing in my name and I look forward to the debate

*The Chair:* This item is now open to debate.

*Bishop Dr Joe Aldred (Ecumenical Representatives):* Thank you, Chair. I welcome warmly the World Council of Churches' Consultation report, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*. I note and am informed by and welcome too the Church of England's submission to the WCC. For the ecclesial community from which I come, and those with whom I work in Churches Together in England, this consultation presents a timely opportunity to focus on matters of ecclesiology and on mission, how the one influences

the other and the extent to which our oneness in Christ and our mission in the world may be rendered ineffective by lack of communion and disunity.

For reasons which are not always obvious, not even to us who work there, CTE has become increasingly an ecumenical instrument which Pentecostal and neo-Pentecostal churches want to join. Since its initiation in 1990, CTE supported, may I say, in no small measure by the Church of England, has grown from 16 to 43 national members, now representing pretty much the breadth of Christian faith in this country.

A significant proportion of the newer CTE members come, as you have heard, from the classical Pentecostal, Charismatic and New churches. Overwhelmingly, these churches do not belong to the WCC and that they gravitate towards CTE, I think, says something about both the nature of church in this country as well as the model and the nature of emerging ecumenical practice. However, because these churches and the ecclesial streams that we are describing, by and large, do not belong to the World Council of Churches, it is unlikely that many of them, if any of them, will engage with *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*.

It is for this reason that I welcome this motion and, in particular, point I. I want to encourage the proposal that the CCU and CTE facilitate the discernment of ways in which greater mutual understanding between the Church of England and the Pentecostal churches can be enhanced, particularly in the areas of ecclesiology and mission. As a starting point for these conversations I can tell Synod that, in so far as the Pentecostal and New churches are concerned, ecclesiology is always in the service of missiology.

Finally, I hope Synod will support the motion that the CCU work with CTE as proposed so that, together, we, the diverse yet one people of Christ, can more effectively impact this nation together as we share the liberating Gospel of Jesus Christ.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Thank you, Madam Chairman, for calling me. I would like to thank, Donald, for this report, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* and note from the Council for Christian Unity. But I am a simple soul lacking in the theological knowledge that many of you have and I come from a joint ecumenical Anglican/Methodist parish and am concerned about the momentum that has gone out of the ecumenical movement since the 1990s and earlier this Millennium.

I have been occasionally attending Christian churches from a congregational church in the 1940s, through Baptist, Methodist, Roman Catholics, not to mention Sikh temples and mosques. I worked in a company town in Kenya where it was company policy that all the Christian churches had to come together ecumenically for their Sunday service every other Sunday. I would strongly urge the Council for Christian Unity to re-enthuse ecumenical co-operation between all Christian churches and denominations.

Many of us here will have experience of joining in services, including celebrations with those from Baptists to Roman Catholics with enthusiasm and no regrets. We need this enthusiasm to become part of the life-blood of the Church of England. All power to your elbow, Donald.

*Mr John Davies (Winchester):* I have been seven years a deanery lay chairman and 13

years a member of Hillsong, London. Like many of us in the Spirit of the Lord's Last Prayer at the Last Supper in the account attributed to the disciple closest to him, I pray that we are entering a period of unity and regeneration. We have spent so much time and intellectual effort trying to reconcile inter-denominational issues at the highest level, but this goes against one of those quizzical aspects of Anglican history.

Most of our fundamental developments have been driven by mass movements of laity. For example, it was the plough boys and plough girls of Reformation England who, equipped with the Bible translations of Wycliffe, Coverdale and Tyndale, inspired by the martyrdom of Ridley, Latimer, Tyndale and Cranmer, guided by the inclusive doctrines of Hooker, drove through the use of the English Bible in churches; passionate laymen, faithful to the stake and rather out of control, working often against less than supportive episcopal authority.

It was the Clapham Saints, lay-led by William Wilberforce, who did more than any other group in modern history to establish ethics in business and public life, to further evangelical mission, animal welfare, social work, prison reform and abolition of slavery; again, passionate laity on fire and out of control in the service of Christ. We should not find this surprising. We know from Luke 2 that Jesus might have had standing in the temple, but he did not work through the high priestly family, the Sanhedrin or the established scholarship of Sadducee or Pharisee. Instead, he built his church on the uneducated laymen of rural Galilee, passionate laymen on fire and sometimes out of control.

My point is this. In planning our work, *Towards a Common [Christian] Vision*, we need to ensure that top-down direction does not smother bottom-up initiatives, which rather we should be encouraging. Initiatives such as "Open the Book", now operating in 2,094 primary schools, over 10% of the national total, delivered by 11,700 ecumenical volunteers, taking Bible teaching to 511,000 primary schoolchildren and predominantly lay led. It is exciting what lay Christians of different denominations working together in prayer can achieve. John 17 in action. Go the laity. Let us just get on and do it.

*The Chair:* After Mrs Ruoff I would like to call the Revd MacLeay and then I would like Prebendary Lynas to come and speak to and move his amendment.

*Mrs Alison Ruoff (London):* I want to support this motion, and particularly looking at paragraph I about mutual understanding and enhancing partnership in the Gospel. Bishop Richard in London always signs his letters off by, "Partnership in the Gospel", and it is a great phrase. But it talks about here, "Across the growing range of churches in this country, in the light of responses to the text" etc. This is really helpful for us and, with the increasing marginalisation in this country in today's society of Christians, I do think we must stand together and work together and have this supporting each other and standing together for the Gospel.

John Davies has just mentioned something about the Reformation. Here, I want my Anglo-Catholic brothers and sisters (and, of course, I am a Conservative Evangelical) to note very carefully. I have to tell you that one of my forebears was not happy with the Reformation. In fact, it was Pope Julius III. Yes, I got a shock when I found out too. It goes back to the middle 1500s. Actually, his brother was my great grandfather times 12

and so Pope Julius III was my great uncle times 12 and he would not like to see me standing here cheering for the Reformation. He was a pretty ghastly man as well. I am sorry about that.

In essence, we as Christian brothers and sisters need each other in all the Christian churches. We need to stand together and show that love of the Lord Jesus Christ in getting out with the Gospel. This is a way of doing it. I am hugely grateful. We need each other as one body and we need each other to love and serve the Lord Jesus Christ to make an impact for Christianity in this country. Thank you.

*Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester):* I enjoyed reading this report. I just feel that there were one or two places where there needed to be greater theological accuracy, especially if we are going to be commending this for study. I refer to Annex 1 and paragraph 5 where it says, "The Church is holy because of God's holiness, because of the gift of Christ's love for her in the sending of the Holy Spirit". This is true but theologically insufficient. To be holy, to be sanctified (it is the same word), is to be set apart to belong to someone or for their use or something like that. The Church is holy, is already holy, because of the being set apart through the finished and costly sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ephesians 5:25, "Husbands, love your wives just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her to make her holy".

We see it, for example, in 1 Corinthians 6 where Paul says to the Corinthians, "You were washed. You were [past tense] sanctified or made holy. You were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God".

As a result, he says at the start of 1 Corinthians, "To the Church of God in Corinth, to those sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be holy".

That is the way that this idea of the one holy Catholic apostolic church needs to be considered. The definition of the Church of God as holy must be firmly rooted in the historic events of the death and the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ as well as the on-going work of the Holy Spirit in our lives. Especially as we see churches moving together, working together, we need the full richness of what it means for the Church to be holy, both already holy and working out that holiness, in order to give us that richness of generosity as we work with brothers and sisters across various divides.

I just feel that at that point, although we especially want to commend every aspect of the work of the Holy Spirit in growing a holiness within us, we also need to recognise that once and for all finished work of Christ that has already sanctified and set apart us and all God's people as His, his holy people forever. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I now invite Prebendary Lynas to speak to and move his amendment. He has up to five minutes.

*Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Baths and Wells):* I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out paragraph (b).'

Can I be very clear in saying I have got nothing against the World Council of Churches or

the Council for Christian Unity and I have deliberately come and stood over this side because I want to be able to look our ecumenical representatives and guests in the face and say, 'This is not about you; this is about the way we as the General Synod do things'. It is a process amendment not a content amendment, really.

I do not want to censor the work that Bishop Donald has so persuasively spoken about. I do not want to stop people talking about *Towards a Common Vision*. What I am after though is trying to stop the fiction, that as a Synod we can gaily send stuff down to the dioceses and pretend that they will dutifully spend a lot of time and effort in bishops' councils and diocesan synods and so on dealing with whatever it is we send down. Paragraph 19 of GS 1986A makes some heroic assumptions, assuming that we stick with paragraph (b) in this motion, about what will happen at local level, discussion groups and study days in parishes, deaneries and dioceses and so on. It seems to me that the content of this report should be and will be discussed at theological educational institutions and such like, but I think the average PCC or deanery synod in our diocese and possibly in yours is going to struggle with the level of material that is in this report.

As evidence, I recall Questions last night. When we got to question 41, I think it was, Patrick Richmond and Vasantha Gnanadoss had been asking about our propensity to send stuff down to dioceses and how many of them had the Business Committee followed through. The answer was five dioceses did not know if they had done something, 23 had not replied, and eight had said they had not got round to it. I can never remember if we have got 43 or 44 or 42 dioceses now but most of them had not done what we had told them to do. Dioceses had not responded in that case to some stuff about intentional evangelism and witness, and this is at a time when Church growth is absolutely on our quinquennium goals of the Archbishops' Council.

Sue Booy, in her answer to that question last night, said it is for us, the Synod members ourselves, to ensure the effectiveness of the calls we make by encouraging follow-up at local level when we get home. Come on, it does not happen all the time. The Council for Christian Unity, bless them, have been very helpful to me in my ministry as a bishop's chaplain. Only about ten days ago I had a rather difficult query about how PCCs and incumbents should handle Free Church ministers who retire into the parish who want to assist in ministry. I sent an email, I got an authoritative answer, fantastic. But if we are looking for new ways of being Synod, if we are trying to encourage our parishes and dioceses and deaneries to concentrate on growth, the common good, reimagining ministry, if we have got a stream of stuff coming down the track to dioceses over Reform and Renewal, RME and all the other things we talk about here, we have got to be selective. We have got to prioritise what we choose to send down. Some things we have to send down, is it Article 7, Article 8 business, those kinds of things. There are matters of priority and significance that our Archbishops or the Synod feel are so significant they need to go to parishes, deaneries and dioceses.

I worked in Church House in a department for four years. In those days Church House departments, it almost seems to me, felt they were demonstrating their worth by the amount of stuff they sent out to parishes, dioceses and deaneries. What CCU and our friends at FOAC (who have had a really good day today), what they can and what they do well is the high level stuff, the stuff that is set out in the motion in paragraphs (a) and (c). I would like to remove paragraph (b) so that they can get on with what they do and



do it well and then leave the parishes, dioceses and deaneries to pick it up if it fits but, otherwise, to get on with the kind of local ecumenical actions which is what they are really good at. I beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I invite the Bishop to respond to the amendment as put at Item 52.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister):* I thank you, Stephen, for the amendment because this is something worth considering and worth thinking about. We are commending this material for study and we are going to be producing study guides and resources to help with study. We are not sending it down for compulsory study or for compulsory debate at every level. We are commending. That is an important and good thing to do.

It has been discussed already in key partner churches. This document has already been translated into 13 or 14 languages and studied at every level. I believe that in the Church of Sweden (of which we are delighted to have the Archbishop with us over this weekend) it has already been through a comprehensive process of discussion and consideration in every parish and every diocese. This is possible if people want to do it. This is about missional opportunity for working with others and that is worth doing. We cannot predict what effect this text will have.

The reception of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, a former book years ago, changed our Church and other churches and our relationships with them for the good. We could not have anticipated that, but if we do not get in conversation about this material with ourselves and with others at the local level, then we are missing out on a huge opportunity which other churches in different parts of the world have already taken. I resist the amendment.

*The Chair:* The amendment, Item 52, is now open to debate.

*A Speaker:* Point of order. Do we need 40 members standing?

*The Chair:* No, this is not legislative, thank you.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells):* Chair, it is usual at this juncture to state all sorts of platitudes about the brilliance of the report and to welcome it wholeheartedly. I would love to but I cannot. The reason for that is I find the report and the CCU response lacking in accessibility. To put it crudely, it does not quite scratch where the Church is currently itching. In fact, in some cases, in some quarters, I believe it will exacerbate it.

While I was at the church fete a couple of weeks ago, absolutely no one asked me or complained to me about the pneumatological tone or asked me what IASCUFO was up to these days. Bishop Donald quite rightly refers to *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. That document was accessible. The language was good but some of the language certainly in the CCU response is inaccessible to the average person in our church, I believe.

I am convinced that the theologians and academics who have worked on this document and on the report presented to us today as our potential response have done a brilliant job. They will have sifted and sorted conflicting evidence to identify consonance and

dissonance as it strikes the diversity of our Church experience around the globe. I thank them for spending two decades in their cloisters and wish them well but the mission of our Church at this time is to reconnect with the people of this country, to reimagine ministry and to go for growth. For many in our pews this sort of report is exactly why those with whom we are trying to engage are turning their backs on the organised Church; they do not understand it.

If we are to re-engage with people and reverse the steady decline in numbers, and to mobilise more to serve as ministers, lay and ordained, we must do better. So, for me, the last thing we should be doing is sub-clause (b) of this motion. We cannot afford to deflect the missionary effort within each parish from the work that they are doing day to day. They are already working with members of other denominations to further the Kingdom, let that continue. I would be happy to allow for further investigation of our similarities and differences as churches and denominations but please do not expect this report to be engaged with at every level of our Church.

*Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London):* Tim Hind, I could not disagree more. For me, this document is feel-good reading. I understand that we are raising areas for future work and we have other comments to make but listen to these three quotes. "The Church enjoys a spiritual transcendent quality which cannot be grasped simply by looking at its visible appearance", and that is my favourite and I think perhaps a relief to all of us. "The Church was intended by God not for its own sake but to serve the divine plan for the transformation of the world". Another favourite where it speaks about the episcopate: "It is the duty of the ones who preside to give voice to the voiceless and to uphold unity and diversity".

The convergence that this document represents has the potential to really help all Christians see other Christians as less different. Reading it helped me to see beyond differences between myself and other Christians. One part of it that made me feel downcast though was the frequent use of the word "churches". It feels like a misuse of language to me, I do not think there should even be such a word. We follow a man who prayed so clearly for unity and we are sadly and sinfully content with disunity.

Unity is vital to the mission of the Church and if the Church develops for a certain type of person or nationality it will only ever speak to that type of person or to that nation. So the word of God is amplified in unity.

I do commend this document for reading and I hope that others will enjoy reading it as much as I did. If it gets a positive reception from other parts of the Church, having it as a common document can help us to look at other Christians with a greater sense of familiarity, simply seeing the other as less scary.

I do not know how to ensure that people actually read it, but that is not our business today. The supplementary questions to Question 41 last night highlighted the potential pitfalls of Synod calling on people or bodies to do this or that, but this is not a specific instruction for what will happen next and perhaps improving that might be business for the next quinquennium and it should not prevent us doing what we have in our power at the moment to recommend people read this excellent document. It is an important statement

of Christian togetherness that should be read widely and can help to break down barriers of unfamiliarity.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Thank you for calling me, Chair. Thinking deeply about the Church is truly exciting, so said Daniel Hardy, one of our finest ecclesiologists. It has to be if we are talking about the Body of Christ, the Bride of Christ, the sign and agent and foretaste of the Kingdom of God. Thank you, Lindsay Newcombe, for confirming some of that excitement. Thinking about the Church ecumenically with the whole body of the Church is even more exciting and that is why I think the amendment would be a loss.

I had a taste of this excitement this week. I was in Taizé and the Brothers had invited other religious communities across the world to reflect together on their common life in Christ and I saw and heard a common vision of the Church; it was remarkable. I saw it at the table of the Taizé Brothers, the long table where they eat together with their guests. This week with Roman Catholics, Benedictines, Carthusians, Franciscan, Jesuit guests, with Orthodox as well, Byzantine, Oriental and Protestant and Anglican sisters as well as brothers, I heard a common vision spoken by the heads of these different communities, a vision of life lived deeply in Jesus Christ, a life given over to the kingdom of peace that Jesus brings, a life that leads us deeper into reconciliation with each other and that draws the whole of humanity into reconciliation with itself and God. I heard the Superior General of the Jesuits say that we need the whole world to enable us to realise the fullness of life in Christ, not just churches but continents exchanging the gifts that we have been given. I heard Brother Alois, the successor to Brother Roger, tell of how Roger formed Taizé in a way that reconciled the truest principles of the Reformation, grace and freedom with the deep tradition of monastic life and recast them for a modern age. I heard the former Superior of the Carthusians, who does not get out much of course, say we need a Christlike limpidity or purity, a transparency of heart that he saw in Roger and the ecumenical community that formed around him.

I wonder what has the Church learnt from the Taizé community and two things come to mind: that our calling is to serve our brothers and sisters in Christ from wherever they come and serve the whole world; and that reconciliation – and this is the important thing – comes through relationship.

So I conclude with an image and a question that relate very much to this amendment and challenge it, I think. The image was suggested by the Abbot of Cîteaux, who has recalled his community to the regular practice of foot washing commended by Benedict not just once a year but on regular occasions. The abbot described it as a dominical command, even a sacrament to actualise Jesus' command to love one another. I wondered what would our Church look like and what would our relationships between the churches look like if we stooped to wash each other's feet, what sort of common vision for the Church would there be from that angle at the foot of the other.

My question, and this is an area that is really absent from the World Council of Churches' document, is how our relationship with the Bishop of Rome might be reconciled through relationship even before it is reconciled through structure. We live in a globalised world where Christianity is both expanding and under great threat. We have grown together in unity and yet we are still separated.

In my adult life though we have seen a universal prophet in John Paul, a universal teacher in Benedict, we have seen now a universal evangelist in Francis, whom I know will be affectionately quoted in our debates on Monday and whom I understand Pentecostals and others love. The universal Body of Christ really is in a new situation described by Pope John Paul in 1995 when he invited the churches together to help him to see what universal primacy might mean.

Is this not the hour of history to say to Pope Francis that we have come to respect your ministry greatly and that of your recent predecessors, even if not Julius III. Notwithstanding the differences and disagreements that remain, we want to find ways to reconcile with you through relationship that though informal is in some way still institutional and though provisional is still personal and real. This is not the time to close down discussion about the Church within our Church or across the churches and with the churches. Thank you.

*The Chair:* After the next speaker I would like to call two more people, however could you please contain your comments to the amendment. Thank you very much.

*Mrs Penelope Allen (Lichfield):* Please resist this amendment. There are two key phrases in paragraph (b) that I am very interested to keep in. One of those is "at every level of the Church". I think Tim and I must worship in totally different places because from my church's point of view, if you wave any document in front of them that is in Church-speak they automatically say, "What does it say?" The second key phrase in there is "in dialogue".

Much of what churches produce in formal language wants translating both by the priest for their church councils and by people in dialogue with others. I think if we just ignore that, if we say, "This document is not adequate for people in the street", we are actually denying access to people who may well understand it, firstly. We are also denying access to those who want the explanation of it.

When it says "in dialogue", much of what we do ecumenically, and I worship in an ecumenical church, a joint Anglican-URC partnership, has to be explained in our church for both denominations. Somebody in our church council goes to the URC moderator for the answer to questions, they go to URC assemblies. I come here. We explain things to diocesan synod. We explain things to our church councils. I write a blog. We have somebody else who writes for our diocesan synod and part of this discussion here will be going to them. They do need to hear it. They need to understand it. It can be explained and I think if we actually take this paragraph out we are refusing people an opportunity that they should all have.

I think the complaint about Church language is actually a general one for many formal Church documents and that is part of the reason for a pulpit, is it not, for someone to explain it to people. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order. Motion for closure after the next speakers.

*The Chair:* You certainly have read my mind, Mr Freeman.

*Revd Janet Appleby (Newcastle):* I was not planning to speak and I will be brief and I hope it will be clear. I want to make a point of clarification because I think we may have been talking at cross-purposes possibly about this amendment. I think we need to distinguish carefully between the language used in GS 1986A and 1986 which is before us (we need to distinguish that language) which I think may be the language to which Dr Philip Giddings was referring and which indeed Bishop John acknowledged was technical. We need to distinguish very clearly between that and the way in which the original document from the World Council of Churches, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*, was written. I really do believe that is more accessible. I think Dr Lindsay Newcombe demonstrated why it is really worth giving everybody the opportunity and encouraging everybody to study it in dialogue with the other churches, as has been said. I do think if we really are serious about our mission and if our Reform and Renewal programme means anything then that mission has to have ecumenism at its heart because Our Lord did pray that the Church may be one that the world may believe, and I do think we cannot separate this from what is at the heart of what we wish to do. I would really wish part (b) to stay in. Thank you.

*Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester):* It is very rare I ever disagree with Stephen, or Tim actually, but in this instance I am afraid I am going to have to. I think passing this information not in a dictat, not in a formal way to dioceses and deaneries who will look at it, it is actually going to be very beneficial and I would urge particularly this to be discussed within deanery synods. I am remembering my own deanery synod, which I had been on for about 18 years, the most interesting discussion we ever had was back in 2003 on the Anglican-Methodist Covenant because it enabled people to look outside perhaps the things that deanery synods normally discuss and actually look a bit wider and talk about how we can engage with other churches in the area, be they Methodist, Baptist, et cetera.

I was always brought up to aim for the highest common denominator. I think by trying to get this information out and encouraging people to look at it, it is the highest common denominator. We should not just discuss it in this Synod hall, we should encourage people. I think this is where it is important that Synod members themselves actually go back to their own PCCs, but particularly their deaneries, talk about this on a particular level and try and widen people's horizons. That is why I urge you to resist this amendment. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order. Motion for Item 52 to be put to the vote.

*The Chair:* That has my permission. I would therefore like to seek permission of Synod.

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

*The Chair:* I now put the amendment at Item 52 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* We now return to the debate on Item 10 as it stood.

*Revd Professor Paul Fiddes (Ecumenical Representatives):* Chair, members of Synod, I am very grateful to be called to speak on this issue since the World Council document on

the Church asks to what extent the text might foster growth in unity among the Churches. I hope that my small contribution here may help us all in answering the question. In accord with the response of faith and order, I want to express my appreciation of the way that the text weaves together the ideas of the Trinity, Communion, or *Koinonia*, and mission in presenting a common vision of the Church. Here indeed is the basis for the Churches growing together in a life of shared discipleship and the central image here is that of *Koinonia*, fellowship in the Triune God, in each other and in the community of the whole world. This truly makes the text a convergence document in every sense.

But I also concur with the critique of the text made by the FAOC response under the heading, “Ethics and Ecclesiology”, paragraphs 8-11. There is an odd weakness in chapter 4 of the World Council document and the response identifies three main problems: a lack of reflection on the redemption of the human community as a whole; an over-limited view of the relation between Church, state and society; and an overdramatic view of the difference between the morality held by Christians in the Church and that shared by people in general in our late modern age.

The point I want to make is that all these lacks come from a curious failure to carry the theme of *Koinonia*, or Communion, forward into the final section which deals with the Church and the world. There are theological resources in the image of *Koinonia* that would help more serious reflection on the relation between the Church and the wider human community. The clue surely lies in asking how all created beings can live responsibly within the interweaving relations of the Triune God and then asking about the particular place of the Church within this universal vision and not outside it. This kind of theological exploration with its practical implications awaits the further discussion which the text itself calls for. This vision of Church in all creation is an essential context for all movement towards Church unity.

Another theological tool which would help us do this exploration lies, I believe, within the tradition of my own Christian confession. It is the image of covenant, which is also central to the reform tradition. The idea of the Church as a community bound together in covenant with God and each other is missing from this text, though covenant forms a natural parallel image with *Koinonia*. Both have what we might call horizontal and vertical vectors, relations with each other and with God which can never be torn apart.

So we need to explore the different kinds of covenant that God makes with the Church, with other faith communities, with those of no faith and with the whole created cosmos. When we have this kind of theological vision of relating to God and living in the space God opens up within God’s self then we will be able to deal with the ethical issues flagged up by this important text.

Finally, and a little closer to home, there is the distinction that the FAOC response develops between grounds for mutual recognition of each other as churches on the one hand and visible unity on the other. It proposes that authentic preaching of the Word and administration of the sacraments is sufficient for recognition of each other but not for full Communion. As an ecumenical partner, I plead that this sharp distinction might also be placed under the lens of *Koinonia* and covenant. I gently suggest that the results might be surprising.

*Revd Canon William Croft (Peterborough):* Thank you for calling me. I broadly welcome the WCC paper and also the FAOC response but I have got one or two points to make in regard to these documents.

The first is in connection with *Towards a Common Vision's* use of *diakonia*. It uses this term in the sense of humble, pastoral service but it is not commented on by the FAOC paper. Several Church of England reports and papers, including the FAOC paper which we looked at earlier this afternoon on senior leadership, have a broader understanding of what *diakonia* is. For example, at section 62 of the document we were looking at earlier today from FAOC, *diakonia* is defined as "a commission to bring God's Word and God's pastoral care to a world in need". That is a broader understanding of that. This understanding, of course, derives from J N Collins' work on *diakonia*, so I do think we need to critique *Towards a Common Vision's* use of *diakonia* here.

In *Towards a Common Vision*, section 64, it is talking about Church and society. The motivation for the Church engaging with the world in, as it describes, its problems and tragedies is given by this document as "faith in Jesus Christ who cared for the poor and challenged authorities which did not show compassion". That, of course, is right but it needs to be amplified. I suggest that this motivation needs to be complemented by the Christian virtue of hope. You do not hear very much about that in these documents. That is, hope in the promise of the new creation, heaven and earth. I think that this eschatological hope is much underplayed in *Towards a Common Vision* and I would like to see us critique that.

Back to the FAOC paper. In paragraph 22 recent Church of England agreements with other churches are listed there but the Fetter Lane Agreement with the Moravian Church in Great Britain is noticeable by its absence and I should like to see that corrected.

The FAOC paper in section 13 welcomes the already referred to Pneumatological turn, that is the greater acknowledgement of the Holy Spirit, and I welcome that, I think this is a very important development, but I do think the way in which FAOC speaks about that does need to be amplified, particularly with the New Testament idea of the Spirit as the down payment for the life of the eschatological Kingdom. The Greek is *arabone* in Ephesians. I think this could be done by an appeal to the ecumenical vision of the Church, a sign, instrument and foretaste of the Kingdom emphasising in particular the last of those three epithets, the foretaste. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* After the next two speakers I would be willing to entertain a motion for closure.

*Mr Peter David Hart (Chester):* We have spent lots of time, have we not, in this Synod on legislation, faculties, finance, et cetera, et cetera, and not forgetting, of course, pianos and chairs. Sometimes when we get bogged down in a legalistic approach it is difficult to see what Mary and Bill, those two people sitting in the pews in our church, can do about this. Can they even appreciate what it is about and, for some strange reason, they may want to? How do we enthuse others? Are we enthusiastic about some of these things? Yet here, in this matter, we do have something that we can take back and I believe be enthusiastic about, that can be discussed, debated and explained at every level, particularly the local level, so I am pleased that we have retained that clause.

Indeed, it is vital that it is approached at all these levels and not forgotten after this Synod. Something here, the unity of the Church, could be addressed as widely as possible. It may be that they will just be small steps when we are dealing with it locally, just a beginning of dialogue with members of other Christian churches, but I would like to suggest that this is the best foundation, personal and local, leading to better understanding.

Look here how the group sessions in this Synod have helped us to appreciate the points of view of others and learn to respect them. You know, Mary and Bill, sitting in those pews, may just surprise us. They may not have deep theological training but they may just surprise us in the contacts they have in the community and how they relate to other people from other churches and which we can build on.

Yes, there are great huge questions to answer, some problems to overcome, but that should not prevent us building on links established over many years with churches and making new links as we strive for unity, unity that has a diversity within it, and we seek God's will for his Church. Let us take this forward, let it be discussed and enthused about at every level being seen as our duty as a priority, not as an added extra. Then, with Mary and Bill and the rest of us, we can hopefully and honestly loudly proclaim "One Church, one faith, one Lord".

*Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities):* I am one of the people who contributed to the making of the FAOC report. Personally, I do express my apologies if the text was a bit difficult, a bit demanding. As Bishop Donald has said, part of that is necessary because we are playing at a fairly high level, but I do admit I think we should have worked harder at actually making the text clearer. The text of *Towards a Common Vision* is much clearer, as has been pointed out. I want to say something about what happens when serious ecumenical engagement does happen. I think the end is analogous to what happens when you have a new operational system for computers which brings together computer systems which otherwise do not really have anything to do with each other, they cannot. I think ecumenism is to be compared (it is not my own image) to one of those operational systems. Do not let me anywhere near one; I might mess it up completely. I hope I am like ecumenism. I think that is one of the things which ecumenism can do. When it does that with churches, of course it does it with people and it does it with cultures.

I am on a small group which is trying to work towards bringing to Synod eventually (it will not be from us but it will be from the groups with which we work) proposals for us to say yes to what the Methodists adopt as their form of personal episcopacy. I may say I think things have begun and we have got a good wind behind us. We began by comparing our responses to the World Council of Churches' Report and both Churches have been long, strong supporters of the World Council of Churches and especially its Faith and Order wing. You would have expected a large measure of convergence, agreement on *koinonia*, their agreement of apostolicity and on the Gospel, but what was significant to me was where we both presented responses which were in common but actually outside of where our Churches would have thought 20 or 30 years ago. There was a common response to the treatment of holiness and sin, which I think is one of the major achievements of the WCC Report. There was the understanding of the Church as an instrument, as having a role of mediation in salvation, a big touchy point in the past. The



language was allowing us to say, "Yes, this is good; this is where we are." Then there was the other one which was about a universal pastor of unity. The Church of England, yes, in our foundational documents we have the Pope as anti-Christ; the Methodists have said similar things. The point was made, of course by a Methodist, that perhaps John Wesley would have thought of himself as the Pope, but that was big thinking outside the box. We were getting together to have something in common about the mystery of the Church through a third party, through the WCC document.

If we can do that with Methodists (and it is a variety of Methodists and a variety of Anglicans) can we not do it with other people? Can we not do it with Pentecostals? One thinks of the foot washing. I had the great privilege to be at a meeting with Pentecostals two years ago when we were trying to begin to get things going together with our Pentecostal brothers and sisters. One of the things which struck the Anglo-Catholics on the group hugely, and we were deeply humbled and impressed by, was hearing how many Pentecostal churches when they celebrate the Lord's Supper they always wash feet. It is after all a dominical command. It is one of the only commands on ritual which our Lord gives: wash feet. The more charismatic Pentecostal-style Anglicans were a little puzzled by this as they never done it. You get some wonderful cross links. I do hope we will engage seriously with the World Council of Churches' text and that the products which we can produce to help people engage with it will be good and simple.

I repeat my apology for my contribution to fog, fog is not good. One wants to get through it and out of it.

*A Speaker:* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

*The Chair:* That has my permission. Does it have the consent of Synod?

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

*The Chair:* I now call upon the Bishop of Peterborough to respond to the debate.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister):* I am very grateful to everyone for a good debate. Bishop Joe, thank you. You have said that it is welcome and it is timely and I agree. John Freeman, yes, the momentum sometimes seems to have gone from the ecumenical movement; please can we re-enthuse. I think this is part of the way of doing that. Talking together at the local level, working together at the local level is right, he is right. John Davies with a stress on passionate laity and lay leadership of mission and do not smother bottom-up initiatives, I could not agree more. Alison Ruoff, let's stand together for the Gospel; yes, because we need each other. Angus MacLeay, a point to make: the Church is already holy in one sense because it is set apart through the finished sacrifice of Christ. I completely agree with you, we need you as part of the ongoing study for this text at the local level. Obviously Stephen's amendment was defeated but I am grateful that he was not critical of the thrust of what was going on; it was simply one particular part of it.

Tim Hind, I think Tim that you were criticising the FAOC response rather than the *Towards*

a *Common Vision* Report. We are not asking the churches to discuss the FAOC response locally, that is a response that has to be submitted to the WCC. The report itself is much more straight forward and I think is worth discussing at the local level. Lindsay Newcombe, convergence that inspires to help unity is vital; yes, absolutely. The Bishop of Coventry, thank you for sharing your excitement of thinking together about the Church at Taizé and reconciliation through relationship. Exactly right; that is what we want to do, we want to encourage local discussion to see reconciliation through relationship. Penny Allen, dialogue at every level; do not deny the people the chance or the explanation. Spot on. Janet Appleby, thank you for clarifying the distinction between the report and the FAOC response. Robin Lunn, thank you for speaking against those whom you sometimes speak with. We all need to shift our positions and our alliances from time to time. Robin, it is beneficial to discuss this. I think deanery synods could do it, thank you for putting that particularly into our minds. Paul Fiddes, yes, the Trinity and *koinonia* and mission; the weaving together. The text, although it is quite straightforward, is very subtle and deep as well and there is much good in it. You have pointed to some weaknesses of the document, which FAOC also identified, and that enhances and stresses the need to study it further. Let's do that. Bill Croft, again you have pointed to some weaknesses and particularly the difficulties of using common language with churches that use words in different ways, and *diakonia* is clearly one of those. This is a convergence text. It is trying to bring together different churches and different ways of thinking. We need to study it together. Paul and Bill, you have both given us points for further study and that is extremely welcome. Fr Thomas, ecumenism as an operating system, and the report is already will helping in our ongoing conversations with Methodists; can it not do the same with others too? Yes, yes, let it.

Finally (although he was not final but I am finishing with him) thanks to Peter Hart. It is worth taking it back to the churches. Mary and Bill at the local and personal level might be excited about it. Let's pray that they are. May that happen. I am excited about it and Peter reminded us of as good words as any to finish with: "One church, one faith, one Lord".

*The Chair:* I now put Item 10 the vote.

*The motion*

*'That this Synod, welcoming the convergence text from the World Council of Churches' Commission of Faith and Order, The Church: Towards a Common Vision:*

- a) *endorse the response from the Council for Christian Unity and the Faith and Order Commission affirming the consonance of the text with the doctrine of the Church of England;*
- b) *commend the text for consideration at every level of the Church of England, wherever possible in dialogue with members of other Christian churches; and*
- c) *ask the Council for Christian Unity to work with Churches Together in England (CTE) to discern ways of building mutual understanding and*

*enhancing partnership in the gospel across the growing range of Churches in this country in the light of the responses to the text from the diverse membership of CTE.'*

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

*The Chair:* That concludes this item of business. I have two short notices and evening worship will begin in a few moments after I give these notices. Synod members may like to know that a revised version of the *Guidelines for the Conduct of the Clergy*, an earlier draft of which was debated last November by Synod, has been approved and declared an Act of Convocation by the respective Convocations yesterday and it is anticipated that it will be published in hard and electronic form in the autumn.

If that does not float your boat, maybe the fact that England have won against Australia by 169 runs will have done. Now please do remain in the chamber as worship will begin in a few moments.

*Members of the Church of England Youth Council* led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Michael Clarke (Worcester)* took the Chair at 8.30 pm.

## **Church Commissioners' Annual Report**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 11, the Church Commissioners' Annual Report. We are going to have a presentation from Andrew Mackie, the Third Church Estates Commissioner. He will have up to 15 minutes to talk to us. We will then have a question and answer session and I shall try and encourage you to chip in with your questions in a way that presents groups of questions for Mr Mackie to respond to, but I will come back to that.

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner):* My name is Andrew Mackie. Good evening to you all. The first thing I must do, echoing perhaps one of the bishops from yesterday, is to apologise in a heartfelt way that I am not Andreas Whittam Smith. I hope that you will forgive that, but I also want to thank everybody for their numerous expressions of concern that have been communicated to me and my colleagues about Andreas and we will of course pass all those good wishes back to him and we are all thinking of him a lot and saying prayers for him and for his swift recovery.

2014 was a good year for the Church Commissioners as far as our investments were concerned, broadly under three headings. Dealing first with investment returns, the Commissioners returned 14.4% in 2014, easily beating relevant industry benchmarks. This was driven by a number of factors, the strong property markets, and of course we have significant investments in real estate. The good performance by our managers overcoming what were mixed fortunes for equity markets. They were strong in the US but, as you will know, weaker in Europe. Thirdly, a cautious approach by the Assets Committee. We could take more risk but we declined to do so; we think, for good reasons. A cautious approach which took the form of increasing diversification, increased commitment, for example, to timber and a reduction in exposure to larger investments. The headline-grabbing key there was the sale of our interest in the Pollen Estate and I

must pay tribute to the outstanding work of our colleagues in the Commissioners, the team, in achieving significantly more than the book value of the Pollen interest.

We operate within an ethical investment framework but actually we are getting more active in that area, and I may say a bit more about that in a minute, but I think it is key to say that this is not simply about exclusions from areas that we invest in. We appointed Edward Mason our first Head of Responsible Investment last year and you will see from his contribution to the Annual Report that we are making significant strides in that area and I think actually can lay some claim to contributing to thought leadership in the area.

This is, as I say, not just about defining areas in which we are not going to invest. We do not invest, for example, in gambling or pornography. Those are, in a sense, the easy decisions to make. It is also about something subtler than that. It is about the dialogue that has happened between us, for example, and the supermarkets to ensure that if we are going to invest in that sector that the targets of that investment market alcohol in a responsible way. It is about the dialogue with BP and Shell which achieved tangible results in the form of resolutions being passed providing for materially increased disclosure of their plans to move towards a more carbon-neutral environment. That is work that obviously is ongoing, it is moving forward and there will be more to say on that, I am sure, in future years.

More important than last year's return, good though it has been, is that we have beaten our long-term target of RPI plus 5% on average for 30 years, so not just last year but taken over a period of three, five, ten, 20, 30 years, we have beaten that target. I think that is important not just because of the numbers that it throws off but because of the quality of the earnings that it is giving rise to. What I mean by that is the stability of those earnings. We are looking to produce a durable, sustainable income flow for our purposes and our purposes, needless to say, are not simply financial; they are not simply to grow the fund, important obviously though that is.

Let me talk secondly, having talked about investment returns themselves, about what we do with those investment returns. The answer is that we spent over £214 million last year on pensions, on parish mission and on ministry support grants, on bishops' and archbishops' expenses, grants to cathedrals and other support for the Church and Church projects. Increasingly, this money is targeted on the poorest in our community but also actually supporting every part of the Church in one way or another.

Last year we participated in a major review of national funding, seeking greater investment in growth. The Resourcing the Future agenda, the implementation of which may require some additional time-limited Church Commissioners' support, is obviously on Synod's mind, particularly after February, and we stand ready to help, although no detailed decisions on the execution of that extra distribution, should it occur, have yet been taken. They will need, as John Spence foreshadowed correctly last night, to be taken carefully and they will need to be taken on the basis of very well thought through business plans because this would be investment in the growth of the Church. We are not suddenly abandoning our adherence to the Charity Commission's guidance that we should be mindful not only of the current generation but of future generations, but, equally, we need to think about what future generations are going to inherit in terms of a Church and we obviously want to play our part to do everything we can to make sure that that is

a flourishing and growing Church.

Thirdly, can I say a little bit about the administrative side of the Church Commissioners' work. The three committees that I chair seek to help the wider church be more effective in managing see houses, in disbursing other episcopal expenses, helping with pastoral reorganisations and advising on church closures where those sadly need to happen and more positively there on future uses.

We are absolutely supportive of the simplification agenda. We are supportive of the key maxim that we should not be doing things in a centralised way or centrally where they can better be done in the dioceses where those actions and decisions are being matched with their effects.

We supported the group chaired by the Bishop of Willesden seeking to simplify and deregulate Church legislation. We are, as an example of that, reviewing our own public hearing processes and asking ourselves the question not are there circumstances in which perhaps we do not need to hold public hearings but turning the question round and saying could we do everything on the papers, could we deal with everything on a written basis and then thinking about exceptions to that line rather than the other way round. Because then the relevant committee thinks - and I agree with this - you may actually come to a more radical and a more meaningful answer and get more movement in the direction of simplification.

One more point about simplification. It is often true that given that all of the Church's rules have been put there not because people have been in love with bureaucracy for its own sake for but for good reason at a particular time, it is true that if you get rid of some of that process you do perhaps lose something. I think what the committees that I am involved with are really grappling with is the idea that we should not run away from simplifying simply if we think we are going to lose something. We should do a balancing exercise of the small amount that we may lose in certain cases against the huge benefits to be wrought by extra simplification.

I think I would summarise really by saying that the Church Commissioners are all about investment, but that is not just about property and shares, again important though they are. All that we do, whether it is fund management, expenditure, our contribution to administration and policy, we should see as investment in the work and growth of the Church. Our ultimate return must simply be the success of the Church of England.

I want finally to thank my colleagues in the Church Commissioners' staff, Andrew Brown and his team, very much for their enormous contribution. They are tireless in helping the Church Commissioners to achieve their goals on your behalf and I would like also to say a very big thank you to my fellow Trustees who also give huge amounts of time and expertise on behalf of the Church. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* Thank you for that. We now move to questions. Can I just point out to you that this is an occasion to ask questions not to make speeches. If any of you were to cross that line, the Chair's wrath will be in your direction.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* Slightly three in one actually. The first thing is many congratulations for the performance last year. It is very good and I am delighted to see it

string over 30 years. If you look at page 22 you will see the UK equities total returns and you will see that the only period between one and 30 years where we have under-performed the FTSE All Share Index is in the last year where we have got 0.7% compared to 1.2%. I would quite like to know the reason why UK equities have under-performed quite so dismally last year.

Secondly, on page 11, you talk about research and it says on the first column: "£0.7m was committed for research to investigate good practice in relation to Church growth." On the next column along it talks about where it has been spent, and it looks to me as if really all of that is going into what you might describe as low-hanging fruit research. I would like to know whether the Church Commissioners are going to put any research spending into that wider part of the population which has no knowledge of the Christian faith because only 5% of those under the age of 35 do have any sort of affiliation with the Christian faith.

My third is a very, very small point which is whether you go electronic or whether you print, when you print your reports in very, very faint and very small font, it gives optically challenged people like me a major problem, so I would be grateful if you could increase the size of font and print it in black in future even if you go electronic.

*The Chair:* Your third question was verging on being a speech but I will let it go. Has anybody got any questions which pick up any of those three points?

*Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool):* It relates really to the investment income that Gavin was referring to. I wondered if you could go into a little bit more detail of the investment income notes on page 45. As Gavin said, the investment income declined and I wondered if we could go into a bit more detail on those.

*The Chair:* There is probably enough in those questions, Andrew.

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner):* Thank you very much for those questions. I hope I will be able to remember them and I will answer them in order. UK equities' performance, obviously one would like to be able to say not only that we have achieved stellar returns in general but that every single element of our returns has been stellar. There are inevitably going to be some areas which perform better than others. I think the key point in relation to UK equities is that we invested principally in smaller companies which themselves as an asset class under-performed UK equities as a whole, so that is the key point.

A subsidiary point is that we actually invested less in UK equities themselves so perhaps there is a slightly disproportionate effect, but the key point is the first one.

Moving to the second limb of the question or the second question, £0.7m was invested in research over three years 2011 to 2013. That money was spent and reasonable people can obviously differ over judgments that have to be taken as to how money is spent in a particular area, but the money was broadly spent on looking at conditions that encourage growth, for example why have cathedrals done so well or what are the factors that lead to the success or relative failure of church plants, and that work led to the work on *Anecdote to Evidence* and *Evidence to Action*. That in itself is laying the foundations for

the Reform and Renewal agenda. None of that is in any way to undercut or diminish the importance of what Gavin is talking about. I do not think I would accept that what I have outlined constitutes low-hanging fruit but, as John Spence said last night, the importance of bringing in young people, a high proportion of whom do not have church contact, is something with which none of us, I am sure, would quarrel for a moment, so we do need to find ways of investing in that segment of the population and I am sure we will, but I am confident that that does not mean that we have in any way not used the money that we have spent on research wisely.

Then I think the third question was about the Annual Report. We actually spend a lot of time looking at the way that we present this. It inevitably costs something to produce a report like this. We think it is an important exercise in communicating not only with the wider Church but also with those in the investment community, and those who are outside the Church but who take an interest in our work. It is very important that we get it right and it is valuable to have feedback about the way in which it is presented. Speaking as someone who is becoming increasingly optically challenged, I have enormous sympathy with the point that was being made.

I think then there was a question about more detail in relation, again, to the investment line that was initially mentioned. We are, of course, as are charities in general now, investing on a total return basis so that may account for some of what is behind the question, but we are more than happy to provide any further detail that we can, that we are able to disclose, and so we are happy to write to you with any further detail that we feel we can provide.

*Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry):* Just two very brief questions, Chair, in relation again to a decline in income. The decline in income I am referring to is, in fact, different. Chair, in a previous Synod debate I called for the Commissioners to have a bias to the poor. I was told at the time that if that was to happen, because a Church Commissioner's role is to maximise profits, it could be professional misconduct because the Church Commissioners potentially would be spending money they should not be.

Well, how can it be justified that we did not go with the bias to the poor, yet the Church Commissioners gave an 18% increase to a staff member equalling £75,000, now with a salary of £409,000, plus the Church Commissioners employ ten people over £100,000 and 38 people over £60,000. In regard to the reputation of this Church, what does that say to people out there that we are effectively giving an 18% increase in salary?

Finally, the second question in relation to that, if it is God's call that people come to serve the Church Commissioners in the role you undertake, then could it be the case that, like lawyers in local government or doctors who work in charities, we as a Church could train people in the vocation of working as Commissioners and maybe pay them a stipend of around £30,000 instead of £409,000?

*The Chair:* Does anyone want to follow up?

*Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* I notice in the useful purple insert that you supported only 34% of UK remuneration resolutions at company AGMs. This is not a hostile question. The amount paid to the highest member of staff is 22 times the salary earned

by the lowest paid member of staff. Is 22 times nothing that you would question if you were at an annual meeting yourself? I really do not know. Since I am up and I will not get called again, on page 65 why did the Bishop of Exeter get so much vastly more than would seem right?

*The Chair:* No judgment there then.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* I also have a question touching upon the poor but rather more directly involving them. When you were addressing us you mentioned that you are in touch with the supermarkets and you illustrated that this is about alcohol pricing. I have just come from the fringe meeting with Tim Montgomerie and Maurice Glasman who have been talking about the pressures upon family life.

One knows in recent Government announcements that we are talking about supermarket hours being extended on Sunday trading and also there will be adjustments to welfare benefits. I wonder when you come to talk to the supermarkets whether you would take the Church's concerns in these regards because, clearly, those two could be toxic pressures upon family life in the country and the poor do not need that?

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner):* Thank you very much for those questions.

Can I deal with the question of salaries or remuneration for particular people first? It would be entirely wrong of me not to say, as the First Commissioner has said in previous years, and it remains true, that the amounts of money that are being highlighted are considerable. They are considerable amounts of income for any organisation to pay to anyone and it would be wrong to pretend anything else. However, they are very capable people who have delivered the sorts of returns that I have just spent some time discussing. They are in most cases, if not all, paid considerably less than they would be paid were they not working for the Church Commissioners. Their remuneration is linked not in the way that remuneration in a number of public and leading private companies is to reward short-term performance, but to reward long-term performance. That link with long-term performance is not simply a matter of looking at the period of performance which is relevant to compute the remuneration. It also relates to the length of time that they have to wait in order to receive it. There is a double lock, a double link, with performance. Of course, the correlation between good performance and remuneration is not infinitely elastic but we think that we have got it right, otherwise we would not be paying the sorts of sums that we are paying. They are considerably less than the relevant people would be paid in the market. These are people who have achieved really outstanding returns for the Church to enable the mission of the Church to be developed. Therefore, we think it is absolutely right that they are paid what they are paid. Actually, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Director of Investments and his team for really an exceptional performance.

Before I leave that point, I think there was a suggestion that we should perhaps be training people in-house and the result of that training in-house would somehow miraculously be that we would only have to pay a fraction of the sum being paid. I do not accept that and I do not think any of my colleagues would either. I have been in other industries where I have seen very good in-house training programmes which are a good thing, and we are



training people in-house; but they do not uniformly, unless you continue to pay people a reasonable amount in the context of the market in which they operate, lead invariably to retention at all. They lead to people being well-trained and then going off to go elsewhere if the gap is simply unacceptable.

The next point was about the Bishop of Exeter and I think the amounts that have been spent on the Bishop's lodgings there. I think that is simply down to the fact that these were incoming works. There is a new Bishop of Exeter. It was the right time to do significant incoming works. Not much work had been done on the building for some time and the number is inevitably higher than it was last year. It looks out of whack with the others but, in fact, that is the reason.

I think the third was a very helpful question about the dialogue with supermarkets and the question of Sunday trading and the effect on family life. This is clearly a critical question. It is something that we all need to engage with. We certainly had every intention of discussing it with the EIAG, but I am very grateful for it having been raised and we will certainly do what we can in discussions with the EIAG to see whether anything can be done to inform our dialogue with the supermarkets.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells):* My question relates to the balance between investment income and our social responsibility as a charity. I am deeply grateful to the fact that the Church Commissioners did respond to my request to engage with my local community over a particular building project that they had which subsequently fell through. What I would like to know is how committed are the Church Commissioners to an ongoing dialogue with an area, for example, like Westbury-sub-Mendip where I live, where there are multiple properties that the Church Commissioners own (farms, houses and so on) and where they could easily pick off each individual one for an individual profit when, in fact, it might destroy the community?

*The Chair:* Does anyone want to go on the back of that question?

*Dr Philip Rice (London):* Inter-generational equity and urgency, I heard from the speaker words along the lines that it is an executive decision about the extra distribution, should it occur. I would be grateful for any further amplification of what would be the justification and do they perceive urgency in making the extra additional distribution, Sir?

*Mr Peter Collard (Derby):* I am going to be struggling here because I also have trouble reading the small print, having lost some of my sight. From memory, if I get it right, can you just clarify that my understanding is correct, that you have made a gain of over £600 million and the costs are around £300 million; I am just trying to understand whether you have any difficulty in employing staff given that your costs are so low?

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner):* Thank you very much for those questions. The first question first, the question of investment income I think versus social responsibility, particularly in the context of properties in this instance in Somerset but obviously the question has a wider application. I think the only general answer I can give to this (and it was, despite its specific geographical context, I think, a general question) is that we work very closely with local authorities and we talk a great deal to the relevant local community.

We have to strike a balance between our responsibilities on behalf of you all to the funds that we manage on your behalf, on behalf of the Church, and our responsibilities to particular communities when we are looking at specific properties. That is an on-going tension and it is a tension that we are there to manage. We will not always get it exactly right. I do not think anyone would. I do not think there is one exactly right answer in any particular context, but it is a tension of which we are acutely aware and we do our absolute best to manage it properly.

On the point about inter-generational equity and the justification, as I understood the question, for making additional distributions, the point I think is the one that I made earlier. We clearly, under Charities Commission guidance and even in its absence we would have this duty, have a duty to look not just to the current generation, not just to all of us who are here now, but to future generations. The Church is here forever, but we need to make sure that the next generation and the one after that and the one after that inherit a Church that is as flourishing and as growing as we can make it within the confines of the first duty that I talked about. Again, it is another tension and it may be that there is a justification given the current circumstances for making some additional distributions. That was, I think, where Synod was when it gave an indication in February that it would be happy to allow us to consider that.

The third question talked about a gain of £600 million and referred to very low costs and the difficulty of attracting the right staff. Well, you will not be surprised to hear me say, given what I said about remuneration, that we face very considerable challenges on that front but we do our best to overcome them and we are extremely fortunate in the calibre of people that we have. I should say on a personal note that I have now been with the Church Commissioners two and a half years and I have been extraordinarily impressed by the calibre and the professionalism of those who work in the Church Commissioners.

*Canon Philip McDonough (St Albans):* My question is the relationship between the Commissioners and the dioceses. When income exceeds budget, would it be possible for some of that excess money to be able to be passed on to the dioceses in order for them to take pressure off parishes in parish share requirements? What I am suggesting is a DBF can apply to the Commissioners for any help with a shortfall of income from parish shares. Most PCCs, most parishes, spend most of their time trying to find where they are going to be able to spend money, is it possible for that cascade to come down to parish level eventually? Thank you.

*Mr Andrew Mackie (Third Church Estates Commissioner):* Thank you very much for that. Very briefly, the fact that income exceeds budget I do not think necessarily leads to what I would describe as excess money. If it went below budget, would we be clawing money back? I think there is a bigger point here. We have to manage the fund as a whole. We take advice from our actuaries as to what is sustainable. We then work with the Archbishops' Council to ensure that distributions are made to the right parts of the Church, but we are not in this business of the management of the fund for any reason other than to further the mission of the Church. It is not as if it is leaking out somewhere else other than the diocese.

*The Chair:* Colleagues, can I, on your behalf, thank Andrew Mackie very much indeed

for that presentation. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester)* took the Chair at 9.10 pm

## **Archbishops' Council's Annual Report**

*The Chair:* We move to Item 12, Archbishops' Council Annual Report, GS 2001. We have behind us, arranging themselves, the Revd Canon Robert Cotton, Mrs Mary Chapman, Mr Philip Fletcher, and the Rt Revd Steven Croft, who are going to offer a brief presentation of the Council's work as outlined in the Annual Report, and then Synod will have an opportunity to ask questions of the panel through me. The presentation is to last for about 15 minutes.

*Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford):* Synod, in the last year the business of the Archbishops' Council has fallen basically into two categories: Reform and Renewal, and we will come back to that in a moment; and everything else. In that sense it is a bit like my experience of running a PCC. Much as you spend a lot of effort trying to focus on vision and implementing that, you also have to do business that may be mundane, is certainly detailed, but also deserves and requires respect, prayerful attention, wisdom and thoughtfulness. I hope you will see behind me a loop of photos of where some of our thinking has led to the allocation of resources. What have we got here? Soup kitchen. You can see "the everything else" behind me. You can read about "the everything else" here. Part of what is going to happen after this brief presentation is that we hope there will be a chance to engage, questions certainly but hopefully, as I said last time, with a slightly different approach to question time itself.

The key phrases that are in my mind when we are dealing with a lot of detailed different aspects of what I am calling "everything else" are these. These are my sort of mental checklist as we are listening to things about safeguarding and ecumenism and soup kitchens and whatever.

The first thing is presence, presence in every community remembering that we are a national Church, we are varied, and the enormity of the task can sometimes be seeking to recognise where God is already present, seeking to recognise what God is already doing but also where and how God is present in different communities. One of the phrases came from John Spence, "So that the risen Christ can be restored to the centre of this country, its conscience and its culture". I love those last three words, country and conscience and culture. So one of my mental checklists is presence, are we making sure that this is about the national Church.

I think the second of my mental checklists is about tending relationships. There was a lot of pressure in our business of dealing with everything else in the Archbishops' Council, much to deal with, but I think we are all very sensitive to this idea about beyond decision-making we need to keep in mind who we should be listening to, who is affected by the decisions that are being made and also about the pace of change. Sometimes the decisions we make will affect people in different ways because they will be implemented at different speeds and that is quite tricky to attend to.

So one is presence, one is tending relationships. The other key word is growth. Growth, as you will know, manifests itself in so many different ways: personal discipleship, being followers of Christ, how growth happens locally is certainly one of the things we keep in

mind, not about institutional growth but how we can allocate resources so that the local bodies, whether they are chaplaincies or parishes or dioceses or lay ministries, can be enabled not only to grow but increase their capacity to grow further.

As we deal with our “everything else” business, I for one, and I think my colleagues as well, would say we are all the time trying to apply these same sorts of principles: presence and tending and growing.

You may well want to pick up on that, on some of the pictures and some of the details in our report, but let me briefly touch on the other part, which is about Reform and Renewal. The urgency and the seriousness of our situation has been brilliantly captured, and I think especially we are grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for articulating it so clearly and helping the language begin to recognise the urgency of the situation and the confidence we can have to know how to respond. The Archbishops' Council role is to offer some oversight as we consider the - and the word is quite difficult, is it a package or is it a programme of renewal and reform, or call me an unreconstructed charismatic but I do like the phrase “the movement of the Spirit”. It is a phrase, your Grace, that you use as well, trying to discern how the Spirit is moving amongst us, and especially again discern how it is moving locally in different ways in different contexts, urban and rural, places of great deprivation, the lay clergy dimension very sensitive to that, and we have not still quite articulated that as well as we could.

What has been special this year, I think, what has been new this year, as I trust all of you will know, is that there was an offer to all the dioceses that the Archbishops' Council should engage with you where you are. There was an offer made to every diocese. The diocese could choose how, but one member of the Council and a senior officer from Church House would come out and visit, contribute to a discussion in some way and in particular to listen as well.

I think one of the bits of our paperwork I really treasure is GS Misc 1116, which looks like this, because in Annex B what we have got here is four pages of the learning that is already taking place. What is encapsulated in Annex B is this is what you are saying in different ways. There is not necessarily a coherent response because there are different responses from different dioceses. That initial programme of Reform and Renewal is already being changed and amended because in the conversations we are having you are having the courage to say, “This won't quite work, you need to do this bit differently”, and we are capturing that wisdom and quite a lot of that is there in that document. You might want to pick up on that as well.

What that is taking seriously is what the First Church Estates Commissioner said so strongly, that if there is to be a release of funds through inter-generational equity it needs widespread support. There is certainly widespread support here but the Church of England is so much bigger than General Synod, and that sense that you too are not only representatives but ambassadors for this movement of the Spirit, of reforming and renewal, and we on the Council are wanting to see that it is not just our programme that we are rolling out but it is our programme and how we can make sure that happens. Maybe some of that you might pick up in our discussion for the rest of our time now.

Especially as we come towards the end of this quinquennium, I want to offer the brief reflection that when I joined the Archbishops' Council as an elected member five years ago the Council was held in some suspicion and disregard. I think especially through this pattern of engaging locally and listening, that seems to have been well received and is actually helping the Council to be a partner with you, all the dioceses and the people you represent, in trying to capture this movement of the Spirit and work positively to create God's future.

That is my brief introduction and, Chair, we are now in your hands as to managing questions.

*The Chair:* Questions, and I mean by that questions, not speeches I hope. It is probably easier to take them in threes.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Thank you for calling me. It is a question about the priority of numerical growth for the new quinquennium on page 3. I warmly welcome this but some clergy in my diocese find the priority on numerical growth stressful and unrealistic if net growth is meant. This is because, for example, the actuarial projections based on age profile show net decline for several decades even if there is real growth in new disciples.

Secondly, the Census and recent surveys suggest a real fall in people calling themselves Christians and people calling themselves Anglicans, suggesting that secularism is having an effect on how people understand themselves.

Thirdly, even Professor David Voas, our own expert behind the *Anecdote to Evidence* research, says that really we need a revival to reverse net decline in numbers. My question is, is net growth in numbers meant by the priority for the new quinquennium and, if it is, is the Archbishops' Council presuming upon revival and the Holy Spirit? Thank you.

*Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* In our parish we would not be happy with income down, expenditure up. In particular a few questions. "Conferences and Courses", page 44, £224,000 losses on conferences this year is twice the loss that there was on conferences last year. On the same page, "Other", there is nearly £100,000 more of other grants receivable. Could we have any information as to where some of these other grants might have come from?

Finally, on page 55 we have the Archbishops' Council Ministerial Training Fund, a restricted fund, which gets quite a lot of money, and one of our main purposes is training for ministry. Why do we have this restricted fund and where does the money come from that goes into it?

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* Let me first say how much I welcome this report, both for its presentation - it is noticeably easier to read than the Church Commissioners' one - as well as for its content. But what were you smoking when it came to the graphic on page 5? It is one of the worst pieces of data visualisation I am afraid I have ever seen. It appears to show expenditure going through the roof whereas the income numbers are shown in a dysfunctional machine, not to scale, with three cogs that cannot work together

because they cannot engage, having teeth of different sizes, and the smallest element frustrates the whole by being required to turn in both directions at once. May we be assured this is not a metaphor for the Archbishops' Council.

*The Chair:* We will deal with that then.

*Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford):* No, but the blessed William Fittall has said it is a parable of the Church of England. I do not know what they were smoking when page 5 was done but thank you for pointing that out, Philip.

Moving along. Patrick, the first question. I wanted to reply partly because I had the good fortune to visit Norwich diocese and it was lovely. I thought we had a great day. One of the things that came out of that visit for me very clearly was the ability to affirm the importance of growth and that will continue to be one of those key words. Throughout the hours of sitting in Archbishops' Council, it will always be, "and how might this affect growth?" It is very clearly a continuing priority.

It was in your diocesan discussion that it became also very clear that growth happens in different ways and we need to just be very careful, as well as continuing to measure it, to be aware of what we measure and how we measure and where we place our concentration. It was the Bishop of Norwich who said that your diocese has done a lot recently with church schools, not just as places of education but trying to grow holiness both in individuals and in organisations within schools, and it is noted that none of those numbers features in the usual Sunday attendance. So there is a real sense, at least this is what I picked up from the Bishop of Norwich, there are things growing significantly both in terms of Spirit and in terms of numbers but you will not necessarily see them if you look at a certain set of statistics. That is part of the subtlety. My understanding is deepening by listening to different dioceses and we need to be aware of when we are dealing with growth.

I trust that none of us presume upon the Holy Spirit but we do trust that the Spirit is going to meet us where we need. Growth is there. Growth is a continuing priority in numbers but let us attend to those numbers with great subtlety and wisdom.

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* I am also grateful to Patrick for the question. It is very important as we move forward that we are combining hope and realism as we look to the growth of the Church. Both are essential lest our conversation becomes oppressive in one way or another or unrealistic.

We need to be realistic about the environment in which we work, a secular and secularising culture which can be demanding in which to share faith, and we need to be realistic about the kinds of numbers that we have projected forward, but we also need to be immensely hopeful in the Grace of God. I would say to most congregations and communities it is right to be thinking in terms of net growth in terms of individual congregations and pray and see what God will do as we move forward. Let us go forward in that way but open to God as to the outcome of our endeavours.

In terms of the financial questions, which is not within my particular expertise but for Christopher's questions, thank you, it is a lower income rather than a loss on conferences

and courses. That just reflects the circumstances of the year. The restricted funds in total of the Archbishops' Council are about £40 million, a lot of money but considerably less than the figures we were talking about in the last report. That particular Ministerial Fund is historic resources and some current giving which is restricted for ministerial training.

*The Chair:* Further questions?

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I am looking at lay leadership on GS Misc 1116. As an illustration of what lay leadership can achieve, in my own parish of St Leonard's in Wendover Deanery in Buckinghamshire we have a lay breakfast, lay service, which is three times the average congregation of stipendiary-led ones. What I am wondering is, is there any information as to when we are likely to see an online interactive modular training process for the laity so that they can actually become much more empowered at the local level without having to commit to huge amounts of time that they do not have available from work or whatever, or travel and so on.

*Mrs Penelope Allen (Lichfield):* Three short things. Firstly, is it possible to stop referring to Votes 1 to 5, which when we are trying to explain the budget elsewhere other than in this Synod are meaningless titles to a lot of people?

Secondly, looking at page 31 and the risks to the Archbishops' Council's activities, I note that the monitoring of potential and proposed legislation is part of the risk taking and I wonder if there is anything coming forward that you are aware of that we should know about in proposed legislation.

On page 44 I note that the number of legacies and donations are rising and are we tapping sufficiently into public goodwill?

*Ven Timothy Barker (Lincoln):* Church of England Central Services, can you tell us please how this new venture is enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness? Secondly, I would be interested to know what other charities with a church ethos are being drawn into this. Thirdly, how can this benefit the dioceses? What sort of impact and benefit can this have to the dioceses?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* If I can take Gavin Oldham's question, I think within the next five years, Gavin, that is a possibility. We hope by the end of this year to have begun a new project of work on lay leadership and ministry in particular. If you look back over the last five years and the distance we have travelled in terms of the development of the Common Awards and the Virtual Learning Environment which accompanies them, that gives us a secure platform for further development of shared learning. The work which is emerging from Reform and Renewal is also giving us the information we need to begin to design and encourage collaboration in lay discipleship, education and formation for ministry in partnership with dioceses. So I think we should take a bold view of what is possible over the next five years and those possibilities are certainly there.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (Archbishops' Council):* If I could take the comment first of all about Votes 1 to 5 which, to be honest, when I first came across them I found them also very



difficult in terms of communications. What I would say though is that if you look both in the budget and in the Report they do have a subtitle so it is clear what each of those is about, and the reason that they are separate is so that members of Synod can see very clearly where different streams of funding that you make available to us from the dioceses is then spent. That is very, very important, and you will see when you come to talk about the budget tomorrow night, because there are some areas, some votes, like Vote 5 for example, where the Council has relatively little control over what the costs are going to be, and there are other areas, like Vote 2, where we have a lot more control and where if you look over time you will see that the Council has worked extraordinarily hard to keep down the increase in Vote 2. So I think while the concept of Votes 1 to 5 may be alienating for some people, it serves a very practical purpose in giving you clarity about what money is going where.

The question on risks, and particularly the risk where we talk in mitigation about keeping track of legislation, we were asked whether there was anything specific coming forward, I think it is important to say that that monitoring of upcoming legislation covers an enormously wide range of topics so there will be things, for example, that we may as a Church be against and want to take a view on - Sunday trading might be an example of that - through to other things which are much more practical, tax and planning, and changes in Gift Aid. We monitor from a number of different perspectives, partly about enabling the Church nationally to develop policy and to communicate that into the public square, and partly to look practically at the implications of upcoming legislation on the operations of the Church, if you like.

There was also a question about checks and does it serve any purpose. I think there is an element of future-proofing in checks. The staff in Church House who work for the various Church institutions are brought together in a way because we work across the boundaries of the Church institutions. There is also the question of providing services centrally which are predominantly services to the three main National Church Institutions but also include services that can be provided to dioceses. It is a practical administrative vehicle. I do not think any of us would want to put it any higher than that but it serves a function.

*The Chair:* More questions or are we too weary for questions?

*Revd Canon Martin Wood (Chelmsford):* I just wanted to drill down more into the risk assessment. The first on page 30, ministerial education recruitment, what is the risk of failure to secure sufficient number and quality of ministers, but then you read what is to be done to mitigate this and there is a whole range of things but there is nothing at all I can see that will actually address not having enough. I wondered if anyone would like to comment on that? What happens if we do not have enough?

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* I think that is probably my question. I would encourage us all to pray that we do. We are currently addressing that through the formation of a new Vocations Working Group, which is looking at ways to learn from best practice to proactively encourage research. We know that the number of ordinands sponsored by dioceses is uneven. Some dioceses have seen a significant lift in their numbers of vocations to ordained ministry; others have stayed static or declined. We want to learn from best practice. We know that within dioceses, ordinands are not spread

evenly across the parishes of the diocese but typically the majority of vocations will come through a relatively small number of parishes and churches, and we want to do some learning there as well. We know that the Church of England Ministerial Education Scheme and intern programmes run by churches are enormously effective in both forming individuals and equipping them for ministry. We are hopeful that by a number of methods these things can be brought together, but I think it would be prudent to show some of that in the risk register in future years.

*Dr Philip Giddings (Oxford):* I am a member of the Archbishops' Council and I am sure Bishop Steven knows there is a question I am going to ask as a follow-up to that.

If in the goodness of God there is not a "sufficient" response in terms of the number of ordained ministers called forward, is the forward planning subtle enough to encourage a fuller use of the gifts and talents of the lay members of the Church?

*Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford):* Since we ran out of time apparently at the last one and we have got extra time I am going to rephrase my question to the Archbishops' Council because it is a central matter. See houses: who is responsible for possibly providing finance for the new sees or the resurrected sees. We have heard of Maidstone and Islington and potentially Marlborough and somewhere else I have forgotten and, wait for it, Whalley, they do not seem to fall easily and obviously under the existing dioceses and existing see houses. Where is the funding for that? Could it be the Church Commissioners? Could it be via the Archbishops' Council? Where should it come from? It is a need.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Answers please.

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* The Chair of the House of Laity has, I am afraid, asked me a trick question because it would be entirely wrong to say that we would only look at ways of using the gifts of the laity of the Church if we do not have enough clergy. Of course, we should be pressing forward with enabling lay discipleship and enabling the whole mission of God through the whole people of God in every possible way, including recognising lay ministries within communities, and one of the things that our research and conversations with dioceses and in dioceses is revealing is real vigour around that endeavour, although very naturally dioceses are pursuing it in particular ways. It is that particularity which is making a national response to that; complex but vital. So thank you for question but it is not "in case we do not"; it is we should be doing both/and.

See houses - responsibility for suffragan bishoprics housing rests with the diocese concerned and not with the Church Commissioners and therefore those questions are looked at in the process of a diocese re-thinking its senior ministry.

Finally, Chair if I may, assuming we are at the end of questions, can we end this session reporting on the Archbishops' Council by paying a warm tribute and thanks to the staff of the Archbishops' Council, to William for his outstanding service in this year as in his preceding years, and to all those who work with him. It is a genuine privilege. All of our staff work very hard under extreme pressure to a really, really high standard and I would invite Synod to express their appreciation. (*Applause*)

*The Chair:* We also of course express our thanks to Robert, Mary, Philip and Steven for their presentation this evening, too.

That concludes this item of business. I call upon the Archbishop of York to dismiss the Synod with a blessing.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Before the dismissal, as one of the Presidents of the Council, on page 5, those cogs that are non-touching, we were not trying to reconstruct the ancient traffic law in the State of Massachusetts which says: "When two cars travelling in the opposite direction come to a crossroads, both shall stop and none shall move until the other has moved." The thing about them appearing not to touch but actually in movement (because I strongly believe the wind of the Spirit blows where He wills) and as long as they are close enough, it actually supports the dispersed authority of the nature of the Church of England. If they touch too much you are not having it disbursed. That is why it was done. I do not know who designed it, but I am trying to give an explanation. I am a strong believer that the Spirit moves where He wills and it does not matter how they are constructed.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* dismissed the Synod with the blessing.

## **FULL SYNOD: THIRD DAY SUNDAY 12 JULY 2015**

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

*The Chair:* Before we come to Item 600, just to say that after last night's review we now return to normal business. I am pleased to see that the Secretary General is no longer "cool" and I am no longer Prince Charming. You will be pleased to know that over £1,800 was raised at the Revue. This was for the Melanesian mission. Thank you, Synod members, for your generosity towards those hit by the recent cyclones. John Freeman (Chester 281) is still willing to receive any last minute contributions. If you think you did not, and you would have loved to, John Freeman is doing it, and I hope it will not be a question of "Point of Order, Mr Chairman".

### **Liturgical Business:**

#### **Christian Initiation: Additional Texts for Holy Baptism in Accessible Language (GS 1958B and GS 1958X)**

*The Chair:* We now come to Item 600 for Final Approval of the draft texts for authorization of Christian Initiation: Additional Texts in Accessible Language. This is Article 7 business. As required by Standing Order 84, that liturgical business was referred to the House of Bishops following completion of the revision stage at the February Group of Sessions. The House has resolved to return it to the Synod for final approval in the form set out in GS 1958B. Members will need the Report of the House of Bishops, GS 1958X, which explains the two small amendments which the House has made to the text in May.

The Convocations and House of Laity did not require that the business be referred to them under Article 7 of the Constitution, so as required by Standing Order 92 I therefore declare on behalf of the Presidents, Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair of the House of Laity that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect of the items of business.

I now call upon the Bishop of Sodor and Man, Vice-Chair of the Liturgical Commission, to move Item 600. He may speak for up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* I beg to move:

'That the liturgical business entitled "Christian Initiation: Additional Texts for Holy Baptism in Accessible Language" be finally approved for a period from 1 September 2015 until further Resolution of the Synod.'

Thank you, Archbishop. I have great pleasure in presenting the alternative baptism texts set out in GS 1958B for final approval. Synod voted by an overwhelming majority to take note of the Report GS 1958A, including these texts, at the February sitting and they were referred to the House of Bishops under Article 7. The House made two small amendments.

First, immediately prior to the February debate I had noticed a problem that had been overlooked in the text of the presentation. This is in lines 28 and 29 of page 2 in GS 1958B. In the event of one male child being baptized, the minister would have said, “God knows him by name and he is his”, which would have confused everyone. Following the Synod debate a number of alternatives were considered but a simple reversal of the statements and casting the first line in plural form solved the problem neatly. The House of Bishops accepted that minor change.

Second, during the debate in February the Revd Canon William Croft pointed to the need for an amendment to the sixth and seventh lines of the first Prayer over the Water, lines 10 to 11 of page 4 in GS 1958B, and the Steering Committee agreed to accept his request and promised to offer a rewording to the House of Bishops at its May meeting. A revised form of words was offered to the House making it clear that “Christ passed through the deep waters of death and opened for us the way of salvation”. During the course of consideration by the Bishops, the House agreed to amend one word in the eighth line making it clear that Christ’s death and resurrection is the supreme act of God’s love for the world which had made available for all the open way of salvation, thus the prayer now reads: “We thank you for your son Jesus, who has passed through the deep waters of death and opened for all the way of salvation.”

No other changes were made by the House of Bishops to these texts, for which Synod had given overwhelming support at its meeting in February, and it is my privilege to move that the liturgical business entitled “Christian Initiation: Additional Texts for Holy Baptism in Accessible Language” be finally approved for a period from 1 September 2015 until further resolution of this Synod.

*The Chair:* Bishop, thank you very much. There will be the normal five minute speech limit which will apply when I open the debate. It is not in order for motions for closure, the speech limit or next business motions to be moved under Standing Order 61(a) and 93. This means that the debate will continue until there is no one standing to indicate a desire to speak, although of course if there are too many people wanting to speak I may shorten the speech limit in the hope that we will get through the business but, again, I am going to be totally in your hands.

Also, it is not in order for a representative of another church to speak in this debate except in order to correct a serious misunderstanding of the facts relating to the beliefs and practices of that particular church. The matter is now open for debate.

*Miss Sally Muggeridge (Canterbury):* Your Grace, I made my maiden speech at the beginning of this quinquennium about this very topic. I just want to say that nobody can dispute the elegance of the Duchess of Cambridge last Sunday in high heels pushing a real pram. I do not know whether His Grace remembers what make it was but it was certainly one that was old but in good use. Seeing her pushing, with high heels on, up a hill, taking her child to be baptized, and for Princess Charlotte obviously to be baptized by the Archbishop, was a very special occasion. Many of us will remember such occasions, whether it be children, grandchildren, a special day marking the beginning of a Christian journey for a young child or an older person.

I am so delighted to see that final approval has at last been reached on the proposed text for authorization. As I say, my maiden speech was on that because I was so aghast at the time in 2010 at the website and how it described baptism. I deal with many young people chattering on Mumsnet not clear what or why baptism is, whether it is necessary or desired, but perhaps to get that place at the Church of England school. Realising that this act of Christian initiation with their child is a welcoming, loving and a very special occasion with no demeaning, demanding unfamiliar words, and the devil might I say excluded, means that it invites all new parents to join in the love, sincerity and, yes, maybe a dash of glamour that a baptism represents, much more accessible language. Thank you.

*Mrs Jane Bisson (Winchester):* Chair, thank you for calling me. This will be a short speech. I am just concerned that a rite that is supposed to be for new Christians or uninitiated Christians that also states that it is in accessible language, nonetheless contains deeply theological terms that maybe some of those in our pews on Sunday would find difficulty in understanding and interpreting.

Whilst I welcome the time and dedication of those who have composed these texts for us, there is in my opinion a flaw. I am referring to the line in the Prayers over the Water, in particular the line that states: “that those who are washed in this water may die with Christ and rise with him”. What does this mean? How are new Christians supposed to understand the truth of this statement? Everyone in this chamber, I am sure, knows what it means to die with Christ but I would like to suggest that for some it has taken many years to realise the cost of this and apply it to our lives.

I do, of course, fully appreciate that dying with Christ and rising with him are what the baptism vows call us to do, but this then is a huge training responsibility for our clergy. For all parties to the baptism, the parents, godparents and other sponsors of the baptism candidate, this will mean exhaustive pre-baptism training before the actual service. To die with Christ is for most a seemingly impossible undertaking and to use this statement and this language so early in their Christian journey is, I believe, a mistake. Unless the Chair can convince me that rigorous pre-baptism training will take place I will sadly be voting against these texts. Thank you, Synod.

*Ven Dr Timothy Stratford (Leicester):* Ten years ago I was rector of a town called Kirkby on the north-east edge of Liverpool, a large outer estate parish experiencing severe multiple deprivation. I met from time to time with others in that diocese to chew the fat over what we called “urban mission”, the mission of the Church to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus in places like Kirkby. Like me, colleagues had large numbers of baptisms in their churches on those estates. We in Kirkby had about 160 a year.

These were a fantastic opportunity to proclaim the Gospel to the community but clergy colleagues hated it. As a liturgist and as a member of the Liturgical Commission I relished the challenge, but the initiation liturgy is a challenge when you are baptising children with 200 to 300 people in church who quickly become disconnected. We discussed preparation but at most realistically you could only do this with a handful of the 50 to 100 people who would attend with each child.

We, the urban clergy in Liverpool, set to and worked through all of the Common Worship options to see if we could find a path through the liturgy that would be more engaging, a way of avoiding the shutters coming down. Most complaints were about the Prayer over the Water, long, disconnected with contemporary conversation, beginning with a clunky response to which there was normally no response, colleagues who struggled with the decision and the Commission also.

After ten years of debate in the Liverpool Diocesan Synod, General Synod, the House of Bishops, the Liturgical Commission, we are here. Ten years. An Orthodox friend of mine thinks this is far too fast. I welcome the new material and think it is timely. It takes nothing away from the Common Worship services you have come to know and love but it offers ministers of baptism a new voice as they try to capture the imagination and share the Gospel, a decision that can be answered by saying “I do”, shorter Prayers over the Water not cluttered with multiple ideas and references or by a clunky response, and advice on giving a Commission in the minister’s own words.

I do not think we have settled the outstanding question about the currency of religious words in contemporary society. Amongst the questions that the Liverpool urban clergy were asking were, “Does the word ‘sin’ convey what we want it to mean or do people just think the Church is talking about sex again or cream cakes?” “Does the word ‘devil’ capture the reality of evil as we understand it or do people just see a cartoon character in their mind’s eye?” These were real questions for the urban clergy who began all this, powerless to change the development of the use of English, and are we not all. Those questions are not fully addressed, barely touched on in the material we have in front of us, still real questions.

I hope those ministers are encouraged by what you now have before you and I hope they continue to stimulate the Church’s debate by making us think harder. I hope, Synod, that you will give this modest supplement to the Common Worship provision your fullest approval.

*Revd Paul Hutchinson (York):* I cannot speak for the manufacturer of the pram but its design looks like a particularly good and famous Yorkshire design.

As a parish priest who has been conducting quite a lot of baptisms over the last 18 years, most of them governed by Common Worship rites, I have been longing for this revision for almost all of that time. As someone who has been on the outer reaches of the Liturgical Commission and Praxis networks, I have been talking about it in various places for quite a long time so I greatly welcome this day. I think that what we have before us is superb work and I thank all those involved: House of Bishops, Liturgical Commission, the various committees of this Synod and everyone who has talked through it over time.

I want to particularly say thank you to the Liturgical Commission for dealing with one area of the text that was not in their specific mandate when they started out. The texts that were listed as particularly needing attention did not include the Presentation of the Candidates, and that was one of the parts of the service where no alternatives at all were offered in the previous rites. I think a wonderful job has been done of that and I shall feel much, much more comfortable with the words that are available.

This is the time to say thank you, the time to take up the rites and the time to recognise that those who are uneasy with some parts of it have four existing prayers and the other prayer in the text to take up if, for example, it is the Prayer over the Water one is worried about. There are various streams of theology there.

Finally to say thank you to Liverpool Diocese for bringing it and thank you to the parish of Kirkby for being the place where it began but, against some of what was said in the first big debate, these are not just texts for Kirkby-type places. Most of my ministry has been in rural parishes, in market towns and in better heeled suburbs, and in all those places too these texts are a gift and I thank the Commission for them and I hope we have them to hand on 1 September. Hallelujah.

*Revd Jonathan Frais (Chichester):* Thank you, Mr Chairman, for calling me. I am going to disagree with my good friend Jane Bisson and say that I think the theological terms in baptism with so many new Christians or not Christians around is actually the way we do things ever since the Great Commission said, “Baptise them in the name of the Father, Son and the Spirit”. That is not easy to hang on to even for a Christian of many years. We know that we have to present that as our faith and nature of God right from the start.

Mr Chairman, I want to speak in favour of this because I think there are many opportunities for clergy to do good preparation beforehand. On page 3, I draw our attention to four parts which are great Gospel terms. Let us start with the Lord himself, so in line 20, “Do you turn to Christ as Saviour?” What a joy to be able to prepare people to be able to say that and know what it means. The Apostle Paul said in Athens that, “God has set a day when he will judge the world by the man he has appointed. He has given proof of this by raising him from the dead”. So there is a day when we will all be held to account, we need to be ready for that, we need to make sure that we arrive with our sins forgiven and Jesus is the Saviour who has come in advance and what a privilege to know him and to follow him.

The second of my four words is equally well-known, it is the cross, whether as a title in line 26 or in the expression “the sign of the cross” in line 31. Jesus himself at Gethsemane spoke about “drinking the cup” and the prophets would refer to this as “the cup of divine punishment for sin”, so Christ is taking that for us, how wonderful. On the Cross he said, “It is finished”, not “I am finished”. No, it was the shout of mission accomplished, and straight after the death the curtain was torn in two from top to bottom, a work of God not man, showing that access to the intimacy with God is now available. We can teach the cross as well.

The third of my fourth words in line 43, “obedience”. This is the proof that it has taken, a life that wants to obey. As you yourself said in a recent sermon, Mr Chairman, from John 17, “Each believer is a love-gift from the Father to the Son”, and we have, as believers, a written word from outside our culture to rebuke our culture, just as it stands outside every culture, just as it rebuked all the cultures that it mentions within it, an unchanging and eternal Word, and we are obedient to that. As we say in our Anglican tradition at the end of a reading, “This is the Word of the Lord, thanks be to God”, and we are people who want to be obedient to that.



The fourth word, following Christ and cross and obedience, is the word in line 12, and that is “sin”, for this is another teaching opportunity as we help people to understand their need of Christ and cross and to express that in obedience. The Apostle John said, “Sin is lawlessness” and we live in a lawless culture. The Ten Commandments call us to have no other God but RE in schools so often leaves the impression that there are many and of equal value. We should have no graven images and yet we have so many substitute gods before us or in our hearts. Blasphemy is casual and now everywhere. There are new plans to further de-regularise Sunday restrictions. The role of parents and families is constantly undermined.

Then in the second half of the Ten Commandments - do not murder - but we have got an Assisted Suicide Bill before Parliament coming up, doctors will be death managers as well as life savers. There is no social shame any more, it seems, for adultery. Stealing, well it is what you can get away with. False witness, a little white lie. Covetousness, our economy depends upon it. What a teaching opportunity to show that we are a lawless culture and the Christian steps out of that and says, “I turn to Christ. I accept the cross. I will obey”.

I commend this. I think there are plenty of Gospel opportunities to teaching. I think it will work well. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Gary Jenkins (Southwark):* The Common Worship Baptism Service perfectly illustrates, I think, the adage that you can have too much of a good thing. It is full of good things but there is just too much of it. That is why, as an inner city vicar, I particularly welcome these new accessible texts. They are just what we need for our parishes. I particularly like the Decision section. The Decision is clear, simple, direct and brief with the same two word response required each time from the parents and godparents. It is in that same spirit of clarity, simplicity and brevity that I shall say no more.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I want to thank the Liturgical Commission for their work. I recognise that these texts are to be approved today and in many ways that is to be welcomed but I find myself rising to say that I am going to withhold my support for these texts today, not because they do not do what Synod has been asked to but they come I think in a context where there are other issues that need to be addressed around baptism before such texts can be permitted.

My main concern is that the quality and the consistency of baptism preparation is so mixed around the country that I fear that these texts will be used as a path of least resistance rather than a text that will be used on occasions such as those that Tim Stratford has mentioned. Unlike Gary Jenkins, although my parish is not quite so tough as his in some ways, I have never had a problem with the Common Worship baptism texts. I think the people who have a problem with the Common Worship baptism texts tend to be clergy rather than the people who are bringing their children for baptism. It seems to me that much of the time what is required is in fact good preparation.

Jane Bisson made her point, and I sense I am going to be voting on the same side as her today, but I think she misunderstands the nature of the death and resurrection of Christ in baptism.

It seems to me that in order to do that, good preparation with couples, with families, with those bringing their children to baptism is what we need to do and we need to bear down on that task in a much more rigorous way. This is the gateway into the life of faith. We are not gatekeepers but we do want to ensure that people understand what they are taking on.

As for those who come to baptism services, do you know what, I really do not think they take much notice of the words we use. I think they take notice of the way they are welcomed, are they present in a church that is full of worshippers who look like they are worshipping or are they there on a wet Sunday afternoon because we cannot be bothered to baptize their children as the Canons require at a main act of worship. I think this is a retrograde step. I am concerned that we are reducing our commitment to proper preparation and while I thank everyone who has done the hard work and that many will rejoice, today I think I am not ready to support it.

*Revd Charles Read (Norwich):* I agree with Jane and with Simon, but I am going to vote in favour of these texts, although Simon almost persuaded me to abstain. The reason I say that is that there is a whole cluster of issues around baptism and its administration in the Church of which these texts address one issue. When I moved an amendment spectacularly unsuccessfully at the last group of sessions, I think I began my speech with a quote from the late and much lamented Michael Vasey, and somebody said, “Are there any more Michael Vasey quotes that you could regale Synod with?” and, as it happens, there is one that is relevant to this. Michael was speaking at a large conference at Swanwick, mainly of Evangelicals, organised by the Group for the Renewal of Worship, and he talked about why Evangelicals have often been nervous about liturgy and have an ambiguous relationship with liturgy, and about how Evangelicals often want clear doctrinal formulae and things, and liturgy does not quite work that way.

The Michael Vasey quote is this, at this Swanwick Conference Michael said: “Evangelicals don’t take kindly to poncing around and poetry.” The first of those things is about ritual, by the way, for those who are not sure. The thing is that liturgy is more than the text. The text might include things that we might label ‘poetry’ but there is more to an act of worship than simply the texts and what we are voting on this afternoon are texts. This is not the totality of it. You can read the text of a Common Worship communion service out loud in about ten or 15 minutes. Mostly our Common Worship communion services take quite a lot longer than that to hold; there is more than simply the text. I agree entirely with Simon Butler, it is the quality of the welcome, it is the preparation, the follow-up, it is all those things, and these are very difficult issues for parochial clergy and clergy and chaplaincy appointments to make work. I think that we will need further help, advice and guidance from the Liturgical Commission in the new quinquennium. I will vote for these texts because they are good at what they do, it seems to me, but they are not a magic bullet which will solve all our baptismal issues.

Members of Synod will know that my main ministry is the training of ministers, including ordinands, and when I look at the baptism material with them, one of the things I do is we look at what the Code of Canon Law says about baptisms. I hope the Chief Legal Officer is impressed that I do that. The Canon says, as Simon reminded us, that baptisms should take place, I think the word is “normally” at a main Sunday service. Then we look at the theological and liturgical issues that lie behind the Canons. I hope the Vice-Chair of the

Liturgical Commission is now impressed. Then I say to my students, many of whom are from rural parishes in East Anglia, “How will this work in your setting?” because as we know in rural places, not least in the Diocese of Norwich, it is quite difficult to hold all your baptisms at a main Sunday morning service. There might be lots of pastoral reasons why you cannot do that. I am conflicted because I do believe it is theologically right to do that. One of the issues we need to grapple with is the one that is alluded to in Note No. 7 at the end, how we combine those situations where the least bad option, for example, is to do a Sunday afternoon baptism or something similar, or that is the most appropriate thing to do, how we combine that with a fulsome welcome.

I will vote with these texts but I do agree with Jane and with Simon that there are more issues here and I hope that the Commission can give us further help in the future. These are very good but they are only part of the solution.

*Ven Christine Hardman (Southwark):* Two months ago I had the tremendous privilege of being invited by the parish priest to baptize our youngest grandson who is two years old. We arrived and I had spoken to him in particular the night before and I was really challenged by the task of explaining to him what was going to happen and what his grandma and the priest were going to do the next day. Two, maybe three and perhaps four is an interesting challenge on this because the children are old enough to be fully aware of what is happening but they are not old enough to be able to have a fuller understanding and be able to answer for themselves in the baptism service. I did my best and I hope that I convinced him of God’s deep love for him and what a special little boy he is. I do not think I managed to make the connection between the water and this reality.

The next day in church I came to the point where I poured the water into the font and he knew what was going happen. I began the Prayer over the Water and he began to give me the most baleful stare I have seen for a long time. I was using the Common Worship baptism prayer so it was a very long, baleful stare. How I wish these texts actually had been available. It is not just about length. The service was in the morning service of a rural church, so a theologically literate congregation, and it is not just about length. These texts are not “baptism-lite”, in my opinion. These texts, in their simplicity, are profound and I think have a deep meaning which has all the more impact for its brevity, so I absolutely warmly welcome the fact that we have these new additional texts for use when people choose to use them and deem them appropriate, and I really hope that we will give them final approval today.

*The Chair:* I was going to say to the Prolocutor “All right” then!

*Revd Ruth Walker (Coventry):* I do encourage you to support these texts this afternoon. For us as a parish and as a diocese they come alongside being part of the pilot project for christenings and we are really in our parish looking forward to being able to use it. It feels like it has come at the right time. I encourage you when the Christenings Project is launched, I know officially in October but beforehand, there is a lot of material on the christenings website which looks at exactly the issues that Simon, Charles and Jane maybe have raised that actually it is about so much more than just these texts. Working through that pilot project has challenged us in our welcome and made us look at how we are working with our families and the preparation we are doing. I do encourage you to see this alongside that and to welcome these texts. There is other work going on and so

do go back, take that and get involved with it.

*Revd Canon Mike Parsons (Gloucester):* I am going to support these amendments very warmly but I want to take us back a little bit, certainly to my early history of being a godfather. The very first time was for a colleague in the physics department in Nottingham. We had been research students together and I was godfather to his eldest son. It was a lovely village church in Nottinghamshire and it was the parents, the grandparents, the godparents and one or two other members of the family gathered around the font at the back.

Bit-by-bit as I have been in ministry the numbers attending baptism services have grown and grown. I am now in an inner city council estate parish where we have on a good day a congregation of 35 to 40 but when the baptism families turn up it is anything from 100 to 200. I have to make certain I never try and baptize more than two children from different families in the same service, after once scheduling three and we had 400 in church. It was an exercise in crowd control. It was hardly a sacrament at all.

But adults come and say they want to be a godparent and I say, "Have you been baptized yourself?" "Oh, no, do I need to be?" I say, "You certainly do. You can come as a sponsor and a supporter but if you want to be a godparent you must have been baptized yourself". The new wording for this baptism service with its simplicity of 'Do you turn to Christ?' is brilliant for preparation. With those adults I say, "You are not going to be baptized in the same service as the child. You will be baptized in the main parish communion and you will attend for some weeks because you will be part of the church, you are making an adult decision and I am going to talk to you about confirmation", which may come a little later. It has not done with most of them yet but it may do. One of the young women whom I baptized as an adult, nine months later came back with her child wanting the child to be baptized and actually wanted to talk more. We develop the pastoral contact. It is there, the wording is there; the context in these new words is there.

If we do not do baptism preparation, it does not really matter what form of words we have got. Various people, unfortunately, will do "preparation lite". Other clergy and lay teams will spend a lot of time on their preparation. It almost does not matter what the words are, but what I did discover when I introduced all this to the PCC is they were horrified at the wordiness of Common Worship and could not understand most of it themselves. It was much easier to get the PCC on board with the words of these new services, and we were one of the experimental ones for the initial draft. They are now much more enthusiastic about baptism preparation. They are more keen to see the people involved coming along and actually asking them serious questions about their commitment. If we get even our small numbers of laity involved, the mission of the church will be hugely improved. I support the motion.

*The Chair:* I see no-one standing so I call upon the Bishop of Sodor and Man to reply to the debate. You have got up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* Thank you, Your Grace. There is a cartoon circulating with an Archbishop standing with his arms deep in a font, his hands firmly in the water, the family looking distressed and saying, "I'm sure she's in here somewhere."

Thank you for the support of a number people here. I will not repeat that support. There has been, I think, overwhelming support. I would like to refer to Jane Bisson's remarks about deep theological terms such as "dying with Christ". The most important exposition of baptismal theology in the New Testament is that which is found in Romans 6 where the essential image that controls the whole of that exposition is dying in water, being buried in the water, rising out, so it is pretty important and may well be, and perhaps should be, part of decent baptismal preparation.

Simon Butler has a problem with the quality and consistency of baptismal preparation and that this might therefore become an excuse. Well, he is right. What happens does matter. Good preparation does matter. Even more important, good nurture matters; welcomes matter. There is a flaw though with the argument that because something is made easier it is devalued. I am a useless cook. Recipe books help me. Does that devalue what I have done? I hope not. If I have help am I thereby devalued in my attempt to achieve something?

Baptizing babies is not like an examination. It is not a matter of using this so that you can cheat. It is using this so that what is good can be better. Charles Read is right in a sense, too, that there is a need for advice and help that the clergy in particular need in terms of baptism preparation and so on. The Weddings Project, the Christenings Project and the Funerals Project, particularly of course the Christenings Project in relation to this, have been an enormous help and are continuing to be an enormous help in enabling us to do these things right. So thank you for all the support.

I do want to get back to this issue about language though. Common Worship is full of propositional language and it is a bit heavy on that sort of propositional language and the thing that the Prayer Book has over Common Worship in particular is that the Prayer Book came at a time when metaphysical language was beginning to be developed in that great golden period of the English language so we get descriptions of sin as "erring and straying from Thy ways like lost sheep". You do not actually think about the doctrine of sin; you see it. There is a mental picture for you. In our revised rites we hope that we have enabled that to happen. It is the same image here in the decision. We all wander far from God and lose our way; a mental picture, not a description. Christ comes to find us and welcomes us home. That is the way that we are thinking nowadays in terms of the revision of liturgy and it is the way that I think we are going to have to go in due course with the confirmation liturgy, too. So I have great pleasure in supporting the adoption of these texts.

*The Chair:* Bishop, thank you very much. I am now going to put Item 600 to the vote. The vote needs to be taken by a decision of each House for which the Registrar will advise as usual. The motion must secure at least two-thirds majorities in all three Houses under Standing Order 35(d)(i)(iii).

*The motion*

*'That the liturgical business entitled "Christian Initiation: Additional Texts for Holy Baptism in Accessible Language" be finally approved for a period from 1 September 2015 until further Resolution of the Synod.'*

was carried after a division by Houses, a majority of not less than two thirds of those present and voting in each House being required. The voting was as follows:

	IN FAVOUR	AGAINST
Bishops	23	1
Clergy	114	6
Laity	126	10

1 abstention was recorded in the House of Bishops, 5 in the House of Clergy and 6 in the House of Laity.

*The Chair:* The required two-thirds majority has been secured in each of the three Houses so, final approval having been given, the Christian Initiation: Additional Texts in accessible language are authorized for use from Monday 1 September 2015 until further resolution of the Synod. That completes this item.

Just to say to members of Synod that you need to remember in your prayers the Chair of the Business Committee, Sue Booy, who was at the Minster but has had to go home because of a health issue, and Simon Butler is now in the Chair for the business of the day. Please remember Sue in your prayers.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart)* took the Chair at 3.23 pm.

## **51<sup>st</sup> Report of the Standing Orders Committee (GS 1991) and Proposed Consolidated Text of the Standing Orders (GS 2000)**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon. We turn to the 51st Report of the Standing Orders Committee (GS 1991) and the proposed consolidated text of the Standing Orders which you will find in GS 2000. This is last of the three items relating to Standing Orders that we have had at this group of sessions, which the Synod will be invited by voting on a single motion to adopt a new consolidated set of Standing Orders.

In your First Order Paper, if you have got something as far back as that, you saw there the motion at Item 50 and then on today's Order Paper IV you can see it there repeated on the front page. I now invite Mr Geoffrey Tattersall, from the Standing Orders Committee, to move the motion at Item 50 in the First Notice Paper. Geoffrey, you have up to ten minutes.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester):* I am sorry about keeping meeting like this but it is your misfortune, of course, not mine. In our Report to the Synod last February, the Standing Orders Committee reported that the text of the Standing Orders of Synod had not been systemically reviewed for many years and that thereafter, although they had been amended extensively, that had only been on a piecemeal basis. Moreover, we advised the Synod that we believed that the election of a new Synod later this year would be a suitable time to reintroduce a likely revised consolidated text expressed in as simple and straightforward a way as possible and expressed in gender neutral specific language, whilst not of course altering the sense of the underlying rules of procedure.

So, you have the amended text. I would like to say that the Standing Orders Committee has worked incredibly hard in producing this, but, of course, you know that that is not true. We have had an input into this but our grateful thanks must go to Chris Packer, Legislative Counsel to the Synod, and to Stephen Slack for their enormous efforts in achieving all of this and they must bear, I hope, the credit and the glory for all this.

Finally, can I say this, that of course in the process of consolidation we have discovered, like the Forth Bridge, that there are parts of the bridge which do need repainting and we will remember them, and of course members of Synod are free to help us by reminding us where bits of the text do need revision and we always welcome to receive communications from members of Synod. With that I propose Item 50 standing in my name.

*Mr Adrian Vincent (Guildford):* Mr Chair, I have changed into this shirt in order to fool members into thinking that my speech on Standing Orders will be an interesting one. When last year the Standing Orders Committee invited suggestions towards a light revision, I wrote in suggesting phrases like “*mutatis mutandis*” “notwithstanding” and “subject aforesaid” should be replaced by simpler wording. Imagine my delight when I did a word search on the new text and these phrases have been expunged from the new version. The Committee has done an excellent job and I hope that when Synod approves this revision the House of Laity and the Convocations will do a similar user-friendly revision by removing such phrases from their own Standing Orders.

The next stage for us will be as set out in paragraph 24 of the Explanatory Memorandum considering changes beyond just the light revision that has taken place. In one suggestion which I raised with the Committee when I wrote to them in 2010, I wrote as follows: “The Standing Orders do not envisage a chair moving a motion for closure. However, chairs back-seat drive the debate by getting a Synod member to propose a motion for closure. The result is a time-wasting rigmarole where the Chair says, ‘After the next speaker I will be looking for a motion for closure.’” I have never known an occasion where a Synod member has not taken the prompt from the Chair. Therefore, what is actually happening is the Chair is proposing the motion for closure through a circuitous route. This circuitous route should be simplified by removing the current pretence. There are two options for doing so. One, the Chair could be empowered to propose motions for closure or, two, Chairs could be given instructions that they should not prompt Synod members to propose a motion for closure and that if the Chair wants to bring the debate to a close they can do so by progressively reducing the speech limit.” The Committee replied to my letter saying that they had considered this but were divided on the issue. I suggest that, five years on, now is the time to actually tackle this unnecessary rigmarole once and for all.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I rise for the second time in the week to respond to Adrian Vincent. I am a member of the Standing Orders Committee, you will not be surprised to learn, and I was one of those who supported his request in the first place. I do think that, if Synod feels about what he has just said as enthusiastically as the applause seemed to indicate, it would be a good idea if we were just each to write in to indicate that actually we think - particularly if Mr Freeman is not going to be with us next time - that it is probably time for us to move on to a more streamlined, simplified form of procedure for closing a debate. It is really just to say that there is support, even on the existing Standing Orders

Committee, for that view, and I am sure because the Standing Orders Committee always responds to the will of Synod and if Synod really does want this they need to let us know.

The other thing I wanted to say, Chairman, as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, is really just to express our thanks as members of that Committee to Geoffrey for his Chairmanship. I have now been on it for ten years and he has been Chair throughout that time. He does, in his wonderfully quiet and unflappable way, a magnificent job in keeping some of the more unruly of us under control and bringing about a result which I think has served the Synod very well. I do think the Synod ought to record its thanks to Geoffrey for his Chairmanship of that Committee.

*The Chair:* I see no-one else standing, so could I ask you to come forward quietly and magnificently, Geoffrey, and respond to the points that have been made.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester):* Mr Vincent, it all goes to show that writing in does work. I am very glad to discover that you have discovered yourself that the material words you did not like have gone out of the revised text. As to what you called almost the “pantomime” of inviting a motion for closure, there obviously are two views about this and indeed, the Committee itself was divided. Ultimately, the decision as to whether to close a debate is a matter for Synod and not the Chair. It is really a question of how that is instigated. Sometimes it can be entertaining, sometimes it provides a bit of a break, but we will look at it again and if, indeed, that is the will of Synod, then so be it. I think we need just a bit more import from writing in. Our postbag is hugely small. Nobody writes to us. It is really rather sad. If you had the courtesy of writing to us and letting us know what you really thought, I promise not to come back again.

*The Chair:* The motion before us is as at Item 50 in the First Notice Paper, “That this amendment be made with effect from 15 July 2015: For Standing Orders 1 to 131 substitute Standing Orders 1 to 154 as set out in GS 2000”.

*The motion*

*“That this amendment be made with effect from 15 July 2015: For Standing Orders 1 to 131 substitute Standing Orders 1 to 154 as set out in GS 2000”*

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much indeed.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 3.38 pm

## **Administration of Holy Communion Regulations (GS 1992)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 502. For this item of business, members will need GS 1992A, the Regulations as amended by the Synod, and GS 1992X, the Explanatory Memorandum. As required by Standing Order 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 Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect



of this item of business. I now call on the Bishop of Sodor and Man to move Item 502. The Bishop may speak for up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Robert Paterson):* I beg to move:

‘That the Administration of Holy Communion Regulations be approved.’

Thank you, your Grace. With Geoffrey Tattersall as my Chancellor and Vicar General, we have this afternoon sewn up, I think. He is the quietly magnificent one, I am the other. Members of Synod, the Regulations in GS 1992 have now been considered by the House of Bishops who made no amendments to them. They are altered from the text that you saw on Friday only by the addition of the amendment which appears in bold type moved by Mr Nick Harding and one or two minor printing changes.

I have little to add to what I said in the debate on Friday, but there are one or points I think should be mentioned. First, concern was expressed about the need for paperwork. The Regulations are deliberately not prescriptive about the way in which records should be kept and the intention is that dioceses should be able to decide for themselves how they keep information about people who are authorized under the Regulations. However, there should be a proper record of those people who are authorized. The reason for this relates to the second concern expressed, which is safeguarding. Parish clergy and others will need to be clear about safeguarding implications in authorizing individuals to administer the sacrament.

Part of proper safeguarding procedure is proper recordkeeping, so that it is clear to everyone who is authorized and everyone who is not. Both these matters will be covered in guidance and the National Safeguarding Team will be consulted on the draft guidance before it is issued. I am pleased that the Synod has warmly welcomed these draft Regulations in the earlier debate and hope that you will support them enthusiastically. Therefore, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you. No-one having put their names down to speak, the floor is now open for debate and the usual speech limits will apply. I see nobody standing. I think we will vote on it.

*The motion*

‘That the Administration of Holy Communion Regulations be approved.’

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

*The Chair:* The motion having been carried, the Regulations will come into force on 1 October 2015. That concludes that item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 3.44 pm

**Diocesan Synod Motion:  
Nature and Structure of the Church of England – National Debate (GS  
1928A and GS1928C)**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 13, the Diocesan Synod Motion on the Nature and Structure of the Church of England. For this item, members will need GS 1928A and 1928C. The motion is to be moved on behalf of the Leeds Diocesan Synod by Mrs Mary Judkins and so I invite her to speak to and move the motion. Mrs Judkins, you have up to ten minutes.

*Mrs Mary Judkins (Leeds):* I beg to move:

‘That this Synod ask the House of Bishops to facilitate a theologically informed national debate about the organisational shape of the Church we are called on to be in order to best equip the parishes to serve the people of our land.’

Thank you. Last Monday I woke up to the news that a dear friend had died. His daughter wrote this on Facebook, “My dear family and friends who have walked life with me at different points along the road; it’s with tears in my eyes, yet peace in my heart, I share that my father, my hero and friend passed away this morning, July 5. It’s not goodbye, dad, it’s until I see you again!”

The “father” was Bishop Terry Kelshaw who died last Sunday at his home in Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA. He was Anglican Bishop of the Rio Grande for many years but my husband, Keith, and I first met him at university when he was curate at Christ Church, Clifton in Bristol. I doubt either of us would be where we are now spiritually but for his wise counsel and unconditional friendship.

At his first sermon in his new cathedral, preaching from 1 Corinthians 1:23 Bishop Kelshaw made clear that his priority would always be the Gospel and that whatever issues the diocese had to address – and there were many, oh, yes – they would all be managed in the context of that priority.

So what has that to do with the Wakefield motion before you? Everything. It is a Gospel issue that we seek to address. Not a church growth issue, not an anti-establishment issue, not a kick the C of E issue, not a sexuality issue (although surely those are vital issues), but a life and death issue. What is our first priority as the Church of England? For Bishop Terry it was to preach Christ crucified, risen and ascended.

It is urgent. Not because our churches are empty, although many are, not because we have so few children, young people, families or men in our congregations, although that is the case in many churches. The July 2012 Wakefield motion (which you have on the Order Paper) asks for an informed national debate about the underpinning theological, missiological and ecclesiological principles related to episcopacy and dioceses. Why? To best equip the parishes to serve the Gospel for the people of our land; to glorify God so that others may see his glory, as the Archbishop of York said.

Wakefield Diocesan Synod ask for a “theologically informed debate” about the “organisational structures of the Church of England” amid concern that the processes being followed by the Dioceses Commission were more pragmatic than based on clear and transparent principles.

The question of local change that led to the formation of the diocese of West Yorkshire and the Dales prompted this proposal from the then Wakefield Diocese. The motion, as the then Bishop of Pontefract, Tony Robinson, made clear, was not intended to, “Try to scupper what was happening”. Rather, he said, the C of E as a whole needed to “rethink its re-purpose and structure” and, yes, we are beginning to do this with Renewal and Reform.

But we are asking for a transparent renewal of priorities, clear guidance that informs all processes; a theology that informs our missiology, that defines our ecclesiology, in that order. Yes, Synod, General Synod has moved on. We are asking for joined-up thinking, not add on but add up. In every generation the Church needs to recall and rediscover that it is here to fulfil Christ’s mission in the world. Its function and structures must, therefore, serve not drive. As the *Mission-Shaped Church* report puts it, “It is not the Church of God that has a mission but the God of mission that has a Church”.

GS 1976 written by our two Archbishops goes some way to address these concerns, that the spiritual challenge of Reform and Renewal is both personal and institutional. Correct. In the opinion of Martyn Percy writing in the *Church Times* specifically about the Green Report, “On offer is a dish of basic contemporary approaches to executive management with a little theological garnish”. Yes, it has been said before.

Changes have been designed to enable the Church of England to be better equipped for meeting the challenges, but thin on theology, focusing mostly on missiology in its broadest interpretation, leaving ecclesiology largely unaddressed. If the theology is weak, how can we be sure they will address Christ’s mission for the Church unless we are clear about what the theological basis for that mission is.

The Archbishop of York contributed to that debate on the new diocese by saying, “Our beloved Church of England is all about worshipping the Almighty God and being at the cutting edge of mission and ministry, living and proclaiming the Gospel in every part of England”. Amen. He went on to say that, “Our challenge is to give shape to a Church fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century”. We need to take risks, he said. There are three parts to our motion.

One, we want a national theological debate. Maybe we should call it a, ‘Conversation’. The Church has to realise again its missionary responsibilities. Most people these days have no residue of Christian faith at all. It is not just dominant. It is not non-existent. We have to go back to basics. It is a critical missionary situation. We need to get all our folk engaged. It is not an optional extra. Perhaps the new catechism being written for the Pilgrim Course sets us on the right path and the debate on the FAOC report suggested yesterday.

The second thing we want addresses the Church Structures for the Gospel, how should we do it, what structures do we need? It seems to me the Church of England has never properly learned how to value, encourage and enable active lay ministry – not lay

Readership or churchwardens. We are not a last resort as we heard yesterday.

Because of my Baptist heritage I want to quote Spurgeon on every Christian's calling; he said, "Every Christian is either a missionary or an imposter". So how is the Church equipping its lay members to be missionaries? What theology is it teaching them? Archbishop Welby said congregations need more than seven minute homilies on Sunday mornings about being nice to people. How refreshing was the Presidential Address on Friday? What structures then, organisations and facilities, will give the best support for the whole *laos*?

Thirdly, the motion argues that these are needed to equip the parishes to serve the people of our land. Note the emphasis, not the cathedrals or the dioceses but the parishes. It does not diminish the role of central structures but, we suggest, puts them in their proper context.

Our friend, Bishop Terry, was theologically conservative and many took issue with his stance on many controversial issues, but few would have disagreed with what an American vicar wrote about him earlier last week, "Bishop Terry loved the Church. He loved her when she was dressed up and beautiful, when she was big and accomplished, when she sang loudly and when she wept silently, when she was wounded and suffering, when she was sorrowful and rag-tag, when she was many, when she was few and when she was just one. Bishop Terry loved the Church".

She went on to say, "I was a newly-ordained Anglican priest when Bishop Terry came to be spiritual leader of the church where I had been serving on the staff. He said even though I was a priest I would be his deacon. Some might see this as a demotion but I would learn much as Bishop Terry's deacon. As I served, I saw his love for Jesus, his love for his wife, Hazel, and his love for the Church, and so I grew to love Bishop Terry". "But, she continued, "I didn't know where I stood with him until he called me into my office and asked for forgiveness for any time he'd been too hard on me, anything he'd said that had been too harsh". "Imagine", she said, "a bishop asking forgiveness for such a thing".

In summary, the Wakefield motion asks us to re-think our core approach, to put theology before missiology before ecclesiology or, as Fr. Killwick said yesterday, triangular ministry of God, ordained and laity, the whole *laos* together improvising in the jazz band.

How might it be achieved in practice? That is for others. I venture to suggest that maybe a small task group could make recommendations for putting these aims into practice. I urge you to consider and debate this motion with great care and humility and then to vote in favour of it. It is time we sent a message to the Church that we have to press forward with the whole mission of the whole person of God. The *laos* of the Church are in this together.

*The Chair:* Item 13 is now open for debate.

*Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds):* I nearly had a mental block there because, of course, we have now formed the diocese of West Yorkshire and the Dales and that is something of what this motion came out of. That has been a very positive step. We have seen many good things come out of that. We are working well in our areas. Although there is a lot

of work to do, I think we are already reaping some of the benefits of that.

I just want to draw your attention to something that the Dioceses Commission themselves said in their Evaluation Report of the exercise of putting this diocese together. Although the thinking behind it is that in each area the needs for a diocese or reorganisation of dioceses may be different, they thought it was important to look at the needs of each area in particular. They said questions variously arose in the evaluation about the criteria the Commission used in the formulation of its proposals for change and whether it was working in something of a vacuum. Could or should there be more debate in the national Church, in General Synod and/or the House of Bishops, for example, about how diocesan structures and arrangements can serve mission, about the vital signs of a healthy diocese and about the role of cathedrals?

I just wish to draw your attention to the fact that the Dioceses Commission themselves felt that perhaps they could do with some help on this. Obviously, those areas are being addressed to some extent in the Reform and Renewal agenda, but maybe some thought needs to be given to looking at this of how structures can serve those ends. Thank you.

*Mr Simon Baynes (St Albans):* Mr Chairman, I am not sure if this motion is the last hurrah of the old Wakefield diocese, but, whether it is or not, I would like to thank them for bringing it to Synod today. I welcome the paper GS 1928A as it raises points which many of us have been thinking quietly to ourselves for a long time. Now is the time for us to stop thinking quietly to ourselves and to move to a proper national debate or conversation on the nature and structure of the Church of England.

There is a real and pressing need for this debate and I am afraid I do not buy the counter-argument in paragraph 7 of GS 1928C that, “It seems very soon to be considering a national debate”. I very much hope that Synod will accept today’s motion; but, more than that, much more than that, I hope that the national debate that follows can be closely interlinked with the programme of Reform and Renewal that we spent so much time discussing in February.

Reform, renewal and the nature and structure of the Church need to be considered in the round. I see these not as two debates or two discussions but as one. Mr Chairman, we are often reminded in Synod that the Church is not a business and I am the first to accept this, but I also accept that the Church can learn a great deal from business. I have spent many years in business and I was fortunate enough to spend most of that time with the fastest growing firm in the UK, the only firm on the FTSE list to grow by 40% per annum for eight consecutive years. When I joined there were 400 staff and when I left 30 years later there were 40,000.

I know what being part of a growing organisation feels like. It feels really good and we can and must learn from that. Church decline need not be inevitable. As I said to the St Albans Diocesan Synod a few weeks ago, put bluntly, I do not wish to be part of a Church in decline, I do not wish to see the Church decline, but if we are being realistic about Reform and Renewal then we must examine our structures. In a theologically informed way, we must find the optimum shape and structures for our Church. It may take a while for the theologians to do their research, but if they do not get started we will not ever have their input to the informed debate and we need this debate. Just as we need to get

cracking with Reform and Renewal, we need to get cracking with this too. I support the motion and ask Synod to do the same.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath and Wells):* I want to give Synod a few images to think about, restructuring in particular. Organisational change, I think, requires us to understand whether or not we have a single organisation or whether we have a multiple organisation, first of all. The first question that I would like people to think about is would the same organisational change come about if we were to look at it from an administration point of view or from a theological point of view?

Maybe we need to restructure it for pastoral and missional reasons in a different way to the way we might need to restructure it for administration purposes. The efficiency on one might be a different thing. Let us not just think about the theological requirement for change but also perhaps the administrative needs for change and efficiency.

In one of his stories Douglas Adams talked about an accountant who is driving towards his office on a particular day and he sees his office, and he sees it lit up in bright lights and he hears major chord music coming from the tannoy and he realises it is a good day and that sales are going well because what has actually happened is that organisation had plumbed into their central systems things that would allow the staff to know the feel-good factor. Does our organisation really make us thrilled with what we see when we see the Church?

In order for us to be able to do it well what we actually need to do is to look at relationships. We need to understand relational matters. In Bath and Wells, with our 'No-one alone' programme we made sure that we had local ministry groups which associated because they had relational connections. How can we do that? This is where I want the vision to come into it.

There are two jigsaw stories that I know. One was a family member who came very thrilled to say that he had actually finished a particular jigsaw in only 20 minutes and he was so chuffed because it said three to six years on the box. The other one is much closer to home. The other one is about an annoyed vicar. The reason why he was annoyed was it was Saturday afternoon, the match that he had been to see, and had therefore delayed his sermon writing, had not gone well, his thoughts were all over the place and he was trying to write his sermon. As he was trying to write his sermon, his son kept coming in and asking, "Daddy, Daddy, can you do this, can you do the other", so the father quite wisely said, "Here's a jigsaw, a map of the world, just go and do that in a quiet corner, please". Five minutes later he came back and he said, "Dad, I've finished it" and he thought, "This is fantastic, how can you finish a jigsaw of the world in five minutes", and he said to him, "How did you do that?" and he said, "Well, on the back of the map was a picture of a man and I just did that jigsaw instead". If you sort out the people, if you sort out their relationships, then you can start thinking about the organisation that you might need to support them.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Thank you for calling me, Chair. I want to support this motion. I am aware that there are more urgent parts of the Reform and Renewal proposals that need to be completed and I am aware that this may look to be a bit of theological rearrangement of deckchairs but theology is part of who we are. I have been

influenced and been grateful to the Revd Keith Elford's book *Creating a Future for the Church* where he emphasises that an organisation and, yes, in some senses the Church of England still is an organisation though I know that there are other ways of describing it, the Church as an organisation, like other organisations, needs to recognise who it is and plot its future in the light of that.

We are facing really quite critical, to use that phrase in its theological sense, challenges to our future. I am aware that we exist to preach the Gospel and that the Church of England may need an ecclesiology, a theology that is more complicated than just the best boat to fish from. We are an organisation that has so much to offer the land and so we need to face up to the challenges we face with a theologically informed hope.

I am encouraged by the Bishop of Chelmsford's language of sentinel, of being someone who is on the lookout on the far horizon. There are many who will encourage us and sing "Always look on the bright side of life", but all our hope on God is founded. So we need to face up to the challenges to us as an organisation, challenges like the apparent secularisation going on around us. As the Census figures show, the numbers recording themselves as Christians, the numbers recording themselves as Anglicans particularly among the young are going down, our ageing demographic leading to a retirement of clergy which will not be compensated for by the 50% increases that are envisioned in Reform and Renewal and leading to more people dying than are joining the Church.

So as we look at the far horizon we need to recognise that our future Church needs to be organised on the basis of the facts and if the facts are as they look to be at the moment that future Church will have fewer clergy and people generally, both clergy and the laity, and of course we are all part of the laity, there are going to be fewer of us quite possibly.

Andreas Whittam Smith spoke to the July 2012 Synod of the drastic reduction in numbers that are projected by 2030, so we need to be looking ahead with a theologically informed perspective not just five years to 2020 but beyond. The University of East Anglia, near where I am based, is doing a 15 year vision process. We need to be that long-term and beyond. We are the Church, do we not think in centuries. We may well need having fewer people, fewer senior clergy, we may need fewer training institutions and the like, we may need to deal with a fall in financial and human resources in the future, all huge challenges to us as an organisation. We may still need to maintain all of our buildings and put some new ones in new conurbations and places where people live. You cannot stretch the resources ever thinner. You may remember the story of the three engine plane flying over the ocean and the tannoy opens up, "Due to a failure of one of our engines we will be one hour slower arriving", and then the tannoy comes up again, "Due to the failure of another of our engines, we are going to be three hours slower in arriving" and someone is heard saying, "If we lose any more engines we'll be up here all night". We cannot stretch things ever thinner and maintain our future as an organisation.

The long time taken, quite properly, for the reorganisation of the Diocese of West Yorkshire shows that we need to be preparing the ground now given how slow it is to turn around the tanker. We do not want that tanker to be the *Titanic*, we do not want to be just reorganising the deckchairs, but we need to be making a theological assessment of the possible futures. We need to listen to the warnings. We need to be aware that the Bible envisages futures for the Church that are not always about growth. If you look to

Revelation, if you look to the epistles, the time comes when there is persecution, tribulation and people do not want to hear the Good News. We need to be organising in the light of these possible futures if we want to be a responsible Synod. I support this motion.

*Mr Ian Fletcher (Leeds):* Despite coming from Bradford, I want to support this motion from Wakefield. We do agree occasionally on things. What we are wanting is a Church fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and this motion is about our mission.

I do not see it as being about West Yorkshire and the Dales particularly but, of course, as the previous speaker said, the time that it takes to get something into place is far greater than we would wish. We need to plan ahead. Mission happens in our parishes. I think in many ways this motion is about what is a diocese. Does it actually help our mission? How do we define it? We might think we know the answer to that but different people see it differently. Is the diocese the bishop? Is the diocese the diocesan office? Is the diocese somewhere in between, a combination of the mission that it enables within the parishes and somehow these other things that come into it? How far do we hang things too much on the bishop? How much do we say, “Well, the bishop will do that” and he cannot do it, he cannot do it all. In West Yorkshire and the Dales we found the need for another bishop to take over the Leeds area because the scheme called for our diocesan bishop to do both. That was never, ever going to be possible, one man could not do both, no matter who he was.

It is about how do we release mission but it is also about being financially sustainable I would suggest and this is where Tim Hind was coming from in his speech earlier on. How do we take those economies of scale? How does an area bishop scheme work? We have had area bishop schemes for years. Are folks saying that under that there should effectively be a diocesan system that enables the area bishop? Surely the area bishops should be out there doing the work and helping and doing away with some of those boundaries. The Archbishop of York gave us a demonstration last night, I think, of how some cogs worked when they are either overlaid or underlaid or something, and he understood what he was talking about – I think – somebody said to me that he did anyway so perhaps he did.

It is about how do we take things forward, what is best in terms of organisation for our Church of England, because that is what we all want and we need to be looking at that, planning for it and talking about what is going on and that means a combination, I would suggest, of theology and also of good business sense. Thank you.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I welcome the motion from the Diocese of Wakefield, not because of the charged issue of episcopal distribution but because it echoes an aim that I have pursued for 15 years. At the end of point 2 in GS 1928A it refers to: “It may be we should be looking for a more regionally shared administration and support”. 14 years ago, I wrote a report entitled *One Body, Many Parts* analysing the extent of administrative duplication throughout the Church which suggested that sums in excess of £15 million per annum could be saved. It also drew attention to the potential release of time spent on administration at all levels – episcopal, clerical and lay – which would be made available to focus on mission and ministry as we have just been hearing. Like many



reports written for the Church of England, mine was shelved in the 'Too difficult' box after a brief appearance at the House of Bishops' Standing Committee.

I have come to realise that while the Dioceses Commission can make some progress in "promoting joint diocesan working across boundaries", which is point 8 in GS 1928C, the key problem is with the fiefdom characteristic of diocesan organisation, the clinging on to administration by those responsible for ministry and mission leadership. You need perceptive and firm direction from a diocesan bishop working with his or her broadly minded diocesan secretary in order to cede administration into a more productive structure by joint working alone.

The only way we can support such direction from General Synod is by including an item in our budget debate which reviews the aggregate expenditure at diocesan church houses across the Church of England. Only then will we be able to see annually the real opportunities to release funds and energy for mission across the Church of England.

My paper identified deaneries and regions as the big opportunity areas for streamlining administration. Others will have other ideas, such as more use of centralised administration. The key point is that we need a driver for change. No decentralised commercial organisation would use such an inefficient system of administration, so let us support this motion in order to get a new determination to streamline our administration. Thank you.

*Revd Preb David Houlding (London):* I am grateful to Mary Judkins from the diocese for bringing us this motion because I think it ties in very well with where we are and in the whole programme of Reform and Renewal. I want to take a little bit further some of the arguments that we have just heard from Dr Richmond. When we ask questions like "Is the diocese the bishop?" we may well also want to ask the question, "Is the General Synod the Church of England?" If we look round at some of our rather elaborate decoration that we seem to have gained this year you might be mistaken for thinking that it is, but of course we all know that the Church of England is at its very best locally, it is where we experience the church above all in the local church, in our ministry to schools, hospitals and chaplaincies.

When I was first elected to Synod 20 years ago I remember wearing a black gown in those days outside Westminster Abbey and feeling somehow I had arrived. I was very proud of being elected to General Synod. Yet as time moves on I am increasingly worried about the way we do our business. We put ourselves into whatever corner it is and we go into battle and we fight the issue and the majority wins. I wonder really whether this body is fit for purpose in the way in which it was set up all those years ago when Michael Ramsey and Eric Kemp undergirded the work that they did theologically by bridging the Convocations and the Church Assembly.

I think the time has come to actually examine again about how we go about our business. Yes, we need a body like this to tackle legislation, of course we do, and the legislative programme of the Synod is vital, but when it comes to matters of doctrine, faith and order, ethical and moral issues, do we really see ourselves at our best. Of course, I am thinking of the great debate that we have had going on for the last 13 or 14 years coming to its conclusion in 2012. It was not until doing the Lambeth Walk, going down Porters Way,

that we actually learnt to listen to one another and do our business differently and, surprise, surprise, we came to a settlement and we all agreed it and now it is a fact that women can be bishops in the Church of England. We all feel affirmed by that because everybody has a place and, going back to that amendment that I put to Synod back in 2006, no matter what your position on the ordination of women may be, we are all loyal Anglicans. I think we need a much deeper examination of the way the Synod works, the way it functions, all its various committees, how it all comes together, underpinned by a good theological basis in order to move the mission of the Church forward.

I have sat on the Archbishops' Council; I have seen how we fight issues there. I have chaired the Appointments Committee and however much I tried to persuade people to leave their baggage at the door, we still managed to fight our own little corners around the table in making appointments to serve the Church of England. We are very much caught up in a parliamentary model and I think the time has come to break away from that. As we look forward to the next Synod, we can see that there are many controversial issues facing us and we are not in the business of excluding one another.

My final comment to Synod, if I may, Mr Chairman, is to respond to my friend, Alison Ruoff last night when she made her confession to us that she was in fact related to Pope Julius III. She is the niece 12 times removed. I always knew that she was a good Catholic girl and all of us – all of us – are good Catholics, good Catholic Christians as well. Thank you.

*Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh (Universities):* I welcome the motion. I particularly welcome Mrs Judkins' request for theologically informed national debate. I very, very much welcome the notion that our theology can never be instrumental or incidental in what we are doing; it is foundational because it is about how we, as the Church, relate to God and relate to God's world. That will be some of what we are talking about tomorrow.

I welcome the comments asking about what is a diocese but these are theological questions, not solely organisational ones. Our use of organisation, our use of resources, is ethical, it is theological, it is about stewardship, but they are not solely organisational questions, they are questions about how different bits of the Church relate to one another. In some of what Prebendary Houlding just said he outlined those beautifully I thought. I am sorry, I am rewriting my speech as I am talking.

I do have one slight hesitation about this motion and it is this. Yesterday we had an excellent and profound debate about the FAOC report on Senior Leadership and we are delighted that there will be further discussion of that in the next quinquennium. We discussed naming of dioceses. We are discussing the various parts of the Reform and Renewal agenda. How many different bits of looking at nature and structure do we need going at any one time? We want to do this theologically, we want to do it sensibly, we want to think about how we relate to one another, how we relate to the society we serve, but we cannot do it if we are doing it in all different places simultaneously. Please, please, can we think sensibly about how we have this debate going forward rather than just welcoming what is a really excellent Diocesan Synod Motion. Thank you.

*Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry):* I had somebody write to me the other day and they called me the Dennis Skinner of General Synod and then at the bar last night somebody said I was the Tom Sutcliffe of General Synod, so I will try not to be that radical.

What I love about this motion is it offers the opportunity to have a conversation that is neither about sex nor gender, which is quite unique in this Synod. For me, there are a number of reforms that we need as a Church going forward. The model we have got now is one that was designed some time ago. Some of the examples are our aspiration to have a more diverse group of bishops. The Crown Nominations Commission, a wonderful group as you are aware, Chair, as you are a member, are a brilliant group but in order to achieve that diversity we need that group to be more diverse. As it has been said, members of that group are elected to General Synod, as with the Church Commissioners, but often they miss a sort of element of diversity.

I think maybe we need to take some practical steps to increase diversity. In regard to dioceses, do we really need so many suffragan bishops? There are lots of questions that I could list all day. I will not start on the laity because it looks like there are more of them here than clergy, so I will focus on clergy and bishops. There are lots of opportunities to have conversations about how we can serve God. I would argue, looking at things theologically, it is actually about seeking God's call for us as a Church.

Finally, and this is a very important issue, the Archbishop of Canterbury has been caught out on a few occasions – I do not mean it to sound like that – in the sense the Archbishop of Canterbury supported a living wage, rightly so, and so did we, but then you get other parts of the organisation not necessarily taking that up and so it becomes very complicated. The public see us as the Church of God and we are the Church of God, one body in Christ, but there are lots of organisations and Church institutions, it all becomes very complicated. I wonder if we can look at simplification and both achieving efficiency and a change in the organisation, just making it a little bit more simple, a little bit more cost-effective and also a little bit more inclusive and approachable. Thank you, Chair.

*The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs):* For those who do not know, the Huddersfield area is basically the western half of the former Diocese of Wakefield, so I declare an interest.

Many thanks to Mary for her introduction. I think she has touched on and raised some really important issues for us. It is very difficult to resist the idea of doing good theology but I think we do need to understand that this particular question does have its origins, of course, in the situation regarding the creation of the new diocese and if you look at the date on which the motion was originally passed it is almost three years ago now. That does lead to some questions about how do we do theology. We do not always do it before we do something, it is also part of a dynamic process of interaction between our practice and our reflection. The experience of the new diocese is going to be part of that reflection and Joyce Jones said something about that a few moments ago.

I do want to endorse what Hannah Cleugh said just two speeches ago, taking us back to that excellent debate we had, led by Fr Killwick, which introduced the FAOC report to us. It also helped us to set the whole context of the Green Report in a different light. I think

it helped us to move forward very constructively and helpfully. It focused us on the whole idea of episcopate, of the role of bishop, and in terms of Church tradition and theology it is very difficult to talk about diocesan organisation unless we are talking about what we mean by episcopate, oversight in its broadest sense. I think Hannah was absolutely right, there is a great danger of duplication and confusion if we go forward with this motion.

I hope, on the other hand, that those who are taking forward the debate and the discussion arising out of that FAOC report will take note of today's debate, will take on board some of the important questions that have been raised, but do that rather than initiate a new one. Important issues raised today but surely Hannah is absolutely right, there is a great danger of confusion if we try and run two tracks on this. Let us stick with the one and I am sure those framing that debate will pick up on some of the important points that have been made today but, regretfully, I will resist the motion standing before us. Thank you.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Chairman, one of the former contributors to our debates whose contributions I most miss is Archimandrite Ephrem Lash, from whom I learnt something every time he spoke. Members may recall that several years ago he spoke in a debate on a similar subject to this and told us about the practice of *episcopate* in the Orthodox Church in Greece. I think he said something to the effect that every large village has its own bishop. He reminded us that that was much closer to the practice of the Church in the early centuries when each significant town had a bishop who oversaw both the church that he led directly and the other churches in the town and the surrounding villages.

In supporting this motion I want to ask that in the national debate for which it calls, serious consideration should be given to a new but in fact very old model of episcopacy, with a bishop in every deanery who is also incumbent of a minster church. Existing dioceses could then be combined with perhaps half or even a third of the current number and a whole tier of suffragan bishops gradually replaced by deanery bishops who would also replace rural and area deans. Such a model would provide much more real and local *episcopate*, much closer to the practice of the early Church, while enabling the economies of scale, particularly of administration, of which Gavin Oldham spoke, which is offered by a combination of dioceses such as has happened in West Yorkshire.

Just to be clear, what I have in mind is that such deanery bishops would also be the incumbent of a major church in the deanery and so would have that direct church leadership as well as the episcopacy of other churches.

I just want to point out in response to the Bishop of Huddersfield that this motion asks the House of Bishops to facilitate a theologically informed national debate. It does not actually ask for a separate thing. I would have thought we could pass this motion and the House of Bishops could facilitate that debate by giving some further direction and instructions to the other groups that are working, particularly on the FAOC work and so on. I do not think we are asking for yet another plate to be spun with all the others. What we are asking for is an enrichment of the work that others are already doing.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester):* I welcome the motion.

“He has shown his people the power of his works in giving them the inheritance of the

nations. The works of his hands are faithful and just. All his precepts are trustworthy. They are established forever and ever, to be performed with faithfulness and uprightness. He sent redemption to his people. He has commanded his Covenant forever; holy and awesome is his name.”

The great reformer, Martin Luther, once said: “No greater mischief can happen to a Christian people, than to have God’s word taken from them, or falsified, so that they no longer have it pure and clear. God grant we and our descendants be not witness to such a calamity.”

This nation needs the Church of England vibrant, progressive, as we have begun to see in many aspects with the great Church working and evangelism initiatives. We need to look very carefully at what the calling of our Church is in our nation today. What is the Kingdom of God and how do we do it as the Church of England? How does it get manifested? What does the reign of God look like and how are we to discern God working in and through these institutions, in and through these structures? What is the relationship between faith and public morality and policy? What should be the relationship between our great Church, our beautiful Church and her voice into our beloved nation? Is religious pluralism biblically compatible and a workable theology of state? Our blessed Church has something to say to the state on this. What does the future of the Church of England look like? Are Christians, we, within the Church of England, called to speak to culture, to transform culture? In short, what is the mission of God for this our Church and what part do we have to play today, in 2016 and way beyond and how are we going to do it? For how we do it here in Great Britain is watched by the rest of the world. It is watched by the Anglican Communion. It is watched way beyond the Anglican Communion. The world looks to us and our nation looks to us for a spiritual lead and, if there is a lack of clear vision in the public space, then indeed we expose our nation to a grave cultural and political crisis.

As Christians we can no longer ignore a growing chorus of voices from theology, philosophy and politics sounding the alarm concerning the growing threat in our nation and indeed in Western civilisation to religious liberty, the rule of law, the freedom of the Church and the survival of the family and hence civilisation as we have known it. The threat is engendered by a growing statist vision of society increasingly committed to a hard, secularist ideology that is now permeating every aspect of our national social order. There can be no doubt, however, that we are witness to this; calamity in our time, in our families and our schools. We have so many schools that we can reverse this in the Church of England if we are bold and certain of our mission, in the corridors of power (and we have access to the corridors of power) and even in our churches themselves. Any missiological analysis of the nation by us that does not address this desperate reality is a compromise. It is part of the reason why we are losing people in our churches. This week in Parliament we have a further move towards assisted suicide. That will be debated on 11 September of this year. This month we have street preacher cases in court for preaching the Word of God on the streets. We have teachers losing their jobs for loving Jesus Christ; social workers losing their jobs and magistrates losing their jobs for loving Jesus Christ.

The Church of England has a place in every village and every town in this, our nation. We are actually the hope of the nation. The people of God in his nation are the hope of

the nation. Jesus Christ is the hope. He is the hope not just for individuals. The Gospel is not just about the redemption of individuals but about the redemption of families, about the redemption of communities and about the redemption of this, our beloved nation.

So what does the Church look like? How are we going to do it? How are we going to get this message out that Jesus Christ, our blessed, beautiful, magnificent Saviour, is indeed the same yesterday, today and forever, and we shall proclaim him in this place and we shall proclaim him in our communities, and just how to do that to a lost and hurting and broken nation is the thing that we need to critically address.

*Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford):* Point of order. Under Standing Order 32, do you accept a motion “that the Synod do pass to the next business”?

*The Chair:* Canon Cotton has moved the procedural motion “that the Synod do pass to the next business”. If that motion is carried, then the Leeds Diocesan Motion lapses and the matter cannot be brought back for debate in the lifetime of this Synod – I can only tell you what the Standing Order says – except with the permission of the Business Committee and with the general consent of the Synod. Canon Cotton, will you now speak to your motion. I am varying the speech limit to two minutes for the debate on this procedural motion.

*Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford):* With many others, I am so pleased that this motion was brought. What I have struggled to identify if we pass this motion is what would be added that cannot be picked up elsewhere. People will already have noted how much the Diocese Commission can do and there has been a lot of reference to the Reform and Renewal programme. Patrick Richmond named a number of specific issues that he thought would be triggered by the passing of this motion, all of which quite specifically already come under Reform and Renewal.

The one thing that has been asked for, which was equally and quite explicitly not taken up at the beginning of the Reform and Renewal programme, was David Houlding’s suggestion that now is the right time to review the workings of General Synod. Even in the motion itself it speaks about equipping parishes, about serving people, and all of those are absolutely integral to Reform and Renewal. Even more than that, the Reform and Renewal programme will not work unless there is not a debate but a national conversation that involves people in parishes and deaneries and dioceses and chaplaincies and chattering amongst their neighbours. Everything that has been asked for is precisely what is already on the go. The Bishop of Huddersfield referred to what I know as the “theological reflection cycle”; that things do not start with theology but we think and reflect and act and evaluate and go round and round and round, and that is how it should be. Reform and Renewal is already on the way. Everything that is being asked for by this motion can be part of that. Indeed, Mary Judkins said at the beginning that the whole mission requires the whole Church and the *laos* is central to that. There should be, using those words, Mary, no division; and it is for that reason that I want to capture the positive spirit that has been stated so far and not have a division. Therefore, I propose this procedural motion that we can be united and move on now to the next business.

*The Chair:* I now call on Mrs Judkins as the mover of the main motion to speak. She also has two minutes. After I have heard her, I will then decide in my discretion under

Standing Order 32 whether to hear any more speeches on the procedural motion.

*Mrs Mary Judkins (Leeds):* It has taken us three years to get to this stage and I have to thank the Business Committee, and especially Sue Booy, for putting up with my nagging. We have got the Sunday afternoon slot of national interest. I am very grateful to everybody who spoke and yes, it is the whole people and so I would not anticipate a division in a vote on something that is so major, that is about theology; the basis of our faith. We are asking that the House of Bishops facilitate. They told us they were theologians. It is in their remit, I would have thought, to help us do this. Clive Scowen was absolutely right: we are asking for them to help enrich a joined-up thinking theological debate of three strands. It is not either/or. It is Renewal and Reform, which has only just started going to the dioceses. It has not got to the parishes yet. It is the FAOC, which will go out for debate, and this one on theology. I have a theology degree. I have not been asked for my opinion yet. This is asking for a national theological debate and even the people in my Bible study group are saying we need that. We need to be able to express that in our parishes, not just in bishops' councils or the hierarchy of the Church, as the people in the pews see it. So I am hoping that you will not turn this down and that you will vote overwhelming for this motion. It is, as I said, a life and death issue.

*The Chair:* I propose to allow two speeches in the debate on the procedural motion, so I would invite, first of all, anyone who intends to speak in favour of the procedural motion to stand.

*Revd Canon Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* I am very conflicted about this debate. I think we already have these discussions. Whenever there is a vacancy in a diocese, certainly in Liverpool, one of the things that we do is ask everyone in the parishes and the deanery synods to tell us what they would like the next bishop to do and how they think they could take forward the mission of the Church. That led to lots and lots of good debates right throughout the diocese. Is this a motion really about episcopacy or not? If it is, then asking the House of Bishops to facilitate a discussion on that to me seems a bit odd. Let me tell you that our job as Christians is to make disciples and not to build the Church. If we make disciples, the Church will be built. If we try to build the Church, we will not necessarily get disciples. If you want a discussion as to how to take forward the mission of God in this country then go back to your parishes and make disciples.

Can I just remind you of one other debate that we have had this Synod that has not been mentioned yet, the *Common Vision* yesterday. That includes other churches and it asks us to say what is the Spirit saying to us today. So please support this procedural motion. We have had a debate and I do not want to have to vote against another one and that is why I want to support Robert Cotton.

*The Chair:* Would anyone wishing to speak against the procedural motion please stand.  
*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I too am mightily conflicted on this situation because, clearly, a lot has happened since the original Diocesan Synod Motion was passed and we would be stupid not to recognise that. The reason I would like the debate to continue a bit longer is so that someone from a senior position might say in words of one syllable that these wider issues that Mary has talked about will be definitely included in the existing pieces of work that we have already started, the Reform and Renewal programme and the matters about senior leadership which we talked about yesterday. If there was a clear

commitment that, yes, we will pick up some of these issues then I think we would know where we stood and it would not matter so much if the motion was lost because the commitment had been given, so let us hear that commitment that these issues will be taken forward as part of Reform and Renewal.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* Point of order. In taking the vote on the procedural motion, could we please vote by Houses?

*The Chair:* There is no provision for a division by Houses on a procedural motion, Mr Oldham. I am now about to put to the Synod the motion ‘That the Synod do pass to the next business’. May I remind you that if the procedural motion is carried the Leeds Diocesan Synod Motion lapses, as I have explained. If the procedural motion is lost the debate on the main motion will resume. I now put to the Synod the motion:

‘That the Synod do pass to the next business’.

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

*The Chair:* The procedural motion having been carried, this brings to an end this item of business and we shall move in a few moments to Item 14, a presentation by the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker) took the chair at 4.50 pm*

## **Presentation by the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns**

*The Chair:* Synod, we now move on to Item 14, a presentation by the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns. This is a presentation under Standing Order 97. Synod will recall that we debated the *Unfinished Business* report in July 2011. As a result of that, we called upon CMEAC to report back to this Synod, and so the Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell, the Bishop of Chelmsford, is going to give a presentation. That will include a short film and that will update Synod members on the progress made over the last four years in encouraging MEA participation in the work and ministry of the Church. Following this presentation there will then be an opportunity for Synod members to ask questions. I call upon the Bishop of Chelmsford to speak.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Synod, first of all, I would like to thank the Business Committee for giving us time for this debate. I think I also need to thank Robert Cotton for helping bring the previous debate to a close slightly earlier than we thought which gives this item a bit more time than we feared that it might have.

In 2013, the Diocese of Chelmsford appointed three new archdeacons. Each of them was a very able and experienced parish priest. However, to my surprise, two of the appointments attracted huge national interest. I got lots of letters thanking me for my boldness of vision. When they were installed in the cathedral, people travelled from all over the country to attend. Why? One of these archdeacons was a black woman and one of them was an Asian man. Without particularly realising it, overnight the Diocese of



Chelmsford had doubled – yes, doubled – the number of black and minority ethnic bishops and archdeacons in the Church of England. This is a shocking statistic and illustrates in very painful and deeply embarrassing detail why this presentation this afternoon is so critically important for our Church, though, with apologies to those who actually have given us a bit more time as it turns out, if you want another illustration you might ask yourself why this presentation is tucked away on a Sunday afternoon where I think many are watching Federer and Djokovic play it out, and also why we have not known until we have got up here exactly how much time we have got.

The Report, which I hope you have read, says this: “Our multicultural society should find its expression in a multicultural church.” What is confounding is that we are still unable to reflect this reality. Quite simply, the leadership and ministry of the Church of England no longer looks like or adequately reflects the diversity and creativity of the communities it serves. This should be a huge concern and directly affects our credibility as a national Church and our mission. Until we look like the community we serve, not only are we denying ourselves of talent and insight, we are making the work of evangelism and service so much harder. That is why this work of inclusion and representation is unfinished business. We may not be guilty of racism, though let us be clear and honest with ourselves, there is still racism in our Church, but I believe it is high time we awoke out of sleep and realised that we are guilty of complacency and neglect, which is why the objectives at the end of this report are so important.

We need first of all to learn about unconscious bias. We have seen examples of it from this platform in this Synod, though perhaps some of us did not notice it. We need to take affirmative action if we are to see our Church leadership and ministry looking like the community we serve. I have been doing a lot of teaching about prayer in the Chelmsford Diocese recently. When I teach about prayer I say this to people: “Stop praying for peace in the world; stop praying for an end to hunger; stop praying about the environment, unless you are prepared to be an answer to your own prayer, unless you are prepared to have your mind and heart and will changed and unless you are prepared to face up to the unconscious bias, the lack of affirmation inside you, if you are not prepared to do that, stop praying about it.”

That is the stage that we have reached as a Church. We have been talking about this for 30 years but actually the statistics tell us that we are going backwards. I do not believe we are going backwards because we are all racists; we are going backwards because we have not faced up to the affirmative action and the changes that we must make in order to make this happen. We rejoice that we now have women bishops in our Church, and look at the progress we have made in an incredibly short period of time, but there has been no bar on black and minority ethnic people coming into leadership and ministry in the Church and yet there are fewer now than there were 20 or 25 years ago. We should be very, very concerned about it.

If you want to change it, then I will tell you where to begin. Begin with your PCC, begin with your youth group leaders, begin with your deanery synod representatives. Look at what your Church leadership looks like at every level and then take the necessary affirmative actions that this Report identifies. Then let us, please, come back to the next Synod and the next quinquennium and have another debate about this so that we can begin to monitor the progress we have to make.

Appointing two able priests who happen to be black to senior posts in the Church of England should not be news. While it is, the issues that we discuss this afternoon are unfinished business.

*The Chair:* With a prayer that the technology works, I think we are now moving on to the video.

*(Video shown)*

*The Chair:* Synod, we are coming now to a time for questions and answers. Supporting the Bishop of Chelmsford in responding to questions from the floor will be Fr Paul Cartwright, who you saw in the video there; Canon Linda Ali; also, the Venerable Danny Kajumba, who is the Chair of CMEAC; and Elizabeth Henry, who is our national officer. It is questions - please make them questions - and the team behind have promised they will make the answers short as long as the questions are. Will those who wish to ask the questions please stand.

*Miss Vasantha Gnanadoss (Southwark):* Mr Chairman, paragraph 29 of GS Misc 1108 speaks of, "Purposeful action to address the existing state of affairs", is it not unrealistic to expect any purposeful action unless the College of Bishops is prepared to face up to the existing state of affairs and is able to change its mindset? The present mindset was made abundantly clear by the attitude to two photographs cited in the House of Lords' debate on fast-tracking women bishops into the House of Lords. The first photograph, the Archbishop of Canterbury said that the Bishops of Burnley and Stockport giving each other a hug was worth a thousand words. Baroness Berridge argued that the photograph of the bishops taken at that consecration highlighted the lack of racial diversity in the College of Bishops. I would like to know, the first photograph is evidence of effective action on one issue, is not the second photograph evidence of 30 years without effective action on another issue?

*Mr Elliot Swatridge (Church of England Youth Council):* Many in our society have jumped on the popular bandwagon of demonising or scapegoating people who have immigrated, demanding they receive less favourable treatment than so-called native Britons. It would be wishful thinking to suggest that the Church has been immune from such rhetoric which has arguably startling parallels with racism. Is it possible that this cultural prejudice towards immigration hinders people from other cultures from feeling welcome in our ministry and how can the Church promote genuine equality for all by fighting for legal protection, dignity and compassion for immigrants?

*Revd Canon Steven Saxby (Chelmsford):* My question in relation to point 3 of the recommendations is whether CMEAC think it might be helpful if we were to try to set a percentage of minority ethnic candidates to be within the talent pool at any one time, and whether there could be something a bit more systematic than simply the nomination of the diocesan bishops? Perhaps if we had a percentage, what would they think a good percentage would be? Could there be a mechanism to ensure that extra candidates could be put into the pool on top of those that are nominated by the diocesan bishops?

*The Chair:* Thank you. Over to the panel.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* We are going to take different questions, each of us, so I am taking Vasantha's question about diversity in the College of Bishops and the two photographs that she referred to which do, indeed, speak volumes about where we are as a Church. I think the question you are asking, Vasantha, is: Is purposeful action unrealistic? Well, I am bound to say I think the answer is no, though I recognise we have to change the narrative.

If we look back over the last 30 years we have to recognise our failure in this respect. Therefore, I think we also have to recognise the fact that there must be a lot of people in our Church who are losing confidence in the leadership of the Church to make the changes that need to be made. I do not want to kind of pull any punches, we are not in a good place on this. We are not in a good place on this. It is not about sitting here feeling guilty about it. As I say, we have just got to wake up to the fact that we need to do things about it and there are things that can be done, but in order to change the College of Bishops we have to change so many other things as well.

As I said briefly in my opening remarks, we have to begin with our DDOs, we have to begin with our PCCs and we have to begin with our deanery synods. We have to take action in those places to encourage and enable people to be part of the life of the Church and then, out of that, we will then get a different sort of leadership. I think purposeful action is realistic if we take it but, hitherto, I think the honest report is that we have not really done that. I am about to stray onto Steven Saxby's question as well but I think I will let somebody else take that.

*Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds):* I am going to take Elliot's question about cultural prejudice. The great thing about the Church of England is that we have a presence in every community and we have got to remember that those who come and worship daily and weekly with us, monthly or even yearly, actually are made up from the community that we serve. With that, all the complexities are going to come with regards bias, with regards conscious and unconscious bias.

We were just speaking at the back about the implications regarding cultural prejudice. We thought about speaking out for those who are seeking safe passage to these shores and safe homes in these shores. The Church is really good at doing that but we do not actually publicise it. The other thing is, of course, we have to look at the way that the Church is seen. If you think back to "*Little Britain*" and that horrible sketch with the Women's Institute and the cooking up of different foods by people from different backgrounds, that is how people see the Church. We have got to break that mould. We have got to challenge those stereotypes. I think it is important that we speak out for those who do not have a voice and also start to teach in our own places of worship and in schools to break down that bias. Thank you.

*Dr Elizabeth Henry:* I think the question was with regards to setting targets. The 'Turning up the Volume' group set a target for increasing senior clergy in the Church of England, and the target was to double in ten years. Between the Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons and Deans of Cathedral that would have been increasing to ten the total number of minority ethnic senior leadership. I think targets is not quite enough, what we really need is affirmative action and we already have a precedent set within this Church of affirmative action. We took affirmative action in moving along the women's agenda –

quite rightly – and we should be taking affirmative action in moving along this agenda. This is the way that we are really going to have the inclusion and representation in our Church that we really should have.

*The Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (Rt Revd Robert Innes):* Before I was made Bishop I was, for nine years, responsible for the Pro-Cathedral of Holy Trinity, Brussels. We were a community of some 40 nationalities with 35% Africans. We were a rainbow community and when that community worked well it was a foretaste of the Kingdom of Heaven with people from every tribe and nation and nationality gathered around the throne of God.

But to make it work required affirmative action. It required us to encourage a young Indian man to be churchwarden and two young African men to become members of the church council, even though they defeated an older white man who has never quite forgiven me for that. In building up our Church life I was enormously helped by CMEAC and particularly by Danny Kajumba, and I am wondering whether CMEAC feels that it has all the resources and encouragement that it needs or whether the Church can be doing anything to build your resources so that you can help us further?

As a white man, I was well aware that understanding the black community and its difficulties and sometimes tensions was sometimes just too difficult for me and I needed expert consultancy. I wonder whether CMEAC feel you have got all the resources you need to help us to become the rainbow community that we would long in our best moments to be?

*Dr Elaine Storkey (Ely):* My question really concerns theological education because there is a thing in the recommendations there that we work with theological institutes and educators. My question is: how far has this got and what resources do you have in order to actually penetrate the theological colleges, not only at the level of awareness amongst fellow ordinands of those colleges to the whole issue of cultural differences and ethnicity, but amongst the teachers too? If I had time I would tell you three horrible stories of my own experiences in theological college with an ethnic minority ordinand which would make your hair stand on end and the long 18 months of work trying to get that resolved properly without it hitting the headlines in the paper. What resources do we currently have and what resources do we need in order to implement these issues in our theological education training centres?

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* Would you agree with me that, in addition to reflecting the diversity of the society we minister to, that a major theological and missiological starting point for this issue is to demonstrate the reality that Paul argues throughout Ephesians 2 and 3 that at the cross of Christ, the divisions between races and genders has been overcome and one new humanity created, and if we believe the cross of Christ is central to our faith this is a vital way to demonstrate it?

*Ven Danny Kajumba (CMEAC):* I am answering to the question from my dear friend, Bishop Robert. One of the things that we should realise is that CMEAC does not have resources. The other thing is that we cannot do it alone. It is for that reason that we have come out with these recommendations, which are very very clear, which means that everybody takes part, that everybody must ensure in whatever area they are that there is increased representation, that there is expressed training for unconscious bias and that they take purposeful action. 30 years on as a priest I have seen regression and that

saddens me and makes me disappointed.

I think one of the things that I told Robert when we met – and by the way I was very surprised to get someone inviting me all way in Europe because they had recognised my talent and I shared with him that where I come from on the mainland nobody asks me for anything – I realised that he was in a good place. My challenge to each one of you is in the form of a question. When you look in the mirror, what do you see? Last year when we had a debate here, the Chair, Bishop Walker, said, “Pale, male and stale”, a very bad picture. Why do we continue to see this picture and what can we do about it?

I think the answer is in affirmative action in which, when you look in the mirror and consider the structures in which you are part, you feel saddened like I am and do something about it. I hope that when that work is done for each one of you, that when you look in the mirror again, you will see someone who looks like me because I too am Church of England.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell) (CMEAC):* I am answering Elaine Storkey’s question with regard to theological education. Two quick responses. I think the first thing that we could do very easily is to make sure that all of us involved in theological education or have an influence on it, which a great many of us do, could make sure that examples of black theology and black theologians are being used in our courses. I know this does happen in some places, but actually to a very, very limited extent in my experience.

There are so many good black theologians around with so much challenging and stimulating theology and that should become just part of the theological landscape that all of us are inhabiting in a multi-cultural world and Church like ours. Let me give a more specific example – because some of you might be wondering what does this phrase “affirmative action” or “purposeful action”, what does it actually mean – in the field of theological education. I am not at all suggesting – well, perhaps I am – that perhaps the Church of England should be more like the Chelmsford diocese, perhaps I am suggesting that, but it would have been one good reason for voting for the previous motion. We have a real issue about the inclusion of representation in our diocese which we are trying to do something about. An example of that would be in the deanery of Newham. In the last census we discovered that the deanery of Newham is probably the most multi-cultural place in Europe and, yet, the vocations coming out of there for all sorts of ministry were predominantly white. That is not what the church and the culture looks like, we weren’t getting the vocations. A priest in that deanery who is himself a significant theologian who has written about Pentecostalism and the Holy Spirit, Chigor Chike, came to me and basically said, “Bishop, if you just give me permission to do the theological training which you are doing in other ways through the diocese and other means, give me permission to do it in the Newham deanery, I will deliver you some vocations”. That was two years ago. Last October we had a service in the Cathedral for the authorization of evangelists that he had trained and we authorized 19 evangelists from the Newham deanery. 18 of them were black or Asian. I am absolutely sure that some of those 18, this is not the end of the road for them; having received some training and some affirmation, getting active in ministry, I anticipate ordaining some of them in another couple of years’ time.

The next question which we are facing, which CMEAC is looking at, is: What does that

say about the way we are training priests? How could we build on that Newham experiment to actually reshape some of our other? We look forward to either having some discussions with the ministry division about this or doing it on the sly and telling them later.

Would it not be better if as a Church we faced up to the need to do things differently, to make access and representation a real possibility for people who do feel sometimes very excluded from our traditional patterns of doing things? Thank you for the question though and it is one that I think should be a priority for CMEAC and one where we really need help. If you can help us, please would you let us know.

*Canon Linda Ali (York):* Thank you, Christopher Sugden, for your question. I would like to answer your question about how we overcome this by pointing you to page 2 of the report and seeing the growth areas of the Church overall. In the "White" column we have a negative figure of 17%. In all the others, even "White Other" (and I think that might be Polish people who have come to this country and are plentiful in the Catholic Church), the "Mixed" races, the "Asians" and the "Black", they have all been increased considerably, particularly the Asian group.

I would also like to say, following up a point made in the little film where the young priest said, "We need people to walk alongside", that is so important. I will demonstrate that by my own experience. As a new Church of England convert, I was baptized Presbyterian, do not blame me, I am very ecumenical. Anyway, I had just gone into a New Church in South London and, after a couple of years, the priest probably saw something in me. He said, "I'd like to nominate you to be churchwarden". I said, "Well, I've never done anything like that". He said, "But I'll help you along". When I was going up after being elected, a little clique of people who had always held office said, "What a farce?"

Now that is just about 20 years ago and I wonder where they are when I can say somebody else walked alongside me, the Archbishop of York, to have sent me a letter appointing me as lay Chair of the wonderful Cathedral we all worshiped in this morning. As lay Canon, people have to come alongside you because some of us just do not probably know the procedures or are probably too shy to make the moves and we need people to walk alongside us. Thank you.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* I am sure I was not the only one, as you started rolling the video, that went into a quiet sweat and starting doing a mental audit of your own church. How many did that? Were you doing that? We did not do too badly up until a point. I went through and I thought, yes, we have had, we have just lost him, a black organist; we have done the choir; we have done in the sanctuary; we have done the sidesmen; we have got the teaching in the children. We are doing quite well across the board. We are three willing priests. We are gay friendly. I think that looks okay so far. Then, I thought, what about our staff team? The problem with our staff team, which is the priests, the churchwardens, the Readers and pastoral assistants is that, first of all, unlike what we have just heard, we went for a long time without a churchwarden. The only qualification there was you had a pulse. We would have taken anybody. We have now filled it. There was not a prejudice about that but we just could not get what we needed.

More seriously is that, in our area, primarily its immigrant population were Sikh, so that

really was not too much of an issue; but, as now we have started to get more African families in, they are younger people. That is great, we love it but, coming in younger, the problem is that they are very busy.

The question is, are there not a lot of bars for the whole population which also affects minorities? It is the same problem. What I am saying is the ceiling there, the only ceiling we seem to have, is a ceiling against lots of other people. That is what I am really putting to you.

*Canon Dr Adanna Lazz Onyenobi (Manchester):* We have heard so much about the training or how you train priests, like the last speaker said, the Readers and all that, but what about getting the people? You have got to get the people before training them. That is one thing. I come from Nigeria originally and I believe Nigeria is a country that has so many Anglicans. When they do come here, eventually, most of them, after staying for some time, turn to black-led churches. I want to ask CMEAC or every one of us, why do you think they do that and what can we do about it? Thank you.

*Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark):* Lots of the questions I was going to ask have been asked by other people. Just in terms of what Adanna has said, one of the things I wanted to ask not just the panel but to ask Synod members was not to look in your mirror but to look around this chamber because when I chair I do and do you see me reflected in the chamber really well? One of the things we have to do is change the way we look. Adanna asked the question about why do people move away from perhaps Anglican churches. Sometimes perhaps it is the way we look that does not attract people.

My question was going to say great video, really positive, good news stories, how are we going to translate that into a mechanism that we can get more regular updates and that we can tell that story really well so that when people hear the story they do not do, as one Tweet I got last night asking me to change the message because it always sounds too challenging, but in a way that says, "This is a really positive part of our Church that we should be living and growing, and we should be all wanting to be a part of". How do we get that message over and how do we tell those stories more often?

*The Chair:* Thank you, Rosemarie, back to the panel.

*Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds):* Thank you, Martin, for your question. I am going to answer the question specifically. You said are there a lot of bars/barriers for people with busy lives, barriers that apply to everyone. The answer to your specific question is, yes, there are, but there are actually particular barriers which apply to groups from different backgrounds, from different diversity groups, be it disability, be it black minority ethnic people. We have got to try and remove the ones that do not need to be there.

Let me give you an example: unconscious bias. If you were interviewing someone for a job, would you have a totally plain playing field (I would hope) or actually would your unconscious bias that you have that maybe you are not aware of come into play? One of the greatest things that I learnt as a police diversity trainer many years ago was that actually we all have prejudice. It was hard for the police to say that because we do not like to admit that kind of thing. It is what you do with that which is really important. You will never get rid of prejudice, only through education, and it is a very, very long drawn-

out process, but actually if you can deal with the bias and be aware of it then you can put something in place to remove those bars which are particular to certain groups and that do not apply to other people at the same time.

*Ven Danny Kajumba (CMEAC):* I am answering the question to Adanna who asked the question about why do our young people go to other churches. Most of the young people that we have, especially who come from Africa and Asia and even the West Indies, are Anglicans, and they are brought up as Anglicans, but when they attend church they do not feel welcome and therefore most of them actually attend our morning services and in the evening they go to the Pentecostal church where they feel affirmed, accepted, welcomed, nurtured and that becomes so difficult for us to hold them.

I want to just give you an example of my children, Nathaniel and Abigail. Both of them actually wanted to become priests in the Church of England and I discouraged them because they asked me, "Where would we be in ten years if we became priests?" and I said, "You'll be nowhere". Today my son is on top of his field in physics, my daughter also in top of her field outside the Church. They would not have done that if they came to the Church of England. However, when they worshipped at HTB my daughter's talents were recognised in that setting and she was given leadership opportunities and now she is the Alpha International African Development Manager. Now had she become a curate in my diocese or your diocese, I am sure she would be nowhere to that level.

Therefore, really we must wake up and try to include young people, to invite them into places of leadership, to nurture them, to mentor them, to welcome them. It is all to do with hospitality. They are not going to be like me who sticks at it for 30 years; they are very different from our generation. Unless we wake up very quickly we are going to lose them.

*Dr Elizabeth Henry (CMEAC):* I think the question from Rosemarie was about measuring, monitoring and evaluation, so a couple of things on that. Page 3 of the report, paragraph 8: "We do not have data on the ethnic breakdown of General Synod boards, councils and committees". I will not read the rest of it, you can read that for yourself. I think it is very clear, for those of you who have read this, we do not have that breakdown because that data is not currently collected. More importantly, that data is not collected at diocesan level, so if dioceses are really interested in changing this ethnic landscape within the diocese, the very first thing you need to know is what do we currently look like and what are we currently doing and what do we need to change and how then can we change it. CMEAC is very, very willing to help in that. We are very willing for you to call upon us. We are very willing to come in and advise and support and aid those efforts.

We do actually have – it was launched today – the diversity survey which was launched today, 'Everyone Counts', and there is quite a lot of information in there; the fuller report is to follow. Again, I stress with you that if you do not know within your own diocese what your inclusion does or does not look like and/or what your representation does or does not look like, how then are you really, really going to address that inclusion and representation because you are starting off with a picture that is absolutely blank and you cannot fill it in. The monitoring and measurement really needs to start at diocesan level as well and you really need to be collecting that data so that you can make a full assessment of where the action that you need to take will be.



*The Chair:* Synod, I am going to try and squeeze one final round of three questions in before we do have to move on to other business.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I have been too long in the tooth on this matter. I love the passion of the Bishop of Chelmsford, I am glad we were separated at birth because I used to speak with the same passion.

Two questions really. First, this word “unconscious bias” is a more polite word. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry talked about “racism” and “institutional racism”. The moment you run away from it I do not think you are getting anywhere. Let me remind you what it said: “Racism: the advantaging or disadvantaging of someone on grounds of ethnicity, colour or culture”. So if you are black and you advantage a black person that is racism. If a white person does to another white person that is racism because of their colour. It is much tougher. Could you go back to that word, Sir?

Secondly, institutional racism, we detect it in processes. Has the time come to actually revisit some of the words of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry because they had a bite to them? These are the polite words that just evades it.

Finally, I am glad, Linda, you and others, all of you, have had experience, people encouraging you. In 1985 Paul Oestreicher, white man, Diocese of Southwark, Wilfred Wood said, “Go and encourage Sentamu to stand”, and I said, “But they won’t elect me” and he put out, “Please put Sentamu first before you vote for me” and I actually did top the poll.

Members of Synod, are you willing in your dioceses where there are ethnic Anglicans to find them and say, “I’m standing but give the election first to X”? If you cannot then you are playing games.

*Mrs Anne Martin (Guildford):* I live in a beautiful village 45 miles from London. There is no ethnic mix whatsoever, apart from two Muslim families who are integrated in the village and one of our congregation is half Chinese. What can we do? What can we do that is positive to help the situation when people feel that they are totally detached from it and live in an environment where there is not an ethnic mix?

*Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* I hear that the Committee recognises that there could be unconscious bias against the minority ethnicity of people who come to this country with so-called “white skins”. Will they be counted in the diversity counts? I am aware of the Dean of Guildford and the Archdeacon of Totnes but nobody else like me who comes from another country, I would say, where also there is a kind of unconscious bias that we might not recognise.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Panel, for the final time, over to you.

*Dr Elizabeth Henry (CMEAC):* First and foremost I would like to thank the Archbishop for raising the issue of racism. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry did indeed talk about institutional racism and the definition being: “It can be seen and/or detected in the policies, procedures, processes and practices of an organisation that serve to discriminate against people solely based on the colour of their skin”. I think that most people in here would say, “Oh well, we don’t do that. That doesn’t happen. It doesn’t happen in our church”.

Well, that is what I hear as I go around the country anyway, “It doesn’t happen in our church”, but clearly it does happen in our Church. I would like to add to what the Archbishop said, which is it is not only institutional racism because when we decide that it is institutional racism that is the issue, go back to the definition, “It can be seen or detected in the policies, procedures, processes and practices of an organisation”, so therefore it cannot be seen in the people.

The issue of racism is both institutional and personal and that is in our Church. I have to say that as I go around the country and I hear from people who are really struggling with some of these issues, which are very, very difficult issues for both people or for both groups, what I do hear is, “How do we deal with it?” I think one of the things that does not happen in our Church is it just is not challenged. We have talked a lot up here today about challenge, “It’s a challenge for the Church to do this” or “It’s a challenge for the Church to do that”, but there is another part of challenge that we need to be very conscious of and we ought to be doing, and that is where racism exists in our Church, be it institutional or personal and/or where unconscious bias exists in our Church, we should be challenging it and we should be calling it. I fear, sadly, that all too often we acquiesce, we do not have the strength to challenge or the knowhow of how do we appropriately and effectively challenge that.

What I would say to you is that unconscious bias, while it is not a replacement and it genuinely is not a nice way of saying racism, it is about recognising that yes we do all possess that but we are all responsible for that and one of the things that we should be doing is we should be challenging wherever we see it.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Briefly to add to that, before answering Anne Martin’s question, is training in unconscious bias, which is the third of the objectives in the report, is again another very easy practical step that we can all take in our dioceses and we can go back to our dioceses and make sure this sort of training is on the agenda for our senior staff team, for those involved in making appointments, in all kinds of ways this is a practical step which we can take.

Perhaps the little giveaway in your question was the “apart from” because in my experience in every community there is an “apart from”, sometimes large, sometimes less large. In all our communities there are other groups of people, sometimes excluded and alienated and put upon groups. I refer back to what Chris Sugden was saying earlier, that this is about the Kingdom of God and we are less the Church that God calls us to be when we are not the Church which represents all God’s people. If we are to fulfil our vocation to be the Church for the nation then we must work hard even if we look around and think we are in a church where this does not appear to be much of an issue for us. In some ways it is those churches where we need to do the work most importantly, to wake up the church to the theological and Gospel imperative of taking these issues of inclusion and representation seriously because they are about the Gospel of Jesus Christ. I could say a lot more but I will sit down.

*Ven Danny Kajumba (CMEAC):* I think there was a question about whether we are concerned about others. CMEAC is concerned about all those who are estranged, the stranger, those who are the other, who are on the edge of society. We do not

discriminate. I think there are a lot of people who are in this category who we should be looking after, and we do.

The other thing which I wanted to say is that MEAC really should be on the agenda of all diocesan boards and councils and bishops' staff meetings and I am glad that there are some dioceses that are starting to do exactly that. I think that will be one of the positive things that we can do. Yes, Christ stands at the altar with his arms outstretched and says, "Come as you are" and we welcome all those who are on the margins.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Synod. This has been a presentation under Standing Order 97 so we do not end with a vote, we certainly do not end with a vote that moves us on to next business, but we do end, I hope, with a determination to go back out into our places and to our people and to be the difference that we want there to be on this matter. Thank you very much for your attention to this debate.

THE CHAIR *Mr Geoffrey Tattersall QC (Manchester)* took the Chair at 5.49 pm

## **Introduction to Group Work and Bible Study on the Environment**

*The Chair:* This is Item 15, an Introduction to Group Work and Bible Study on the Environment. The script says to me that I just have to sit here and look beautiful. That is not going to be possible but Dr Paula Gooder is going to now address us and I will remain silent.

*Canon Dr Paula Gooder (Birmingham):* I do not know if this is entirely necessary but I am not standing again, so this is my very last chance to say Paula Gooder, Birmingham 249.

I would like to thank the Business Committee for inviting me to set out the Bible study work both in this presentation and then in the questions for discussion tomorrow morning. This is a subject very close to my heart and I have done quite a lot of work on it over the years, so it has been a huge pleasure for me to be able to think through the issues again and to introduce them to you.

What I hope from tomorrow morning is that you will have the opportunity, before we get into the detailed debate of the practicalities of the day, to do some deep theological thinking, some thinking about what we believe about our relationship with the environment. What I have done is been deliberately challenging. I was aware when I was writing the questions that I was bowling you some really quite challenging questions but I thought that you would be up for a little bit of a challenge, to scratch your head. The purpose of this evening is to get the juices flowing so that you can begin to hit the ground running when you start your questions tomorrow morning.

There is no obligation upon you whatsoever to agree with anything that I am going to say, but what I am hoping you will do is to begin to be stimulated in your own thoughts so that by the time you get to the groups tomorrow you are all ready to go with your thoughts and your reflections on the whole question of the environment and how we relate to the environment, particularly from the Bible.

Tomorrow, when we begin our exploration of the environment and its importance, we join with our ecumenical partners. Many of our ecumenical partners have already done significant work in this area and it is worth just reminding ourselves of some of them. I do not know if you know of the work of Bartholomew of Constantinople, the Ecumenical Patriarch. Since 1991, since he became the Ecumenical Patriarch, he has done such astoundingly good work on the environment and ecology that he is affectionately known as the “Green Patriarch”, which I think is a rather nice attribute.

You will also be aware, I am sure, of *Laudato Si'* that was brought out on 24 May by Pope Francis. Again, a very, very significant document on the environment and its importance and I commend it to you very highly indeed. Pope Francis has a knack apparently of bringing out accessible, inspiring and really very interesting documents and I would recommend this to you for your consideration.

We also join many of our non-conformist colleagues in thinking about the environment. Time for climate action is just one example of the many things that are going on. So you would think, would you not, that therefore within Christianity we have always been very positive about the environment, this is something that we are confident in, we know what we think and we all agree together on its importance. You might think that but, sadly, you would be wrong if you did think it.

One of the very, very striking things is to trace the way through Christian history that our views on environment and the importance of climate change, for example, have changed. If you have a look at biblical scholarship in particular, this was not an issue at all really until the 1970s and before then people had really quite clear views on what the Bible said. It is one of those very striking features that actually within the Christian tradition until about the 1970s people were at very best ambivalent about what they thought the Bible said about the environment. What I want to do this evening is to begin to set up why they were ambivalent, where that came from in their interpretation of scripture, and what we might want to say to it which will then open up our conversation for tomorrow.

I have three suggestions of where the biblical tradition challenges us to think more deeply about the environment and why it is that actually until around the 1970s people took a very different view than the view that we take today.

The first of the places that we need to have a look at is Genesis 1:26-28. If you want to have a look at any one passage which has influenced our thinking more than any other, it is Genesis 1:26-28. When you start looking at the scholarship on Genesis 1:26-28 it is quite frankly somewhat uncomfortable until you get to the 1970s. Richard Burrige, in his presentation on Friday evening, drew our attention to Lynn White and what he argued in 1967. Lynn White argued that our current attitudes to the environment - current then in 1967, which I feel the need to point out was before I was born so it is not that current - in 1967 Lynn White argued that it was Christianity that must bear the blame for attitudes to the environment. He placed the entirety of the blame at the feet of the Christian tradition, which is a very striking and troubling thing.

We would probably want to disagree with him and say that he overestimated his case, nevertheless where he was in any way right we need to accept that and look at very hard at our interpretation of scripture and actually how we engage with it. Part of the Bible

study tomorrow in the opening worship is an act of confession because I think time and time again we need to come back and confess those times when our exploration of issues around the environment have not been as exemplary as they might be. So if in any way Lynn White was correct in suggesting this, we must confess our part in that.

Following 1967, Lynn White's views began to be taken up by various other people, and particularly biblical scholars, so by the time you get into the 1970s you begin to find some texts, some work that is beginning to have a think about actually what Genesis 1:26-28 actually says and it is significant. For those of you who cannot bring it in its entirety to mind, I have the key parts of it up on the screen. Unfortunately, it would not all fit so we have Genesis 1:26 and 28 here. Let me just read it for you again: "Then God said, 'Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over the cattle and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. God bless them' and God said, 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth'".

The reason why Lynn White and subsequent scholars were very clear that Genesis 1:26 was the origin of people's attitudes to the environment are the words that I have bolded for you on the screen: "have dominion, be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it" and again "have dominion". It certainly seems to suggest that what Genesis 1:26-28 is saying is that we as human beings may use and abuse the planet exactly as we choose and that God intended us to do so.

You may be slightly shocked to see this quote but I think it sums up how this passage was interpreted for many, many years. Benno Jacob was writing in the 1920s and he said: "With this one word 'subdue' echoed again in Psalm 115:16 humanity is granted unlimited sovereignty over the planet Earth, therefore no work that is done in it, for example, drilling or the levelling of mountains, drying up or diverting rivers and similar things, can be regarded as a violent ravaging that is repugnant to God." Shocking quote but what is even more frightening is that when he said it in the 1920s nobody thought there was anything wrong with him saying it, everyone accepted that was a proper interpretation of Genesis 1:26-28.

One of our great challenges, therefore, is the whole question of how do we interpret that passage. It is a crucially important passage. Are we, if we care about the environment, to pretend it does not say what it says? Are we just to skip quickly over that particular bit of Genesis, which would be rather problematic because it would require you to skip over being made in the image of God, which we may not want to do either? What therefore do we do with this kind of passage? Well, of course what we do is we wrestle with it, we think about it, we explore it together. One of the key bits of your Bible study tomorrow is the opportunity to wrestle with this and explore it, which I think is a very important thing. What kind of things might we want to say about the interpretation of this passage and how might we want to be able to explore it for ourselves?

What I want to do now is explore with you some of the answers that some people have given to how we should interpret this passage just to get your juices flowing, as I said earlier. One argument that various people have put forward is that the blessing of God

to “fill the earth”, looking just particularly at that little bit, was a very time-specific commandment.

So some people would argue that God said that people should fill the Earth and then they did. Exodus 1:7 says: “The Israelites were fruitful and prolific; they multiplied and grew [just as God had told them to] exceedingly strong so that the land was filled with them.” Some people argue that actually the command to fill the Earth was completed. It stopped in Exodus 1:7 and therefore we should not be carrying on with it because the command was completed at that point. I do not know what you think about it as an argument. It is an interesting one. I think probably not quite as persuasive as some of the others but, nevertheless, just worth having in our minds when we are thinking about it. One possibility is that actually this was a time-specific command, particularly the multiplication issue.

The next thing that we need to do is to turn our attention to those tricky, difficult words “dominion” and “subdue” and to begin to have a think about what those words mean. Someone called Norbert Lohfink began some of the research on how we may begin to reinterpret Genesis 1:26-29 and his argument in the *Theology of the Pentateuch* is a really very, very interesting one, and he does a very valiant job of reinterpreting both words. He argues that both words are not to be understood as a domination kind of word but he argues instead that they are understood to be pastoral and nurturing and caring.

As I say, it is a very, very valiant job, but modern scholars are not persuaded by his valiant job, the trouble being how the words are used elsewhere. As you probably know, when you are trying to work out what a word means in the Bible, what you do is you look at how it is used on other occasions to see what it means. Let us just have a quick look at them and we can begin to see how they are used elsewhere.

The first word is the Hebrew word *rada* and it means generally “to rule”. It is what kings do. You can find it used in an entirely neutral context just to describe what somebody does. I Kings 4:24 is an interesting example: “He had dominion over all of the region west of the Euphrates from Tiphseh to Gaza.” The idea there is it is simply a job description. It does not tell you in any way, positively or negatively, what *rada* means; it is simply what he did. You also find it used in very positive contexts like for example Psalm 72: “Give the king your justice, O God ... May he have dominion from sea to sea.” What that seems to be suggesting is that dominion there is given to people by God and that they exercise it on behalf of God, so it is very strongly connected to the rule of God in the world. Of course, you can also find it in negative contexts like Leviticus 25:43: “You shall not have dominion or rule over them with harshness”, the implication being that you could rule over somebody with harshness.

The word *rada* therefore is actually quite a straightforward one. It is a neutral word that only has a moral judgment in a particular context. I think if we only had the word *rada* in Genesis 1:26 we could, with an entirely clear conscience, say this is not a difficult word at all; it simply means to relate to the world in the way that you do. Therefore, I would have no trouble if it was just the word *rada*. Unfortunately, however, it is not just the word *rada* that we have. We also have the word *kabash*. This is where the valiant Norbert Lohfink tried to argue very strongly that the word *kabash* was not a negative word. The trouble is every other time it appears in the bible in the Old Testament it is used in what we would regard as a more negative context. It is used in Jeremiah 34 to describe how you turn

people into slaves. It is described in Joshua 18 to describe how you conquer lands. It is really rather hard to spin it in a much more positive light. Therefore we have to recognise that the word “dominion” may not be the problematic word we thought it might have been but “subdue” remains problematic and challenging.

If the words are not helpful for us, how else might we begin to explore this particular passage? One of them, and this is suggested by the great Old Testament scholar John Rogerson, of whom I am a great fan, who suggests that actually you should understand Genesis 1:26-28 as being a command that exists in a harmonious pre-Fall context. What he reminds us of is the fact that before the Fall the world was entirely vegetarian. So therefore if you are to have dominion and subdue in an entirely vegetarian context (I happen to know that John Rogerson is a vegetarian and I suspect there is a little special pleading going on) he argues that if you understand it in that context that maybe “dominion” and “subdue” have a different feel to them and that actually it is not quite so combative as it might be in another context. Again, I commend it to you as a view for you to reflect on.

My own view is this, that one of the things that we do, and we make the mistake of is that we forget that Genesis 1:26 begins with this description of human beings being made in the image of God. One of the things that I am sure you know is that if there is one verse in the Bible that has been interpreted more than any other verse, it is Genesis 1:26 about people being made in the image of God, but what intrigues me is in very, very few of the treatments about what it means to be made in the image of God does anyone ever tie up being made in the image of God with their relationship with creation. Genesis 1:26-28 is surely absolutely about being made in the image of God in your relationship with creation? What I would suggest is that what God says to humanity comes in the context of us being made in the image of God, so therefore if we are to have dominion we must do it as God would because we are made in the image of God. If we are to multiply, fill and subdue the Earth we must do it as God did, who created the world. If you have dominion and subdue in the way that God does and not in the way that we do, then surely that whole verse looks completely different and that tying up of the image of God with the environment then actually completely turns this verse around and we recognise that what we are called to be and to do is God, who created the world who loves the world and said, “This world is good”, we are called to be as God to this world. If we do that, how could we do any other than have dominion in a very positive way; subdue the world in a very positive way? You begin to see that actually the verse has a completely different resonance if you remember the image of God stuff. That would be my argument about Genesis 1:26-29.

The first complexity of interpreting the environment and the issues of the biblical tradition is Genesis 1:26-28. There are another two that I want to recommend to you to reflect on, but there are probably lots more, so let me encourage you to think of other reasons why it is that we might struggle to think properly about the environment. The next argument that I would put forward about why we struggle to engage with the environment as much as we might, I would identify as the Fall. The Fall, as I am sure you know, is that place where God articulates a combative relationship from now on between humanity and the created order.

For example, have a look at Genesis 3 when God is cursing as a result of the Fall. God

says to the serpent: "I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers. He will strike your head and you will strike his heel." To Adam he said: "You shall not eat of it, cursed is the ground because of you. In toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life." What Genesis 3 does is set up a relationship between humanity and creation which, as I have said is antagonistic and combative and not harmonious as it was before, and you could argue that as a result of the Fall we are now in an alienated relationship from the environment.

Whenever you say that I think you need to recognise that this is a very important observation. But, and this is for me the really important "but", we - shock news of the afternoon - are Christians and have a New Testament as well as an Old Testament. For me one of the really important things is to recognise that the theology of the New Testament about what happens in Christ through his death and resurrection actually transforms our relationship with creation. For me one of the really important things to recognise is that we might have set up an antagonistic relationship with creation after the Fall but then there was the death and resurrection of Jesus and, as you know, what happens in the death and resurrection of Jesus is the in-breaking of new creation, so the new world, the world to come, now breaks into the world through the resurrection of Jesus. Therefore, our relationship with creation has to have been transformed. There can no longer be the intrinsic antagonism between humanity and creation because of Jesus' death and resurrection. We are very good about talking about redemption as the effect that it has on us, and that is very important, but I think it is very important to recognise that the correlation of the implication of redemption is that now we have a transformed relationship with the planet; now we have a transformed relationship with the environment. We cannot be in alienation with the environment anymore because of Jesus' death and resurrection.

You may be aware that 2 Corinthians 5:17 is one of those slightly hotly contested passages and it is because of the Greek. It is a rule of thumb really that the more important a verse is the harder it is to translate it into English. It just works that way time and time again. The problem with 2 Corinthians 5:17 is there are not quite enough words in the Greek. Literally what the Greek says is: "If anyone in Christ new creation." Make a sentence out of that, Paul seems to be saying to us, and it is a real challenge because the question is what words do you need to put in to make it the sentence that it needs to be. The traditional translation, as I am sure you will all know, is "if anyone is in Christ he is a new creation". The translation you have got up there is the NRSV. The NRSV, as many of you will know, is an inclusive language version so of course it was not going to put "he is a new creation" and instead they put something else, but it is much more theologically significant what they have put than simply an inclusive version of it because if you stop and think about it, the difference between "if anyone is in Christ he is a new creation" and "if anyone is in Christ there is a new creation" is it is a completely different theological concept.

So which is right, the older translation which says "he is a new creation" or the more modern NRSV "there is a new creation"? It will surprise you to know that the answer is "Yes, they are both right". I think that is why Paul uses the language as he does in a very judicious way. If anyone is in Christ, of course that person is newly created. How could you not be newly created through the death and the resurrection of Jesus? But at the same time if anyone is in Christ new creation has broken into the world. The new has



come into the old. It is now possible to live a resurrection existence early. We can now live as though we have already died and risen in the world as it is. For me one of the really important implications of that in the environment is that as we relate to the world, we must now live in the world, this world, the old creation, as though it were the new creation, as though we were living eternally in the world that God has created. That seems again to transform the issue.

I have one final point before I introduce in more detail the Bible study questions. The other big issue that dogs Christianity, and those of you who know me well and know what I am working on at the moment will know that this is a real passion of mine (so I get to have a little bit of passion at this point in the afternoon), one of the really interesting things that happens when we read Paul is we read Paul through the lens of Plato. Whether you know it or not, you all have an inner Plato. He lurks there ready to rise at various moments. Do not hear me say that I think there is anything wrong with that, Plato was a very, very fine Greek philosopher, but there is very strong evidence that I could give you if I had an extra couple of hours to illustrate that Paul, in my view, was not influenced by Platonic philosophy when it comes to dualism.

Let me explain what I mean by that. Platonic dualism is the idea that there is body and there is soul. Body is physical; soul is spiritual. Body is negative; soul is positive. Plato says very iconically at one point that the soul when it enters a human body is “entombed in the coffin of the body”, which is a very striking image that he brings up for us; the idea being that the soul is good and glorious and mighty and when it becomes entombed in the coffin of the body everything is spoiled. What happens as that flows outwards is you end up with a dualism that says “this is good” and “that is bad”. This is good, which is soul and spirit and things that are non-physical; that is bad, those things that are physical. So you end up with this very interesting dualism in which you have a physical/spiritual split and those of you who know about what is going on in New Testament studies will know there is a very strong movement now among New Testament scholars to believe in the resurrection of the body and not in a soul who lives eternally and spiritually in the heavenly realms. That begins to unpack this issue in a really very significant way. If Paul is not dualist then he does not have these two categories. He is not saying that the body is bad and the soul is good and, by extension in this issue, he is not saying that the created world is bad to heaven’s good. It is a different way in which he unpacks it. That is a really important thing to recognise when we are thinking about this subject of the environment. We all too easily assume that we are functioning with a Platonic lens and if you take that Platonic lens off everything changes.

So just a few points on that. This is the point I have just been trying to make to you. The issue that I have been talking to you about already is that you cannot assume that Paul functions with this Platonic dualism and when you take that away you have to read Paul in a completely different way. For me one of the really striking things that that does is it means that, all of a sudden, the created world comes in as a great good. Paul, I would argue, is not a dualist, if you want some technical language, but he functions with duality. What I mean by that is the duality is this world and the world to come. When he goes backwards and forwards in his twos he is talking constantly about this world and the world to come. This world will come to an end; the world to come will not. This world is governed by sin and slavery and all those kinds of things; the world to come is governed by the Spirit and freedom and joy and hope and all those kinds of things. What is very

important is creation is in this world; it is also in the world to come. Bodies are in this world; they are also in the world to come. When you change the duality in that kind of way the texts begin to unpack and you begin to see new and significant things.

The final thing I just want to draw your attention to therefore in the light of that is, fascinatingly, time and time, again Paul links redemption with creation. We find it in Romans 8 which I am going to be suggesting you have a look at tomorrow. You find it in 2 Corinthians 5 and, really intriguingly, you find it in the Colossians Christ hymn. The Colossians Christ hymn has two halves. The first half talks about creation. The second half talks about redemption and Paul very, very carefully and creatively puts those things together, and I would argue that the connection between creation and the environment, creation and redemption is a really, really significant connection in Paul and we need to explore it a little bit more.

Those are my three arguments about why we have not engaged with the environment quite as much as we might have. What I have done for the Bible study is given you four key questions to have a look at. The first is why do you think that care for the environment has been so far down the list of Christian priorities for so long? What I have been talking about just now, you might want to talk about some of those things and to pick up other issues that are important.

Then to turn to Genesis 1:26-31 and to begin to explore in more detail what you think Genesis 1:26-31 has to say about our relationship with God and with the world that he created. Then we move on to Romans 8 and have a look at the connection between redemption and creation and then finally ask the question of how important we think this is within our Christian world. We will have different answers to this but it is worth exploring it together. For me I would put it right up there at the top of my list, maybe two or three at the top of the list of how important it is. Other people would put it somewhere else. However, I think it is worth exploring all of these things.

Those are the four main questions. Some groups will be incredibly talkative and that will keep you going happily way beyond the time that they need. If you are in a less talkative group or you just want a little bit of help to think into things, there are supplementary questions under each one of the four main questions which I hope will help your juices to begin flowing.

I have hugely enjoyed exploring this material and I really wish you fun and stimulation and challenge tomorrow as you begin to explore it yourselves.

*The Chair:* Your spontaneous applause says it all, does it not? What a brilliant exposition of an introduction to our group work tomorrow. That concludes this item of business, but can I encourage you to remain in the chamber as worship will begin in a few moments.

*Members of the congregation of St Michael le Belfrey* led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart)* took the Chair at 8.32 am.

## **The Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for 2016 (GS 2002)**

*The Chair:* Good evening, everyone. Please take your seats. This is Items 16 to 23, the Archbishops' Council Budget and proposals for apportionment for 2016, paper GS 2002. We are invited to approve the Archbishops' Council Budget for 2016, the apportionment proposals for the sums needed amongst the dioceses and also approval of the pooling adjustments in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands.

The Chair of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee, Canon John Spence, will introduce all these items on your Order Paper IV, page 3, in one speech. In order to do that, I would be grateful if under Standing Orders you would allow me to extend his speech to 15 minutes. If that is acceptable to you, please show.

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much indeed. That means that there will be a need, once Canon Spence has spoken, for you to allow me to cluster the responses in two or three and then invite Canon Spence to respond as we go through the debate which will make things easier for him. May I have your permission to do that, that he may speak more than once?

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much indeed. I am going to suggest that when it does come to the speeches, in order that the timescale of an hour may be kept to for our following item, that the last bit of business will be a three minutes' speech limit for those who are contributing. Canon Spence, can I invite you to address us.

*Canon John Spence (Ex officio):* Things change quite a lot in a day. Last night I was playing the role of a bishop, whereas now I revert to that of a parish treasurer about to share difficult news with their PCC, albeit on a slightly greater scale. I was also last night an ugly sister and had to go through the pain of watching my sister, that brat, Cinderella, get off and marry Prince Charming.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I can reveal to you exclusively – and I do not want you to tell anybody else about this because he could get into trouble – but today at lunch-time in the presence of the Third Church Estates Church Commissioner, the Archbishop of York proposed marriage to me; and while I do not care for Cinderella, ladies and gentlemen, I do think Prince Charming should be warned about bigamy.

The fact is, however, that the resource need does not fit the financial glass slipper and I need to talk you through what we are doing to fix the budget for 2016, but in the context of what I said to you last year that the budgeting model is broken and I have committed that we will revert to you for the 2017 budget with a more sustainable solution. I am going to talk you through each of the areas of activity but I am not going to start with the most

difficult. I will start with those where there is least issue.

On Vote 3, which is all about support grants to organisations like the Anglican Communion, Churches Together, the Church Urban Fund, Fresh Expressions and so on, we will spend £1.3 million, which basically is the same as last year except for a modest increase to the Anglican Communion. The Archbishops' Council have agreed that we need to review the efficacy of this spend as part of the 2017 work to ensure that we are making the most effective use of funds in this regard.

Vote 4, which is about missions and pensions, is where we pay pension contributions for those involved in missionary work at home and overseas, and £787,000 is what it is. It is a tiny increase based on assumptions of the same number of people as last year.

While Vote 5, that in respect of retired clergy housing, rises as is agreed by the policy of this organisation by 5%, this is a commitment we have made in the last quinquennium and have agreed that it must continue to ensure the adequacy of that provision. That 5% accounts for 0.7% of an overall apportionment increase and so if we did nothing else, if we froze everything else, the apportionment to dioceses would rise by 0.7% simply because of that item.

Vote 1 is about ministerial training. We all understand the goals that we have in increasing the number of ordinands in training but, of course, that is something we are not seeing yet. Actually, the projections because of historical pattern suggests that the number of people in training next year will be slightly down on previous years; but we have made provision for the final part of 2016, the start of the 16/17 academic year, in the hope that we are seeing more ordinands and that is why that budget modestly increases.

We all hope that those goals can be achieved over the longer term. While we are not seeing any increase in the number of ordinands yet, it would be wrong to have any mechanisms in place which deterred that trend. Therefore, we have removed any cap on that budget line for next year. If we do see a considerable increase in the number of candidates coming through – which we will all celebrate – we will find a basis on which we can provide that funding in 2016, knowing, of course, that the main burden will fall on 2017 and future years and you all know what we are doing in that space.

It is in Vote 2, National Church Support, that the biggest issues arise. The Budget that has been put in front of you represents a budget of £12.1 million, being 5% higher than the budget for 2015. We are already spending in excess of the budget for 2015 because of the provision for safeguarding. The staffing need was greater than was understood when I stood before you a year ago. We are in excess of our budget for 2015 helped by additional support from the Church Commissioners. 2016 takes account of the increase in that staffing and also in the need to undertake some other specific projects within Church House.

We are not seeking to pass on the full amount of that to the dioceses. Indeed, it is quite important to understand that in 2016 the dioceses are only being asked to support 83% of the total budget under Vote 2 for National Church Support. Of a total budget of £12.1 million, we will ask the dioceses to contribute only £10.1 million, which is an increase of 2.2% against that 5% spend.

The rest of the money will be found from reserves, though we cannot take as much from reserves as we did last year as we are getting down to a level that we consider to be prudent. It will come partly from rent relief directly attributable to the Archbishops' Council where the rental being earned by the Corporation of Church House is such that they are able to give us something back by waiving our own rental, they are doing so well from conferences. That is something incidentally we need to be mindful of when seeking to influence the Corporation about who they allow to have events there.

We are going to benefit particularly from the generosity of the Church Commissioners who are not only letting us use their rent relief for this year but also for next, and the total support from the Church Commissioners next year will be nearly a million pounds.

So of the £12.1 budget for next year, £10.1 million or 83% comes from the dioceses; 8% from the Church Commissioners; 4% from our own rent relief, and 5% from our reserves. You understand why I say the model is broken. If that rent relief had not been available, we would have had to increase the apportionment by a further 4%. We have no guarantee that it will continue. We are already having to reconsider the need for the amount of safeguarding resource we require because already it looks as if we do not have sufficient for what is being demanded of us.

So I present to you a budget of £12.1 million under Vote 2, 5% higher than this year but less than 5% of the actual spend and where we have used other sources of funding to limit the amount we ask of the dioceses through apportionment to 2.2%.

To put this in historic perspective, if I was to look out over the last ten years I would have seen that the vote to the National Church Support Budget rose by 0.5% per annum for the first five years and declined by 0.3% over the subsequent five years. Out of the total apportionment, the share that the National Church Support is receiving has gone from 40% to 37% to 34%. If we are to ensure that we have the engine room at the centre that facilitates the power of the dioceses to achieve their goals and the quinquennial goals of the Church, we simply cannot go on in that way.

We have secured efficiency upon efficiency. William Fittall, Ian Theodoreson and the great team there have striven hard to find new ways of doing things, but we simply will not be able to continue that. What we have therefore sought to do in 2016 is to minimise the burden on the dioceses, and I appreciate that a 2.5% increase is still more than you would want to have at time of virtually zero inflation. Let us put it again against the context that for each of the last five years the increase that we have asked of you has been well below any measure of inflation in each of those years. While 2.5% is higher than you would wish to face, I hope you will understand that it is the very minimum which we can ask of you.

My commitment remains that I will work with colleagues in the Archbishops' Council to provide a basis for a sustainable budget regime going forward which, at once, enables the dioceses to maximise the resource you have to do your work, which ensures that you have an engine room at the centre which facilitates you and which drives every source of cost-effectiveness.

You are asked to approve Votes 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. You are asked to agree the

apportionment increase of 2.5%. Just to remind you, that is done on the basis where those dioceses of greater wealth and resource pay a little bit more than those who are not so well off. We update the figures every year but the formulaic basis is unchanged from previous years, as is the basis of the pooling of support for ordinands in terms of family maintenance. That operates on the same basis and is, again, unchanged from the year before.

I think I have said enough to introduce the Archbishops' Council Budget to you. I will be very happy to receive your views and contributions and to respond accordingly.

*The Chair:* Canon Spence, thank you very much indeed. It is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a three minute speech limit.

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* Much of my professional experience is in information technology and digital services and it is about IT and related elements in Vote 2 that I would like to comment. The summary table on page 19 lists three substantial technology-enabled projects with expenditure in 2015 of £462,000, for which only £50,000 was budgeted. That amounts to roughly 80% of the apparent total overspend on Vote 2 of £510,000 in 2015. How did this come to pass?

Well, there are two clues in a terse section on IT at page 32. Paragraph 74 explains the investment in modern IT infrastructure. All well and good and no doubt necessary, but how is it that it was so grossly under-estimated? No provision at all was apparently set aside for the website or for CRM – presumably, customer relationship management, which raises an interesting question as to who those customers might be, but perhaps I have misunderstood the acronym.

Paragraph 75 notes that a system of IT governance is now in place to develop and maintain the IT strategy for the National Church Institutions. Good. It is about time too. I have just re-read the 2007 IT Service Review for the Archbishops' Council, to which I contributed. Amongst our recommendations were the establishment of an IT management board and the development and publication of an IT strategy. I do wonder how those and our other suggestions were implemented, if at all.

I have two forward-looking questions. Firstly, noting that there is again no budget provision for technology or digital projects in 2016, is that deliberate and is it realistic? Secondly, might the Synod have sight of the IT strategies for the NCIs? I would hope that it features a rapid move to digital solutions and a commitment to support Synod members, not just Synod staff, with effective IT services. Please, take this as advanced note of questions in November should the diocese of Rochester's electors permit, or even an offer to help, whichever you prefer.

*The Chair:* I will hear Canon Bruinvels and then ask for a response.

*Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford):* Declaring two interests as a Church Commissioner and the Deputy Chairman of the Legislative Committee. I also want to discuss Vote 2. Although I fully support the expenditure plans that Canon Spence has so properly introduced, my concern is point 2 in the executive summary. I mentioned it yesterday, it

is to do with national safeguarding work. Yes, it is perfectly correct that the Council has budgeted to spend, instead of £44,500, an increase to £557,500 in 2016. My concern is I do not think that is enough; I really do not think it is enough. I think there are going to be major other issues coming before us and so I would like it to be looked at again.

I also want to query, looking very carefully at the way it is supported, and Church Commissioners, £539,000, that is on page 28; Church of England Pensions Board paying £12,372; and Archbishops' Council £674,000, the role of the Clergy Discipline team, the designated officer.

Again, that is growing. If we mention the Pemberton case, I expect part of it is still *sub judice*, we must recognise that our bishops are having major costs. It is quite right that the partnership that Canon Spence mentions between the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council is working well, but neither have got those sorts of funds readily available. I would like that to be looked at again. I think it is very important. We must, of course, look at safeguarding. We must look at clergy discipline.

As the Deputy Chairman of the Legislative Committee and, indeed, involved with the women bishops' legislation particularly, at this point I wish to pay tribute to the full legal team, the Legal Office. We get really good value under Stephen Slack. I think that is another recognition that we look to. We do get the best of legal advice. The House of Bishops know that but we are not there as a blank cheque, an open cheque, so please may that be looked at again. Thank you.

*The Chair:* John, do you want to respond to those two now and then I will take some more.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Thank you very much. Philip, thank you for going back; I cannot say I was around at the time of the IT strategy in 2007. What I do know is that we have a lot of work to do in that space. The shared services company employed a new head of IT just around a year ago. On arrival, she very quickly identified a list of needs that required addressing and that could not wait for another year while budgets were created, so a refreshed programme was put in place which is now well on the way to completion and which explains why the overspend is there.

No, it does not contain enough for websites, for CRM, for all the media solutions and I am very grateful for the offer of help because, increasingly, I do believe we need to reach out. There were people at the Reform and Renewal fringe meeting yesterday who were making the same point. I think we do need to reach out to people and really understand what it is we need to do. That is a piece of work that is being taken forward. Andrew Brown is the Chief Officer in Church House on IT. We need to develop what I would regard as a new strategy, Philip. I have no real strategy to show you. I have things that have been done and things that we know need to be done but, in terms of developing a strategy worthy of the name, I think we need to develop that and absolutely involve you, those of who you are willing, Philip. Expertise is gratefully received. I know Gavin Oldham has been talking about it this weekend and Christian Sorensen yesterday, so that we can really get that into a place so that this Church of England has a strategy that will meet the needs of those people that we do not reach otherwise, as well as the Church as a whole.

To Peter, yes, the safeguarding piece, I have said already we recognise that the resourcing is not sufficient. We all understand how quickly this issue has risen in the firmament. We could not have predicted that, I think, three years ago. One might have said, with hindsight, we could have made earlier provision. What matters is that we have put the people in place now. Graham Tilby has been asked now to go back and review again what looks like a long-term, sustainable resourcing solution. The Church Commissioners in providing their support have made it absolutely clear that that is on the proviso that we fully get the safeguarding house in order. They have also made clear that they will not provide funds for those dioceses where safeguarding is not being taken sufficiently seriously or thoroughly.

We are all agreed that the prime responsibility for safeguarding within a diocese lies with the diocese, but I think we will equally understand that it would be untenable for the Church at the centre, if anything were to go wrong in a particular diocese, to absolve itself of any oversight responsibility; and so Graham needs to have the infrastructure which enables him to work in partnerships with dioceses, where they so need it, but also to have some sort of level of monitoring to make sure that there are no weaknesses and, where weaknesses are revealed, to escalate.

That is an urgent piece of work which was commissioned in the last month. I await the results of that; I believe that they will be coming to me in the next month or two. Once they are there, I can take them to Archbishops' Council. We will not wait to find budgets in order to put in place the resource that is required to give this issue the highest priority.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. The floor is open.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* I would like to say to Rob Cotton that I am not proposing marriage to Tony Redman, but I might propose an electoral pact, as we get confused so often. More seriously, can I point out that reading the Budget did not bring home to me quite the drama of the excellent presentation that Canon John Spence has given, and I wonder whether that is deliberate or whether we could have been given more warning that there was bad news in the pipe? I suppose this is partly a matter of style, but maybe there would have been more awareness in the chamber. I would like to ask what the progress is with projections and models for the Reform and Renewal proposals, particularly in regard to future numbers of ordinands.

I have just been at the pensions' fringe meeting and the pensions and the CHARM schemes all do projections and modelling for 30 to 40 years into the future, so I hope that we are making some progress in applying a similar level of rigour to the Reform and Renewal proposals. I wonder, if the ordinands do not materialise, whether the extra funds that we are in principle agreeing to release might be directed in other places so that the extra funds might help with some of the financial challenges we are facing. I wonder on page 6 whether the Church census that is described is an additional one to the 'Everyone Counts' census results on diversity in the Church that have just been announced at the statistics fringe meeting? What was the nature of that Church census and what data will that give us?

I would also like to ask, with indulgence, feedback from some dioceses suggests that there is a lack of strategic capacity; a lack of capacity to produce, for example, diocesan



vision strategies which are necessary to get grants and there can be a vicious cycle – as everyone is working hard to save money and to keep the show on the road, there is not the time to give to strategic planning. Would it be possible for the Council as part of Reform and Renewal to investigate giving financial and other help to dioceses to help them build their strategic capacity and unlock funds? I hope that is relevant and helpful, thank you.

*Mr Paul Hancock (Liverpool):* My questions are about the Vote 1 Budget and the tables on page 14. If you look at the tuition costs, they rise fairly regularly across from 2014/2015 to 2016/17. Similarly, the university fees decline over the same period, but the ordinands' allowances seem to jump about a bit more; it is a less regular increase. It goes from £4,179,000 to £4,223,000 to £4,376,000. So the jump from 15/16 to 16/17 is nearly ten times the difference in the budgets between the revised forecasts for 2015 and the draft Budget for 2016. I take on what you have said, Canon Spence, about sort of trying to cut your cloth, but it does not seem realistic to me that the draft Budget is so low when we are expecting that academic year, 2016-17, to have that big jump of nearly 370,000.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Canon Spence, would you like to respond to those two at this point, and then we will see.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Forgive me, Patrick, if I forget one or two of the points you made. I will try and cover them all.

In terms of the Reform and Renewal piece, yes, we are undertaking detailed modelling in terms of resourcing ministerial education. The Archbishops' Council have set up a financial planning group which met about two weeks ago and really was providing significant challenges. I would not want you to underestimate the challenge that has been given in these places to really think through what does that modelling look like; what does the profile of expected priestly retirements look like; and therefore to understand, if one was to see the growth in the ordinands, how that offsets.

If we do achieve substantial funds to help us with the surge in ordinand training that we all pray will happen, it will be given for a precise reason by the Church Commissioners. You will understand they will not, I think, enable us to use the money as we wish because they have very strict limits on how that can be spent. But we are not there yet. The modelling has been completed, 'Resourcing the Future', as I think you all know. We are getting to the stage where our financial guidelines will be in place in order for us to make a detailed formal approach to the Church Commissioners this autumn. That will be available for scrutiny by Synod in due course and that piece of modelling is very clear.

The trouble with resourcing ministerial education is that one needs to separate, I think, the investments one wants to make to help catalyse the ordinand growth in the first place, what you need to do to help dioceses have the capacity to cope with increased applications and to increase the number of applications in the first place; but what you then need to do with the funding, and that is complex because of the legal restrictions placed on the Church Commissioners.

If I stay with Reform and Renewal, you are absolutely right to identify the need for us to support dioceses who so want it in the development of their own strategic capacity.

Funding is already being made available for that now. We are on a programme where Philip James and Julian Hubbard and others are meeting with every diocese around the country – well, every diocese that has asked to meet them so far. I think they are up to 24. They are going round identifying what support we can give and we have opened up a funding stream to help that, but much more important to me is the practical help we can give and we need to make sure that Philip and his team are resourced accordingly. The census that you mentioned is costing about £50,000. It will give more comprehensive information than has been available through previous surveys and is being funded by the Church Commissioners.

I am really sorry, Patrick, if you do not feel that I have made clear in the past that the financial modelling of the budget was unsustainable. I made it absolutely clear at this meeting last year that I had to present a sticking plaster budget and that is the case this year because of the work underway. I know just one of the things I must do is to work with the Archbishops' Council so that is a sustainable piece. I do not mean to say that the Church is bust, it is not, but the option at the moment is we would have to ask the dioceses for significantly higher levels of proportionate increase than we want to do given the many priorities that you have before you.

Turning to the second question, I am afraid I cannot give you the detail of exactly why there is that disparity and I am quite happy to provide it separately. What I do know is that we have to model these budgets based on best expectations of the mix of training and pathways through which ordination candidates will go and the colleges that will be chosen because they have different rates. We know that we work very hard to get best value for money. We want to make sure that the TEIs – the educational institutions – are sustainable while at the same time we are not paying more than we need to pay. I am very happy to provide a more detailed answer in writing afterwards.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich):* Two apologies. The first apology is I am sorry I was not in the beginning of this debate to come in and ask questions.

Second, I am going to go back to the communications budget and I have two simple questions. The first is this: why has £113,250 come from the Pensions Board, could somebody explain that? Secondly, I understand it is the policy now to put all advertisements for clergy posts on a central website run by Church House. This will have a detrimental effect on the advertising revenue of the *Church Times* and *The Church of England Newspaper*. I just wonder are we spending money in one area to the detriment of another organisation in another? Thank you.

*Mrs Penelope Allen (Lichfield):* Firstly, I apologise for asking the same question twice but I do not feel I had an adequate answer to my question yesterday about the use of the titles Votes 1 to 5 and whether we could lose those titles which are meaningless to everyone we try to explain them to.

Secondly, just to ask a question about lay training and whether there is anything within the ministry budget that is tagged for online learning. I would be very interested to know that, please.

Thirdly, the Fresh Expressions budget on page 33. We have 150 Fresh Expressions in Lichfield Diocese and I am wondering whether that budget is adequate for Fresh Expressions.

Lastly, just to welcome looking at policy for chaplains. I think quite often chaplains in schools and in workplaces and in colleges and further education feel rather disconnected from the centre Church. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I am just looking to see if other people are standing. I am just reminding you that I am going to take all the votes straight through when we come to the end of this period of debate. I see one more gentleman standing. Would you like to come and make your point and then we will take those three at once?

*Mr Robin Stevens (Chelmsford):* I never thought I would hear myself say it. It is a small point and I refer to page 30 in the Report where on that page the word "stewardship" is used twice. We have a stewardship department; the stewardship department is going to develop new stewardship programmes. I wonder whether thought should be given now to changing the word "stewardship" to "Christian giving" or something along those lines, because tomorrow surely we have a day debating stewardship issues. Stewardship is a much wider word than just funding the Church of England from the giving of Church people. I think where we are now, stewardship is too constraining a word. I have seen parish accounts where there is a line on the accounts marked "stewardship" and it means the freewill giving of Church people. I would like to suggest, Mr Chairman, that we might give some thought to adjusting that in the future so that the giving from Church people, which is one of the major income streams of the Church, is given a proper title and "stewardship" can properly apply to the huge spread of issues where we use God's gifts properly in his service. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Canon Spence, would you like to respond to those three points? Thank you.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Thank you. I think I will start with Robin. Well done again, Robin, on your efforts last night, you put in a huge amount of work. Can we just note your views on that. Stewardship actually contains quite a wide cornucopia of activity, including some resource to help procurement and to try to achieve the best deals across the Church.

In terms of Jonathan's piece, the £130,000 is because of the shared service model where the different NCIs and Church House contribute to the common resource that works for them. Communications is one area, I think, where we are under pressure. Can I note your point about the policy around advertising, it is a point well made. Life is moving very rapidly, is it not, in terms of the whole way in which these job advertisements are undertaken.

To Penny, I listened to you very carefully yesterday and I was utterly sympathetic which is why today I tried to give each of the streams their full title. Certainly I do not see why

we should not be giving them the full title with "Vote 1" and "Vote 2" in brackets beside it. It is a shorthand that sadly we sometimes get used to. It is just so often, is it not, that one gets into in-house language and we should always remember that this is about clergy training or ordinand training, it is about National Church support, it is about support grants, about mission and pensions and about retired clergy housing.

There is a modest sum in one budget for online training for lay people, not enough to make a big difference, and that I think is one aspect that has to be rolled into this IT strategy development that I referred to earlier.

The Fresh Expressions that comes in this budget is only that which goes for the support of the national charity at the centre. It is assumed that giving money for Fresh Expressions is a diocesan responsibility and so it is down to the dioceses to support Fresh Expressions at the level that they wish to do so.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I was not intending to speak, but hearing Robin talking about stewardship I recalled in my mind when I was on the Finance Committee of the Archbishops' Council and we used to talk about legacies. At that time it was felt that the central Church should not seek legacies because it was felt that might run against that happening at the local level. I think maybe things have changed since then and there are a large number of people who may well be prepared to leave something to the Church of England in their will to go into the central Church. I am just wondering, bearing in mind the strains which are going to be coming on the Archbishops' Council's budgets in the future, whether we might revisit the whole question of whether we start opening up the door to legacies coming in again directly into the central Church.

*The Chair:* John, would you like to comment on that?

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* Gavin, thank you very much. We have actually started a more proactive promotion of legacies or encouraging people to give legacies. We ought to be very careful, of course. I am a local boy. The parish, the diocese, should take precedence but, yes, there will be those who are keen to leave the money to the Church of England as a whole. We have started promoting that and we have seen an uplift in that income.

*The Chair:* John, if you would stand by the microphone, I am going to ask you to move Item 16.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I beg to move:

'That this Synod do take note of the Report'

*The motion*

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

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

*The Chair:* I am now going to go through the next items on your Order Paper IV on the expected expenditure in respect of each area specified below, "That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2016, as shown in its budget" and then I am going to ask you to vote on each one in turn without the need to mention the numbers 1 to 5 because it is written on the paper as Item 17, £13,488,475 for Training for Ministry.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Item 18, £12,153,987 for National Support.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Item 19, £1,272,082 for Grants and provisions.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Item 20, £787,950 for Mission agencies' clergy pension contributions.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Item 21, £4,359,170 for CHARM Scheme.

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Item 22, "That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2002) for the apportionment amongst the dioceses of the net sum to be provided by them to enable the Council to meet the expected expenditure shown in its budget for the year 2016."

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*The Chair:* Over the page, Item 23, "That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2002) for the pooling adjustment for 2016 in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands."

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* I so move.

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

*Canon John Spence (ex officio):* With your leave, Bishop, just before we conclude, this is the only opportunity I have publicly to give thanks to all the staff of the Archbishops' Council for the considerable amounts of work that they do. You will have seen from what I have laid out tonight the complexity and urgency of the issues with which they are dealing. They do so always with very good grace despite the numerous requests I and others make of them. William Fittall's outstanding record of service will be recognised elsewhere, but Ian Theodoreson and David White – David is a real unsung hero who gets so little public appreciation and who is always by my side – can I pass on my thanks to all of them. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* That ends this item of business.

*A member:* Would it be in order to thank Canon John Spence?

*The Chair:* It is in order and with your permission, Canon John Spence, we would like to add our applause in thanks for your continued work in this matter. That ends this item but there is one further item to come.

*THE CHAIR Canon Ann Turner (Europe)* took the Chair at 9.14 pm

## **National Society: Development of Teaching and Educational Leadership Partnerships**

*The Chair:* So, Synod, we come to the last item of the day, Item 24, the National Society: Development of Teaching and Educational Leadership Partnerships. This will be a presentation under Standing Order 97. The presentation will be given by the Chief Education Officer, the Revd Nigel Genders, and I have pleasure on your behalf to welcome him to give that presentation. After his presentation there will be the opportunity for a few questions.

*Revd Nigel Genders (Chief Education Officer):* Thank you very much. I too want to start this evening with apologies. I am not sorry that I am not the Bishop of Ely but I am sorry that the Bishop of Ely is not able to be here again this evening. Bishop Stephen has asked me particularly to offer his continued apologies for not being with us as he was very much looking forward to introducing this item because he is so passionate about it. It falls to me to introduce this presentation for you, for which you will have seen a paper GS Misc 1109.

I had the pleasure of being at the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration of a church school last month. My job was a very simple one: it was to present a nice commemorative scroll, which we give on these occasions, and, as the order of service made very clear, to give a short talk. There had been a lot in the service about the founding of the school so in my talk I decided to simply ask the children what they thought their school was for. I picked out some answers, as you do, by going around the congregation, all the pupils of

the school were gathered along with parents and staff, and the answers were mainly “Maths”.

I was hoping to get something more rounded and something about abundant life, as it is a very good Church of England school, but time and time again the answer came, “Maths, we just do maths”. I spotted a little girl, a very well turned out little girl who was in Year 2, so age 7, who looked eager to contribute and I thought she looked an absolute safe bet. So I passed her the microphone and I wrote down afterwards what she said, because this is what she said exactly: “School is all about getting good qualifications because if you don’t get good qualifications you won’t get a good job and then you won’t have any money and you won’t be happy”. There, in that one brief sentence from a perfectly lovely seven year old, was the all prevailing economic narrative of education writ large, a narrative which society has bought hook, line and sinker.

Now our vision for education is bigger than that, it is a compelling vision for the transformative purpose of lifelong education in the mission of the Church with a focus on wisdom for living and the spiritual, intellectual and emotional development that leads to the flourishing of every person, but in order to deliver that we need to do much more as a Church to call, train, equip and nurture teachers and leaders to share that vision. So this presentation is intended to update Synod and involve Synod in the work that we are doing to develop and promote a more effective way of doing that.

My job is easy this evening, it is simply to introduce to you with great pleasure Professor Joy Carter. Professor Carter is the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Winchester, one of our leading Anglican Foundation universities. She has been Chair of the Cathedrals Group of universities in the past and I am delighted that she is now chairing our project Steering Group for this new development work which she is now going to talk to you about. I am delighted to hand over to Professor Carter. Thank you.

*Professor Joy Carter (Steering Group Chair): (Referring to slide show)* Good evening. Your Graces, members of Synod, thank you very much for inviting me here to share some of the excitement with you about this new project. Thank you also for still being here at this very late hour of the evening.

I want to do four things. First of all to say a little bit about the foundations on which we build. Then ask the question what is the problem we are trying to fix, not so much a problem as an opportunity, and why act now. Then I want to just outline briefly the vision for you and lastly tell you about progress so far.

First of all about the foundation. The Church has been working in education not just for decades but for centuries and to me it feels like this: strong, deep roots, hugely powerful, tremendous amounts of success.

My own institution, Winchester University, is about to have a big birthday. We are 175 years old on 1 August this year. We were founded by the Church in 1840 to train teachers to teach the poor. The Church has deep roots and firm foundations in education.

There has been much success over centuries with classroom education as well as university education and lots and lots to celebrate, which brings me to my next question

which is this: is there a problem to fix or maybe just an opportunity to address?

The opportunities are these: to empower teachers and leaders with a very special sort of Church of England education; to address the shortage of teachers but not just the shortage, to address retention as well; to think about the great churn in the role of universities and schools and how the two link together that is going on at the moment with changing Government policy; and also to respond to new directions for diocesan leadership.

So why act now? It really is a case of seize the moment for lots of reasons and here are just two of them because there is lots of interest and lots of public discourse around character education, lots in the media, lots of books about it, lots of people talking about it. The Church is a very important contributor to that debate. Also there is rapid change in teacher training structures so there is a real reason for making a difference right now.

So what indeed is our vision? Well, as Nigel has said, it links to transformative lifelong education. It speaks of spiritual vocation, of wisdom for living and of the flourishing of individuals and society. It is a vision which has a very firm underpinning of theological thinking. It is a theological reference group chaired by Professor David Ford. Some more foundations are about very high-class research to do with things like leadership, to do with character formation, concerned with pedagogy and much more, and that is the underpinning of the project. From that underpinning comes a renewal of the vision for the Church and education and out of that vision springs all sorts of new things. Those include action on retention and recruitment of teachers, information about training and packages for leadership training, for diocesan teams, for aspirant head teachers, for existing head teachers, indeed for governors in schools as well and also for parish workers, and all of this is about inspiring and empowering partnerships.

Let me say again how important classical education is and exam results will continue forever to be important, but there is something equally important, perhaps even more important to do alongside and that is character education. We are really pleased that the Department for Education has given us a character education grant and they are looking for us to have leadership in this area. The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues has funded a report and a conference for us too, exploring the Church of England approach to character education.

What do I really mean by character education? Here are just a few examples. We are talking about self-control. We are talking about that wonderful curiosity that young people often have and sometimes it is beaten out of them at schools and elsewhere. We are talking about creativity, sometimes messy creativity but is it not lovely? It is about having a positive outlook on life sometimes with adversity to deal with. And it is about craftsmanship. It is about many other things, too, and here are just a few more of them. It is about this one, endurance, and really importantly it is about collaboration and communication.

It is about two other really important things too, two things which all of this in this room tonight need more of as well. It is about courage. In the needs analysis that we are still carrying out, teachers and head teachers are telling us that courage is a really important characteristic for themselves, not just the young ones that they are responsible for.



Another thing that we all need more of is this one, resilience and determination; the determination to succeed. Our teachers, our aspirant head teachers, our heads, our diocesan teams and our young people need this sort of resilience and determination.

So what progress have we made so far? There are lots of good things to tell you. We received a positive response from the House of Bishops, the Archbishops' Council, diocesan directors of education and others, and we are in the middle of a detailed needs analysis. All sorts of interesting things are happening here, lots of consultation, interviews, surveys with teachers and head teachers, hundreds of them, conversations with children's youth and family workers and of course a lot of conversations with diocesan leadership.

Where do we go from here? In September and October we are trying ideas for partnership working of various sorts and a really important date, on 10 November the proposal to the National Society Council. So there is lots going on but we are still at a very early stage.

I just want to finish by saying this to you. We must not forget that the Church of England's vision for education is actually about lifelong learning. This is one of our students with one of the old people in our community. For the time being, this project is focusing on schools and let me say again it is not just about traditional qualifications, important as they will always be. It is really about this: it is about educating the whole person, it is about gaining knowledge tempered by humility resulting in wisdom and it is about flourishing individuals who contribute to flourishing societies.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are very excited about this project. We are passionate about it. We hope you share that excitement and passion with us. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Synod, Revd Nigel Genders and Professor Joy Carter will be very pleased to answer your questions which I would like to take in groups of three, so if you have a question for our panel perhaps you could stand.

*Professor John Bull (Newcastle):* Nigel made much of the school he visited about the persistence of the answer "maths". I assume the school was referring to the requirement regarding this country's need for STEM subjects - science, technology, engineering and maths. Am I correct in my assumption?

*Canon James Allison (Leeds):* I am, and I am sure many other people who are involved either in governance or who have teachers in their school, will be aware of the phenomenon that we have of teachers in their early 50s who are declaring that they are completely burnt out and worn out and have been treated by some of the schools in which they work as a disposable asset, which is difficult given that they are also being told that they are expected to work until they are 68. The question I have is whether the National Society is addressing any of the issues that are involved with older teachers that seem to be coming up in the parishes but not being addressed in the schools?

*Miss Emma Forward (Exeter):* My question is this: what can we do about the following two things? The first is the risk to children and the opportunity to children in this digital age, both in terms of their own personal health and their personal safety and in their

education and how they learn. Secondly, what can we do about the increase in mental health issues for young people, especially things like eating disorders and suicide, which is a huge issue?

*The Chair:* Could we have some responses, please?

*Professor Joy Carter:* I am a scientist myself so I am very pleased to hear mention of STEM subjects. I suspect, although Nigel may tell us otherwise, that the children were just talking about traditional maths as taught in schools. However, STEM subjects, clearly, are really important and often it is about role models. I have a particular passion about women in engineering and women in science, and I think we have a responsibility to bring role models into schools to liaise with businesses as well as with educational establishments to really inspire young people to a whole range of things they can do which include STEM subjects.

*Revd Nigel Genders:* I would like pick up on James's point about burn-out amongst the teaching profession, which is true across the whole age range. One of the things which we are ambitious and hopeful about in this particular project is that we are seeking to provide a means of taking teachers from that call and vocation to teach right through initial teacher training and continued professional development, and their development as teachers and leaders and senior leaders and heads even into the future in a way which really nurtures the individual, and helps them not to feel that the world is against them but that they have got the whole weight of the Church of England standing by their shoulders to be able to say, "We are in this together."

When I talk to teachers as I go around dioceses, as I do, that is the thing they cry out for; the kind of confidence and the courage that Joy was talking about that means that we are able to be in this together, and providing the tools and the equipment they need in terms of continued professional development will be the means by which they can do that. We are hopeful that this absolutely addresses that issue.

If I just hand over to Joy to pick up on the digital age and then I will come back to you about mental health.

*Professor Joy Carter:* I think they are two very good points about the digital age and mental health. I absolutely agree that there is both a risk and an opportunity there. I am sure that in our leadership programmes which we are developing we will be very aware of both of those things. Sometimes the risks can be mitigated, can they not, by other activities such as sport and a whole range of other things, and I think this whole notion of character education really plays into the question of risk and opportunity of digital media.

*Revd Nigel Genders:* That is true in the area of mental health. I think it brings us right back to John's question at the beginning as well. Of course maths is really important but one of the problems that schools sometimes face is that the pressure to deliver on particular things is so intense that they are sometimes persuaded not to see education in the round. So what we are hoping that this project offers is a means of giving teachers and leaders that confidence to be able to really promote the flourishing of children in the classroom. I spoke to one school where the year six teacher, so the end of primary stage, had decided that because they were under such pressure in terms of their maths and

English results, for the whole of year six they would just do maths and English. It was not a Church of England school. Those things are really important, but you have to ask what that is doing to the mental health of children, and what we are wanting to offer through this kind of partnership work is the confidence for teachers to be able to say actually there is a whole range of things which will serve our children well. It is not about where you feature in the performance tables; it is what will equip these young people to be flourishing human beings in the society in which they serve.

*Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Guildford):* We have heard lots of enthusiasm and passion tonight which has been great. Clearly, partnerships are very valuable within the life of our Church and schools. We have heard a lot of great words about character, courage, determination and resilience, and it has been good to hear about the further consultation that will take place. I am still at the end of it not entirely clear what is going to happen and when. Therefore, I wonder when this does come to the National Society Council, will there be clear strategic objectives about what is being aimed for here, how those objectives fit into the wider mission of the Church, how those objectives will be delivered, what resources will be required and what review period will be built into it to check this is the best use of money.

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* I warmly welcome this initiative. Thank you so much for the presentation and the work as it moves forward. I am sure this is much needed. We spent a very interesting and creative day with our head teachers and chairs of governors in Sheffield last year exploring the Rule of St Benedict and other resources in the Christian tradition for offering leadership for Christian places of formation. The head teachers themselves have asked for another similar day this year and there is, I think, a very significant appetite for this.

I am fascinated by the opening paragraph in the paper and also paragraph 4 which talks about the "Anglican vision for education". I would love to hear a bit more about that and also how you intend to work ecumenically with other Christian churches engaged in education and also in the inter-faith area.

*Dr Yvonne Warren (Coventry):* Just following on from the second question and also Nigel's answer to that, is the reason that so many head teachers leave early and feel disillusioned and teachers themselves feel disillusioned because the power of governors and the chair of governors and parents has gone too much one way and they seem to have so much power?

*Revd Nigel Genders:* Philip, thank you very much for the sharp focus question about objectives and about the future. We are deliberately bringing this to you at the stage where it is in development in order to keep Synod abreast of our thinking and our developments. What we are seeking to do is to carry out that needs analysis. We have got a team of people working on that needs analysis across the country to see what teachers and leaders are telling us they really need, as Joy described. Then we are turning that into some initial pilot programmes and Pathfinder programmes that explore the areas of initial teacher training, of leadership training for aspirant heads and other leaders, for governor training and for training of diocesan education teams as well as clergy and lay people working in schools and with schools. Then we will turn all of that work into an absolutely clear business case that will describe the resource that is needed

and the success criteria upon which it will be based. That is the next stage that we are in the development of doing and we are looking for that kind of clarity as we develop the work.

As for the Anglican vision for education that the Bishop of Sheffield has asked further about, yes, we recognise that in order to promote this vision we need to ensure that it is a shared vision for education that the Anglican Church can really get behind. That is why Professor David Ford is going to be chairing a broad group of people who will be working with him. We have been in discussion FAOC and with the House of Bishops and we are taking a big item to the College of Bishops in September to ensure that the bishops and the theological weight of the Church of England really sits under this. Developing that Anglican vision so that we can be really clear about what it is that we are promoting that we want to be taught in our schools is really important. Joy will say something about the universities at that point.

*Professor Joy Carter:* Thank you. I just wanted to say that also we are working in the university world with the Catholic universities and the ecumenical universities so we are very used to working with different parts of the Christian church to the same goals, and I am sure we will continue to do this in developing a unique vision of our own but sharing some of the foundations with our friends in other bits of the Church.

*Revd Nigel Genders:* Picking up Yvonne's question, the issue about sustainability of our system is one where we really build proper partnerships. It is not necessarily about power and control and whether there is too much power in one direction, but it is about ensuring that governors and teachers and parents and people working in our parishes share this common vision for education and can, therefore, be joint ambassadors for it. So often teachers feel on their own, that they have just got to fight against a particular version which is coming out from one source. Again, it goes back to that courage and that confidence which comes with the whole of our network standing shoulder by shoulder and saying we really have got this clear sense of the flourishing education that we want to provide for our children and we can deliver that together.

*The Chair:* A further set of questions.

*Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds):* In the description of the vision for education that was given there were a lot of abstract nouns. What place is there in that vision for explicit information about the invitation to experience a life-changing encounter with Jesus Christ and with the development of individual and corporate spirituality and ethos? We are often told that schools are at the heart of the Church's mission, is it also the case that the Church's mission is at the heart of schools in that explicit way?

*Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* Following up that question and Bishop Steven's question, I am the governor of a community school in my area that could not be a more secular school but it is a values' based education and all those sorts of values are things which that school promotes. I would be sort of expecting an Anglican or a Christian school  
---

*The Chair:* Could we have your question, please, as there are a lot of people wanting to ask one?

*Revd Christopher Hobbs (London):* Yes. Well, I would be expecting, would you not, things like revelation, thanksgiving, humility, that kind of a value, a more specifically Christian value?

*Revd Canon Karen Hutchinson (Guildford):* Thank you very much for that presentation. I had only just received the Synod papers when a local headteacher of a community multi-academy trust took me aside and had a bit of a go at me about the Church becoming separatist and driving a wedge between Church and community schools, that there was a suggestion that teachers would have to choose between training in a Church training college or a community-wide teacher training. How accurate is that perception and is there any danger that Christian teachers might lose opportunities to be 'salt and light' in community schools?

*Revd Nigel Genders:* Paul's question about a vision and the place and the value of a specific and distinctive and focused Christian vision, we absolutely agree with. One of the projects which we are developing that you will have heard about before, for instance, is the Christianity Project which is seeking to ensure that the teaching of Christianity within our schools is so fantastic that young people get a proper understanding of the whole sweep of salvational history through their study of Christianity within schools, rather than it being a sort of tour of 'Here is the altar, there is the pulpit' type of religious education.

That kind of intentional and specific teaching of Christian theology within our schools is key for that. But the mission, the ethos, the thing which our schools hold dear, is that sense of being absolutely distinctive about where that narrative comes from. So at the very heart of all that we are doing, both through this partnership and through the whole work of the education office, as articulated in the '*Going for Growth*' strategy, is that life-transforming encounter with Jesus Christ and the Christian faith.

Those values that we have, those virtues which we are seeking to nurture in our children, are based on the narrative of the Christian faith and an encounter with Jesus Christ. That is clearly at the heart of what we are seeking to do. Others will share some of those values and some of the results that flow from that, but we have to be absolutely clear about the narrative that underpins them and the focus on that Christian narrative and the life and death and new life of Jesus. I think that picks up on the virtues question, but I know that Joy wants to say something more about that as well, particularly from the great work they are doing in Winchester.

*Professor Joy Carter:* Thank you. I absolutely agree with what Nigel has said and I would just like to echo it and to just add that for me I believe that values are at the heart of every Church of England school, or at least certainly should be. They will have a slightly different flavour depending on the type of school, the community, the particular sort of leadership and it is good and right that that should be the case. Humility, thanksgiving and revelation are really important, each one of those. Right at the end of my talk, I talked about knowledge tempered by humility resulting in wisdom.

*Revd Nigel Genders:* Is it separatist? Well, Canon, we really hope not because we went into education in this country because of our commitment to our mission to the nation because, actually, education is part of our mission as well, that bringing of justice and liberation and freedom that comes through education. That is what our mission is about as well. We are not wanting to be separatist. We are wanting to say, let us be absolutely

clear about what happens in our schools but, also, let us make sure that we equip and train people with this bigger vision of education and bigger vision of what education can achieve for young people so that all schools can benefit from this. We look forward to the day when people will think, actually, if you want to be trained to be able to really understand what education is for and to be able to deliver a broad empowering vision of education, then go to the Church of England because they really know how to do it.

*The Chair:* I will certainly take three more questions.

*Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth):* Thank you for that fascinating presentation but this is a question about governance. It is something I know something about, I am chairman of a sixth form college, my husband is chairman of a Roman Catholic primary school, and we talk about governance quite a lot in my family. We talk about the increasingly heavy responsibility for governance and for governors, the fiduciary duties on governors and the increasing responsibilities that they have. I wondered how you envisage finding and resourcing, properly resourcing, governors of the future, given the increasing workload in the role which often conflicts with people working long, full-time jobs these days and not much time in the evening once they have looked after their children? In particular, how are you going to resource Anglican primary schools with Christian governors - I will not even say necessarily Anglican, but Christian governors - in the future? Thank you.

*Ms Alison Fisher (Leeds):* Again, from a governor perspective, I am just interested, in this project, whether you are involving conversations and influence with the regulator because I think that is a really crucial element.

*Revd Chris Strain (Salisbury):* As a governor of an RC C of E VA secondary school I am quite concerned with the curriculum. There have been huge changes recently coming in, and there was some talk, with the new EBac coming in, that there may not be a place for RE. We teach RE to GCSE level for all students, will you be doing what you can to make sure that RE is part of the EBac?

*Professor Joy Carter:* We are fighting over the first question; we both want to answer it. Perhaps Nigel will have something to add to what I have got to say, but I just want to say from my own perspective I think governance is hugely important. Nigel may say how we will resource the work on governance, but all I want to say is we are committed to resourcing it.

You talk about the increasing complexity, increasing busy lives; and how true that is and, yet, how important is governance. In my own university there is a large number of diocesan governors and they really shape the character of the university. They make a massive difference to the culture and the strategy from a Christian perspective. I understand the importance of getting that right. As I say, Nigel may say how we are going to resource it but I want to say we are committed to resourcing it.

*Revd Nigel Genders:* I think partly the question, Lucy, is not how are we going to resource it but how are we going to resource it as a Church. When we talk about vocation, as we do and as we will under the Reform and Renewal Programme, vocation is also about vocation to teach and vocation to be a governor and vocation to carry out a Christian ministry in those contexts. I think the challenge for the Church is how are we going to

provide the future governors that we need as a vocation and as a Christian ministry amongst us. We will be working very hard to ensure that that is part of all that we seek to do.

One of the specific ways that perhaps we can help with that is by rethinking how we think about the role of governance. Increasingly, schools are grouping together in groups of schools, whether they be federations or multi-academy trusts. That gives us the opportunity to think about governance in different ways, to think about the kind of strategic top level governance that you need over a group of schools, as well as the day-to-day role that you need in a local school which is much more concerned with the individual school and the teaching and learning and the pastoral support and all those sides of things. Rethinking governance is one aspect of that, but the Church actually calling governors from amongst ourselves and promoting governance as an authentic and worthwhile and exciting Christian vocation.

As for influence, well, of course, the regulator would not want to be influenced by anybody, that is why they are a regulator. But we are talking to both Ofsted and to, more importantly, the Department for Education about this project. The Department for Education think this is a very exciting project which they are positive about us developing and they want us to develop and, hence, particularly around the character work, they have put their money where their mouth is to certain degrees as well. Ensuring that we have that on-going conversation and influence is really important.

Christopher's question about the EBac, yes, I said something about it just this week, and I am seeking meetings all time to talk about this really important question of whether religious education is part of the EBac. It really needs to be. At the very moment when we need greater religious literacy in this country, when we need our young people to understand the driving force for 80% of the world's population, not to study religion as part of their curriculum and to understand world religions in their own terms and in a systematic proper way is a huge oversight, and so we are constantly seeking to ensure that religious education has its proper place within the curriculum because actually our children are entitled to that education.

*The Chair:* Synod, because I know you can cut the preamble to a minimum, we have time for just two more questions.

*Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool):* In regard to the Character Education Programme there has obviously been considerable consultation. I would just like to know whether there has been any direct engagement with young people, particularly secondary school young people, and whether there has been encouragement for heads to engage directly with pupils in terms of their responses as part of consultation processes?

*Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford):* A chairman of governors. How can we increase the number of candidates applying to be headteacher under these exciting plans? Secondly, how can we keep those and stop them from resigning? Thirdly, how can we have more committed chairs?

*Revd Nigel Genders:* Yes, the 'Going for Growth' strategy, as you know, sets out for us the important requirement to hear the voice of children and young people and to make sure that we do that. Part of the Character Education work that we are beginning to

develop, and we are developing through this grant and is going to be going on through the coming months ahead, is that we are absolutely engaged with the young people that we are seeking to serve. It is understanding from those young people what they think their character is about and how we develop that and equip them and encourage them and move them forward. Absolutely, there will be engagement with young people and we are looking to do that in a number of different ways actually, through different aspects of the project.

Going back to Peter's question about how we recruit and retain and train headteachers, again it goes back to the point I made about vocation. Vocation in the Church tends to get used in particular circumstances and in particular ways. What better way of engaging with the young people in this country than being a teacher or being a headteacher and being a leader of a school which is seeking to promote that Christian character in its ethos? If we as a Church can show the joy and the excitement of that mission and the way that that is a key element of what we are seeking to do as a Church, then, I think we will stand more chance of recruiting the heads and supporting the heads and retaining the heads who will lead our schools for us into the future.

*Professor Joy Carter:* I just want to add something on the question of engaging with pupils. I am really glad that somebody asked that, because for me one of the biggest revelations of my career has actually been student engagement and there is a big revolution going on in higher education at the moment about partnership working with students. Amongst the primary schools that we link with, one of the most iconic schools in our area is one where the pupils' voice is the loudest. I am really glad that that question was asked and I am really keen that we should do that going forward.

*The Chair:* Synod, thank you for your engagement with this topic. Thank you very much to the panel and that brings this item of business to a close. Before I ask the Archbishop of York to dismiss us, perhaps you would like to show your appreciation to the panel.

There are now two items of what I will call housekeeping. Tomorrow morning, members will begin by meeting in groups, discussing the environment, and Morning Worship will take place in the groups. A reminder to those members who are leaving the campus tomorrow, you will need to check out of your room and return keys to the porter's lodge before making your way to the group work. Could I now call upon the Archbishop of York to dismiss us with a blessing?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* dismissed the Synod with the blessing.



## **FULL SYNOD: FOURTH DAY MONDAY 13 JULY 2015**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart)* took the Chair at 11.30 am

### **Combatting Climate Change: The Paris Summit and the Mission of the Church**

*The Chair:* Continuing on our environment day after our groups, we come to Item 25 on Order Paper V, Combatting Climate Change: The Paris Summit and the Mission of the Church (GS 2003). We are focusing on the global dimensions of climate change, looking ahead to the forthcoming Paris Summit, calling for long-term carbon reduction measures and questioning the Church's Environment Working Group to consider producing suitable theological and liturgical resources for parish use. I invite the Bishop of Salisbury to open the debate. You have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* I beg to move:

'That this Synod, believing that God's creation is holy, that we are called to protect the earth now and for the future, and that climate change disproportionately affects the world's poorest, and welcoming the convergence of ecumenical partners and faith communities in demanding that the nations of the world urgently seek to limit the global rise in average temperatures to a maximum of 2°C, as agreed by the United Nations in Cancun:

- a) urge all governments at the COP 21 meeting in Paris to agree long term pathways to a low carbon future, supported by meaningful short to medium term national emissions pledges from all major carbon emitting nations;
- b) endorse the World Bank's call for the ending of fossil fuel subsidies and the redirection of those resources into renewable energy options;
- c) request the Environment Working Group to develop *Shrinking the Footprint* to enable the whole Church to address the issue of climate change, and to develop and promote new 'ecothological resources', as proposed by the Anglican Communion Environmental Network in February 2015;
- d) request the Ministry Division to hear the call of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network bishops for programmes of ministerial formation and in-service training to include components on eco-justice and ecotheology; and
- e) encourage parishes and dioceses to encourage prayer and fasting for climate justice on the first day of each month.'

On this last day of Synod it is really good to be looking forward and outwards to address an issue of global concern that is the big issue. Thank you to the Business Committee for organising this and to you, Synod, for supporting the motion from Southwark Diocese in February 2014 that set up the Environmental Working Group. On the Order Paper there was a misprint that was corrected from 20C to 2°C. I think that was fairly obvious but just to point it out.

My sartorial elegance is to do with a shirt given to me by the Archbishop of Cape Town at my consecration as Bishop - Archbishop Thabo is the Convener of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network - and also a Cross of Nails which is based on Coventry's more elegant version. These are very much carpenter's crosses and a keyring symbolising the world, given to the environmental bishops that met at Volmoed, a retreat house with a name that means "courage" that was meant to encourage us.

The motion is to support and strengthen those preparing for the Paris Summit at the end of the year and beyond. It also challenges us and the whole of the Church of England. When the background paper for this debate was written, the Papal Encyclical had not been published and *Laudato Si'* is very welcome. It addresses not just Roman Catholics, not just Christians, not just people of faith but the whole world about the care of our "common home". Its Franciscan joy and delight in response to creation has caught the imagination. It is serious and it is hopeful. Francis, the Pope, shows us just how inseparable the bond is between concern for nature, justice for the poor, commitment to society and interior peace.

Our Bible studies and group work rooted this debate in Scripture, as did the Ethical Investment Advisory Group's presentation on Friday evening. Their policy is not for debate now but for this afternoon, but it is an exemplary piece of work setting a clear direction for us as a Church which others are already using.

This morning's motion develops previous Synod debates, especially the 2005 General Synod resolution supporting the message and recommendations of the report *Sharing the Planet*. It is in a trajectory set by the Anglican Communion in the 1980s with the Five Marks of Mission, the fifth of which is to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the Earth. This is integral to evangelism and mission, not an "it would be nice if".

As Paula Gooder said last night, there is an ecumenical consensus that has emerged around climate change. Pope Francis also refers to the work of Patriarch Bartholomew, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. It was really good to have the Archbishop of Uppsala here addressing us at the start of this Synod. The Swedish Church's Bishops' letter about the climate published in 2014 is a very significant contribution. It takes science and theology seriously. It recognises that we have entered a new era in which people are causing climate change. They write: "Our knowledge about future climate change is subject to a range of uncertainties .... No one is able to predict exactly how the climate will develop. However, it is essential to act now. It will certainly not be possible to establish that there is an alarmingly high temperature increase until it is too late to avoid it. Uncertainty about how the climate system reacts to emissions cannot therefore be used as an excuse for postponing powerful measures until we have more certain information. The only reasonable approach to the climate challenge is to act with caution."

In the words of a placard on the recent climate change lobby of Parliament: "There is no Planet B".

The motion reflects the statement from the meeting of Bishops of the Anglican Communion's Environmental Network in February and from the recently renewed Lambeth Declaration on Climate Change signed by our Archbishops and our faith leaders. They said the task is urgent, considerable and we need to work with partners.

In the last 150 years we have burned fossil fuels that took one billion years to lay down in the earth. The earth cannot sustain this level of consumption. This is about our 'reading the signs of the times' and 'seeking the common good'.

The science, economics and politics all point in the same direction. Climate change disproportionately affects the poorest. They are the most vulnerable to increased storms, rising sea levels, changing patterns of rainfall, floods and drought. We live interconnected lives. What is bad for our neighbours is bad for us.

It is nine years since the Stern Review estimated that the impact of climate change on the economy will be the equivalent of reducing the gross domestic product globally by between 5 and 20% negatively per year. That has been much debated. Since then, Lord Stern has revised his view. He says he underestimated the risks, the impact of climate change and the probability of temperature increases, which will be much greater.

And of course the economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of the environment.

Before the General Election the then main party leaders - and I might have to remind you, David Cameron, Ed Miliband and Nick Clegg - pledged to work together across party lines to address the challenge of climate change: working towards a new international deal on climate change; to agree UK carbon budgets in accordance with the Climate Change Act; and to accelerate the transition to a low carbon economy and end the use of unabated coal in power generation.

There is a high degree of unanimity and leadership from the UK but it is difficult to get urgent international commitments to fair, ambitious, accountable and binding climate change agreements.

Our politicians welcome the support of the Church and the faith communities. The Conference of European Churches is working together to prepare for Paris.

At root, I think this is a spiritual problem. We get things fundamentally wrong, especially when we behave as though we are the centre of everything. What is needed is a change of heart and of direction, a humbler, smarter and more urgent approach to our care of God's Earth - repentance for the forgiveness of sins as well as the engagement of our best minds and hearts.

The motion is one of the longest to come to Synod in William Fittall's time as General Secretary. He says that is not necessarily a sign of excellence. It also perhaps makes it a bit vulnerable to fiddling with. There is the idea that the proposed amendments might

help us focus the debate. The motion makes a theological statement that we believe God's creation is holy, asks something of us that we are called to protect the earth now and for the future, recognises that climate change disproportionately affects the poor and welcomes the convergence of agreement about the need to limit the global rise in average temperatures to less than 2°C.

This is urgent and it requires us to work together with partners.

We urge all governments at the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework on Climate Change in Paris from 30 November to 11 December 2021 (COP 21) to agree long-term pathways to a low carbon future. The UK has shown and is showing significant leadership. Paris will strengthen the international framework that reduces carbon emissions.

It is really important to think that the task is beyond Paris. It is a journey through Paris. We will need to extend climate finance to help the less developed world to 'leap frog' to low carbon technology and renewable energy. The politicians' political courage needs support.

We need to move from subsidies of fossil fuels to investment in renewable energy. It is already apparent in the way our National Investing Bodies are moving in response to the EIAG report.

We need to continue to shrink our carbon footprint and use the opportunities of churches and schools to educate and inspire change. Every diocese is supposed to have a diocesan environmental officer to champion this. Use the resources. When you go back from Synod encourage parishes to use the existing and excellent resources to lead your church through a changing climate.

There needs to be a much stronger movement of the people who are part of our churches. The Environmental Working Group can develop and promote new eco-theological resources. Yes, it is a new word like economy, ecology, using the eco of our house and eco-theology and eco-justice for the love of God and of our neighbour. It is a spiritual problem and it is complex. Pray about it. Use the resources of prayer. Fasting is not "skipping a sandwich". It is about what you hunger for: hunger for justice. Actually discover what it is to be hungry like the poor of the Earth.

At the end of the trip with Christian Aid to Malawi we met with the poorest people we had met all week. They were planting trees to address the issues of deforestation and soil erosion. The poorest of people making a long-term sacrificial investment. That is what is required of us now. That is what is being asked of us as Synod to encourage our churches to engage with.

I move the motion in my name.

*The Chair:* The motion is now open for debate. I intend to take several speeches and then move to the amendment. Alexandra Podd for her maiden speech followed by Caroline Spelman.

*Miss Alexandra Podd (Church of England Youth Council):* This is my maiden speech. There is a psychological phenomenon known as the “bystander effect” where in an emergency, with more people there, it takes more time for something to happen. So for 20 witnesses it will take 20 minutes, say, for 999 to be called because more people are there. In other words, the more people that are there, the less will be done and the slower it will be.

I have absolutely no doubt that this needs to be passed. I have spent hours and hours in lectures as a geography undergraduate at the University of Birmingham, with lecturers changing their syllabuses trying to confirm to us that climate change is not a myth. Unfortunately, they never change their exam questions to match this syllabus, but you cannot have it all.

Our practice as a Church needs to be sustainable. This is something that takes financing, practicalities and the clear environmental concerns that we are discussing today into account. I appreciate the eco-theological resources that are being proposed and we have seen, but I would also call as a Church that we would provide some clear, practical advice for our own lives, whether it be encouraging churches to put solar panels on the roofs of vicarages or whatever else that we can easily adapt into our own lives as we call the rest of the world to follow this.

A recent World Health Organisation Report said that between 2030 and 2050, 250,000 additional people will die per year due to climate change impacts. That means that many here and especially myself will see five million extra deaths by the time I am 56, an age I was assured yesterday is the average age of a bishop.

I believe that this is an emergency in so many terms. So, Synod, I leave you with a question. There are almost 500 of us in this chamber: how long is it going to take us to call the environmental emergency services?

*Mrs Caroline Spelman MP (Second Church Estates Commissioner):* I want first just to thank you for the very warm welcome I have had at my first Synod. As an MP I am used to putting up Synod members in my home when it takes place in London but this did cause my diary secretary to challenge me over who “General Synod” really was.

I welcome this opportunity to inform and encourage you as members of Synod on the progress of the negotiations for a United Nations’ agreement on climate change. In my previous role as Environment Secretary, I was involved with the negotiation of two United Nations’ agreements, on biodiversity in Nagoya in 2010 and on sustainable development in Rio in 2012, and I cannot stress enough how hard it is to get 194 nations to agree unanimously. So, the fact that the preparations for the Paris talks are going well is encouraging.

You may recall that the previous attempts to reach agreement in Copenhagen ended in disaster with recriminations against the hosts. Since then, Europe has been working very hard behind the scenes to encourage developing countries, who were anxious about having their opportunity to develop choked off, that it is in all our interests to address the damaging consequences of climate change.

The good news from the preparations is that countries like China and the United States are serious about a deal. Each country has to forward to the UN its intentions to meet the target of pegging global warming to 2°C. So far 18 countries, including China, the US, the EU, South Korea, Mexico, Russia and Canada, have submitted their initial offerings, which amounts to about 56% of the emissions reductions that we need. Those from Japan and Australia are expected later this month and others including Brazil are anticipated by early autumn. The offers received so far are not enough to reach the 2°C target but more progress is likely to be made as the talks reach their final stage. There is nothing like a few all-night sittings to focus the mind on peoples' last and best offers. The UK's offer is part of the EU offer but our own Climate Change Act already binds us to higher targets than the rest of the EU. It is very significant that our carbon emissions are falling whilst our economy is actually growing, and the UK is seen in the vanguard of delivering the progress which is needed.

I was delighted to attend the climate change rally in London earlier this year, and well done to the organisers, but sometimes I felt when I met my constituents and other constituents that people were not entirely clear about the leadership that the UK provides. The UK believes that the faith communities have a key role to play on climate change and welcome the Lambeth Declaration of 2015. In their view, the Church of England can help galvanise a response from wider faith communities and use its networks to reach beyond even the wider Anglican Communion to other faiths. Things can go wrong at the last minute and relations can suddenly sour between countries or between blocs of countries. Trust and goodwill are engendered by good personal relations between ministers and negotiators and, in my view, what we need to do is pray very hard for all of them.

The Church must be seen to practise what it preaches and in the short time that I have been in this role I have been really heartened by the Commissioners' decision to show leadership amongst institutional investors on the mitigation of climate change through its own investment practice.

Addressing climate change, as the Bishop said, is not just a scientific problem, it is a moral one, and if we do not resolve it, it will have a major impact on the lives of everyone but especially the poorest. Our generation owes it to the next generation to tackle a problem not of their making.

Let me finish with a challenge: as a result of this debate, what is it that you and I are going to do differently that will make that change?

*Revd Duncan Dormor (Universities):* "Finding ways to develop a sustainable relationship with nature requires not only engagement of scientists and political leaders, but also moral leadership that religious institutions are in a position to offer."

Not Pope Francis but two very eminent academics, an economist and an atmospheric scientist, writing last year in the leading journal *Science*.

Each day in my context, a leading global research university, I sit down at lunch with people working extremely hard on bringing about climate change through a wide range of research, from artificial photosynthesis through low energy architecture to developing sustainable business leadership and practices, but without strong political, religious and

moral leadership, frankly, such innovative work is unlikely to achieve very much at all.

In very warmly welcoming this motion, I want to touch on two points which come out of my context. The first is a principle about which there is also clear agreement between the Pope and some leading economists; that it is impossible to tackle the environmental challenges effectively without simultaneously tackling poverty. What we are interested in then is climate justice. As the Pope's Encyclical puts it: "A truly ecological approach always becomes a social approach; it must integrate questions of justice in debates on the environment, so as to hear both the cry of the earth and the cry of the poor."

That leads me to my second more substantial and specific point which concerns the issue of false accounting. Conventional economic measures, including for example GDP and allied concepts, provide false or partial or biased ways of talking about the economy at global, regional and national levels. Globally, there is a massive \$72 trillion gap, a gaping hole in the accounts because that is the estimated amount of goods and services essential to the global economy made up of what is called natural capital. That is the stock of natural ecosystems on earth, including air, land, soil, biodiversity and geological resources. The measurement and evaluation of these benefits, known as natural capital or resource accounting, is not an easy business but it is possible and the methodologies are improving.

Such a form of holistic, one might call it "realistic", accounting provides a useful toolkit that allows a fuller accounting of the negative spillovers, the hidden costs of economic activities like pollution. As such, if it gains greater currency and legitimacy, which it could do with our support, it will allow governments, multi-nationals and local companies to be held to account and indeed to integrate sustainability into their businesses. It will also unmask the clear reality that in the world of ecological debt the most highly indebted countries are in the northern hemisphere.

We are at a watershed moment, a crossroads, a *kairos* moment, if you wish. It is time to act. The Pope is making the weather. The scientists are toiling in the modern day vineyards. We should stand up for the waters are rising and the clock (*chronos*) is ticking for many of our brothers and sisters. Christians have led significant changes to the global economic system before with the abolition of the slave trade and in the pursuit of global justice; I hear their slogan echoing today: "Am I not a man and a brother; am I not a woman and a sister?"

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby):* First of all, I think we would all want to thank Bishop Nick for the leadership he is showing in this area and the way that he has picked up what is a very crucial moment, as Duncan Dormor has just said, and has led it and is leading it very effectively. It is a moment at which we sense the current of events running in a new way. There has already been comment on *Laudato Si'* on the Pope's stress in this area and the way that that has changed the approach and people's thinking, but the Ecumenical Patriarch, as we heard yesterday, has been for many years one of the world's leading experts in this area and continues to work extremely powerfully. So you have the leaders there, with Bishop Nick and Archbishop Thabo in South Africa, of three great Communion around the world all deeply committed, and we are grateful to them.

Actions have to change if words are to have effect and, as Nick said, the issue is one of the Common Good and the Common Good is one of our quinquennial aims so this is immensely relevant to us.

I want to pick out four particular areas very briefly. The first has already been mentioned by Caroline Spelman in her maiden speech, that of education and networking. We have unrivalled access to networks around the world. How are we going to use them and look beyond our own boundaries as the Church of England to draw in the resources of the whole Communion? This is a moment not for just looking inwards. It is still too big an issue for most people to get their minds round, including most of us here. It is above all a classic issue for the whole people of God, not just for the clergy, the bishops and the ordinands. Part five of the Anglican Communion's Marks of Mission says that we are "to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth". That has been in our objectives as a Communion for many years. We have to come back to that and say what are we doing as part of our educational work and networking that will demonstrate that we take it seriously?

Secondly, we have to come back to the basic social teaching principle of the dignity of the whole human person and the breaking down of the barriers between us achieved in Christ. In other words, as Duncan Dormor said, this has to be holistic. There are many questions that stop us facing climate change. We need to be deeply engaged in the development, as we are through the Anglican Alliance, of the new Sustainable Development Goals if climate change is to have the place that it needs in international policy. Conflict is one of those areas that destroys any attempt to manage issues around climate change. Climate change is both a driver of conflict and a victim of conflict and we must face that reality and use our networks to address that issue.

Thirdly, co-creativity, we need an imaginative commitment to new ways of approaching the subject of climate change that does not accept a deterministic or selfish nationalistic policy. We cannot simply look at ourselves and say we must do better and kick the ladder away from the vast majority of humankind that is struggling to find the prosperity that we enjoy so richly. That requires a huge investment in new ideas. If you look up Leo Johnson's work in this area, it is quite fascinating.

Lastly, it must be incarnational. Alexandra Podd and Caroline Spelman spoke of this. We are to be exemplary in what we do ourselves. That comes down to some very basic things about faculty legislation, about the use of our buildings and imaginative work there, about how we use our heritage, about how we use and invest our finances (of which more later today), and around how we heat and light things. Symbolic actions such as use of paper at General Synod, the amount we travel and disinvestment or the tackling and engagement with companies in certain areas like Arctic drilling are equally important. This is not a stand-alone issue. It cuts across all we do. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham):* Earlier this year a motion was brought to the deanery synod of which I am chair, via their PCC, by the Justice and Peace Group of one of the parish churches. Conversations were happening in PCCs and deanery synods across the diocese. Some of those responsible for getting those conversations going are in the gallery today. This movement of people and concern led to the Diocesan Synod Motion listed on page 20 of the Agenda.



Part (a) was intended to give Synod an opportunity to express its mind on disinvestment and will be picked up through Hugh Lee's amendment this afternoon. Part (b) was to encourage investment in renewable energy and low carbon technologies and will be picked up in my amendment this afternoon. Part (c), which calls on Her Majesty's Government to ensure that binding agreements are reached at the Paris Summit, is picked up here. We are delighted that this motion is being debated and being brought to Synod by the Environment Working Group.

My sisters and brothers in Birmingham want to stress the urgency of the situation. Public policy is key. This afternoon we will talk about investment policy. A 2011 study by Mercer highlighted the importance of climate policies as a risk factor for investors, given their ability to incentivise meaningful changes in the energy sector. I have learnt a lot over the last few months, and particularly the last few weeks, about the complexities of climate change and investment.

One thing I think I understand clearly now is the difference that an agreement in Paris would make to those who seek to lead on sustainable investment. An agreement to keep to 2°C would provide a climate where investment in renewable energy could really take off and investment in fossil fuels would become increasingly unattractive. The Global Apollo Programme to combat climate change, highlighted by the First Estates Church Commissioners at the Church Commissioners' AGM, brings one clear simple insight: if clean energy is less costly to produce than energy based on coal, gas or oil, then coal, gas and oil would simply stay in the ground. This requires research.

The target of the Global Apollo Programme is that energy from renewable sources becomes cheaper than coal in the first place in sunny parts of the world by 2020 and worldwide from 2025. That would be a start. Then, the target becomes for renewable energy to become cheaper than oil and then gas. An agreement at the COP 21 meeting in Paris that agrees a direction of travel to a low carbon economy with meaningful short to medium term pledges will help to create that policy framework where the investments required to address the targets of the Global Apollo Programme flow more readily.

The end of fossil fuel subsidies and their redirection, as mentioned in part (b) of the motion, could be another significant contributing factor. As I said, my sisters and brothers in Birmingham wish to underline to you the urgency of this matter. Our sisters and brothers in Malawi, Birmingham's linked diocese, some of whom we saw in Professor Burridge's presentation on Friday, desperately need the world's community to act urgently, to strive to safeguard the integrity of Creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

I urge Synod to wholeheartedly support this motion but, more than that, to continue to act and to pray on it as we return to our dioceses and parishes, our places of work, our families and our communities.

*The Chair:* Margaret Swinson, then I am going to ask Revd Jonathan Fraiss to speak to the amendment in his name at Item 53.

*Canon Margaret Swinson (Liverpool):* "Why should I tidy my room when the world is in such a mess?" That was a slogan on a T-shirt that my son had when he was small. I

could say that he could probably do with the same T-shirt still, but that is not the point. You might recall in the report back from the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in Auckland that I spoke of our meeting with the Polynesian community. We received a presentation about the environment and the consequences of environmental change for them in music and dance. It was a very powerful presentation, but not as powerful as what happened as we were leaving and getting back on the bus. As we left, one of those present shook my husband's hand and he said, "Help us, we're desperate".

That message was reinforced in what Bishop Nigel said to us at the revue on Saturday. That message has stayed with us since that visit and has made us think seriously about what we do. The world is in a mess but there is tidying up that we can do. There is tidying up that is our responsibility. The Archbishop of Canterbury has highlighted that this is a very big issue and people find it difficult to get their heads around it, and Caroline Spelman asked us to think personally about what action we might take.

I would like to offer two suggestions about forms that maybe our fasting should take if we pass this resolution and include paragraph (e) in either the form that it is currently in or the form in the amendment; actions which will focus our attention perhaps more sharply on the climate change and environmental aspects of our lives than just on our stomachs.

Watching video content, undertaking Google searches and generating spam - I am sure we never generate spam in the Church of England - generates 38 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions a year, the same as eight million cars. Perhaps we should have a day off from Google. Perhaps we should use our brains or books rather than resorting to Googling when we want the answer to even the most simple of questions.

Perhaps we should also spend time deleting things that we do not need from Cloud storage. Cloud storage is not free of environmental cost and much of the energy used for it is not green. It is coal powered. Most of the energy that is used in Cloud storage is not transactional energy. That is less than 15%. Most of the energy is for the running of the air conditioning systems and the back-ups, just in case the main one fails. In the US alone that data storage generates 97 million metric tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Think twice before you decide to download onto your Cloud storage 100 photographs, of which 25 are not in focus or are the same as the other 25 that are next to them. If you had to keep it in your living room, would you keep it? That will help us to tidy our rooms and, as we tidy our rooms and set an example for others, that should hopefully begin to generate some real good for those people who are desperate because their land is disappearing.

*The Chair:* Revd Jonathan Fraiss to move the amendment in his name.

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

*Revd Jonathan Fraiss (Chichester):* I beg to move as an amendment:

'Leave out "holy" and insert "good".'

Thank you, Mr Chairman, for calling me. When someone saw this they said to me, "Are

you sponsored by those award winning wine growers of Sussex that you want to insert the word 'good'?" No, but I do have a reason for liking the word. Among the many background papers for today, in our debates, both before and after lunch, the thickest one, GS Misc 1110, has at page 10 a study on Genesis where it uses the word "good". The world was made good.

Of course, that was elsewhere in Genesis 1 as we studied another part of Genesis 1 in our groups earlier today. Yet, the word used in this motion in line 1 says, "That God's creation is holy", a slightly surprising choice of word; one that, as we heard, makes a theological statement. Of course, "holy" is so familiar to us; it is part of our faith language. God himself is holy. The temple of the old Covenant was, "The holy place". In the New Testament the demons in the synagogue cry out at Jesus, "You are the holy one of God". Christians are called to be holy, filled with the Holy Spirit, looking forward to the Holy City, the new Jerusalem.

In honour of all that, we call our Bible holy. But the word "holy" is not the word used in the Bible for Creation, instead it is "good"; now broken, of course, as well as beautiful. This good world is the context of the work of our holy God. Yes, I know "good" is less eye-catching than "holy", but it is God's word for our world. Let us use the theological basis we have set up and allow that basis and work done to inform and mould the motions we bring. Mr Chairman, I submit this amendment to Synod for its consideration. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Open for debate, Professor Burridge. Sorry, just before you speak or get ready to speak, I will ask the Bishop of Salisbury to respond.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* Thank you very much. I want to resist the amendment, though I am grateful for the conversation about it. Language is important and the word "holy" is used in the statement from the Bishops of the Anglican Communion's Environmental Network and we shared the understanding that Creation is holy and that we are called to serve and protect the earth now and for future generations.

Now it would be tidy if we kept the word because the statement from the Anglican Communion of Bishops is going to be part of what goes to the ACC meeting next year, but I do recognise that tidiness of language is not going to be enough. But why "good"? Does not Genesis say after the sixth day that the Creation was very good? There is a theological point here, not just a scriptural one. "Holy" is set apart. Psalm 24:1 was used on Friday night: The Earth is the Lord's and all that is in it. We live in these between times, with a memory of paradise and a hope of heaven, but we are called to live on earth as people who want to live as if the Kingdom were here and now. That requires a reverence for this Creation and the longing for a new heaven and a new earth to which we witness. I think that is what it is to treat the earth as holy with reverence.

In the Encyclical the Pope draws on his namesake patron, St Francis; and, of course, the stigmata, the wounds of Christ on Francis's body living joyfully, with the way it is with the wounds of the earth and living joyfully as if in the resurrection now. That is why "holy", I think, is a wholly appropriate word.

*Revd Professor Burridge (Universities):* This is the only contribution I will make in this

debate, so can I just say a huge thanks to Bishop Nick and the 'Shrinking the Footprint' and the Environmental Working Group for the way they have been complementing all we have done on EIAG. I thank Mr Frai very much for his reference to page 10 which I helped to write, particularly about Genesis 1. He is, of course, absolutely right that the word there that is used is "good".

However, I would urge Synod to resist this motion, not just because, as Bishop Nick has explained, the word "holy" is the one used in the Anglican Communion Eco Bishops' statement. It is a joy to me that my wife is also an Old Testament biblical scholar and we have been engaged in a lot of discussion recently with Jonathan Sacks about the impact of the holiness movement after the return from the exile upon the Book of Genesis.

While Mr Frai is absolutely right that the word used there is "good", the reflections on the experience of the exile raised the whole notion of holiness. It was because the seventh day is holy and because the land is holy was felt to be really important, and it was the failure of the Israelites to keep the land holy that actually meant, as it says in Leviticus 18: "The land will vomit you out because you have defiled it." Very strong words. That is how they understood what had happened to them in exile; that the land had vomited them out. "The land will yield its fruits, and you will eat your fill and live on it securely ..." if you follow my covenants, and so on. "But, if you do not, I will bring terror on you, consumption and fever that waste the eyes and call life to pine away. You shall sow your seed in vain .... Your strength shall be spent to no purpose. Your land shall not yield its produce and the trees of the land shall not yield their fruit."

That is what Bishop Nick and I were seeing in Malawi. That is what we are seeing all over the world. We are defiling the land and it will vomit us out of it. We are called to try to keep the seventh day holy, to give the land its rest and we have not been doing that.

That is why, although I recognise the word "good", I think having this notion of "holy" is really important because it is the presence of God in the land through His people that makes the land of the Creation holy. We have treated it badly. We have defiled it. So important though the word "good" is, I do think that I want to keep the word "holy". Thank you.

*Mrs Madeleine Ratcliffe Holmes (Europe):* I think the last time I spoke on the environment in London I said how thrilled I was that, eventually, the Church of England, the Anglican Church, was actually looking at our environment and what we are called to do. What I wanted to say today was to encourage. I noticed that our heading is, "The Paris Summit and the Mission of the Church". I firmly believe that the environment is an amazing mission tool where we can reach outside our churches, encouraging people in the work of the environment and climate change.

In my four years in the Diocese of Europe those who supported and helped me were those on the team of 'Shrinking the Footprint'. Those were the ones that encouraged and helped me. I wondered if you would really like to know that, in fact, David Shreeve's article on "Forward to Paris" appeared in this French publication recently, *L'Unité Chrétienne*. The Director of the publication says this, "I am now sure my French Readers will be impressed by the way the environment issues are taken into account in the Church of England in very concrete and pragmatic ways. We hope this will help Christians in

France to be themselves on the road to Paris”.

I think really what is true is that actually here in the UK, you do do an enormous amount. What is very important is to get back to our grass roots as well because actually this is our responsibility, each and every one of us. I think that sometimes it is fear that keeps us back.

We must encourage one another to do whatever we possibly can in whatever small way. Those in power and in governments, they will be tackled. We do not have to fear because we, Madeleine Holmes or you, cannot tackle them, but we can work in our own ways. So I would encourage you to be really, really strong and take up your responsibility. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Archbishop of York and, after the Archbishop of York, I would be grateful for a motion on the closure for this amendment.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Bishop Chair, please. I want to support Nick that this amendment really should not be accepted, simply because I would have accepted it if we were talking about the world but in the New Testament the world picture is a totally different question. The thinking is about Creation. Whatever is brought into being out of God is always holy. It cannot be but holy. It is Creation we are talking about.

Do you think that the holiness was simply restricted to that account in Exodus 3 with the burning bush? Listen to these words, “When the Lord saw that Moses had turned aside to see, God called to him out of the bush, ‘Moses, Moses’, and he said, ‘Yes, here am I.’ Then he said, ‘Come no closer. Remove the sandals from your feet for the place on which you are standing is holy ground’.” Was that only limited to that encounter in Exodus or do we sincerely believe that Jesus’s coming and ascending the Kingdom of God, actually that reality, is still true?

Yes, it is true in Romans 8, the whole of Creation is groaning, wanting to be liberated; but it is groaning, why? Because of the one who subjected it to the groaning in the first place. I think the word “holy” should not be limited in the sense in which my dear brother who moved the motion seems to imply. For me, I think I want to retain that sense of holiness. You see, the Jews are fantastic. They wear a *kippah* on their head because they say they are walking on holy ground and they are in God’s Creation. They are not detached. We need to go back to that place that wherever we are walking, whatever we are doing, the place is holy.

That one wonderful image you get from Desmond Tutu, what persuaded him to become a Christian. It was because Trevor Huddleston, whenever he came into the house and Desmond Tutu’s mother was cooking, he would take off his cap and doff it. He said, “How come a white man is doing that to my mother?” He asked the question. “Because your mum is holy.” Why? “Because she is created in the image and likeness of God”. Wherever we are moving, we are in God’s world, God’s Creation. Therefore, for me it actually ties up that whoever is holy brings into being something cannot but be.

Yes, the sin of Adam has come and infected us and corrupted us, but I still want to believe

this creator God who loves all of us, what he created is holy. I am corrupted, but it still does not take away from the image of his creator. So please retain the word because it gives us a much, much clearer theology than goodness, which can be very subjective.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

*The Chair:* That has my consent, does it have the consent of Synod?

*This motion was carried on a show of hands.*

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. The motion before us is the amendment to leave out “holy” and insert “good”.

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

*The Chair:* Can I ask Canon Sugden to move the amendment in his name, which is at number 54 in your Order Paper.

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

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After paragraph (b) insert –

“(–) encourage the redirection of resources into other lower carbon energy options;”.’

Synod, this is a friendly amendment. The overall goal is, of course, to secure supplies of energy without more CO<sub>2</sub>. The issue of ending energy subsidies endorsed in clause (b) is important, not only for fossil fuels. Some subsidies for renewables as well are funded by additions to the energy costs of all customers.

Less well-paid people paying for their energy through pay-as-you-go meters are paying the same extra tariff that provides the subsidies and these are a regressive tax. This means that poorer people in society are paying through their already hard-to-afford fuel bills for the attractive returns offered to those with the funds to put solar fuel panels on the roofs of their homes or churches. The Church should not be a party to such a regressive tax. We cannot claim to be following an ethical approach to energy by collaborating in this unethical approach.

Some zero and low carbon sources such as nuclear and carbon storage are not renewables but are worthy of investment and do not involve regressive subsidies. A group of highly qualified scientists from Harwell churches in the Oxford diocese is ready to put their decades of professional experience in this field at the service of the Church and its policy and investment bodies on this matter.

I urge Synod to add the words, “encourage the redirection of resources into other lower carbon energy options”, to make clear that renewable energy options are not the only

recipients we wish for redirected resources and certainly not those that involve a regressive tax on the poor. Thank you, Synod.

*The Chair:* Bishop of Salisbury.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* This puts me into a difficult position, I think. I am willing to accept the amendment as written, but I think I want to make it clear that I do not accept the arguments that Chris has just laid out. That is problematic, is it not, because it gives mixed signals?

The main motion is towards a lower carbon society. That is what we are aiming for. Therefore, it seems to me, as stated in the text, I am very willing to accept the amendment and actually I think it is helpful; but I do think the debate that would need to happen is a much more complex one than I think we are capable of running through this amendment, and I simply want to register that I would need to come back on the arguments as put, because it is much more complex.

Nevertheless, in terms of the addition that has been proposed, I am willing to accept that we encourage the redirection of resources into other lower carbon energy options as well as renewables.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* In view of that acceptance, I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I put that to Synod, would you accept a motion of closure on this item?

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much indeed. I now put Item 54 to you, to insert after paragraph (b), “encourage the redirection of resources into other lower carbon energy options”.

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

I will now ask Archdeacon Jan McFarlane to put the amendment in her name at Item 55.

*Ven Jan McFarlane (Norwich):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (e), *leave out* “to encourage prayer and fasting” and *insert* “to draw attention to the initiative supported by members of the Faith and Climate network encouraging Christians to pray and fast”.’

Some years ago I was asked to do some communications training with a group of newly ordained Roman Catholic priests. After a busy morning we retired to the local pub for lunch. Being unused to having a clerical collared woman amongst them, they very gentlemanly invited me to order first. I normally eat a vegetarian menu but somehow accidentally ordered a very juicy rare steak. My Roman Catholic brothers then ordered -

fish, fish, fish, fish and fish. Yes, it was a Friday.

So maybe this experience has made me a little over-sensitive, but I am just uneasy about paragraph (e), that encouragement to fast as it currently stands. I am uneasy, I think, first, because without the background that is offered in that paper, the call on its own to fast on the first day of every month could set us up, I think, for failure. If I were a mischievous journalist - a contradiction in terms, I know - I would wait a month or two and then I would ring round a goodly selection of bishops and Synod members on the first of the month to check that they were fasting. It has the potential to distract from the matter at hand.

I am uneasy because it looks a little as if we are using fasting to make a political statement, something which I am not sure Jesus recommended. Even after everything we have heard so far this morning, as critical as this issue is, why this one issue? Why this one issue that we are going to choose to call for a day of fasting? Why not for human trafficking? Why not for domestic abuse? There are lots of other issues that need our priority. Thank you.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* Well, we have eaten very well here in York, have we not? I am going to resist this amendment but, actually, I would like a discussion on it. The business of prayer and fasting cannot be adequately caught as skipping a sandwich. This is about what do you hunger for? This whole business about how do you pray, what do you want and how do you discover that without experience something of the hunger for justice.

I like the idea of journalists checking up and, if they did, what they would find is that sometimes on the first of the month I do not fast because I am doing something else. Actually, this is about finding a day.

Some people will fast for 24 hours, some will miss a meal where they can, we will do it in varied ways, the question is how do we pray for something, that is really what it is about, and can fasting support that process.

Yes, of course it is integral. Praying for one thing does not stop you praying for others. One of the themes really coming through in this debate is how integrative and holistic this is, so praying for one thing does not stop you praying for others; it makes you realise how much more you want the things of the Kingdom of God.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I am afraid there is still a two minute speech limit.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Thank you for calling me, Chair. I was not planning to talk in this debate but I think Synod might like to know some of the background to the Praying and Fasting for the Climate Initiative. This comes from somebody called Yeb Saño, who is a Filipino diplomat who I think at the last COP talks, or certainly at one of the major climate change talks, began to fast himself and wanted to go on fasting until a meaningful agreement was reached, but at the end decided it was better to stay alive. So he stopped his continuous fasting and decided to fast on the first day of every month until a meaningful climate change agreement has been reached. His initiative is called the Fast for the Climate Initiative.



We in this country, as part of the Faith for the Climate Network, have set up something called the Pray & Fast for the Climate Initiative. It is supported by this network that we have set up, which is an inter-faith and Christian network and we are encouraging parishes to do this. This is a specific reference to something very specifically in preparation for Paris and that is why I would urge you to resist the amendment and stick with the motion as proposed. Thank you.

*Revd Charles Razzall (Chester):* On the Business Committee we have had some discussion about the amount of food we do eat here, and I think that was well made by Bishop Nick. Please resist this amendment. The Pope in his Encyclical talks about the sacrificial element that is at the heart of all this, and a good fast in that seeking of justice and in linking it with prayer is absolutely at the heart of what we should be about, I do not think it is tokenism. Let us support Bishop Nick on this.

*The Chair:* Miss Dailey, and then after that I would be grateful for motion for closure on this amendment.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* I would like to support this amendment from the Archdeacon of Norwich, first of all for some of the reasons that she mentioned in relation to the fact that there are many other things for which we may wish to fast in addition to the climate issue, but also I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Church of England actually has a traditional discipline of fasting which it ignores. I am no better at this than most people. Fasting should be an important part of our Christian life. The Muslims are currently in Ramadan and frankly I feel they put us to shame in that way.

We should revive the practice of fasting which is part of our Anglican tradition, and so let us do that first, let us take fasting seriously. By all means let us make this one of our concerns but I do not think we need to have something new, let us actually make use of what we have already got.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

*The Chair:* Thank you. That has my consent. Does it have the consent of Synod? Thank you very much.

The motion before us is the amendment at Item 55: “leave out ‘to encourage prayer and fasting’ and insert ‘to draw attention to the initiative supported by members of the Faith and Climate network encouraging Christians to pray and fast’.” There will be a division of the whole Synod.

*The amendment was carried following a division of the whole Synod. The voting was as follows:*

<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>160</i>
<i>AGAINST</i>	<i>147</i>

*13 abstentions were recorded.*

*The Chair:* We now resume the main debate on the amended motion and call the Bishop of Sheffield followed by Revd Plant.

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* I am very grateful for this debate, for the work done by the Environmental Working Group and for the lead given by Her Majesty's Government that we heard about earlier. I wholeheartedly support all parts of this motion. Together with other northern dioceses, Sheffield has supported the Hope for the Future campaign, which has been one of the campaigns encouraging lobbying of MPs and candidates which continues its work.

I want to address my remarks especially to what used to be clauses (d) and (e) and are now (e) and (f). As Chair of the Ministry Council, I wholeheartedly support the call of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network for programmes of ministerial formation and in-service training which address this issue. I will willingly ensure there is an audit of the way ordinands and others engage with these issues in the coming year and I expect to find a great deal of good practice already in our colleges and courses. Pope Francis in *Laudato si'* calls for nothing less than an "ecological conversion of individuals and communities". I love that phrase "ecological conversion". He quotes Pope Benedict: "The external deserts in the world are growing because the internal deserts have become so vast". He writes: "A healthy relationship with Creation is one dimension of overall personal conversion."

The strength of *Laudato si'* is the deep rooting of the environmental crisis not in some esoteric branch of theology but in the centre of the Christian vision of God and the earth, the centre of what it means to be human and the centre of a theology of hope.

Limiting carbon emissions is absolutely vital but will not in itself address the whole problem. The environmental crisis, as we have heard, is also a social crisis and a spiritual crisis. The roots of this crisis lie, according to Francis, in what he calls the "omnipresent technocratic paradigm in the cult of unlimited human power and in the rise of a relativism which sees everything as irrelevant unless it serves one's immediate interests."

I am cautious about a new branch of theology called eco-theology and a new branch of ethics called eco-justice. We simply need to rediscover the ecological imperatives at the heart of all Christian theology and all Christian ethics and set these perspectives at the heart of all Christian formation in catechesis in schools, in local churches and in all forms of ministerial education.

One of the pieces of work I have done over the last few years is on the Lord's Prayer, and I have become more and more convinced that the petition "give us this day our daily bread" is not a petition for God to give us these but is a petition to learn contentment in all our lives and in every day, that we ask each day only for enough for that day. Thank you.

*Revd John Plant (Leicester):* I would like to say thank you and I want to support this motion. I think it is brilliant and reflects some fantastic work that has gone on by Bishop Nick and Richard Burridge, supported by Church House staff and others. I think it sends a fantastic message out not only to the Church but to the wider nation. May I say how

pleased Christian Aid were to be able to add to the resourcing of Richard and Nick in that process in taking them to Malawi.

What I think I am so encouraged by is the conversation that we are having here and the way in which the connection between climate change and poverty has been so clearly understood. Nazmul Chowdhury said just recently, "Forget about making poverty history, climate change will make poverty permanent". I think it is so important that this proposal we have here is able to link both the high level engagement that we are going to be talking about this afternoon with local action and that sections (e) and now (f) in that help the churches to do that local engagement and local resourcing.

I think it is really important for us as churches to remind ourselves that we can do so much more than we think. I was involved in the organisation of the mass lobby of Parliament and I have to tell you that organisations like Oxfam, who were involved in that, would give their right arm to have networks like we do into every community across the country, to be able to put thousands of people from churches onto the streets of London to be able to engage, as Caroline mentioned earlier, with their MPs. David Cameron said recently to Loretta Minghella, CEO of Christian Aid, "I need to be hearing about this in the parish hall of Witney. You need to be talking about this to create the political space so that we can really make a difference", and Caroline again hinted at that, we need both momentum and space.

Can we just say as well, we are talking about Paris but it is really important to know that Paris is not going to be the last step. We have got to be thinking beyond Paris because not everything will be delivered in the Paris meeting. We need to be in this engagement for the long-term. I would like to commend to you not only the kind of materials that are available, the pilgrimage to Paris, the resources there, the fasting and praying resources that are there for you, but to begin to look with churches not only engaging now but thinking beyond December as well to keep the momentum going beyond that. We need to think how we use our influence to be good news to the poor.

*Dr Elaine Storkey (Ely):* I want to draw on the speeches and we have just heard from the Bishop of Sheffield particularly. I have heard three things this morning. One is that this is not our problem, we have to get on with preaching the Gospel. The second is that we do need a new theology if this is going to be our problem, something more versed in eco-ethics or eco-theology.

Then this wonderful assurance that, no, we do not need a new theology and that is what I want to take up. We do not. We have already got a theology of God, a theology of Creation, of humankind, a theology of neighbour love, a theology of sin, a theology of justice, a theology of compassion, a theology of prayer, a theology of redemption and a theology of judgment, all of which feed into our understanding of climate change. Concern for that actually draws on every area of our theology.

I want to take one example which links us in with the last speaker, and that is the example of the effects of climate change and especially global warming on the poorest communities of the world, an example I have come into contact with regularly over the last 18 years when I have been President of Tearfund visiting Africa and parts of Asia. What have I seen? Floods, hurricanes, droughts, fresh water contamination, coastal

erosion, deforestation and the impact that all of that has on our neighbours half a world away. I have seen homelessness, environmental refugees, elimination of natural habitats, loss of biodiversity. I have seen swelling seas, the salination of well water, the shortage of fresh water everywhere, people becoming more thirsty and water becoming a global problem, the disappearance of natural lakes. I have seen parched land, harvest failure, food insecurity, hunger, famine, disappearance of pasture, dwindling of forests but also a dwindling of domestic flocks, hunger, famine and again loss of biodiversity. And diseases, loads of them: new diseases, old diseases, vector diseases, waterborne diseases, new strains of malaria, sleeping sickness, illnesses that affect the eyes and so on, often resistant to present treatment, reproductions of tougher areas of mosquitoes and insects than we have seen before and moving up as the climate gets warmer into different areas. All of these areas are actually absolutely vital.

Where do we go with our understanding then? If we do not actually act on our theology that we have got it has got everything to do with us, it violates our theology of humanness, it violates our theology of neighbour love, our theology of justice where the poorest communities of the world who contribute least of all to the carbon emissions actually pick up the tab majoritively. It violates our theology of creation and the ability of the poor to enjoy creation. It actually violates our theology of redemption centred upon Christ on the Cross who gives us forgiveness and reconciliation with each other, with God and with the Creation. We are denying redemptive living, fruitful productive living to the poorest of the world by our inability and recognition of our part in this whole process. We have got the resources, we have got the theology, we have got the power, we have even got the numbers to make our voice felt. We have got this ability to call on those resources and make sacrifices ourselves to make a change. Have we got the will to do that?

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of Order, Mr Chairman. After the next speaker I tender a motion for closure on Item 25.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. I would like to hear two more speeches from Mr Sewell and the Prolocutor, Ms Hardman, and then I would be grateful for that.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* Every debate needs a devil's advocate. Unquestionably, at some time in the future humankind is going to need to move towards a non-carbon based economy which may or may not include carbon-free nuclear. The question before us is whether the time to rapidly accelerate out of the carbon economy is now. On practical and ethical grounds, I urge caution in respect of the suggestion that the carbon economy can and must be closed quickly. In energy terms, the world is like a trapeze artist. Moving from one trapeze to another can be done, but timing is critical. You have to know the next trapeze is in its proper place before you let go. Be impatient, get that timing wrong, and you crash.

Throughout our discussions a case has been put in uncritical form, it is green energy revolution to help the poor, but what if the choice is green energy revolution or help the poor, that is much less comfortable. Do not just take my word for this, listen to Bill Gates who has invested billions of his own money both in renewables R&D and helping the poor in Africa: "Renewable energy technology as it is now has no chance of powering a reasonably numerous and well-off human race. This is actually a very simple thing to work out and just about anybody numerate who thinks about the subject honestly can

come to the same conclusion.” He recommends we do the job properly, prioritise the smart research, and I agree, get the green trapeze up to speed and then jump. Is there an emergency forcing us out of the carbon economy even at the risk of getting it catastrophically wrong? The answer is no.

As a former Green Party National Secretary, I should remind you that if the Nobel Prize Committee ever created a prize for failed apocalyptic warnings, the Green movement would win it every year by a country mile. Thirty years ago I, and others, were predicting human life would be impossible by 2015. Unfortunately, in the last 30 years that pesky capitalism, which we despise, has enabled more people to live longer, better fed, better medicated lives, infant mortality has reduced, worldwide literacy rates are advancing. By every rational metric, human welfare has increased. The number of people living in absolute poverty has reduced since 1981 from 53% to just 17 today. That is astonishing.

Lifting the poor out of poverty is unfinished business but how did it happen? The answer is it happened through two forces: cheap energy and free trade. I sometimes wish that when we had our theological material we had been offered to reflect upon the Exodus passage on the governmental tyranny of asking people to make bricks without straw. When Moses stood before Pharaoh he did not ask for the minimum wage ---

*The Chair:* Mr Sewell, I am going to have to ask you to draw your remarks to a close.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* I will do now, yes. --- or to cut the overseer’s bonuses. He knew that the way to the Promised Land was through freedom and faith. It still is.

*Ven Christine Hardman (Southwark):* As a lot of you know, because I have been so excited about it, I have finally achieved the ambition on my last Synod of cycling from home to here. What is so great about travelling somewhere on your bike is that you are really in touch with the communities and the landscape that you are going through, you are not in a little metal box protected from everything.

On Thursday, towards lunchtime, I was getting very hungry, as were my companions. We had to avoid busy roads so we were going through all kinds of smaller roads and we ended up cycling through the village of Drax and then to the power station. For a long time before that we had been looking for somewhere to eat and what struck me so powerfully was the level of deprivation of facility in the villages we were cycling through, a level of poverty. The pub was shut, there was no café, the only thing there was a small *Costcutter* supermarket. We thought we were going to have to go on for a long time, but, lo and behold, as we were at the Drax power station we came to the Drax social club and it said beautifully and welcomingly “Non-members welcome”. So we went in and we had a really lovely warm welcome at the Drax social club and our lunch there.

That day, or just the day before, George Osborne had removed the subsidy on wood pellet burning; Drax are trying to shift from coal to wood pellet burning. Their shares dropped to 28% that morning and it was quite clear that there are very likely to be job losses because their profitability has been severely impacted. I personally think it was an incomprehensible decision of the Chancellor but I will leave that there.

My point is that the cost of energy reduction or turning to carbon fuels, for that is what they are doing, is disproportionately borne by people not just in other countries but in our own country. There are communities that pay the impact of this far more than others. That is the first point I wanted to make. We need to know that.

Moving on from the Drax social club, much refreshed and heartened, not long afterwards we were passed by a succession of skips and lorries and the stench from those lorries was quite appalling. They were going to one of the largest landfill sites that there is in our country. That coming so soon after the Drax experience made me also see the desecration in our world, this holy world of Creation, that we are causing by our lifestyle and our thoughtless use of resources and waste that are quite incomprehensible; we do not need to do that.

Two things. Please let us be aware of who carries the cost of our decisions and let us absolutely firmly, with joy and commitment, affirm this motion.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

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

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

*The Chair:* The motion as amended is before you after the Bishop of Salisbury has an opportunity to address us in response to the debate. Thank you very much, Nicholas.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* Thank you very much indeed. You might be relieved, I am not going to reply to everybody’s contribution.

Some of the Salisbury team came saying this might be a snooze event. It has not been, you have done brilliantly. This was not motherhood and apple pie, it was a recognition of a very, very complex issue and setting clear direction of travel, and I am really grateful for that. There were two maiden speeches at the beginning, congratulations to Alexandra Podd and great to have Caroline Spelman here, and both Archbishops spoke. There were three what I took to be friendly amendments to help us crystallise the issues. I want to congratulate Christine Hardman for cycling to Synod.

Some themes really emerged, did they not? This is urgent. It needs to be dealt with in an integrative kind of way, it is not a stand-alone issue. There is a degree of sacrificial living that is required of us, whether or not we fast. Actually I would encourage those of you to fast who want to, it seems to me it is very much part of the Christian and praying tradition. It needs imagination, not just to accept the way the world is described. The other day Elaine Storkey talked about the power of words to shape our thinking and I think that is what Duncan Dormor was saying about the way we describe the financials of the world, we need to approach this imaginatively.

Martin Sewell, I think you caught yourself by describing yourself as the devil’s advocate. It is good for the debate though. The question is, is there an emergency? Well, it is the

boiled frog syndrome, is it not, the frog is in the pan, the water is heating up, by the time it gets too hot the frog cannot move. There is a different way of thinking about it which is to do a risk assessment and say, "There's danger here, get out quick". I think that is what we are judging. This is about reading the signs of the times, that is the difficulty of this. I think there is an ecumenical consensus as there is a consensus in the wider world.

I loved the Bishop of Sheffield's contribution. It took me back to the President of the Methodist Conference talking about Methodism as an 18<sup>th</sup> century Fresh Expression. There is just that sense in which we are repackaging this. We have got the resources deep in the tradition. I agree deeply with you, Steve, actually, and with Elaine Storkey, the resources are there. Somehow we need to gain a new urgency about them because the question in Paula Gooder's Bible study was why are we not paying proper attention to this, why are we finding it so difficult to turn ourselves into a movement on it, why is it so difficult to act corporately. I think that is one of the things that we need to address through the depth of our theological traditions.

What can we do? Actually you could look at the Shrinking the Footprint website, there are good resources there, you could sign the Lambeth Declaration, but above all you need to take this home, think about it, pray about it, talk about it in your communities and encourage others to do the same.

At the meeting of environmental bishops in South Africa in February, Bishop Jane of Edmonton in Canada, not North London, comes from a place where the economy is very dependent on oil. Bishop Ellinah from Swaziland said, "So you're saying we can't burn the abundant coal that we've got?" Bishop Api from Fiji said, "The waters are coming up to our necks". Economic justice and climate justice must go together. I urge you to support this motion.

*The Chair:* The motion before us as amended at point 25.

*Revd Professor Richard Burrige (Universities):* Point of Order. I want to try the Standing Order old 36(b) that I did the other day or new Standing Order 37.3: "The Chair must order there be a counted vote of the whole Synod if at least 25 members so request". Because of the size of the Synod here, and there are so many people here, it would be really good to actually know the numbers of those of us who want to support this.

*The Chair:* Do I see 25 members standing? I do, yes. Even I can count up to 25. This is a division of the whole Synod.

*The motion as amended*

*'That this Synod, believing that God's creation is holy, that we are called to protect the earth now and for the future, and that climate change disproportionately affects the world's poorest, and welcoming the convergence of ecumenical partners and faith communities in demanding that the nations of the world urgently seek to limit the global rise in average temperatures to a maximum of 2°C, as agreed by the United Nations in Cancun:*

- a) *urge all governments at the COP 21 meeting in Paris to agree long term pathways to a low carbon future, supported by meaningful short to medium term national emissions pledges from all major carbon emitting nations;*
- b) *endorse the World Bank’s call for the ending of fossil fuel subsidies and the redirection of those resources into renewable energy options;*
- c) *encourage the redirection of resources into other lower carbon energy options;*
- d) *request the Environment Working Group to develop Shrinking the Footprint to enable the whole Church to address the issue of climate change, and to develop and promote new ‘ecothological resources’, as proposed by the Anglican Communion Environmental Network in February 2015;*
- e) *request the Ministry Division to hear the call of the Anglican Communion Environmental Network bishops for programmes of ministerial formation and in-service training to include components on eco-justice and ecotheology; and*
- f) *encourage parishes and dioceses to draw attention to the initiative supported by members of the Faith and Climate network encouraging Christians to pray and fast for climate justice on the first day of each month.’*

*was carried following a division of the whole Synod. The voting was as follows:*

<i>IN FAVOUR</i>	<i>305</i>
<i>AGAINST</i>	<i>6</i>

*4 abstentions were recorded.*

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Michael Clarke* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

**Climate Change and Investment Policy**

*The Chair:* We come now to Item 26. Just a word of explanation from me about how we are going to handle this item. You will see that there are a number of amendments listed. What I am proposing is that we have a short general debate, that I then ask Hugh Lee to speak to and to move his amendment. We will then deal with that before moving on to Items 57, 58 and 59 which, although they are quite distinct, they are about the same piece of text, so at that stage I am going to ask those amendment movers to speak to but not move their amendments and we will come back to deal with the amendments once we have heard all three and then we will deal with the amendment at Item 60 as we have with Hugh Lee. Sorry if that sounds a bit complicated but I think it is the best way of ordering our discussion.



Can I just say before we start that the Dioceses of Birmingham and Oxford, as we know, proposed Diocesan Synod Motions, which were on their way here in parallel with the MPA's motion, which we discussed this morning. Both Birmingham and Oxford have supplied the paperwork which would have gone with their DSMs which were circulated to us. We should be grateful to both dioceses for that and particularly to Catherine Grylls and to Hugh Lee. Thank you both of you.

I am now going to call on the Bishop of Manchester to move the motion standing in his name. He will have up to ten minutes.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I beg to move:

'That this Synod, accepting that the threat posed by climate change to the environment and human wellbeing requires urgent action to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels, and recognising that achieving this effectively without creating damaging and unintended economic consequences requires political subtlety, flexibility and a focus on achievable change:

- a) affirm the policy on climate change and fossil fuel investment developed following the Southwark DSM passed by the Synod in February 2014, recommended by the EIAG, and adopted by the National Investing Bodies ('the NIBs');
- b) welcome the divestment by the NIBs from companies focused on the extraction of oil sands and thermal coal;
- c) urge the NIBs to engage robustly with companies and policy makers on the need to act to support the transition to a low carbon economy and, where necessary, to use the threat of divestment from companies as a key lever for change; and
- d) request the EIAG and the NIBs to report to the Synod within three years with an assessment of the impact of the policy adopted, including the efficacy of engagement and the progress made on portfolio decarbonisation.'

I am delighted to propose this motion on climate change and investment. I speak in my capacities as a member of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group, a Governor of the Church Commissioners, and of course, as a member of this Synod.

There are three things I want to speak about. The first is the importance and urgency of climate change as an ethical investment issue. The second is why the particular climate change policy that has been adopted by the National Investing Bodies is the right one. The third is the importance of a very strong and unified affirmation of this new policy by us here at Synod.

We have heard much already this Synod, especially this morning, about the importance and urgency of action on climate change. I do not propose to go into detail on that again. Do allow me though just to reiterate the scientific consensus is that without an energy

transition, we may be on course for a world 4-5°C warmer by the end of this century. Warming at these levels, as we heard this morning, would be so damaging to creation and to the world's poorest and most vulnerable that it is a moral imperative to ensure that it does not happen. We do not have much time to ensure that emissions peak, then decline and finally end so as to give us a chance to restrict that warming to the 2°C mark.

Climate change calls for an urgent response from all of us, a response individually, institutionally, nationally and internationally. And that includes investors. The question is not whether climate change is an important and urgent ethical investment issue, but how to reflect this importance and urgency in our own ethical investment policy. In that regard, I think the investment bodies of the Church are very fortunate that we have got the EIAG. It is made up of representatives of key parts of the Church. We have outside experts. We have trustees of the investing bodies. We provide independent and, I believe, authoritative ethical investment advice.

As you saw when that policy was presented to you on Friday evening, the EIAG develops policies that are formed by biblical understanding, by theological reflection and by an appreciation of the views of the Church. These policies are without exception extraordinarily well-considered – we take our time over them – and distinctly Anglican. They are practical ones, too, for those institutional investors who hold fiduciary responsibilities.

The EIAG started to review its climate change policy in 2013. The following year Southwark Diocese brought a motion to Synod, to which the Chairman has referred, calling for an ambitious policy aligned with the Church's 'theological, moral and social priorities' and that motion was overwhelmingly endorsed by 274 votes to one. We are grateful for this. That meant we knew we were working on a policy for which we had a very strong mandate. By the end of April this year we got to the point where the new policy was adopted by the trustees of all three investment bodies and on 1 May it was announced. We have been criticised for taking that long over the policy. Indeed one of the EIAG critics (not, I hasten to add, a member of this Synod) talked as saying that EIAG deliberations were taking roughly as long as Jesus' public ministry.

Well, I make no apology for that. It is the length and the depth of deliberation that has gone into this policy that make it such a good one. I know from having been involved in it how right to the end we were working hard to get this better and deeper and clearer. In the end even that critic conceded he was rather impressed by the policy. He told the *Guardian* that much credit was due to the CofE when we made our announcement.

Yes, there are many activists and people deeply concerned about climate change, including the *Guardian* newspaper which seems to have me writing rather more than is good for me, who believe that the ethical investment answer to climate change is a very simple one: divest from all companies involved in the extraction of fossil fuels. I do have a great deal of sympathy for this campaign. Indeed my environmental activist daughter is signed up for it. It is a campaign that has galvanised people and particularly younger people who need to be galvanised on climate change. It has put pressure on many investors who, frankly, needed a wake-up call. So I am proud that our new policy excludes two categories of companies entirely from investment, those who derive more than 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or the production of oil

from tar sands. Through disinvestment from such companies the Commissioners and the Pensions Board have sent a prophetic signal which has been picked up across the world. There is an urgent need now to move away from fossil fuels – starting with the dirtiest – and transition to a low carbon economy.

The beauty of the policy recommended by EIAG is that it is not all about disinvestment. It is also about engagement with the companies who will inevitably play a large part in determining whether the energy transition takes place and whether it takes place in time. I am thinking of the oil and gas majors, the big mining companies, the utility companies and the most energy-intensive industries. You cannot simply make them go away and start again without them. But, as members of Synod know, when the Church's investing bodies say they will engage and make a difference, it is not an empty promise. They mean it. The investing bodies have engaged on climate change since 2012, working with the UK's largest extractives and utility companies. When that programme began only one of those companies was A-rated for climate change by the sustainability NGO, CDP, which is our benchmark, five were B-rated, four were C-rated and one was D-rated. By 2014, as our engagement progressed, three were in Band A and every single one of the others were in Band B. That is, Synod, I would argue, demonstrable, measurable change.

This year we took a further step. We co-filed our first shareholder resolutions on climate change, at the BP and Shell AGMs. Both resolutions were supported by 98% of the shareholder vote. This is an unprecedented action by institutional investors. These resolutions are not just one-offs; they set a new, demanding and legally binding standard in reporting on climate change for oil and gas majors and they make it clear that we will use our influence in AGMs in the future.

Very soon after those resolutions had been passed BP and Shell, together with four other European oil and gas companies, collectively called publicly for the pricing of carbon. Carbon pricing is the key to incentivizing on the transition to a low carbon economy. Even the oil and gas companies are advocating it. The political space for governments to make it a reality grows indeed.

Make no mistake, our support for the companies we engage with is not unconditional. The new policy is crystal clear on this. It says that the investing bodies will divest from companies if after engagement we do not think they are taking seriously their responsibilities on climate change.

There is a great deal more to our new policy than divestment and corporate engagement. The policy also includes commitments to intensify our engagement with policymakers, to increase investments in climate change, mitigation and adaptation, where these meet our risk return criteria, and to measure and reduce the carbon footprint of our investment portfolios. As Jonathan Spencer, the Chair of the Pensions Board, made clear on Friday, the investing bodies are actively and urgently working on all of these issues. Our new policy has already been welcomed from both within and outside the Church. You heard the Bishop of Salisbury say this morning that the policy was exemplary. Nick Stern, the Chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change, has praised the investing bodies' 'fine and wise leadership'. Christiana Figueres, the Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, said the policy is 'expressive of investor integrity'.

A number of amendments to this motion have been proposed, as the Chairman has indicated, including by members from the Dioceses of Oxford and Birmingham, who so graciously consented to Synod debating this motion following on from Southwark rather than taking their own motions on this occasion. These amendments have been made in a constructive spirit and I will be happy to recommend approval of the majority of them.

Members of Synod, I hope you will again show unity on climate change. I hope you will strengthen the hand of the investing bodies as they implement their new ethical investment policy. I hope that you will overwhelmingly vote for this motion.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Bishop. The debate is now open.

*Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford):* Mr Chairman, in the beginning (that is of my time in Synod) there was no EIAG. Ethical considerations of investment were somewhat haphazard. The Synod asked that they should be more systematic so there was the EIAG. Advisory it may be but taken seriously. The Synod saw that it was good – most of the time – not least on climate change. This report that we are debating today has drawn well-deserved tributes from so many different quarters, as we heard on Friday. Long may the NIBs make truly good investment decisions on the advice of the EIAG.

In past debates, and there were three earlier ones on this in my lifetime, I have explained the crucial significance of policyholders, as Duncan Dormor said this morning, although I was drawing on my own research experience as a geophysicist. I also pointed out the relativity of energy costs, the need for Christians to live simply and the complexities of environmental decisions.

Over the past 20 years I have argued that the best way to reduce dependence on fossil fuels was to move to alternative energy sources and called for more investments in those areas, not just companies but also universities, like my old college Imperial where valuable research was being carried out. Clause I of our motion implicitly acknowledges this in the phrase “... the need to act to support the transition to a low carbon economy”.

It is interesting that when President Obama interviewed David Attenborough recently there was a casual reference to China, that the way China will meet its increasing energy demands is through solar energy, hydro-electric power and so forth. The best among these alternative sources is probably solar energy.

Mr Chairman, it is not carbon dioxide that warms the Earth but the sun’s radiation so let us harness solar energy to combat the effect of solar radiation that is trapped by carbon dioxide. There is a beautiful symmetry about it. But that will become viable only when cheaper solar cells are available and that is when there is investment in R&D, again not just in companies but in academic departments as well. It is heartening that the call for R&D in these areas is now becoming mainstream, unlike the first time I spoke about it. Indeed, I am delighted about it. Clause I is not explicit about positively investing in alternative energy sources but there are two amendments that could remedy it and I hope we can support them.

Mr Chairman, when the Class of 1990 had its induction we were told not to thank the Chair for calling us to speak. I am going to break that injunction for the first time in my

time here and thank you and thank all of the Chairs over time who have given me the enormous privilege of sharing some of my thoughts with the Synod.

*The Chair.* Dr Thomas-Betts, I am sure my fellow Chairs would join me in granting you absolution.

*Mr William Seddon (St Albans):* Synod, I very much hope that you will join me in supporting this motion. This is the moment to give a ringing endorsement to the EIAG and NIBs whose commitment to ethical investment in general and climate change in particular is huge. Through my work with the Methodist Church and as Chair of the Church Investors Group I have had the privilege of seeing them at work first-hand and they really do walk the talk.

On Friday we heard about the effectiveness of the default engagement position with divestment as a weapon of last resort. Today I have two more examples of why the EIAG approach is the right one. Institutional investors are being encouraged to commit to forceful stewardship which includes constructing low carbon portfolios, voting shares for a move to a low carbon world and pressing for value-enhancing low carbon business plans. Where do those trying to encourage investors to take this seriously turn for inspiration? It is the Church of England and the Methodist Church because they are at the cutting edge of effective engagement.

Important though an engagement framework is, the result can be slow in coming. Two years ago a major international miner told me that some in the industry were concerned at the danger of losing the social mandate to operate unless there is change but did not know how to do it. Consequently, they turned to those that had consistently challenged them on social justice issues, the church investor bodies. As a result, chairs and chief executives of major mining companies have sat down with senior Church leaders, including the Archbishop of Canterbury and the President of the Methodist Conference. A channel has been established through which the light of theological reflection is shined on business to help develop a model of sustainable mining and unequivocally contribute to the Common Good. This would not have happened had we disinvested.

God can be served from two positions: the prophetic voice denouncing evil from the outside, such as Elijah when Queen Jezebel was killing the prophets, and the insider guided by faith working practically to right wrongs, such as Obadiah who used his position in the royal household to save the hundred prophets. Similarly, the Church can prophetically denounce fossil fuel companies through divestment. It can also, like the EIAG and NIBs, work from the inside to encourage a move to a low carbon economy. What we must not do is argue among ourselves. The real problem is indifference and denial elsewhere. It is not a question of either/or but both/and. Together the Church's prophets and investment insiders can make a difference.

*Revd Preb Stephen Lynas (Bath and Wells):* When I spoke about safeguarding a couple of days ago in this Synod I reminded us that we needed to put our money where our mouth is. Now we are discussing our own investments as NIBs and ethical and climate change issues, and we are being encouraged to think about exactly how we put our money where our mouth is. I just want to raise a concern that we do not think this is too simple and easy. This is not about motherhood and apple pie; it is more complicated.

I was actually very cross on Friday morning as I set out to come to York to hear on the radio that the Church of England is going to invest in solar farms. Dr Thomas-Betts might want to close her ears for the next couple of minutes. I tracked down the story that I had heard on the radio when I got here to GS 2004, which some of you will have in front of you, and paragraph 16 of that document which says that the Church Commissioners “have entered into a framework agreement with a solar power company, Lightsource, to develop solar power generation on rural land owned by the Commissioners.”

I live in the middle of nowhere in Somerset. The village where I live has three national nature reserves around it and such farmland as there is is very largely pasture. If I travel four miles to the west of my house into the parish of West Huntspill there is a solar farm, in fact two, just near the M5. If I travel five miles the other side of Glastonbury, there is another very large solar farm in the fields. If I travel up on to the Polden Hills in the parish of Shapwick I can look down on the Somerset Levels, which a winter and a half ago were covered in water and reflecting the light because of the flooding, and now down in that area they are reflecting sunlight in one part because there is a huge solar farm. The reason they are there is not because the burghers of Somerset have gone green; it is because farming does not make much money. With globalisation, with commodity prices being affected by what happens in China (or wherever it may be) the dairy farmers are in big trouble, cereal farmers are going up and down year by year. Farming does not make money but solar farming does because it is subsidised.

There is also the issue that solar farms are hideous. We have to say this. We may not all agree with it and as soon as you say that you are accused of being a NIMBY. I do not think I am a NIMBY but I just want to say we must not pretend this is all about being green; it is more complicated. I have solar panels on my house so I cannot be a NIMBY. I am not against them but in fact I only have solar panels on my house because of pressure from my wife who is greener and more ecological than I am and because there is a Government subsidy. Those solar panels on my roof pay most of my electric bills for the year. Our DBF has put solar panels on many of our parsonage houses because they make some income.

It is not only about the subsidy which skews the economics of the thing. There is also the issue of food production having to be done differently because we are covering fields in glass and steel. When we studied Genesis this morning we talked about our disconnection from the land in our modern society. What could be more disconnected than covering a field with steel and glass instead of growing stuff? And because every field in Huntspill or Butleigh is covered with glass, that means some bit of food is having to be brought in from somewhere else to replace what could have been raised on that field and then we get into food miles. It is actually very complicated.

Lightsource describe themselves as the UK’s leading renewable energy people. They have a wonderful website and their agricultural brochure, which I suspect is all over the desks of the investment folks at the Commissioners, shows pictures of happy geese, sheep and hens wandering around underneath a forest of steel and glass. It does not actually say that sheep may safely graze but that is what it means. We have to decide if we want a secure food stream which is actually very green or a proliferation of subsidised stuff. So we need to think about solar panels on churches rather than fields. We might need to think about solar roof tiles rather than great big panels. I simply want to ask that

we do not say this is very simple and I also want to ask that the Commissioners think very carefully and do not just present this as a kind of “green wash” exercise but recognise that the whole subsidisation stuff is part of the package. I will vote in favour but I do want us to think a bit harder about what it means.

*The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson):* Many of you will be aware that Lancashire has been in the news in recent days with regard to applications by Cuadrilla for drilling applications for fracking in the county. Those applications have just been turned down by the county council. I hear now there is an application for fracking drilling to be allowed across the Pennines, the other side, in Yorkshire.

I want to draw your attention to GS Misc 1110 and to page 20 where the EIAG offers comments on fracking and I want to make a comment on each of their comments, if I may.

The first is that they say that exploration should not lead to a presumption of extraction. I think it is bound to lead to extraction in due course. There is a huge amount of money invested in that exploration and, if gas is found, it is most likely that it will lead to extraction of shale gas. I just want to draw attention to the fact that it is not right to say that it does not create any presumption. I think it is very likely indeed.

The second point is on their second comment they mention a number of conditions that they would want to refer to as they consider an application for funding, et cetera, in support with regard to a fracking application. The most important one is missing. The most important issue about fracking is independent regulation. At the moment there are plans for self-regulation of the fracking industry and it is really important that considerations are given in this area that it is independent regulation of that industry as it gets underway. They say here that they should comply with all relevant legislation. I think that needs to be strengthened to include independent regulation of the fracking industry as and when or if it is allowed to do its work.

*The Chair:* I invite the Revd Hugh Lee to move his amendment.

*Revd Hugh Lee (Oxford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (c) after “lever for change” *insert* “including the threat of disinvestment from oil companies within three years unless they have committed to ceasing oil exploration and reducing production consistently with limiting the global temperature rise to 2°C”.’

I have earned my living in the fossil fuel companies of the world for the last 48 years and I have been working as an economist on climate change for over 20 years. Also in 1998 I co-founded a gas and electricity company, which I still chair, called Ebico which is not-for-profit and does precisely what James Featherby advocated on Friday evening. We charge our customers that can afford it a little bit more so that we can charge our poor customers a lot less.

My amendment at number 56 is about the oil companies, and I am delighted with the new policy of the EIAG and the NIBs and I want to wholeheartedly support the motion. It is a

wonderful step forward that we have disinvested from coal and tar sands.

The oil companies are different from the coal companies. We need the oil companies with their vast experience and money to save the planet. So how can we persuade the oil companies to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem? I meet regularly with the researchers in the climate change departments of BP and Shell and they do excellent work but they have not yet got to the stage of challenging their companies about the mind-set that they are still in. This mind-set can be summarised as saying that it is the responsibility of governments to do the right thing about climate change, meanwhile we oil companies will make as much money as we can from the oil that we have still got and are allowed to sell. It is true that the oil companies are now advocating carbon pricing and, as an economist, I think carbon pricing is superb but it will not get there in time. I asked the chief economist of BP only last month what carbon price is needed to get us within 2° global warming. He said \$140. At the moment the carbon price is less than 10, there is no chance of any international agreement getting it to \$140 by 2020.

The fossil fuel companies spend about \$670 billion a year exploring for new fossil fuel reserves. If even some of that money was spent on low carbon energy, just think how much more widespread and how much cheaper it will become. I believe the NIBs with others, of course, can change the oil company mind-set through their policy of engagement. This is a big ask, but they must do it because the alternative is that the oil companies go on producing more oil and so we get more than 2° global warming and we slide into environmental disaster which will then become an economic disaster for us all.

So how do we change the oil company mind-set? By telling them that we and they have only got three years. The IPCC has calculated that global carbon emissions must start falling by 2020, so the oil companies have to decide by 2018 to start reducing their production. I have been told by the Head of Responsible Investment for the Church Commissioners, who is sitting on the platform, that that is unrealistic, but he did agree with me that three years before the fall of apartheid almost everybody except Nelson Mandela said that was unrealistic. Moreover, three years is the timescale in which investments in oil companies are in danger of becoming bad investments.

In the last three years the shares in coal companies have fallen in value by 80%. We should have got out of the coal companies three years ago. Let us not make the same mistake again. If an oil company does not change its policy in the next three years, it is going to become a very risky investment as the head of the Bank of England has warned us.

The value of those shares depends on the value of the reserves that they have got and those reserves are going to become valueless because they are not going to be produced one way or another, or they are going to be produced and everything is going to become valueless because of the economic disaster. At a Carbon Trust event in June, a former chairman of Shell said that he believes disinvestment is a rational approach to the distressing lack of progress in the oil industry. I urge you to vote for my amendment and I also support all the other amendments.

I formally propose the amendment standing in my name at number 56.



*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Mr Chairman, I indicated at the beginning that most of the amendments that are being put before us today I will be happy to accept. I am afraid I cannot support this particular amendment though. I made it clear in my speech opening up the debate that the National Investing Bodies are prepared to make further divestments if companies are not responsive to engagement and that they do not recognise their responsibilities on climate change.

We are actively working on developing an engagement framework that sets out our expectations of companies and that is the thing that will guide our engagement. That work is only beginning now, it will be done by next summer, but we cannot draft the engagement framework on the floor of the Synod this afternoon. Furthermore, the engagement frameworks that we are working on are more detailed and more sophisticated than where the amendment would force us to go.

We are going to be setting out realistic but stretching and very clear expectations, and they will be published so that you will be able to see what we are up to. We are not going to set companies up to fail, nor are we going to create requirements that are hard to interpret. Further oil exploration is not actually superfluous. Although we cannot safely burn all the oil that we have found, some of those reserves are in the wrong places; they are politically unstable places. Some of them will be very high cost. Some further oil exploration is not in itself inconsistent with restricting warming to 2° and is prudent to do.

The challenge for oil companies is not deciding whether to explore but deciding whether to bring those assets they have found into production. There is a real risk that major capital expenditure in new high cost projects in the years ahead will, as Mr Lee indicated, end up leaving oil companies and their investors with stranded assets, so questioning the decision-making on capital expenditure on new production assets will be a key part of our engagement activity, but stranded assets is actually an investment, not an ethical investment issue at the end of the day.

We cannot expect all oil companies to start to reduce their production now. Global demand driven by the emerging markets – they are some of the poorer parts of the world – that we have spoken of, is still rising. The pathway to 2°, including from the International Energy Agency, acknowledges that oil and gas demand is yet to peak. We are still getting the political and policy framework in place that will drive the transition to low carbon.

Carbon pricing, you say, will not get us there in time; no, but it is a step along the way. Three years before the ending of apartheid very few people would have predicted it. Yes, indeed, but I am not sure that is quite the analogy to go with because three years before the ending of apartheid nobody knew it was going to end in three years, but you are asking us now to commit ourselves as though something will definitely happen in three years. That is not what I think we should be doing.

Thank you for the amendment. I think this is an important discussion point but I do ask, members of Synod, please, will you reject this amendment.

*The Chair:* We are now debating the amendment standing in Dr Lee's name.

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

*Mr Clive Scowen (London)*: Firstly, can I just record an apology. When I spoke yesterday I gave the impression that Mr Freeman was not seeking re-election. He assures me that he is and, if I have caused any offence, I am deeply sorry.

With regard to this amendment, I found I agreed with quite a lot of what Hugh Lee said and found it even more puzzling that he was moving the amendment that he has, because I regard this amendment personally as utterly self-defeating.

I also wish to say that I find the notion of threat of disinvestment, which is in the main motion as well as the amendment, really rather peculiar, particularly when we are talking about oil companies. It seems to me that they would like nothing better than to be shot of troublesome activist shareholders. Now there may come a time when divestment is the right thing to do anyway, but it is no threat. It will not leave the board of BP and Shell quaking in their boots, rather more likely singing in their baths.

In fact, the strategy proposed by this amendment merely gives the oil companies notice that all they have got to do is to refuse to budge at all for three years and then we will guarantee that we are going to go away and leave them alone. It just plays into their hands. I think the notion of ending exploration and reducing output is also unrealistic, for the reasons the Bishop of Manchester has said.

The way to reduce the amount of oil extracted from the ground is to reduce demand. That requires major investment in alternative sources of energy, as many have already said, and in ever more efficient ways of burning that oil and other fossil fuels that are burnt in order to get the maximum amount of energy from the least amount of fuel. In any event, what matters is not how much fossil fuel is burnt but what happens to the product of that burning. Massive investment is needed in research into effective carbon capture and storage, into ways of removing carbon from the atmosphere like the artificial photosynthesis that Duncan Dormor referred to earlier.

We need to use our own influence as shareholders in these major oil companies to press them to use their profits to make the sort of investment that nobody else is going to make into such research and to develop those things into practical reality. I beg the Synod to resist this amendment and to go with the strategy that has been outlined to us.

*Revd Janet Appleby (Newcastle)*: Thank you, Chair, for calling me. I am very grateful both for this morning's very constructive debate and to the EIAG for their excellent and thoughtful work so far in the documents we have had, and particularly to the Bishop of Manchester for this very timely motion. I do agree wholeheartedly with what has been said about the need to dialogue, to influence fossil fuel companies where we can and recognise that it can indeed, as has just been said, be far more effective than knee-jerk disinvestment.

However, I did find myself willing to support Hugh Lee's amendment. Why? Well, section I of this amendment does use the words, "Robust engagement". I think we have had a very reasonable document from the EIAG and I just fear that perhaps there is a danger of them being too reasonable, because surely the threat of disinvestment will only be taken seriously if it is time limited and specific because deadlines are what concentrates

the mind, and we have a deadline in global warming that needs to be more explicated. I think it is especially important that at some point in the near future we cease exploring for new oil and gas fields because the climate cannot afford us extracting, as we have already found.

So please notice the amendment is not saying that we will disinvest, but only the threat that if the companies are not taking this seriously enough. I see the Bishop of Manchester says they are going to be bringing terms in shortly that will give some idea of what those serious things will be that will mean that such a deadline will no longer be necessary. We are not saying it definitely will happen, but only if they do not do as we ask. I think it will be great if it encouraged them to be more creative, if it stimulated their minds. Would it not be great if the likes of Shell and BP actually themselves decide to put resources into alternative energy?

I find it difficult to stand here because I do not normally support these kinds of motions. I am normally cautious and consensus seeking, but what really concerns me is that after this morning's debate are we still really taking this issue seriously enough? Are we walking the talk? I am so inspired by what Pope Francis has said in "*Laudato Si*", the call that we all need to sacrifice for the greater good. He lives in a way that walks the talk and that inspires people. So how can we get everyone to take us more seriously? In the Second World War people took it seriously. They worked together because there was a real threat. Did you know that the average British woman then only owned three blouses? We are an awful long way from that in our complacent and comfortable, consumer-driven lifestyles.

How are we going to really learn to live more simply that others will simply live? We do need sometimes to be more robust. If we are going to reduce energy, as is drastically needed, the use of it, and without our economy collapsing, we will need to work together in the way that the EIAG wants us to. I think whether we are idealists or pragmatists, whether we are scientists or economists, whether we are business people, leaders or theologians, whoever we are, we need to work together because we are in a drastic situation. I do urge you to consider supporting this amendment. Thank you.

*The Chair:* After April Alexander I would welcome warning of a motion.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* I would just like to pick up some comments of Hugh Lee's and unpack them a bit more than the Bishop of Manchester had time to in his speech. What he said was that this was an investment not an ethical decision. The ethical strategy is the primary one and the decision, in the case of the Church Commissioners at least, is taken by the Assets Committee. Once made, it is for the Assets Committee to make investment decisions within those parameters.

Potentially stranded assets are a risk and they have to be managed. That risk has to be managed through a series of investment decisions. If the world manages to reach decisions which achieve a target of warming to no more than 2° and implements them, then the fossil fuel assets will become stranded and we hope that the NIBs have disinvested long before that. But it will be an investment decision and not an ethical decision. We need to separate the two.

The other small comment I might make, one or two people have mentioned how much does it worry large corporations if we disinvest? It seems to worry them quite a bit, to the extent that one from whom we disinvested about three years ago has now made contact to see if we will reconsider our decision. I think that shows that it matters. Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* A motion for closure on Item 56, Chair.

*The Chair:* That has my approval, does it have the approval of Synod?

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

*A member:* May I request a vote by Houses on this matter, please?

*The Chair:* Do I see 25 members of Synod standing? I do not. We can move to vote on the motion standing in Mr Lee's name.

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

*The Chair:* Now we move to three amendments which are all about inserting words after paragraph I. I am proposing that we take the proposers of each of those three to speak first, we will then have some debate and then vote. Can I call upon Canon Chris Sugden with a five minute speech limit? Just so there is no doubt, you are speaking to but not moving your motion.

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* There has been quite a lot of name dropping so far in our debate: daughters, wives, senior officers of oil companies. I have taken evidence from two family cousins, one the ecology officer of BG Group and the other an international director of Shell. On what basis can a culture which increasingly affirms the unfettered right of an individual to self-expression call for the extension of legislation about the environment?

It can become an exercise in sheer power with no visible moral basis. Our Christian understanding can lead the way on this. We have an understanding of persons different from the rest of Creation, of the poor and their call to be dignified stewards of Creation, and of the moral basis of law and rights which gives us a unique perspective on the nature of the world and our part in it. The Christian Gospel must also be heard and experienced by the poor as good news, to be authentic.

The alternative to fossil fuels for many poor nations is not expensive renewable energy but no fuel at all, and no fuel at all at times means no refrigeration for medicines in health clinics and no warmth for very poor families on freezing nights. In South Africa alone less than 60% of the population have access to electricity. They can have gas but this would involve shale from the Karoo Desert or the mountains of coal that they sit on. Do we say to the mother whose premature baby dies due to lack of power that they have got to pay extra for solar or nuclear?

The cost of transition to a low carbon generation for the UK alone is £200 billion and to switch all our homes to low carbon heat networks will cost another £150 billion plus, so what price austerity? Energy requirements are forecast to double in the first half of this

century and progress should be made towards cleaner and more efficient energy. The expanding population will want to be mobile with cars and plane travel, so the value of fossil fuel assets will remain high.

Fossil fuels will still comprise a majority of the energy mix, so it is better to develop this responsibly than cut investment and stifle development or leave energy provision solely to less responsible enterprises not accountable to shareholders. Natural gas, a lower carbon fuel, is abundant and relatively cheap. Making gas available now will help nations to meet their carbon reduction targets, designed to limit emissions. Replacing China's energy requirement, currently met by coal, with gas will make a big difference.

The Church needs to be involved with the international oil companies and influence them. Switching to low carbon economies will involve investing billions of pounds. Most governments are too short term in their thinking to do this. It will be the BPs and the Shells that do it. We need to be at the table with them and encourage the work of those energy companies committed to carbon pricing which this amendment introduces into the motion, and also investing into research in cleaner fuels, natural gas and carbon capture and storage. I propose the amendment standing in my name and urge Synod to support it. See you at sunrise.

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

*Mr John Freeman (Chester)*: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank the EIAG group, Oxford and Birmingham dioceses for all their hard work.

I started my working life designing bigger and better CFC plants and spent time as an undergraduate commissioning a liquid oxygen plant to supply fuel to the rocket motors for Britain's ballistic missile programme and all the CO<sub>2</sub> that produced. I have since reflected on this, as at this morning's Bible study, whilst repenting of my evils.

I have been a keen recycler since habits developed in my childhood in the 1950s where the local Taplow paper mill took waste paper. I helped persuade my employer to recycle waste paper and acted as a local collection point for 10-tonne lots of waste paper. I have low energy bulbs purchased in 1978 still regularly in daily use. I recycle as much as I can, purchasing only the food I need, leaving home with very little in my fridge for this event, solar cells on my roof, as well as a thermal system fitted in '94 that supplies most of the hot water this time of year. There was enough on Friday, with my son returning from night work, for him to have a bath, me to have a bath and then to do the washing up. There we are.

There are some of the practical reflections of the question in question 4 of this morning's Bible study. It is often said, why should I do anything? In reply, the answer, folks, when you go back home, is to say, 'The little that we do, if we all do a little bit, the cumulative effect will have an increasing effect on reducing the problems of fossil fuels'. What we need to do is put our backs behind the wheel of utilising solar power. It has already been referred to. The sun sends us all the energy for today's world population and future growth, and we need to solve the problem of capturing this solar energy for use at night and develop the technology of better batteries.

There is already plenty of good work going on. I am asking the Investing Bodies and the Government to support this research. I would also encourage the Church Commissioners, Caroline Spelman, to urge DfID to use their money to supply solar systems to those in developing countries. The light has come on, so I will sit down.

*The Chair:* Mr Oldham, after whom I would like to hear from Catherine Grylls to speak to her amendment but not to move it.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I was the person in the Ethical Investment Advisory Group who initiated the policy review now before you. Its predecessor had no teeth at all and, therefore, provided little more than lip service. As Chairman of the Christian Ethical Investment Group, I campaigned strongly for more focus on the environment, largely in recognition that our generation has so much more impact on the lives of successor generations than any generation before us. But I have to say that I am dismayed to see, in spite of the Bishop of Manchester's daughter, how little younger generations pick up the cause and how hard it is to turn people's genuine attention to long-term disasters. It is, as Lord Stern pointed out, a matter of the heavy discount we attach to the importance of future events. I have come to agree with those who say that the best chance of restricting temperature rise to 2° is that the price of climate friendly energy becomes less than climate unfriendly fuels. In this respect, there has been many advances in solar and tidal energy generation. Wind is more questionable. I am particularly interested myself in the rise and fall of a tide. For example, an old cargo ship anchored in the Bristol Channel could generate enough power for 500 houses just by going up and down with the tide.

I strongly support the new policy and, in particular, the call for engagement. It is far more effective than divestment. For example, our new alcohol policy has resulted in genuine change of behaviour in the marketing stance of both producers and supermarkets. We can achieve likewise with the fossil fuel companies.

Why, for example, can they not turn to hydrogen production and distribution so that we can have climate friendly cars which travel more than 100 miles without switching off their heating? They have them in California. I also welcome the fact that the policy has retained guidance for National Investing Bodies to seek out investment which not only produce sustainable energy but which also represent adaptation to the impact of climate change. You will find this on page 4 and page 21.

One key example of adaptation is a London property in the wake of the installation of the Thames Barrier. Those who invested in property after the barrier was installed have gained many billions of pounds as a result of the stability and security provided. We cannot just stand on the streets waving our placards, although we should do that too. We should also invest like the Five Wise Virgins in looking ahead for preparing for the climate change that will, I am afraid, come.

So I very much encourage you to support this motion and I hope that the new policy will be welcomed most warmly by the Synod. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Canon Catherine Grylls to speak to but not move her amendment.

*Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham):* I would like to begin by expressing appreciation for the new Climate Change Policy, for the work behind it and that it was ready in time to be presented at this group of sessions. The amendment before you arises, as I said this morning, out of a motion passed unanimously at Birmingham Diocesan Synod in March. At that point, the policy was as yet unknown and the possibility of publication by now seemed still to be in doubt.

As the Chair mentioned, there is a brief background paper to that motion, GS 1113, but it is very brief as we were aware there were a number of papers on this broad topic already and that theology and scriptural material are comprehensively covered in the EIAG policy and in this morning's group work and Bible study. But I invite you now to turn to GS Misc 1110, page 3, to paragraph 5f.

This amendment seeks to give Synod the opportunity to affirm, draw attention to and encourage substantial action on this element of the new Climate Change Policy. The National Investing Bodies have decided that they will, "Increase their investments in climate change adaptation, and in sectors and activities such as sustainable energy, energy efficiency, carbon capture and storage that may make a significant contribution to reducing global greenhouse gas emissions or facilitating the transition to low carbon economy, to the extent that such investments meet their investment risk/return criteria".

Before I go any further, I want to make it clear why the amendment does not restate the requirements to meet the investment risk/return criteria. It is omitted not because it should be overlooked but because it is taken as read, taken as a given.

The Church Commissioners, the largest of the National Investing Bodies, have already made significant impacts in the area of climate change, as outlined by the Bishop of Manchester, and are to be congratulated on appointing to a new post of Head of Responsible Investment and for their stated aim of seeking to be at the forefront of responsible investment practice.

Element (f) of the new policy provides an opportunity for the Church Commissioners and the other two National Investing Bodies to provide a significant lead in rebalancing their investments in the energy sector and in particular growing their investment in often smaller companies who are in the renewable energy and other low carbon energy sectors. As the motion states, urgent action is required to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels. Disinvestment in oil sands and thermal coal is an important and significant step but there are other issues yet to be addressed, among them public policy.

In his speech to the Church Commissioners' AGM recently, the First Estates Commissioner noted: "While it is all very well not to invest in certain companies and to urge oil majors to make moves that will protect the world against adverse climate change, there is a still more important aspect of the Commissioners' policy and that is the Commissioners' low carbon investments."

As I said, this amendment enables Synod to affirm the importance of that policy aspect.

*The Chair:* Canon Giles Goddard now to speak to but not propose his amendment.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Thank you for calling me, Chair. Can I first advise Synod that I do not intend to move the second amendment under my name because I am confident now that the existing reporting arrangements are enough, so on the fifth amendment I shall be silent. Ha ha!

I am really delighted that we are finishing this quinquennium thinking so profoundly about the world we have been given by God. One thing which has not been mentioned is that we face potentially a global rate of extinction of species unmatched for millions of years. It is very good that the Church of England is taking these matters so seriously. In fact, I have to pinch myself when I think how far we have come in the past couple of years.

I am glad that the EIAG policy is already bearing fruit in terms of divestment and engagement. The question which is not answered, and it is a crucial question, is how do we know when the engagement is being effective? What are our success criteria? Do we want, for example, Shell to pull out of drilling in the Arctic? It is really interesting that they announced that they were restarting their drilling on the same day that they agreed to support the Aiming for A shareholder amendment. Do we want them to reduce or change the huge amount of lobbying that they do of governments? Do we want them to focus on gas instead of oil as an interim measure and then quickly move away from fossil fuels entirely?

My amendment asks the EIAG to publish its engagement criteria so that everyone knows what is being asked for, how and when by. It does not seek to specify what the criteria might be but it is good to hear from the Bishop of Manchester that they are planned to be ambitious. Andreas Whittam Smith acknowledged in his speech to the Commissioners' AGM last week how urgent the challenge is. Clearly there may be times when particular requests are commercially sensitive and we would not expect that to be published, but it would be very helpful to know the engagement framework as specifically as possible. I am conscious that there may be resource implications attached to this request and I urge the NIBs, if Synod supports the amendment, to make the necessary resources available to the EIAG.

The Church of England is now a leader in this field, something we can be proud of. My amendment will help us to be even more of a leader as well as helping Synod to engage with it. It will make the policy stronger and more robust and I urge you to support it. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Ladies and gentlemen, there are three amendments in front of us, Items 57, 58 and 59. There is an opportunity now for general discussion before we move to vote on each of those.

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

*Revd Professor Richard Burridge (Universities):* Like Canon Betts, I was told not to thank the Chair but I would like to do so for this, which will be my last speech to Synod. In my first speech to Synod, as well as my last speech to Synod, I take what John Goldingay taught me at theological college: good theology is good for you. I am sorry that you no longer think that having peer reviewed academic theologian seats is important.



In my last speech, as in all my speeches, I wish to commend to you the theological basis of this policy. I am sorry that I was not able to get the supporting paper as part of the policy, as is the case normally and I hope will always be the case in future. I am sorry about the time taken. Whether it is as long as Jesus' ministry depends upon which Gospel you follow. If it is Mark it is only 40 days, and we did feel like we were in the wilderness quite a bit of the time. We did see with the FAOC report that actually a long gestation period involving good theologians produces a very good report. I am grateful to everybody who has worked so hard on this and to the various amendments, all of which we are supporting, with the exception of Hugh Lee's, which I will explain in a moment.

I really just want to draw Synod's attention to the theological part and in particular the comments at the bottom of page 13, top of page 14, about living between the times and actually how we go about conducting our relationship. It seems to me that it is about relationships in engagement rather than a list of demands. My own academic work has been driven by the observation of the French-Canadian Jesuit Guillemets that "Jesus gives us a direction rather than directives. He is a preacher who wants to be followed, not a philosophical teacher who wants to be obeyed." It is about a relationship. There is only one criterion in which we disinvest: when they are not listening any longer. That is why we divested from News Corp, Vedanta and SOCO, and we will do it. There is no point in actually just having artificial targets. Are we getting somewhere?

When Jesus met Zacchaeus, he did not say to Zacchaeus, "You're a dirty rotten collaborator and I'm not allowed to have anything to do with you", he said, "Go and put the kettle on". Then when Zacchaeus said he was going to give half of it away, Jesus should have said, "Zacchaeus, we're in Luke Chapter 19, turn back a couple of pages and you will see that I have said 'Give it all away'." Whereas in fact what he said is, "Today salvation has come to this house". It is an ongoing change.

I commend this policy to you, there is teeth to it, it is robust engagement, there will be reporting back. It has been a privilege to share this journey with you for 21 years. I hope you will continue to take good theology seriously and I am going to try and write up the books that have been inspired by this in the meantime. Good theology is good for you. Thank you.

*Mr Elliot Swatridge (Church of England Youth Council Representatives):* I support this policy but with a word of caution. I want to speak on an ethical point.

I am compelled to question the 10% threshold in paragraph 7 of GS 2004, the proportion of revenue a company may receive from oil sands or thermal coal, major pollution generating activities, before the NIBs are compelled to exclude the said company from their investments. In all the discussion on investment as a key lever for change I am made uncomfortable by what seems to be a highly utilitarian approach. In ethical theory, utilitarianism argues that an action is justified if it produces an outcome of the greatest good for the greatest number. In other words, the end justifies the means. We can do anything, justify anything, as long as the outcome is highly good.

This ethical theory sounds superficially convincing but has the fatal weakness that it fails to account for the intrinsic nature of human rights. If human rights are real they cannot simply be ignored for the promise of some greater good.

Here is a thought experiment. Would you permit the torture of 100 people indefinitely if one billion starving people would be guaranteed food and freedom from hunger? Pure utilitarianism would justify this. Yet I believe Christ would condemn this because he cares for the intrinsic dignity of all even if they are in the minority. How is this relevant? With investment it could be argued that one ought to invest in even the most unethical company if it has the outcome of influencing its policy.

Here is another thought experiment. Take the example of a firearms company. If a given organisation invested in it, it would mean that that money from that organisation would be used for manufacturing and distributing firearms which could potentially be used to kill and maim innocent men, women and children. Yet, on the other hand, this organisation by its investment could theoretically influence the company to stop providing firearms to oppressive regimes, but would this be right? Does this form of action honour God? Under utilitarianism the answer might be “yes”, yet I believe Christ would condemn such action.

It is for this reason I am made uncomfortable that we feel it is acceptable to invest in companies receiving up to 10% of their revenue from oil sands or thermal coal. This means that if we gain, say, £100,000 of profit from this investment, £10,000 could still theoretically come from the terribly environmentally destructive activities.

I argue that we must stand on principle. The end does not justify the means as much as we might wish that it did. We must reduce these thresholds as far as possible even if this means our results are mitigated. God does not call us to profit in any way from unethical activity even to achieve a good end. We need to ensure our investment policy brings glory to God. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I am going to put Chris Sugden’s amendment to the vote but first, Chris, would you propose formally.

*Revd Canon Dr Christopher Sugden (Oxford):* I beg to move as an amendment:

“(–) urge the NIBs to encourage the work of those energy companies committed to carbon pricing and investing in research into cleaner fuels, natural gas and carbon capture and storage;”.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The Bishop to comment.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Thank you, Chairman. Can I say now that I am supporting this amendment and supporting the other two that have been spoken to but not yet formally proposed. Canon Sugden’s amendment underlines the very first of the commitments of the new climate change policy that we are going to engage with companies to encourage them to assist in the transition to the low carbon economy. I think the amendment plays well to our engagement style. Christian engagement is not always about wielding a big stick. An intrinsic part of being a Church investor is being supportive and encouraging of positive corporate behaviour and so I recommend, members of Synod, that you approve this amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. We vote now on the amendment in Mr Sugden’s name.

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

*The Chair:* We now move to Canon Catherine Grylls' amendment. Canon Grylls, would you propose formally the amendment which you spoke to?

*Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham):* I beg to move as an amendment:

'After paragraph (c) insert –

"(-) urge the NIBs proactively to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and other low carbon energy sectors and to track low carbon indices;"

*The Chair:* Thank you. Bishop?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I have already let the cat out of the bag, have I not? I am very grateful for this, another supportive amendment. It underlines the commitments in the new climate change policy both to increase investments in climate change mitigation and adaptation and to reduce the carbon footprint of our investment portfolios. Yes, I would have preferred the amendment to be clear that it relates to making investments that are consistent with the Investing Bodies' risk and return criteria but the spirit in which the amendment has been made is very clear and I am grateful that when she spoke to it a few minutes ago she said that the amendment should not be read as urging the Investing Bodies to make investments that do not meet their risk return criteria. Indeed, that was implicit in what she was proposing, that was taken as read. Again, I recommend, members of Synod, that you approve this amendment.

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

*The Chair:* So to Item 59. Canon Giles Goddard, would you please formally propose.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* I beg to move as an amendment:

'After paragraph (c) insert –

"(-) request the EIAG and the NIBs to publish their 'engagement framework' by June 2016;"

*The Chair:* Thank you. Bishop?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Again, very grateful, it is a supportive amendment. It underlines the commitment in the new climate change policy to engage intensively and professionally with companies on climate change. Investing Bodies in the EIAG have developed successful engagement frameworks in the past. I think alcohol was referred to in Professor Burrige's speech a few minutes ago and we will do the same on climate change.

We completely recognise the interests of Synod and other stakeholders in the Church in the engagement framework and we will certainly be pleased to publish it. I think I gave that one away in my opening speech. We will gladly present it and that initial engagement work done at an ethical investment fringe meeting here in York in a year's time and we look forward to discussing it, I was going to say with you but with some of you and some

of the new members of Synod at that time. I think the timescale proposed for developing and publishing the engagement framework is a realistic one and so again, Synod, I warmly commend this amendment to you for your approval.

*The Chair:* We now vote on Item 59.

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

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 60, Canon Goddard's motion. It has been withdrawn formally. Would you just repeat that for formal purposes?

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard:* I formally withdraw my amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I see nobody standing. We move back into the general debate. Comments, points, on the motion as amended.

*Revd Canon Martin Wood (Chelmsford):* I do thank you for calling me. I have been wondering whether to say something and I feel that I must.

Looking at the motion that we looked at this morning, it refers to the fact that climate change disproportionately affects the world's poorest and yet in all the motions we have had before us there has been nothing at all about engaging with the people who are most affected by climate change. Is there any way at all in which we can engage with those people? In our group work this morning we talked about the fact that relationship is important, that talking to people, the links with other parishes in other parts of the world, that is obviously important. Secondly, of course, there are things like the collection that we took at the Revue on Saturday night, and that is good. Thirdly, of course, when there is an emergency appeal I know that many churches and many Christians are most generous to that.

What about our investments? What about our investment policy? Should we have something in that? Should we be paying attention when we invest in companies to what they are doing when they are working in other parts of the world where the poorest of the world are most affected by climate change? Should we be paying attention to what they are doing? Should we be looking, for instance, at projects that they are supporting in those parts of the world? Should we, for instance, be looking at the way that the factories in those places are being looked at? Should we be thinking, are they as robust with their policies with those factories as they would be if those factories were in this country? Should we be looking at the wages they are paying? Should we be doing all these things? Should we be doing that with the companies in which we are already invested? Maybe, should we think in terms of companies that we might invest in where there is good practice?

I do support this motion but I do hope that we think about that as well. Thank you.

*A member:* Point of Order. Motion for closure, Chairman, on Item 26?

*The Chair:* There is one speaker I would like to hear from. Mr Sewell.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* Thank you. First of all, I would like to bring you a bulletin from the frog. He says, "It's not easy being green". He also says, "The temperature here hasn't changed for 18 years, can I come out now?"

Nevertheless, let us talk about the policy here. I am very pleased that Chris Sugden's motion has been passed. There is a lot that I agree with and I like. The one problem that I still have is in relation to shale gas, because there is little doubt that the discovery of shale gas has had a fantastically depressing effect on energy prices. That is good news for the poor. When I was speaking earlier, my primary purpose was good news for the poor. We have to keep that option open. I do not want us out of shale gas, because if we get out of it and disinvest from this sort of thing it will be bought up by Chinese millionaires, Russian oligarchs, Middle Eastern sovereign wealth funds. That is not just going to go away and be unused. I would like us to stay involved with the shale gas project because it is so important that the poor have access to the lowest priced energy. We all know, and many of you will be very suspicious of companies, that if you give any company *carte blanche* to set the price high, that is what they will do.

I want us to have a voice that says "We are not uncritically engaged with the climate change debate" but there is so much in this that I do appreciate that if you want to join me, those of you who just want to put a marker down, I am happy to abstain. I do not want this not to pass but I just think that we do need some markers that we need an awful lot more careful thinking. Robust intellectual questioning should not be a no-go area in this area.

*The Chair:* Amanda Fairclough was standing, I did not see her in the shadows.

*Revd Amanda Fairclough (Liverpool):* I speak as a Church Commissioner and a member of its Assets Committee. Both the Assets Committee and the Board of Governors worked really hard and thoroughly on this policy. We reflected on it, we argued about it and it was not easy work.

It is right that it should not be easy, living in this world is not easy. There are difficult questions asked of us as we invest. Stephen Lynas brought up the point about some green investments appear to be not as green as they might be, so solar energy potentially removing agriculture. Agriculture itself has quite a heavy carbon footprint. We have to balance that all the time and, yes, sometimes that does mean adopting a utilitarianism in theology, but if it was good enough for Dietrich Bonhoeffer it is good enough for me.

We take our responsibilities as trustees very seriously. We take this policy very seriously. It is serious work for serious people dealing with serious problems. We will continue to work on it and develop it, and as trustees we will ensure that we live by it, follow through on it and we will be accountable under it. Synod, please, I ask you, demonstrate your trust in us as your trustees by giving your resounding support to the motion. Thank you.

*A member:* On a point of order, Chair. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

*The Chair:* That would have my support. Would it have the support of Synod?

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

*The Chair:* Bishop?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* It has been an excellent debate. Thank you to all who have contributed to it. I do not have time to refer to every contribution but I am very grateful for the tenor of the debate as well as for the particular content of it.

Anna Thomas-Betts, yes, the EIAG created and the Synod saw it was good. Perhaps after this morning maybe it is even holy; we shall see.

Bill Seddon, thank you for reminding us that we work from the outside and the inside, that kind of twin-track is rather important.

Stephen Lynas, who spoke about the danger potentially of some solar farms on agricultural land, I think Amanda Fairclough has already responded to that and I do not have anything I want to add further to her words apart from to say we are dipping our toe in the water pretty small scale at this stage.

The Bishop of Blackburn on fracking, I thought we might hear something from Blackburn Diocese on that subject. Fracking contains investment issues, it contains ethical investment issues, it contains other ethical issues, and much of the debate around fracking is actually beyond the ethical investment, in terms of climate change it is a much wider issue and that I think we have referred to very explicitly in the papers that were presented to you.

John Freeman, a penitent sinner. God loves you, Mr Freeman. I wondered with the story of the bathwater and the washing up with you and your son, was that the same water? That would be too much information, would it not? You reminded us that we must all do our bit.

Gavin Oldham, thank you for having initiated this review. Yes, if we are looking big scale and long term, we need green energy to be cheaper than its traditional alternatives. Thank you for giving us the example of the alcohol policy as one where we had shown that we could make a real change by remaining engaged rather than disinvesting.

Giles Goddard pleading the Fifth amendment, as they say in the USA. Thank you for that. I think that made for a clearer debate this afternoon.

Elliot Swatridge, 10%. At the end of the day a figure is a figure. Why 10%? We did look at a range of figures in the EIAG. I think, for me, the persuasive reason for 10% is that is a threshold we use quite often in our other policies, so that is a tried and tested one that picks up the real companies that are focused on a particular form of business and avoids dragging in companies who are actually really doing something else but have a small exposure to a particular thing that we do not really want to associate ourselves with. That is why the 10% figure was arrived at. It is one that we commonly use.

To Martin Wood from Chester, I think the very important question is about how do we pay attention to what companies are doing overseas, there are some issues there around

supply chain that we are certainly looking at. Issues around wages are important but, again, as with the fracking issues, they are ethical investment issues, they are not climate change issues and this is a particular climate policy we are looking at today.

Finally, Professor Burridge, disinvest when they stop listening to you. I think, as always from you, that is very clear and precise. We will miss your theology even more than we will miss your shirts if you are not returning to us on Synod.

Members of Synod, tomorrow is my 35<sup>th</sup> wedding anniversary. I will sign off by saying that as a committed environmentalist I am not buying my wife anything made out of coral.

*Mr John Wilson (Lichfield):* Point of Order. Because what we are about to vote on has much wider implications beyond this house I wonder, Chair, if you will consider a count of the whole Synod.

*The Chair:* Do I see 25 members standing? Yes, there are 25 members standing. This is a division of the whole Synod.

*The motion as amended*

*'That this Synod, accepting that the threat posed by climate change to the environment and human wellbeing requires urgent action to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels, and recognising that achieving this effectively without creating damaging and unintended economic consequences requires political subtlety, flexibility and a focus on achievable change:*

- a) *affirm the policy on climate change and fossil fuel investment developed following the Southwark DSM passed by the Synod in February 2014, recommended by the EIAG, and adopted by the National Investing Bodies ('the NIBs');*
- b) *welcome the disinvestment by the NIBs from companies focused on the extraction of oil sands and thermal coal;*
- c) *urge the NIBs to engage robustly with companies and policy makers on the need to act to support the transition to a low carbon economy and, where necessary, to use the threat of disinvestment from companies as a key lever for change;*
- d) *urge the NIBs to encourage the work of those energy companies committed to carbon pricing and investing in research into cleaner fuels, natural gas and carbon capture and storage;*
- e) *urge the NIBs proactively to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and other low carbon energy sectors and to track low carbon indices;*
- f) *request the EIAG and the NIBs to publish their 'engagement framework' by June 2016; and*

- g) *request the EIAG and the NIBs to report to the Synod within three years with an assessment of the impact of the policy adopted, including the efficacy of engagement and the progress made on portfolio decarbonisation.'*

was carried following a division of the whole Synod. The voting was as follows:

IN FAVOUR	255
AGAINST	0

7 abstentions were recorded.

*The Chair:* That concludes that item of business. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 4.01 pm.

## Farewells

*The Chair:* Synod, I do not know whether I am a good thing but you are certainly getting too much of me this afternoon, I fear. We now come to Item 27 on your Order Paper farewells. I am going call the Archbishop of Canterbury to give a farewell for the Bishop of Lichfield.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby):* Doing these is a very mixed blessing. It is wonderful to be able to recognise the enormous contribution made by various people when we get to the farewells and to say thank you to them properly, but it is also invariably deeply sad.

It is very apparent that Jonathan could have had careers in many different directions, which would have led him in all sorts of ways in God's service, but in testing out his vocation to ordained ministry all those years ago as a candidate sponsored by, of all places, Lichfield, Jonathan was attentive to seeking what God wanted him to do. He served in parishes in the north and south of England, in town and country, and then in parishes in the Diocese of Canterbury.

In case people are in any doubt that some of our bishops have deep parish experience, his time in Canterbury is described as follows in his two churches:

"His church in Folkestone, situated between a railway siding and a housing estate, grew dramatically during his time there so they had literally to knock down the walls and build a larger extension. All the money was given by the parish itself. From a small daughter church, it became one of the largest and liveliest parishes in the deanery and it was entirely a communal church based in the life of the community. After that at St Mary Bredin in Canterbury known as SMB there was sustained and steady growth during Jonathan's incumbency. In 1987 it was decided to relieve the pressure with a church plant in a school at the other end of the parish and in 1993 he opened yet other extension to the church, again all paid for by the parish."



The person who wrote that went on to say that: "During that year the church was full with students and young people in the evenings as well as with a wide cross section of ages and types in the morning, and the fruit of his ministry is that it still is."

Not everyone can say that.

During this time he continued both in his study but also teaching because he was involved in training curates, Readers and ordinands in the Diocese of Canterbury. He taught New Testament Studies in Canterbury's School of Ministry as well as homiletics and mission studies. He became someone who was looked to when there was a need for the contribution of new ideas for diocesan strategy. He has a great gift of languages and was a natural person to link with the Continental churches. He was a member of the Meissen Commission. He is well-known and liked by his fellow clergy and when proposed for General Synod easily topped the poll for the diocese.

Inevitably this led him to further calls, first as Bishop of Southampton, and he demonstrated there that he was a bishop who was both able to encourage and enable but also to lead in mission. Then finally the return to his sponsoring diocese, this time as bishop.

When Jonathan arrived in Lichfield there were, as usual, considerable challenges as there are in every diocese. There was all the difficulty of financial issues and the challenge of having to face reductions in clergy numbers, but Jonathan has never been content simply with managing decline, quite the reverse, and he set a determined course for the diocese in a Going for Growth strategy. At the time this seemed very counter-cultural. One of its earliest outworkings was the appointment of an archdeacon whose explicit priority was to enable numerical and spiritual growth. When Bishop Jonathan rang up Bob Jackson who had recently finished his work as a Springboard Missioner, Bob recalls Jonathan's quiet determination and decided that here was someone he liked and could trust. Bob and his fellow growth officers, with the unwavering support of Jonathan, helped to enable the change of culture that continues to bear fruit today.

It is very moving to hear also from his colleagues - and once again this is something that I saw when Caroline and I had the pleasure of 24 hours with Jonathan last year - that his colleagues saw Jonathan not only as a person with a passion for mission but someone who has been profoundly inspirational through the example he has set of personal holiness, fidelity to scripture and servant-hearted leadership. His ministry of preaching and teaching has been especially appreciated. His sermons, full of powerful exposition helpfully contextualised, are full also of dry and often self-deprecating humour.

He has been Bishop of one of the larger dioceses of the Church of England with a fully delegated area scheme. He is a naturally collaborative leader and has been an extremely good fit for that diocese. His commitment to achieving consensus has been notable and he has overseen excellent key appointments within his diocese. One of the most noticeable things about him is the lack of ego, and the ability to trust the contributions and gifts of colleagues and that has borne a rich harvest. He is unstintingly kind and gracious and his ability to put any visitor at his ease with his obvious interest in them and concern for them is notable and memorable.

In addition, at national church level, Jonathan has worked extensively with the College of

Evangelists and then also as the link between the Anglicans and the Old Catholics. That may have passed some people by but I can assure you that it has its exceptionally demanding moments which he has managed with immense skill and kept up powerful relationships through some difficult times. His relationship with Archbishop Vercammen has been hugely appreciated and he has also made regular contributions in a thoughtful and powerful way in the House of Lords.

Throughout all this, Jane's unstinting support in the work of caring for the well-being of clergy and their spouses has been particularly notable. A clergy families handbook has been encouraged and with, support groups for spouses within each of the episcopal areas, Jane has been a wonderful partner in their Christian ministry. She served as a Reader but has her own academic credentials and indeed taught at one stage at the University of Kent.

We are all aware that in recent months Jonathan has been doing dogged with ill-health and that cannot have been anything but a great trial for him and Jane when they so much wanted to continue to the last moment of retirement with all the energy and vision that has characterised his ministry over so many years in different parts of the country.

Jonathan and Jane, we want to assure you of our prayers, of our sadness at your going, our rejoicing at what you have achieved and our love and thanksgiving. We pray that you and Jane may have the retirement that you so richly deserve. (*Applause*)

*The Chair.* I now call upon the Archbishop of York who also has some farewells to make.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Bishop David, love in Christ. As we come now towards the end of this General Synod and prepare to share in Holy Communion as a final act together, the moment has now come to reflect on the journey that we have been on over the past five years. The bare facts of legislation completed, motions passed, liturgy approved are set out in the document that the Business Committee has circulated to us. We have not been idle.

I am glad that the three daleks, one here, one over there and one over there, have not been activated; we have not heard the word "Exterminate!" I do not know why they did arrive with no activity. Anyway, we have not been idle.

But when we look back on what we have experienced, what we shall remember is not simply the debates, the issues and the conversations, but the people with whom we have travelled on the journey. For many this has been their first General Synod. For others of us this has been another in a series of Synods we have served in over more years than we may care to admit. What unites us is that we have each, through our speaking and listening here, wanted to contribute to the wellbeing of that part of Christ's Church in which we have been serving called the Church of England. We have each been sustained, even when the going has got tough, with a conviction that what we do here needs to be done well and, more importantly, to the glory of God.

It would be invidious if I were to try and name all those who have made a particular contribution over the five years, so God forgive me. I would like to express special thanks to all those who have served on the Panel of Chairs as well as to our legal and

administrative staff who have helped to keep us to task with their customary skill and cheerfulness. Please congratulate them all. *(Applause)*

We have a list on the Fifth, Sixth and Eleventh Notice Papers of the 99 members who have signalled that they will not be seeking re-election to the Synod. No longer will there be “ninety and nine that safely lie in the shelter of the fold”. I want to record the debt of gratitude that we owe each of them for all that they have contributed, whether this has been their first Synod or just the most recent in a long series. Among them and many others, we congratulate the Prebendary Rod Thomas who will be leaving the Synod following his nomination as Bishop of Maidstone. You leave us to go to some other pastures. God bless you. *(Applause)*

In their song, reflecting nostalgically on what was lost when Dr Beeching closed so many railway stations in the 1960s, Flanders and Swann captured the feel of an era that will never return: “No churns, no porter, no cat on a seat, At Chorlton-cum-hardy or Chester-le-Street, We won’t be meeting again on the slow train”. And so to pick a few names at random, for us it is a “no”. Will you please help me quietly chugging along the tracks - chug, chug, chug, chug. Come on, start! Chug, chug, chug!

No Storkey, no Sugden, no Marshall, no Gilley;  
No Berry, no Marshall, no Monckton, no Lilley;  
No Johns, Jeans or Dyer, no Gooder, no Key;  
No Ward, Wood or Ruoff, no Johnston, no Lee.

The train has stopped! Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

Having done that, I am just going to mention four others and pray for the forgiveness of others for having to be selective. Really God forgive me about this.

First, very briefly, we say farewell to that most unusual double act, the Christina Rees/David Houlding Show. We congratulated Christina for her richly deserved CBE at the beginning of this group of sessions. She has served on the Synod for 25 years, chaired WATCH for 14 years and for many years has been a member of the Archbishops’ Council. David Houlding has also served in a variety of roles, including the Archbishops’ Council, as Chair for ten years of the Appointments Committee and, most recently, of the Convocations’ Working Group on the Clergy Professional Guidelines. They have come to symbolise that commitment to work across the usual boundaries and we shall miss them both very much. *(Applause)*

We also need to record our profound gratitude to Officers of the Synod who will not be returning in November.

Dr Philip Giddings arrived here at General Synod in 1985, that intake of a rather wonderful crop of people, which included me! Dr Giddings was a fresh-faced lecturer in politics at the University of Reading. By then he was already a veteran in the Diocese of Oxford, where he had been a member of his diocesan synod for 11 years and a member of his bishop’s council for six. Following his election to the General Synod he used his time learning the workings of the General Synod before launching himself into membership of the former Board for Social Responsibility, the Executive Committee and the Crown Appointments Commission. A brief stint as a member of the Panel of Chairs was followed

by two spells as Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, chairmanship of the Church and World Division and then Chair of the newly created Mission and Public Affairs Council. For the past 15 years he has served on the Archbishops' Council, most recently as Chair of the House of Laity. There is much else, including notably in the area of ecumenical endeavour that I have left out in the interests of brevity.

Philip's staunch support of the laity, his unwavering commitment to the importance of the synodical system, his passion for mission and his concern for the welfare of staff at Church House have been quite outstanding. What we have seen here has simply been the tip of an iceberg of his service to the Church of England in so many different roles, as Reader, trustee, wise counsellor.

Philip, thank you for what you have contributed to the life of the Synod over the past 30 years and through it the Church of England. We wish you and Myfanwy all best wishes. *(Applause)*

This July also marks the Venerable Christine Hardman's last session on Synod. She served as a deacon from 1984 and ten years later was among the first wave of women to be ordained to the priesthood. She subsequently served as Archdeacon of Lewisham and Greenwich in the Southwark Diocese, from where over the years so many good things have actually come.

In her 14 years in the General Synod she has been a member of more groups than I have time to list, but they include the Toyne Group on reforming the Pastoral Measure, numerous Steering Committees, the Spending Plans Task Group. She has on several occasions been an eloquent member of our team explaining legislation to the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament. Over these past five years she has been Prolocutor of the Province of Canterbury, the first woman to serve in this role.

Christine's candour, creativity and determination to get things done have made her a key contributor to the Archbishops' Council and to all the other groups on which she has served, including the Steering Committee for the women bishops legislation that secured final approval a year ago. Christine is an exemplar of a work/life balance and when not engaged on church work can be found cycling across the States, kayaking over the Niagara Falls or attending Van Morrison concerts. Christine, we are in your debt and wish you and Roger all the best wishes. And since you agreed to marry me I am divorcing you so that there is no bigamy created. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

## **Dissolution of Convocations of Canterbury and York and of the Synod**

*The Chair.* Although that has completed that item of business, there is a little bit of constitutional work we have to do. I call upon the Archbishops to address us to explain the position as regards the dissolution of the Synod.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby):* By Writs dated the tenth day of June 2015, addressed to myself and the Archbishop of York respectively, Her Majesty has ordered by, and with the advice of, her Privy Council that the Convocation of Canterbury and the Convocation of York, which were called together on 23 November 2010, should be dissolved today, the thirteenth day of July 2015.

In obedience to Her Majesty's Writ addressed to me I have executed an instrument dissolving the Convocation of Canterbury immediately upon the Prorogation of this group of sessions.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* In obedience to Her Majesty's Writ addressed to me, I have executed an instrument dissolving the Convocation of York immediately upon the Prorogation of this group of sessions.

In consequence of this dissolution of the Convocations, under section 1(4) of the Synodical Government Measure 1969, this General Synod will also be dissolved immediately upon the Prorogation of this group of sessions.

*The Chair:* God Save the Queen. Under Standing Order 14, I adjourn this sitting for 15 minutes to enable the hall to be prepared for the service of Holy Communion. A bell will be rung to let members know when we are ready to begin. Synod is not yet prorogued.

*The Archbishop of York presided at a celebration of Holy Communion.*

## **Prorogation**

*The Archbishop of York* prorogued the Synod.

# INDEX

- accountability, of Archbishops' Council 20
- action, affirmative 236–40
- Administration of Holy Communion
  - Regulations 25–31, 219–20
- Admission of Baptized Children to Holy Communion Regulations 2006 26–7, 30–31
- adults, vulnerable *see* safeguarding
- Advisory Group on the Confessional 92
- Amending Canon No. 33 16
- Amending Canon No. 35 24–5, 26
- Anecdote to Evidence* 193, 201
- Anglican Alliance 283
- Anglican Communion Environmental Network 276, 277, 278, 286, 293, 299
- Anglican Consultative Council 285
- Anglican-Methodist Covenant 13–14, 64–5, 148
- Anglicans, minority ethnic 49, 79–80, 86, 235–46
- Appointments Committee 229, 326
  - and Church Commissioners 80–81
  - guidelines 86
  - question to 72–3
- apportionment proposals 254–65
- Archbishop of York, Presidential Address 4–15
- archbishops, and safeguarding 105–6
- Archbishops' Advisor on Bishops' Ministry 60–61
- Archbishops' Council:
  - and Anglican-Methodist Covenant 64–5
  - Annual Report 199–206
  - appointment to 22–3
  - Budget and Apportionment 107, 108, 254–65
  - and growth 199–200, 201–2
  - Ministerial Training Fund 201, 203
  - minority-ethnic members 86
  - questions to 85–7
  - and Reform and Renewal 199, 200, 203
  - staff 265
- Archbishops' Review Group 55, 57
- Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments 61, 75, 90
- Archbishops' Task Group on Evangelism 73, 88–9
- archdeacons:
  - and ecclesiastical property 166–7
  - faculty jurisdiction 126–7, 129, 130, 133, 135–9
- Architects Act 1997 137, 138
- area bishops 227
  - and traditionalist catholics 90
- Article 7 business 207–217, 219–30
- baptism:
  - additional texts 16, 207–217
  - Commission 210
  - Decision 212
  - Prayer over the Water 208, 209, 210–211, 214
  - preparation 209, 211, 212–13, 215–16
  - Presentation of the Candidates 210
- Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (WCC) 174, 180
- Bartholomew, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople 247, 277, 282
- bats, in rural churches 128, 129
- bedroom tax 69–70
- benefactions boards 132, 134
- benefices, suspended 117, 118
- bias, unconscious 236, 238, 239, 242–4, 245
- Bible study, on the environment 246–53
- biofuels 43
- bishops:
  - appointment 74–6
  - in every deanery 231
  - in House of Lords 71–2
  - housing 85–6
  - interim 121
  - and safeguarding 96–8, 102, 103
  - and *see* houses 195, 196, 205
  - as teachers 149
  - women as 16, 229, 236, 237
- Bishops' Advisory Panels 48, 66–7
- bishop's mission orders 26, 119
- Book of Common Prayer 79
- Budget and Apportionment for 2016 107, 108, 254–65
- Business Committee:
  - Chair 140, 141
  - question to 73–4
  - Report 15–22
- Cahill Report (2014) 101
- Called to Act Justly* 82
- Canon 113 91–2
- Canon B 8 51–2
- Canon B 12 25–6
- Canon B 43 104
- Canon B 44 30
- Canon B 44A 30
- Canon C 8 103–4, 109
- Canon C 18 149
- Canon C 30 102, 170
- Canon E 6 103
- Canon E 8 103
- carbon capture 19, 309, 312, 314, 317, 322
- carbon reduction 19, 276, 278–9, 281, 289–90, 293, 295–9, 312
  - and carbon pricing 302, 307, 308, 312, 317
  - and investment 36, 37, 43, 281, 300–302, 304, 314, 318, 322

cathedrals:  
   and lay distribution of Communion 26  
   and Masonic services 89  
 CBC (Church Buildings Council) 134  
 chairs, disposal 135–6  
 chancellors, diocesan, and faculty jurisdiction 131, 132–3  
 chaplaincy:  
   importance 19, 262  
   workplace 65–6  
 character education 267–8, 269, 274–5  
 Charities Act 2011 113  
 Charity Commissioners 191, 197  
 CHARM scheme 259, 264  
 children, and distribution of Holy Communion 26–31  
 Children and Young Person’s Act 1933 97–8, 103  
 Christenings Project 214, 216  
 Christian Ethical Investment Group 313  
 Christian Initiation: Additional Texts in Accessible Language 207–217  
 Christianity Project 272  
*The Church: Towards a Common Vision* 18, 173–90, 222, 234  
 Church Buildings Council (CBC) 134  
 Church Commissioners:  
   Annual Report 190–206  
   and Appointments Committee 80–81  
   and Archbishops’ Council Budget 255–6  
   Assets Committee 190, 310, 320  
   and costs of safeguarding 110, 259  
   ethical investment 190–91, 192–3, 302, 305, 307, 310, 313  
   and low carbon investments 37, 43  
   minority-ethnic Board members 79–80  
   Pastoral Committee 80–81  
   questions to 79–81  
   and Reform and Renewal 44–5, 194  
   and Regional Shared Conversations 94  
   and research 193–4, 201  
   and Resourcing the Future 191–2, 260  
   and simplification 192  
   staff remuneration 194–5, 197  
 Church of England, nature and structure 221–35  
 Church of England Central Services 203  
 Church of England Legal Aid Measure 1994 97  
 Church of England Ministry Experience Scheme (CEMES) 49  
 Church House:  
   Conference Centre 82–3  
   staff 204, 293, 327  
 Church Investors’ Group 37–8, 304  
 Church Representation Rules 98, 169  
 church schools 265–6  
   ethos 271–2  
   governance 273–4  
   and mission 271  
   in multi academy trusts 63, 274  
   school Eucharists 25  
 Church of Sweden 2–4, 180, 277  
 churches, black-led 242  
 Churches’ Funerals Group 87  
 Churches Together in England 174, 175–6, 189–90  
 churchwardens:  
   and faculty jurisdiction 130–31, 139  
   and safeguarding 97–8, 100–101  
 Churchwardens Measure 2001 97  
 churchyards, and faculty jurisdiction 137–8  
 clergy:  
   deposition from Holy Orders 91  
   house-for-duty posts 67–8  
   locally supported 117  
   retirement age 68–9  
   retirement housing 255, 264  
   in same-sex marriages 93  
   self-supporting 59, 65–6, 67–8, 73, 116  
   sickness 116  
   stipends 45–6  
   suspension 97, 98, 104, 110  
 Clergy Discipline Measure (2003) 91, 97, 149  
 Clergy Representation Rules 169  
 clericalism 50–51  
 climate change 247, 276–99  
   and investment 31–43, 83–5, 284, 299–323  
   and migration 38–9  
   and poverty 34, 276, 278–9, 282, 294–6, 301, 319  
   and renewable energy 35, 36–8, 40–41, 276, 279, 284, 289–90, 299, 306, 309, 312–14, 318  
 Climate Change Act 278, 281  
 Climate Change Levy 40, 42  
 Cloud storage, and energy 285  
 coats of arms:  
   relocation 132–3, 134  
   restoration 134–5  
 College of Bishops:  
   and discipleship and ministry 50–51  
   and minority-ethnic Anglicans 237, 238  
   and senior leadership 53  
   and sexuality 93  
 colleges, theological:  
   and minority-ethnic ordinands 239, 240–41  
   and *Resourcing Ministerial Education* 47–8  
 collegiality, and leadership 145, 148, 149  
 Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns (CMEAC) 49, 80  
   presentation 235–46  
 common good, and climate change 278, 283, 304  
 common tenure 115–16, 120, 121, 122  
 Common Worship 141  
   baptism service 210, 212, 214–16  
 communications, budget for 261–2  
 Conference of European Churches 278  
 confessional, confidentiality 91–2

confirmation, role 26–9  
 conflict, engagement with 52–3  
 congregations, age profiles 87  
 Corporation of the Church House 94, 256  
   question to 82–3  
 Council for Christian Unity:  
   question to 64–5  
   and Reformation anniversary 89  
   and *Towards a Common Vision* 173–5, 176–90  
 courses, theological, and *Resourcing Ministerial Education* 47–8  
 Crown Nominations Commission 230  
   questions to 74–6  
 CTE *see* Churches Together in England  
  
 DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) 100, 101, 103  
 deanery bishops 231  
 deans, and leadership development 55–8  
 deeming, procedure for 170  
 dementia, and liturgical resources 78–9  
 Developing Discipleship 50  
 Development and Appointments Group 153–4  
 Development of Teaching and Educational Leadership Partnerships 265–75  
*diakonia* 186, 189  
 digital media, as opportunity and risk 268, 269  
 diocesan advisory committees (DACs) 127–30, 133, 135, 138  
 diocesan boards of education 63  
 diocesan boards of finance 107, 113–14, 164  
   and Church Commissioners 197  
 diocesan environmental officers 279  
 diocesan registrars:  
   and faculty jurisdiction 131  
   and safeguarding 98  
 diocesan safeguarding advisers 97, 101, 102, 104, 106  
 diocesan secretaries, and Crown Nominations Commission 75  
 Diocesan Stipends Funds Measure 1953 113  
 Diocesan Synod Motions:  
   distribution of Holy Communion 25–6, 28, 31  
   nature and structure of the Church of England 221–35  
 diocesan synods, lay chairs 50  
 dioceses:  
   and clergy stipends 45–6  
   and National Church Support 255  
   pastoral committees 81  
 Dioceses Commission:  
   and provincial boundaries 77, 87–8  
   questions to 77–8  
   and West Yorkshire diocese 222, 224, 228  
 Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 77  
 disability:  
   and benefit reforms 70  
   and vocation 49, 66–7  
 Disability and Jesus 49  
*Discerning and Nurturing Senior Leaders* 46, 53–8, 154  
 discipleship, lay 49–50  
 Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) 100, 101, 103  
 disinvestment vs. engagement 32–3, 36, 37–8, 83–5, 300–302, 304, 306–311, 313, 315–19, 322–3  
 diversity:  
   and Appointments Committee 72–3, 86  
   and ordinands 48–9  
   and Pensions Board 82  
   and senior leadership 58–9, 230, 235–8  
 Draft Amending Canon No. 34 95, 102–111, 170  
 Draft Diocesan Stipends Funds (Amendment) Measure 112–14  
 Draft Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 115–24  
 Draft Ecclesiastical Property (Exemptions from Requirement for Consent to Dealings) Order 2015 163–8  
 Draft Safeguarding and Clergy Discipline Measure 16, 95–111  
  
 EBac 273, 274  
 Ecclesiastical Committee 101  
 Ecclesiastical Offices (Age Limit) Measure 1975 68  
 Ecclesiastical Property Measure 2014 164, 166–7  
 ecclesiology:  
   and ecumenism 173–90  
   and mission 175–6, 181, 221–35  
 eco-theology 276, 280, 293, 294, 299  
 ecumenism 13–14  
   and ecclesiology 173–90  
   ecumenical representatives 1–4  
   and education 270  
   and the environment 247, 276, 277, 298  
   and interim ministry 121, 122  
   and joint public issues 69  
   and leadership 144, 147–8  
   and mission 184  
 education:  
   and British values 21  
   and character 267–8, 269, 274–5  
   development of teaching and educational leadership partnerships 265–75  
   lifelong 266, 267, 268  
   religious 21, 61–2, 272, 273–4  
   sex and relationship 62–3  
 Electoral Roll applications, and date of birth 87  
 energy, renewable 35, 36–8, 276, 279, 284, 289–90, 295–6, 299, 312–14  
   investment in 40–41, 303, 305–6, 309, 313–14, 318  
 environment:



- and ecumenism 247, 276, 277, 298
- group work 19, 246–53, 275
- and investment 17, 31–43, 83–5, 191, 281, 284
- Environment Working Group 276, 277, 279, 284, 287, 293, 299
- episcopacy:
  - as collegial 149
  - and ecumenism 144
  - and structure of the Church 231
- equity, inter-generational 44, 191, 196–7, 200
- Ethical Investment Advisory Group:
  - Annual Review 31
  - and climate change 31–43, 83, 277, 279, 300–304
  - and disinvestment vs. engagement 32–3, 36, 37–8, 83–5, 300–302, 304, 309–310, 313, 315–19, 322–3
  - and fracking 306
  - and lettings of Church House 82–3
  - questions to 83–5
- ethics, medical 71–2
- European Referendum 70–71, 92
- evangelism, intentional 88–9, 179
- Evangelism Task Group 73, 88–9
- Evidence to Action* 193
  
- faculties, online application 125, 131
- Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 124–42
  - Appeal Rules 125
  - and archdeacons 126–7, 129, 130, 133, 135–9
  - List B 126, 128, 131, 133–4, 135, 137
- Fair Funerals Campaign 87
- Faith and Climate Network 290–91, 292, 299
- Faith and Order Commission:
  - and *Senior Church Leadership* 53, 143–63, 229, 230–31, 234
  - and *Towards a Common Vision* 173, 185–9, 222, 234
  - and Transformations Group 89
- faith schools, admissions policies 62
- farewells 140–42, 323–7
- Fast for the Climate Initiative 291–2
- fasting, and climate change 276, 279, 285, 290–92, 297, 299
- Fetter Lane Agreement 186
- Five Marks of Mission 277, 283
- five principles (women bishops legislation) 90, 158
- food banks 85
- fossil fuel 278, 297–8
  - and investment policy 32–3, 36, 38, 40–41, 284, 300–304, 306–317, 322
  - subsidies to 276, 279, 284, 289, 299
- fracking 306, 321
- Francis I, Pope:
  - and the environment 247, 277, 282, 286, 292, 293, 310
  - as universal evangelist 183
- freedom of religion 21, 232
- Fresh Expressions, budget for 262, 263
- funeral services 86–7
  - independent celebrants 108
  - and vulnerable adults 108, 109–110
  
- gender, and language 79
- General Synod:
  - appointments to boards and committees 72–3
  - chaplain 17
  - dissolution 327–8
  - ecumenical representatives 1–4
  - new members 1
  - quinquennium goals 16, 179
  - security during sessions 17
  - worship 17
- Glencore Xstrata 83–4
- Global Apollo Programme 284
- Going for Growth 272, 274, 324
- governors, school 63, 267, 270, 271, 273–4
- Green Report 53–5, 57, 60, 144, 151, 153, 157–8, 222, 230
- group work, introduction to 246–53, 275
- Guidelines for the Conduct of the Clergy* 190
- guild churches, and lay distribution of Communion 26
  
- hatchments:
  - relocation 132, 134
  - restoration 134–5
- headteachers, Christian 274, 275
- Holy Communion, Administration Regulations 25–31
- homophobia 92–3
- Hope for the Future 293
- House of Bishops:
  - and additional baptism texts 207–8
  - and administration of Communion 26
  - and benefit reforms 70
  - and clerical culture 51
  - questions to 51–61, 87–94
  - and safeguarding 90–91, 102, 110
  - Safeguarding Guidance 98
  - and same-sex marriage 93
  - Standing Committee 52, 77, 228
  - and women participant observers 94
- House of Laity, Standing Committee 50
- House of Lords:
  - bishops in 71–2, 325
  - women bishops in 237
- house-for-duty posts 67–8
- human sexuality, views on 76, 92–4
  
- immigration 237
- improvisation, faithful 145–6, 148, 149–50, 158, 223
- Incumbents and Churchwardens Measure 1964 164
- INSEAD 56
- Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 137–8

Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change 38

Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum 114, 164, 167

investment:

- and Diocesan Stipends Funds 113–14
- and the environment 17, 31–43, 83–5, 191, 281, 284, 299–323
- in renewables 40–41, 303, 305–6, 309, 313–14, 318
- and stranded assets 39, 40, 308, 310

Joint Covenant Monitoring and Advocacy Group 64–5

Joint Public Issues Team 69

Jubilee Centre for Character and Values 267

Judge School of Management 56

justice:

- and church expenditures 85–6
- climate 276, 282, 298, 299
- social, ecumenical approach 69

*koinonia* 185, 187, 189

laity:

- and distribution of the sacrament 26, 30
- lay leadership 50–51, 90, 144, 148, 203
- lay ministry 50–51, 90, 144, 203, 205, 222–3
- and mission 49–50, 223
- and Reform and Renewal 203
- and training 203, 261, 263

Lambeth Declaration on Climate Change (2015) 278, 281, 298

language, gender-inclusive 79

lay workers, and safeguarding training 103

leadership:

- and collegiality 145, 148, 149
- lay 50–51, 90, 144, 148, 203
- in New Testament 16, 143–4, 147–9, 160
- in schools 265–75
- team 148
- see also* senior leadership

legacies 263

Legal Office 123, 132, 258

Legislative Business 24–31, 95–142, 163–9

Legislative Committee 102

Liturgical Business 207–217

Liturgical Commission:

- and baptism texts 210–214
- questions to 78–9
- and Transformations Group 89

Local Ecumenical Partnerships 121

Low Carbon Investment Registry 37

Luther, Martin, *95 Theses* 3, 89

lychgates, and faculty jurisdiction 138

MACSAS (Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors) 91–2

marriage, same-sex 93

Masons, and services in cathedrals 89

Meissen Agreement 89, 324

mental health, and young people 268, 269

migration, and climate change 38–9

Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors (MACSAS) 91–2

Ministerial Education Scheme 205

ministry:

- interim 116–23
- lay 50–51, 90, 144, 203, 205, 222–3
- locally supported 117
- and Readers 89–90
- rural 60
- self-supporting 59, 65–6, 67–8, 73, 116
- workplace 51, 65–6

Ministry Council:

- questions to 47–51, 65–7
- and Reform and Renew 86

Ministry Experience Scheme 49

mission:

- and church schools 271
- and climate change 276–99
- and ecclesiology 175–6, 181, 221–35
- and ecumenism 184
- Five Marks 277, 283
- and laity 49–50, 223
- sustainable 44

Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 80, 82

Mission and Public Affairs Council:

- and European Referendum 70–71, 92
- questions to 69–72

*Mission-Shaped Church* 222

mitochondrial replacement therapy 71–2

Moravian Church 186

National Church Support 255–6, 264

National Curriculum, and Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) 62–3

National Investing Bodies, and climate change 31–43, 279, 300, 303–4, 307–8, 310, 312–14, 316–18, 322–3

National Safeguarding Advisor 101, 105, 107, 108–9

National Safeguarding Team 20, 107, 110

National Society, Development of Teaching and Educational Leadership Partnerships 265–75

National Society Council, questions to 61–4

New Churches, and ecclesiology and mission 176

*A New Settlement, Religion and Belief in Schools* (Clarke & Woodhead) 21, 61–2

News Corp, disinvestment from 85, 316

Old Catholics 325

*One Body, Many Parts* 227–8

"Open the Book" 177

ordinands:

- numbers 45–6
- pooling adjustment for training 254, 257, 264

ordination training *see* training, theological

Paris Summit 17, 32, 38, 39, 276–99  
 parish logs 131  
 parishes:  
     and parish share 198  
     rural, and church building repairs 127–8  
 Parliamentary Unit 69  
 parochial church councils:  
     and ecclesiastical property 164  
     and safeguarding 97, 100–101  
 patronage, and suspension of rights 117–18  
 Patronage (Benefices) Measure 121  
 pensions:  
     mission agency staff 85, 255, 264  
     and retirement age 68–9  
 Pensions Board:  
     and low carbon investments 36, 302  
     question to 82  
 Pensions Measure 1997 85  
 Pentecostal churches 176  
 pianos, replacement 136–7  
*Pilgrim* course 222  
 Pilling Report 92–3, 150  
 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 137  
 Pollen Estate, sale 190–91  
 Porvoo Agreement 3  
 Porvoo Communion 89  
 poverty:  
     and church expenditure 85  
     and climate change 34, 276, 278–9, 282, 294–6, 301, 319  
     and energy needs 40, 41–2, 289  
 Pray and Fast for the Climate Initiative 292  
 preferment list 105  
     and talent pool 59–60  
 President of Tribunals 97–8, 101, 102, 103  
 Presidential Address to Synod 4–15  
 Private Member's Motion, senior leadership 16, 143–63  
 property, ecclesiastical 163–8  
 provinces, boundaries 77, 87–8  
 Provincial Episcopal Visitors (PEVs) 90  
  
 Questions 16, 18, 23, 43–94  
     length of notice 169–70  
 quinquennial inspections 127, 130, 137–8  
 quinquennium goals 16, 179  
  
 racism 236, 237, 244–5  
 Readers:  
     and ordained ministry 89–90  
     and safeguarding training 103  
 Reconciliation Ministry 52–3  
 Reform and Renewal 16, 19, 53, 88, 133, 146, 148  
     and Archbishops' Council 199, 200, 203  
     and Budget 258–60  
     and Church Commissioners 44–5, 194  
     and leadership 148, 152–3, 162  
     minority-ethnic members 86  
     and nature and structures of the Church 222, 224–6, 228–9, 233–5  
     questions to 44–7  
 Reformation, 500th anniversary 89  
*Reimagining Europe: Our Shared Futures* 70–71, 92  
 religious education 21, 61–2, 272, 273–4  
 Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee, questions to 67–9  
 research:  
     and Archbishops' Council 204  
     and Church Commissioners 193–4, 201  
     and leadership 267  
 Resourcing the Future 44–5, 85–6, 191–2, 260  
 Resourcing Ministerial Education 45, 46, 47–9, 51, 53, 260  
 retirement age 68–9  
 risk assessments, and safeguarding 91, 102–3, 104–9, 110  
 Royal United Services Institute conferences 82–3  
 Rule Committee 126, 127, 131, 132, 133–6, 138  
  
 safeguarding 16, 90–91, 95–111  
     and administration of Holy Communion 200  
     costs 110, 255, 256, 257–9  
     and pastoral care 100, 101  
     and President of Tribunals 97–8, 101, 102, 103  
     and risk assessments 91, 102–3, 104–9, 110  
     training 103, 106, 109, 110  
 Safeguarding Vulnerable Groups Act 2006 97, 103  
 schools:  
     and collective worship 62  
     Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHE) 62–3  
     and religious education 21, 61–2, 272  
 Secretary General:  
     question to 94  
     salary 85–6  
 see houses 195, 196, 205  
*Senior Church Leadership: a resource for reflection* 53, 143–63, 229, 230–31, 234  
 senior leadership:  
     and gender balance 58–9  
     learning community 53, 56, 58–60, 154  
     minority ethnic 235–9  
     Private Member's Motion 16, 143–63, 229  
     and rural ministry 60  
     and talent pipeline 56, 58  
     talent pool 55–6, 59–60, 237  
 Senior Leadership Programme 53–8  
 sexuality:  
     and homophobia 92–3  
     Regional Shared Conversations 93–4  
*Sharing the Planet* 277  
 Shrinking the Footprint 128, 276, 287, 298,

299

simplification 115, 192  
of faculty jurisdiction rules 124–42

Simplification Task Group 51–2, 118, 122

Single Transferable Vote (Amendment)  
Regulations 2015 168–9

SOCO International, disinvestment 84–5, 316

spare room subsidy 69–70

Standing Orders:  
proposed consolidated text 217–19  
and Questions 16–17, 43  
SO 14 328  
SO 21(c) 99, 104, 114  
SO 26(b)(ii) 136  
SO 32 233–4  
SO 35(d)(i)(iii) 216  
SO 36(a) 101, 111  
SO 36(b) 156, 298  
SO 37:3 298  
SO 55(c) 112  
SO 59 105  
SO 59(c) 96  
SO 61(a) 99, 104, 114, 208  
SO 66 24  
SO 69 170  
SO 84 207  
SO 92 207, 219  
SO 93 208  
SO 97 235, 246, 265  
SO 115(e) 20  
SO 117(c) 23  
SO 130(a) 16, 170

Standing Orders Committee, 51st Report 23–4, 169–73, 217–19

Statutory Instruments Act 1946 139

STEM subjects 268–9

Stern review 278, 313

Stewardship 262

suffragan sees, and traditionalist catholics 90

Sunday trading 195, 196, 204

Sustainable Development Goals 283

Synodical Government Measure 1969 328

*Talent and Calling* 152

*Talent Management for Future Leaders and Leadership Development for Bishops and Deans* *see* Green Report

teachers:  
burn out 268, 269  
training 266–7, 272

Terms of Service Regulations 2009 68

theology:  
black 240  
and the environment 276, 280, 293, 294, 299  
and nature and structure of the Church 221–35

*Towards a Common Vision* 18, 173–90, 222, 234

*Towards the Conversion of England* 10

traditionalists, and area and suffragan sees 90

training:  
lay 203, 261, 263  
online 261, 263

training, theological:  
and Budget 255, 260–61  
and ecotheology 276, 280, 293, 294, 299, 316  
full-time residential 48  
and minority-ethnic ordinands 239, 240–41  
and *Resourcing Ministerial Education* 47–8, 260

Transformation Steering Group 89

Transformations Group 79

trees, cutting back 139

trusts, multi-academy 63, 274

Turning Up the Volume 59, 238

1277: Make Them Count 64

*Unfinished Business* report 235

United Nations, and climate change *see* Paris Summit

universities 271  
governors 273

values:  
British 21  
in Church schools 271–3

Vedanta, disinvestment 85, 316

vesting, prohibition 103–4, 109, 110

Victorian Society 126, 128, 129–30

vocations:  
and disability 49, 66–7  
growth in 259–60  
lay 49–50  
to school governance 273–4  
to teach 273, 275  
young 48–9, 120

Vocations Working Group 49, 50, 51, 66, 150, 204

Vote 1 48, 255, 260, 264

Vote 2 204, 255–6, 257, 264

Vote 3 255, 264

Vote 4 85, 255, 264

Vote 5 204, 255

voting:  
by Houses 101, 107, 111, 114, 216–17, 235  
single transferable vote 168–9  
by whole Synod 156, 292, 298, 322–3

Wash House project 55

West Yorkshire diocese 222, 223–4, 226–7, 230

Women Bishops Measure 16

*Working with the Spirit* (Perry report) 152

World Council of Churches, *The Church: Towards a Common Vision* 18, 173–90, 222, 234

young people:  
and mental health 268, 269

minority ethnic 242–3  
Young Vocations champions 49

*Index created by Meg Davies (Fellow of  
the Society of Indexers)*

