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CHURCH COMMISSIONERS  
Mrs Susie Leafe (Truro) to ask the Church Commissioners:  
Q1  How much money has each diocese/cathedral received from the  
Church Commissioners, whether directly or through the Archbishops’  
Council, each year since 2014 in:  
(a) Strategic Development Funding;  
(b) Lowest Income Communities Funding;  
(c) support for Ministry of bishops;  
(d) support for ministry of cathedrals;  
(e) Section 21 grants;  
(f) Section 23 grants?
Loretta Minghella to reply as First Church Estates Commissioner:
A The requested information cannot be reproduced within the constraints of the Questions Notice Paper and has therefore been placed on the notice board.

PENSIONS BOARD
The Revd Anne Stevens (London) to ask the Chair of the Pensions Board:
Q2 In November 2016 the Pensions Board announced it had reluctantly decided to close the Manormead Nursing Home by 31 March 2017. The Pensions Board has given assurances that in taking the decision it was not the intention to close Manormead Supported Housing or to sell Manormead, and that it would be seeking alternative uses for the buildings. Since March 2017 the Manormead Nursing Home has been standing empty except for the kitchen which continues to serve the residents of Manormead Supported Housing. Can the Pensions Board give General Synod some idea of what steps have been taken and what progress has been made in finding an alternative use for the Manormead Nursing Home buildings?

Dr Jonathan Spencer to reply as Chair of the Pensions Board:
A No steps have yet been taken to find a future use for the former nursing home building at Manormead. The Pensions Board continues to carry out essential maintenance works on the building, and ensures that it remains safe and secure.

The Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham) to ask the Chair of the Pensions Board:
Q3 Following the Government’s interim response to the Law Commission report, “Pension Funds and Social Investment”, it appears likely that following a consultation on the most effective way of delivering the Law Commission’s recommendations, legislation will be introduced to allow pension funds to ‘mirror members’ ethical concerns’. In the light of the Government’s response and the recent letter from a number of clergy, does the Pensions Board have any plans to respond to the government consultation and in preparation to ask its members about their ethical concerns in general and on climate change in particular?

Dr Jonathan Spencer to reply as Chair of the Pensions Board:
A The Pensions Board will consider responding to the Government’s formal consultation on the Law Commission’s report when it is available. We are open to the views of all our stakeholders on ethical investment issues, but we are not planning to canvas scheme members on how we should respond to that consultation.
ARCHBISHOPS’ COUNCIL

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Q4 What progress has been made since July 2017 with the Implementation Plan in GS 2056 “Setting God’s People Free”, approved by Synod in February 2017?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

A Progress has been made on all 14 of the priority areas outlined in “Setting God’s People Free” [GS 2056]. Dr Nick Shepherd began as the Programme Director in Nov 2017 to coordinate implementation with colleagues in NCI’s and dioceses. The pilot diocese initiative has been expanded with 27 dioceses now included in learning communities to facilitate the strategic and practical implementation of SGPF. The first commenced in January 2018. Dr Jamie Harrison (chair of the House of Laity) and the Rt Revd Rachel Treweek (Bishop of Gloucester) have accepted roles as champions for the work of SGPF. The Faith and Order Commission have established a steering group to facilitate ‘Theological Enrichment’ which includes overlapping work on the development of lay ministry. The first of two series of supportive materials for SGPF has been published. This and further materials will be integrated into the wider work on digital resources for discipleship.

The Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Q5 To what extent is it felt that the concept of “Worshipping Community” found in the Statistics for Mission is understood in the same way in churches and parishes across the Church of England? Does this concept have a solid base from which meaningful statistical information can be gleaned?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

A Thanks to the efforts of diocesan staff and others, understanding of the concept of the worshipping community has improved considerably since it was first included in Statistics for Mission in 2012. Since it is an inherently less precise measure than some of the others that churches are asked to provide, there are occasions when changing local interpretation leads to unrepresentatively large changes in a church’s worshipping community. Churches are able
and encouraged to correct erroneous historical returns where necessary to better allow them to interpret trends in their worshipping community figures. No one measure of attendance or participation is sufficient to summarise all that takes place in churches, which is why Statistics for Mission continues to cover several different measures.

The Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Q6 In the Statistics for Mission form, why is there no reference to confirmations?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

A Information about confirmations is provided directly from Bishops’ offices. The most recent information can be found on page 36 of the Statistics for Mission 2016 report.

Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Q7 The latest Statistics for Mission have shown that the average church attendance by children, defined as under 16, fell by 22 per cent between 2006 and 2016. What plans are in place to discuss the reasons behind this dramatic drop-off in overall church attendance by young people, and in doing so, to include a study on the many individual congregations within our church who are managing to reverse this trend?

The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as President of the Archbishops’ Council:

A The wide discussion we envisage within dioceses will lead to further work in the light of the feedback and full consideration of the issues within the House of Bishops and the Archbishops’ Council. We aim to identify existing excellent practice and disseminate it and will then promote cross-cutting work within dioceses and the national church, involving education, ministry, mission and the new evangelism and discipleship department to ensure that mission and ministry among and by children and young people is prioritised.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q8 Youth for Christ in a report last year, ‘Generation Z’, discovered that 73 per cent of young people who believed in God stated their own family was their biggest influence in their view of faith. What plans therefore does the House of Bishops have to discuss and publish theology regarding discipleship in the family?
The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich) to ask the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:

Q9 At the July 2017 Group of Sessions I asked the Archbishops’ Council why it seemed to have lost explicit strategic focus on passing on the faith to new generations. The response accepted that it was not prominent as a heading but noted the Council was discussing evangelism amongst university students and work in RE and schools. The Church Times recently highlighted our need to pass on the faith to new generations and advocated the need to encourage passing on of the faith in home and family. Does the Council have any plans to add any prominent objectives to pass on the faith to new generations, and does it accept that passing on the faith in the home and family, as well as in school and university, is strategically important?

The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:

A With permission, I shall answer Questions 8 and 9 together.

The role of parents and families is vitally important for passing on faith. Research commissioned by the Church of England shows that 56% of practising Christians say they came to faith before the age of 10. Care for the Family research shows that although 90% of Anglican families thought it important to teach their children about faith, only 29% thought it was their responsibility. Archbishop Sentamu and I have circulated a discussion paper to all bishops which identifies the need for schools, churches and families to work effectively together to develop ministry and mission among and by children and young people.

Our aim is to stimulate a wide discussion with the aim of enabling a full engagement with the issues in dioceses and within the House of Bishops and the Archbishops’ Council that will lead to further work in this area.

Mrs Susie Leafe (Truro) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q10 In the light of the view taken by the World Mission and Anglican Communion Panel that international relationships “contribute to the development of discipleship and mission in the Church of England” what plans have been made to support and encourage those bishops, clergy and laity who plan to attend Gafcon, probably the largest international Anglican gathering taking place this year?

The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:

A We strongly agree with the view of the Panel that international relationships contribute to the development of discipleship and mission. I am personally pleased that every diocese has some link to Anglican Provinces across the world, and we are keen to continue
developing these relationships. The recent Primates Meeting underlined the importance of such relationships. I have had conversations with, and listened to, the views of those planning to attend the Gafcon conference, and am keen to increase attendance at any event that encourages the flourishing of the whole Anglican Communion.

Miss Deborah Buggs (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q11 How are companion links being affected by divisions in the Anglican Communion?

Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q12 How are Companion Links being affected by divisions in the Anglican Communion?

The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:
A With permission, I shall answer Questions 11 and 12 together.

Companion Links across the Anglican Communion are flourishing. They provide mutual support through visits, gift exchange and prayer. They are a tangible sign of the Body of Christ crossing cultural differences. A minority of links have experienced specific challenges because of differences in the Anglican Communion. In these cases, Church of England links continue to support link partners through prayer in the hope that fuller relationships will be restored.

The Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q13 An integral part of the legislation for Women Bishops was the appointment of the Bishop of Maidstone and the agreement of the clear possibility and means for any PCC to petition the Diocesan Bishop to arrange for the provision of episcopal ministry in accordance with their theological convictions. However, in view of the considerable variety of response across the dioceses to petitions seeking episcopal ministry from the Bishop of Maidstone, from the ‘thorough inclusion’ of the Bishop of Maidstone to his being de facto refused or disallowed to parishes, what guidelines for a consistent and fair response from Diocesan Bishops have been discussed and agreed by the House of Bishops?

The Archbishop of Canterbury to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:
A I am very grateful to the Bishop of Maidstone for his work which has been welcomed in many dioceses, both in individual parishes and in the wider diocesan structures. So far it has not proved necessary for the House of Bishops to consider such guidelines, but I and Bishop Rod would be pleased to hear of any issues that might need to be addressed.
Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q14 What measures, if any, are being taken to ensure that in future responses from the House of Bishops to General Synod motions are reported first to Synod members, rather than appearing in the national press or elsewhere?

The Bishop of Leeds to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A The House of Bishops always seeks to ensure that material intended for members of Synod is provided to members first. There are, however, times when it becomes clear that details may have been leaked to the media – often in the form of deliberately partial information, and with a particular intent. In such cases it has been necessary to bring forward publication. We would remind members of Synod of their responsibilities when handling confidential material.

Canon Tony Allwood (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q15 Given that over 30% of practising Anglican clergy are currently self-supporting ministers (SSM), and that very few SSM clergy currently sit in General Synod;
1) has the House of Bishops considered appointing a Liaison Bishop, preferably with SSM experience, to act as lead bishop on issues concerning such clergy in order to ensure their concerns and views are properly represented in the Church of England;
2) if the House of Bishops has not yet appointed a Liaison Bishop for SSM clergy, will they be considering doing so; and
3) how many dioceses have appointed an SSM cleric as a Bishop’s Officer for Self-Supporting Ministers?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A I understand that in the past a bishop was appointed to liaise with self-supporting ministers (SSMs) and Bishop’s Officers for Self-Supporting Ministers, and to bring their interests to the House of Bishops. There is not currently a bishop in this role. Since this was found to be helpful in the past and since the role and contribution of SSMs is vital in the Church of England and its dioceses, I will enquire about how the matter may be brought to the attention of the Standing Committee of the House to consider what action it should take.
Information about the category of ministry of Bishop’s Officers for SSMs is not kept in the National Church Institutions. However, I do have information about those who attended a Ministry Division consultation on SSMs in 2015. Over 50% of the Bishop’s Officers who attended were themselves SSMs.

The Ven Luke Miller (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q16 Given the commitment to mutual flourishing in the Five Guiding Principles, what work has been done to monitor appointments to senior staff teams and cathedral chapters of clergy (other than bishops) who cannot for theological reasons accept the priestly ministry of women, and is it the case that there are currently only three archdeacons, no dean and one residentiary canon who are traditional catholics, and that no such appointment is currently held by a conservative evangelical?

The Bishop at Lambeth to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

The Archbishops’ Secretary for Appointments collates diversity monitoring data for the appointments of bishops, deans, archdeacons and residentiary canons. The latter two require the data to be provided by the dioceses making the appointments, and this is not always easily obtainable. As more dioceses use the “Pathways” online recruitment system, the diversity data will be easier to monitor and analyse.

There is no central record of the Church Tradition of clergy in post, and I am therefore unable to comment on the indicative numbers which Archdeacon Miller has provided.

The Ven Luke Miller (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q17 Given that there are models to encourage other minority groups into senior positions in the church, what methods or structures are being used to encourage the appointment of those who cannot for theological reasons accept the priestly ministry of women to senior positions, and how is their success or otherwise being monitored?

The Bishop at Lambeth to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A A programme for clergy from the Traditional Catholic tradition took place in December 2016 in conjunction with The Society, and there have been conversations with the Bishop of Maidstone exploring a similar programme for clergy from the Conservative Evangelical tradition.
Bishops are also encouraged to consider clergy from these traditions when making nominations for the Strategic Leadership Development Programme, and approximately 6% of participants across the three cohorts of this programme consider themselves Traditional Catholic or Conservative Evangelical.

The House of Bishops has considered the report from Sir Philip Mawer and I refer to the Archbishops’ statement of 6 February. Recommendation 2 of Sir Philip’s report sets out the issues that need to be explored as we seek to respond to this challenge.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q18 Does the House of Bishops plan to consider the report issued by the Rt Revd James Jones KBE which was commissioned by HM Government, is directed to all public institutions, and is entitled “The Patronising Disposition of Unaccountable Power”? In doing so, will it consider whether there are lessons that might be learned from the report by the Church in the context of its relationship with victims of abuse and whether, in particular, the “Charter for Families Bereaved through Public Tragedy” proposed in the report might provide a template for one aspect of that relationship?

The Bishop at Lambeth to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A The House of Bishops has no plan to consider this report. However, issues relating to power and authority are being discussed as part of the development and leadership programmes which the Bishops are now undertaking. Questions of power also relate to C4 Safeguarding training on handling disclosures, the vital importance of listening to the voices of those who have been abused and finding ways to go on listening. This is because for some people it takes years before the full trauma of abuse unfolds and it affects people in different ways.

The Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q19 The Independent Reviewer’s Report for the Archbishops on the nomination to the See of Sheffield was received in the autumn. Has that report been considered by the House of Bishops and, if so, how far has that consideration got to in terms of its time-frame for concluding changes and action?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:

A The House of Bishops read and discussed the Independent Reviewer’s report at their December meeting. I refer members of Synod to the announcement about this matter which Archbishop Justin and I made earlier this week.
The Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q20 Are there any plans to review the operation of the faculty process under Canon C4 particularly given the overly intrusive nature of the process as it currently operates and the serious safeguarding risks in which it currently places individuals who have escaped from previous abusive relationships?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:
A Being remarried with a former spouse still living, or being married to someone who has a former spouse still living, is a canonical impediment to ordination as deacon or priest. The Archbishops may, in their discretion, grant a person a faculty removing that impediment. Application for such a faculty must be made in accordance with Archbishops’ directions. These require references to be provided and interviews to take place. This ensures that all the necessary information is available to enable the relevant diocesan bishop to decide whether to make the application and the Archbishop to decide whether to grant it. ‘Appropriate enquiries’ are to be made of the candidate’s former spouse ‘unless it shall be impracticable to do so’. Where making such enquiries would give rise to a serious safeguarding risk they will not be appropriate and should not be made. There are no plans to review the directions.

Mr Simon Baynes (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q21 Paper GS Misc 1179 states (at paragraph 5) that the House of Bishops, at its meeting on 11-12 December 2017 “received updates on the decisions of the Archbishops’ Council, Church Commissioners and the newly-established House of Bishops Delegation Committee (HBDC)”. When was the HBDC established, what is its membership, and what are its terms of reference?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Chair of the House of Bishops:
A The House of Bishops agreed in May 2017 to establish the House of Bishops Delegation Committee (HBDC) as a Committee of the House for a three-year period, to be reviewed in May 2020. The HBDC met for the first time on 20 November 2017.

The membership and remit of the Delegation Committee are listed on the Church of England website at:
The full Terms of Reference of the Committee are available on the Notice Board.

Clause 5 of its Terms of Reference state that “The Committee must report promptly and regularly on its activities and decisions to the House.”

**Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q22** What action is the House of Bishops proposing to take to follow up the responses to the Mawer Report, with particular reference to theologically informed discussion about the Five Guiding Principles?

**The Revd Anne Stevens (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q23** Sir Philip Mawer recommended a "theologically informed discussion about the Five Guiding Principles" in his report to the Archbishops. Has the House of Bishops considered the report and, if so, what are they proposing in this regard?

**The Bishop of Coventry to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**A** With permission from the Chair, I will answer Questions 22 and 23 together.

Members of the Synod should be aware of an announcement from the Archbishops regarding the House of Bishops’ response to the recommendations made in *Review of Nomination to the See of Sheffield and Related Concerns: Report by the Independent Reviewer*, which provides the information asked for in these questions.

**Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q24** In 1987 General Synod endorsed the report of a Working Group on Freemasonry (GS 784A). That report “points to a number of very fundamental reasons to question the compatibility of Freemasonry and Christianity”. 2017 saw a series of major events celebrating the 300th anniversary of the United Grand Lodge of England. Among these events were services that took place in a number of our cathedrals. How many cathedrals hosted such events and on what basis are such events considered to be compatible with the Church of England’s position on Freemasonry and Christianity?

**The Bishop of Coventry to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:**
Data regarding frequency of services linked to specific outside organisations is not routinely collected and monitored centrally by the Church of England. As to the second part of the question, GS 784 identified significant concerns about the participation of Christians in Freemasonry without making a formal recommendation on this matter. Services of worship held in Church of England cathedrals are bound by relevant aspects of ecclesiastical law, including the requirement of Canon B 5 that services covered by the Canon ‘shall be neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter.’

Mr Clive Scowen (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q25 What Biblical, theological and anthropological reflection has the House undertaken on the nature and significance of gender, particularly in the context of considering how the church should respond to people who experience gender dysphoria and whether it is (a) possible for gender to be changed and (b) appropriate to encourage those who experience such dysphoria to seek gender reassignment; and will the House seek to ensure that future guidance, issued in the church’s name to schools and elsewhere, reflects a distinctively Christian and Biblical understanding of (i) gender and its significance and (ii) how children and others who appear to be confused about their gender can be best helped?

The Bishop of Coventry to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A Thank you for these important and complex questions.

The process of reflection on issues of gender dysphoria and reassignment are being undertaken as part of the work of the Teaching Document on human sexuality and marriage which will develop the work already done by the House of Bishops in Some Issues in Human Sexuality.

Currently four Thematic Working Groups are considering these topics from biblical, theological, historical, anthropological and scientific perspectives. This painstaking and rigorous study is being done by experts in their fields. Furthermore, plans are in place to engage more widely to ensure that the concerns of Christians in diverse walks of life and embodying a range of experiences in this area are taken into account and addressed. The aspiration is to produce a resource that, drawing deeply on scripture, is distinctive in its Christian perspective, useful for parishes and church schools and widely read beyond the church.
The Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q26  By what authority do members of the House of Bishops refer to questions of human sexuality as a ‘first order issue’ when the Bishop of Norwich, speaking on behalf of the House of Bishops at Synod in February 2017, was very clear that such questions are not first order?

The Bishop of Coventry to reply on behalf of the House of Bishops:

A  In his answer to a question from Ms Ozanne in February 2017, the Bishop of Norwich stated that ‘The teaching of the House of Bishops is that sexual orientation has no bearing upon a person’s salvation,’ while Christians may nonetheless ‘disagree deeply’ as to whether particular ethical choices ‘lead away from the path of life’. He also pointed out that the Faith and Order Commission’s Report *Communion and Disagreement* ‘proposes a more nuanced typology than that of “first- or second-order issue”, and notes that one of the characteristic features of truly serious disagreement in Church life is lack of consensus about the type of disagreement that is at stake.’ Neither in this answer nor elsewhere has the House of Bishops expressed an authoritative view on how questions of human sexuality should be categorised in relation to this or any other typology of theological disagreement.

The Revd Prebendary Simon Cawdell (Hereford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q27  Has the House of Bishops received the report from the working group on the theology and practice surrounding the ministry of absolution as envisaged in GS Misc 1085? If so, what conclusions has it reached, and if not when might such a report be expected?

The Bishop of Durham to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A  Both the House of Bishops’ Standing Committee and its Delegation Committee have seen drafts of the Report on the Ministry of Absolution referred to in GS Misc 1085. Although the Group – which I chair – has done a great deal of work, and is grateful to all those who have made submissions to it, it needs to meet again to consider new material from the Anglican Church of Australia which has recently been reviewing this ministry. Until it has done this it would be premature for me to report on the group’s conclusions. Once it has met - in a few days’ time - the intention is that it will then be able to finalise its Report and submit it to the House of Bishops (and the Archbishops’ Council). Publication of the Report will be a matter for those bodies.
Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q28 What progress has been made since Synod’s decision to call on Her Majesty’s Government to ban the practice of Conversion Therapy, and what plans are there to ensure that the decision to endorse the 2015 Memorandum of Understanding is communicated to all clergy so that they ensure this harmful practice is now stopped?

The Bishop of Carlisle to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A As is standard practice, on 21 July 2017 the Clerk to the Synod informed the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department of Health of the outcome of the General Synod vote on Conversion Therapy. A response was received on 24 August re-stating the Government’s position on this matter and referring to the Memorandum of Understanding published by the UK Council for Psychotherapy in January 2015. No further correspondence has taken place between the National Church Institutions and HMG on this matter. The result of the July vote was reported on the General Synod web page as well as in the Business Done and Report of Proceedings. It is for individual Bishops to decide how they communicate this decision to the clergy in their diocese.

The Revd Peter Kay (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q29 Recent attendance figures for the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of Scotland show rates of decline that pose deep questions about their futures. The 2016 Scottish Church census shows that the SEC’s Sunday attendance fell 29% over the last 14 years, to just over 13,000; the Church of Scotland’s attendance fell 40% in the same timeframe. At the July Group of Sessions the Bishop of Coventry said that the Church of England would continue to “listen and learn from” the experience of the SEC and the Church of Scotland; will such listening and learning in relation to human sexuality include wider missional considerations, not least these rather shocking figures?

The Bishop of Chester to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A The work towards the Teaching Document will involve the groups concerned listening and engaging ‘beyond their own membership… including ecumenical and Anglican Communion partners’ (GS Misc 1178). In addition, in order to address issues of human identity, sexuality and marriage, the Teaching Document is adopting an inter-disciplinary approach, including exploring missiological perspectives
Regarding the reported figures from the 2016 Scottish Church Census published by Peter Brierley, the reasons for rises and falls in church attendance are likely to be complex, and it would be difficult to single out debates over human sexuality as a decisive factor for them.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q30 Has consideration been given to how “Issues in Human Sexuality” is discussed with potential ordinands pending the new Episcopal Teaching Document on Human Sexuality with its commitment to a “21st Century understanding of being human and being sexual”?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A Thank you for this important question.

The current expectation is that the diocesan director of ordinands and the sponsoring bishop explore matters to do with human sexuality with all candidates before they attend a Bishops’ Advisory Panel. All candidates are required to give assurance that they have read “Issues in Human Sexuality” and they are willing to live within its guidelines.

While work towards the new Teaching Document is taking place, the Ministry Council has asked the Pastoral Advisory Group to offer advice on best practice in this area of selection, on the basis of a holistic view of relationships and sexuality in the discernment and development of a vocation to ordained ministry. It is hoped that this will lead to guidance which will enable candidates to make a well-founded positive response to the ordination question, “Will you endeavour to fashion your own life and that of your household according to the way of Christ, that you may be a pattern and example to Christ’s people?”

The Revd Sally Hitchiner (London) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q31 What progress is being made by the Pastoral Advisory Group and how should individuals offer their experiences to the group’s discussions?

The Bishop of Newcastle to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A The group’s first full meeting took place in November 2017. Having given time to getting to know each other, members then clarified its tasks: (1) reviewing advice provided by the House of Bishops on pastoral ministry to same-sex couples; (2) offering advice to bishops regarding specific cases of clergy and laity in same-sex relationships; (3) exploring what “radical new Christian inclusion in the Church… founded in scripture, in reason, in tradition, in theology and the Christian faith as the Church of England has received it” means in the life and mission of the Church.
These tasks will involve listening to individuals and congregations to articulate and share examples of good practice of pastoral care of and engagement with those who identify as LGBTI+. Individuals who would like to share their experiences to inform the group’s discussions are welcome to do so by writing to me as its Chair.

The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEIs) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q32 When may clergy expect guidance from the House of Bishops, similar to the guidance issued in 2002 (‘Marriage in church after divorce: Form and explanatory statement – a leaflet for enquiring couples’ [link to PDF]) for cases in which one or both of a couple seeking marriage in church has a former spouse (or spouses) still living from a civil same-sex marriage or a former partner (or partners) from a civil partnership?

The Bishop of Willesden to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A As the Church of England doesn’t solemnise same sex marriages, the only context in which this question might arise is where someone formerly in a same sex relationship seeks to marry a person of the opposite sex in church. In such a case, the form mentioned in the question applies. The form stresses that marriage in church after divorce is possible “in exceptional circumstances” and that no priest is obliged to conduct such a ceremony. It also encourages the couple to reflect seriously on what they have learned from their previous relationships and an attitude of penitence for past failings is clearly implied.

People approach the church for marriage with all manner of past relationships behind them. The guidance is flexible and sufficient to meet the context implied in the question.

Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q33 GS Misc 1178 (An update on “Welcoming Transgender People”) states “After taking time to consider the issue prayerfully, the House would like to encourage ministers to respond to any such requests in a creative and sensitive way.” Please could clarification be given as to “what time was spent considering the issue prayerfully” and by whom, and whether the whole House took time to consider the matter together or just a subcommittee of the House?
Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q34 Noting the support amongst all the Houses of this Synod for the need to recognise the need for transgender people to be welcomed and affirmed in their parish church and for its desire that the House of Bishops consider whether some nationally commended liturgical materials might be prepared to mark a person’s gender transition, would the House please clarify the process by which it arrived at the decision not to commend such materials as it is not mentioned in the Summary of Decisions listed in GS Misc 1179?

The Bishop of Willesden to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A With permission from the Chair, I will answer Questions 33 and 34 together.

The House has echoed the need for transgender people to be welcomed and affirmed, and it has recommended a new pattern for the liturgical recognition of transition which will require (as the questioner mentions) creativity and sensitivity on the part of the minister. The possible courses of action were discussed in detail by the new House of Bishops Delegation Committee, which considers issues related to mission, ministry, and public policy. The full House of Bishops was briefed on the Committee’s recommendation and accepted it at its December meeting.

Mr James Cary (Bath & Wells) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q35 What was the theological basis for the House of Bishops’ advice on using the Affirmation of Baptism service for acknowledging a gender transition?

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q36 What specific theological resources did the House of Bishops consult to arrive at the statement contained in GS Misc 1178, “that the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith, found in Common Worship, is an ideal liturgical rite which trans people can use to mark this moment of personal renewal”?

The Bishop of Exeter to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A With permission from the Chair, I will answer questions 35 and 36 together.

Some of the background for this decision and the continuing dialogue in the House on this matter is given in GS 2071 B. The New Testament understands our identity to be rooted in Christ of which
baptism is the sign and the seal. The inward and spiritual gift in baptism is union with Christ in his death and resurrection, the forgiveness of sins, and a new birth into God’s family, the Church. The House recognized in the rite of the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith a liturgical framework where these truths can be celebrated by trans people after an experience of profound change, and give them an authentic and positive opportunity to re-dedicate their lives to Jesus Christ.

**Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q37** How will recognising a ‘transgendered’ person’s new identity through a Reaffirmation of Baptismal Faith affect Baptism Registers throughout the country which record the birth sex and gender?

**The Bishop of Exeter to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**A** Unlike Birth Certificates which do state the sex of a child, Baptism Registers record the dates of an individual’s birth and baptism, names, names and occupations of parents, names of godparents, address, and the name of the minister administering the sacrament. They are permanent records which legally may not be amended. The rite of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith, which is used for various reasons and at different seasons in the Church’s year, celebrates and affirms a person’s original baptism. The rite neither repeats a person’s baptism nor negates its validity. As with all other services, an Affirmation of Baptismal Faith is recorded in the Parish Register of Services, but is not entered in the Baptism Register.

**The Revd Julian Hollywell (Derby) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q38** Given the House of Bishops guidance on the use of the rite of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith for those wishing to mark a transition from one gender to the other, will the House further agree to ask dioceses to include in the annual returns provided to the Church by parishes, figures indicating the number of occasions such a rite is used for this purpose?

**The Bishop of Exeter to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**A** As the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith (for this purpose or any other) often occurs within the context of another service, it may not necessarily be recorded separately in Parish Records thus making the collation of accurate annual statistics difficult and unreliable. However, if the House requests it, the Research & Statistics unit, in consultation with the dioceses, will look into ways of collecting this information.
Dr Angus Goudie (Durham) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q39 The House of Bishops voted overwhelmingly at General Synod in July last year to welcome those transgender individuals in our churches who were transitioning. This was very warmly received as an example of the change in tone advocated by the February Synod last year and the Archbishops’ Call for ‘radical Christian inclusion’. In view of the widespread pain and disappointment that this was not reflected in concrete action regarding liturgy, what practical actions are the House pursuing in order to give meaning, substance and reality to that change of tone?

The Bishop of Exeter to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A The House has affirmed the vote of Synod by reasserting the unconditional welcome of the Church to trans people. It has also taken concrete action by recommending an existing liturgical rite for the purpose of welcoming and affirming a trans person in their new identity. Ministers are encouraged to construct bespoke services, incorporating an Affirmation of Baptismal Faith, suited to the circumstances of an individual and which are pastorally sensitive. It is anticipated that further encouragement and guidance for such services will be prepared in the coming months.

The Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q40 In the light of the Carlile Report and the letter of several eminent historians to the Church Times about the failures in investigating claims of past historical abuse against Bishop George Bell and the response from the Archbishop of Canterbury in December, that a “cloud still hung over the memory of Bishop George Bell”; what weight will be given to the value of fair historical judgement in assessing the lives of the saints for inclusion in the Sanctorale at its next revision and in particular the continued presence of George Bell in the calendar?

The Bishop of Exeter to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A All liturgical business, including any future review of the Calendar, is only carried out by the Liturgical Commission at the invitation of the House of Bishops. If such a request were made, any proposed amendments to the Calendar would require a full synodical process and at that stage the Commission would seek advice from the House about the parameters of the review. It is worth pointing out that Bishop Bell appears in the Calendar as a ‘Commemoration’, meaning that it is up to individual clergy and parishes to decide whether or not they wish to observe the day.
Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q41 What is the role of General Synod with regard to safeguarding, particularly in terms of policy, oversight and review?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A Under Article 6 of its Constitution, the Synod's functions are legislative (6 (a)) and deliberative (6 (b)). Under 6 (a) the Synod considers and enacts legislation on safeguarding. In exercise of its deliberative function it can debate motions on matters of safeguarding policy, oversight and review.

Additionally, the Standing Orders relating to Questions allow members to put questions to the Chair of the House of Bishops relating to those aspects of its business that concern safeguarding, including the formulation of safeguarding policy and the guidance it produces on safeguarding (to which bishops and others are legally required to have due regard).

The Synod's safeguarding role is set out in House of Bishops practice guidance which may be viewed on the Church of England website.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q42 What is the role of bishops with regard to safeguarding and to whom are they accountable on safeguarding matters?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A The Bishops’ role with regards to Safeguarding is twofold.

Firstly, as Diocesan Bishops, they have overall responsibility for Safeguarding within their diocese as outlined in House of Bishops Practice Guidance.

Secondly, as members of the House of Bishops, they have a collective national responsibility as leaders of the Church of England to ensure that the whole of the Church is a safe place for children and vulnerable adults and that survivors are treated fairly. Bishops are accountable to the Archbishop of their Province for all matters including Safeguarding. They are offered support and challenge by the Independent Chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding Board. As trustees of their Diocesan Board of Finance they are also accountable to the Charity Commission.
The Revd Christopher Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q43 Under the Disclosure and Barring service eligibility guidelines, leading regular Sunday worship is not defined as a regulated activity. In rural areas lay people often lead Morning or Evening Prayer on a Sunday where there is no priest present (under Canon B 11(1)), and will sometimes robe for the purpose, and some dioceses have authorised lay worship leader schemes for such ministries. At present, these people are not eligible for a DBS check for this ministry alone, and yet leading worship and robing puts them in a perceived position of trustworthiness and authority in a congregation or community. Will the church of England take active steps to address this issue with the Government, to ensure the safety of children and vulnerable adults in our churches?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A It is not clear that any change in the current position is called for. Lay people leading worship are already eligible for basic DBS checks. Enhanced DBS checks are only for those individuals who work, or have substantial contact, with children or vulnerable adults. So lay worship leaders of the kind described will be eligible for enhanced checks if they lead services exclusively for children or vulnerable adults or where they are members of a PCC, which qualifies as a children’s or vulnerable adults’ charity.

In any event, it needs to be borne in mind that only a tiny percentage of individuals who abuse are convicted. DBS checks can only ever therefore be one element of the safer recruitment process and organisations must never rely solely on DBS checks when recruiting. Further guidance on best practice can be found in the Safer Recruitment Practice Guidance on the Church of England website.

The Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q44 Has any consideration been given to the value to the Church of the process of Neutral Notification whereby an individual, concerned that their actions, however minor, towards a child or vulnerable adult might be misconstrued or misinterpreted, can make their own report to a responsible person without fear or detriment or stigma?
The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A  The current guidance in relation to responding to an individual who may have concerns about their own behaviour in relation to a child or vulnerable adult is outlined in the House of Bishops guidance responding to safeguarding concerns or allegations against Church officers. This is based on the Children Act 2004 (section 11) requirements for faith organisations. This expects that any information received about concerning behaviour needs to be shared with a safeguarding professional, in the Church’s case the DSA, for consideration. If an offence is indicted and/or there is a potential current risk to a child and/or adult this information will also be shared with statutory agencies.

DSAs are currently available for advice and support in relation to appropriate behaviour around vulnerable people. Outside of statutory organisational requirements, there is more flexibility to offer such a service, for instance ‘Stop it Now’ https://www.stopitnow.org.uk/.

The Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEIs) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q45  Given the Church of England’s commitment to becoming a safe church, what consideration is being given to removing the one-year rule in the Clergy Discipline Measure in relation to cases where bishops and other office holders fail to respond appropriately to disclosures of abuse that are made to them?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A  The one-year limitation period generally serves a useful purpose, recognising that justice needs to be administered without delay. Where there is good reason for a complaint not having been made within one year, the President of Tribunals can nonetheless give permission for the complaint to be made out of time. However, the limitation period has now, for good reason, been removed in cases where the alleged misconduct is of a sexual nature towards children or vulnerable adults; and when considering the responses to the NST’s recent consultation on the CDM we shall consider whether there is a case for removing it in other safeguarding contexts.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q46  Given Lord Carlile’s recommendation (at paragraph 49) for a published standard of proof that applies to complainants can the Church of England’s safeguarding arrangements continue to describe those alleging abuse as ‘victims’ or ‘survivors’?
The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A  Whilst paragraph 49 is not a recommendation by Lord Carlile, the response to safeguarding concerns or allegations against Church officers is outlined in House of Bishops guidance, which was agreed by the National Safeguarding Steering Group. The guidance is clear that the use of the expression ‘victim/survivors’ does not presuppose that any allegation will be substantiated. The guidance states, “This guidance will usually be needed before there have been any findings in criminal, civil or disciplinary proceedings. At this stage there will be people who have made complaints (referred to as safeguarding concerns or allegations in this guidance) and people against whom complaints have been made. Both victims/survivors and respondents will at this stage be alleged victims/survivors and alleged respondents. For ease of reference this guidance will use the terms ‘victims/survivor’ and ‘respondent’ without presupposing the accuracy of the complaint. These should be regarded as neutral terms that do not imply the innocence or guilt of either party.”

Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q47  Given that many General Synod members may be unaware of the scale of safeguarding casework, please could you state the number of open safeguarding cases in the Church of England as a whole in 2017? Of those cases, how many involved an allegation of some form of abuse?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A  Each diocese is asked to complete an annual self-assessment circulated and collated by the National Safeguarding Team for the previous year’s activity. Our current data therefore relates to 2016 activity. In 2016, dioceses reported that they were dealing with around 3300 safeguarding concerns or allegations, the vast majority of which related to children, young people and vulnerable adults within church communities. Around 18% related to safeguarding concerns/allegations against church officers. These figures do not distinguish between previously open and new cases that started during the year.

During 2016, 338 risk assessments were completed by dioceses, of which 19 (6%) were in respect of members of clergy. During 2016, there were 867 Safeguarding Agreements in place of which 682 (79%) related to known offenders. A small number of complex and high-profile cases are managed by the National Safeguarding Team in collaboration with relevant dioceses.
The Very Revd David Ison (Deans) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q48 The Elliott Review of a safeguarding case which reported in March 2016 included in its recommendations two key statements about structurally changing how the Church of England approaches safeguarding: that 'The National Safeguarding Team should be given the power and the responsibility to monitor practice and to intervene where it is thought necessary to do so' and 'Safeguarding decisions as they occur across the Church, should be subject to review by an independent body within the Church, which has the skills, knowledge and expertise to do this. The role of the National Safeguarding Team should be looked at again to enable it to possibly fulfil this requirement.' What progress has been made in implementing these recommendations?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A Since the publication of the Elliott Review in March 2016, the role of the NST has been defined within House of Bishops practice guidance, ‘Key Roles and Responsibilities of Church Office Holders and Bodies’, October 2017. The independent Peter Ball Review recommends that ‘the role and responsibilities of the National Safeguarding Team should clearly reflect an emphasis on planning and supporting continuous improvement in diocesan safeguarding services’. The NST is taking an increasing role in quality assurance work having commissioned independent diocesan safeguarding audits and ‘Safeguarding Progress Reviews’ with all dioceses, where it will take a ‘critical friend’ role. The House of Bishops session on safeguarding in December 2017 also agreed that further work be undertaken this year in respect of ways to strengthen independent oversight and scrutiny of safeguarding practice, and this will include how the role of the NST can be strengthened in relation to its monitoring and powers of intervention.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q49 In the light of the Carlile Report, what actions are the House of Bishops planning to take to restore the reputation of Bishop George Bell?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A I refer to the media statement that I made on Wednesday 31 January and my reference to the statement made by the National Safeguarding Team on the same day. I am unable to say anything else at this stage until such matters have been concluded.
The Ven Julie Conalty (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q50 For the record and the benefit of members of General Synod who have not read the Carlile Report, could you please summarise the principal errors of law and good practice identified therein, and outline what measures are being taken to avoid those mistakes in future by way of retraining, amending procedures, recruiting a specialist safeguarding lawyer, or otherwise?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A It would not do justice to Lord Carlile’s review to attempt to summarise the key points of learning and I would encourage members of Synod to read the report for themselves. However, the National Safeguarding Steering Group is working through its consideration of how to give effect to the recommendations of Lord Carlile’s independent review into the case of George Bell. I have made it clear in previous statements that the NSSG accepts the main thrust of the recommendations, though respectfully differing on one part of one of them. I have apologised for any failings in the process and we are now considering how best to make improvements in light of the review. The NSSG will report to the House of Bishops as soon as this process is complete.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q51 In the light of paragraphs 14, 17 and 31 of the Carlile Report and the failings identified in that report in the workings of the Bishop Bell Core Group, will consideration be given to introducing screening processes to ensure those people appointed to core groups investigating abuse of any kind (historical or not) are independently minded, who can think critically and forensically in respect of allegations and denials of abuse, who can call for evidence when required, and are confident enough to make findings of fact?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A The purpose of the core group is to oversee and manage the response to a safeguarding concern or allegation in line with House of Bishops’ policy and practice guidance, ensuring that the rights of the victim/survivor and the respondent to a fair and thorough investigation can be preserved. Since the Bell case, the House of Bishops has published revised practice guidance on ‘responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations
against church officers’ which includes further clarity with regards to its membership and function. I am confident that collectively the core groups have the right spread of skills and expertise they need to perform this role. It is, however, accepted that further guidance is now required with regards to posthumous allegations, which will give consideration to Lord Carlile’s specific recommendation concerning the presence of someone assigned to the core group to represent the interests of the accused person and his or her descendants.

Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q52  (i)  What fees and expenses have been paid (or agreed to be paid) to Lord Carlile for his Review, published on 15 December 2017, into the way in which the Church of England dealt with a complaint of sexual abuse made by a woman known as ‘Carol’ against the late Bishop George Bell;
(ii) What other costs were incurred by the church (including by the Diocese of Chichester) in relation to Lord Carlile’s review; and
(iii) Who, or what church body, has paid, or will be paying, all such fees, expenses and costs?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A  (i)  Having consulted Lord Carlile, I can confirm that the costs of the review were £35,000 plus an additional £3,000 for administrative support;
(ii) I am not able to identify the costs of incurred by the church in relation to Lord Carlile’s review as this would involve extensive work and have an unreasonable impact on the work of the NST;
(iii) The costs of the independent review were met jointly by the Archbishops’ Council and Church Commissioners.

Mr Philip French (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q53  Which individuals and/or groups were provided with Lord Carlile’s draft report (in whole or in part) for comment, between the receipt of the draft in October 2017 and publication of the final version on 15 December 2017?

Mr Philip French (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q54  Were any significant amendments or redactions made to the draft Carlile report (as received in October 2017), before the final report was published?
The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A With permission I will answer questions 53 and 54 together.

Upon receipt of the first draft of his report, the NST agreed with Lord Carlile the key areas on which comments might be offered, which were:

- factual points
- general substantive points not affecting the recommendations
- matters affecting the possible jigsaw identification of ‘Carol’
- typographical errors

The above criteria informed decisions as to who to circulate the report to for comment. Upon receipt of a range of comments relating to the above areas, Lord Carlile accepted some changes and rejected others. For the most part, the amendments made were in respect of matters of factual accuracy and possible identification of ‘Carol’. No changes were made to the recommendations of the report.

The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q55 In order to clarify the role intended to be undertaken by the external lawyer who attended meetings of the Core Group, can the standard client care letter (which all solicitors must deliver on receipt of instructions) provided by her be made public, so as to make clear her understanding of the role she was asked to perform?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A The external lawyer involved in the core group was given clear instructions well within her professional expertise. The Carlile Report recognised that the external lawyer offered advice, including in respect of the civil burden of proof and expert evidence. This would be consistent standard practice in such cases. The release of any standard client care letter would be a matter for consideration by the Bishop of Chichester.
The Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q56 On what basis did the Press Statement of 22 October 2015 [Carlile Report Annex A, pages 3-4]:

(a) state that “expert independent reports” had found “[no] reason to doubt the veracity” of the allegation made against Bishop George Bell when the psychiatric report commissioned by the Core Group referred expressly to the possibility of false memories and said unambiguously that that could not be excluded; and

(b) give the impression that a “thorough pre-litigation process” had taken place when no serious attempt had been made to seek testimony from important living witnesses?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:

A I understand that Professor Maden routinely makes reference to the ‘possibility of false memories’ in his reports. Their inclusion does not therefore suggest that this was more or less likely in this case.

The Carlile Report offers a chronology of the work that was undertaken by the core group including the use of an external, experienced lawyer and consideration of two external experts’ reports. However, I accept that a number of aspects of the process could have been much better, as pointed out in Lord Carlile’s report. I have apologised for these failings, and we are seeking to learn the lessons of this review.

We are now examining in detail how best to give effect to the recommendations, taking account of Lord Carlile’s analysis.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:

Q57 In the light of the statement on 15 December 2017 by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his response to the Carlile Review into the way in which the Church of England dealt with a complaint of sexual abuse made by a woman known as ‘Carol’ against the late Bishop George Bell, “We realise that a significant cloud is left over his name ... no human being is entirely good or bad. Bishop Bell was in many ways a hero. He is also accused of great wickedness. Good acts do not diminish evil ones, nor do evil ones make it right to forget the good,” is there considered to be any evidence or other information that would support or corroborate the claim by ‘Carol’ that she was sexually abused as a child by Bishop Bell?
The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A  I refer to the media statement that I made on Wednesday 31 January and my reference to the statement made by the National Safeguarding Team on the same day. I am unable to say anything else at this stage until such matters have been concluded.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q58  Since Lord Carlile, in the report of his review into the way the Church of England dealt with a complaint of sexual abuse made by a woman known as ‘Carol’ against the late Bishop George Bell [GS Misc 1173], has effectively found the process of the Core Group that investigated the complaint to be fundamentally flawed, is it accepted that, if the Church of England wishes to act justly, it has two options: if it is to maintain that “a significant cloud” remains over Bishop Bell’s name, it must either (i) set up a fresh independent review into the truth or otherwise of Carol’s allegation, to be conducted in accordance with correct procedural principles, to include ensuring representation of the interests of the late bishop, and abide by the outcome, or (ii) if it is not prepared to go to the expense of such a review, it must accept that the Core Group’s effective finding of Bell’s guilt [see Carlile report para 237] cannot stand, and say so?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A  I refer to the media statement that I made on Wednesday 31 January and my reference to the statement made by the National Safeguarding Team on the same day. I am unable to say anything else at this stage until such matters have been concluded.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:
Q59  Is it unambiguously accepted that the prejudging of a case through the legal heresy that “the victim must be believed” must play no part in the Church’s processes in determining whether a case of alleged sexual abuse is or is not made out?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:
A  It has never been the case that the ‘victim must be believed’ in determining a case.

The determination in any case whether an allegation is made or not made has always been in accordance with a civil standard of proof, i.e. the balance of probabilities. The process determining this is
outlined in the House of Bishops guidance ‘responding to safeguarding concerns or allegations against Church officers’. This was agreed by the National Safeguarding Steering Group. The guidance uses the term ‘taken seriously’ in responding to such concerns. Section 2.2 clearly states that the response should not prejudice any statutory investigation that may be required but should be compassionate.

**Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) to ask the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**Q60** Before the Statement issued on 28 June 2016 that there was to be an independent review, commissioned by the Church of England’s National Safeguarding Team, on the recommendation of the Bishop of Chichester, “to see what lessons can be learned from how the [George Bell] case was handled”, the Church of England refused to disclose any information, beyond that set out in the 22 October 2015 statement, on which the civil claim by ‘Carol’ was settled, claiming that it was precluded in law from doing so by the need to protect the “survivor’s” privacy. It was indicated that this was in accordance with legal advice. Given the comprehensive explanations set out by Lord Carlile without in any way compromising the complainant’s proper claim for anonymity, is it now conceded that a transparent explanation of process is desirable, lawful, and not at all problematic?

**The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:**

**A** The purpose of commissioning an independent review was to ensure that there was a transparent explanation of the processes that led to the decisions made in respect of this case. In doing so, a judgement was made that it was in the best interest of all concerned that this be explained by someone independent of those processes.

The National Safeguarding Steering Group is working through its consideration of how to give effect to the recommendations of Lord Carlile’s independent review into the case of George Bell. I have made it clear in previous statements that the NSSG accepts the main thrust of the recommendations, though respectfully differing on one part of one of them. I have apologised for any failings in the process and we are now considering how best to make improvements in light of the review. The NSSG will report to the House of Bishops as soon as this process is complete.
SECRETARY GENERAL

The Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) to ask the Secretary General:

Q61 When can we expect to see the establishment of the Church Buildings Commission, further to the decision of General Synod in November 2015?

Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:

A The majority of recommendations in the report have been progressed, including legislative change to allow Festival Churches and more flexible operation of services within multi-parish benefices.

The recommendations on closer working between Church House staff teams and the creation of a new statutory Commission (which the report suggested could ‘perhaps’ be called the Church Buildings Commission for England) are progressing. Joint staff training and site visits are now regularly arranged. A joint meeting at member level took place in January 2018, involving members of the Church Buildings Council, the Mission and Pastoral Committee, the Church Buildings (Uses and Disposals) Committee, and the Mission Theology Advisory Group. The purpose of this group is to think creatively about how the buildings resource in Church House can support mission. It will exist for a year, then its findings will be reviewed in the context of the aspirations of the Church Buildings Review.

Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds) to ask the Secretary General:

Q62 The overnight expenses allowances for members on Synod business have not increased since 2014. Since it is becoming increasingly difficult at times to find accommodation under the £131 limit for London as hotel rates have been increasing in excess of general inflation, when will expenses rates be reviewed so that members are not out of pocket in attending General Synod?

Mr William Nye to reply as Secretary General:

A The cost of reimbursing Synod members for their expenses is borne by the dioceses.

The current Rates and Expenses policy – which apply to National Church Institutions’ Boards, Committees and staff as well as Synod members – will be reviewed by AC staff during 2018. The review will benchmark current rates for travel and accommodation against relevant sector comparisons to ensure reasonable levels of compensation.

To support this, work is in hand to assess whether a corporate travel management solution would provide more competitive rates for Synod members, other members of Boards and Committees and staff.
Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:

Q63 What is the Church’s position on the wearing of religious head coverings generally (including whether there are circumstances in which they should be banned) and, in the light of that, what is the policy in relation to the wearing of religious head coverings in Church schools?

The Bishop of Ely to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:

A The Church of England does not have a stated position on the wearing of religious head coverings but seeks to apply biblical principles in a religiously plural society in a way which promotes dignity and respect. In our vision for education we describe this approach as educating for community and living well together. There is not a national school uniform policy. We encourage Church of England schools to set uniform policies drawing on their own knowledge and experience of the cultural and religious traditions of the communities they serve, in balance with the well-being of their students.

Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:

Q64 In the light of “Valuing all God’s Children – Guidance for Church of England schools on challenging homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying” (2nd Edition, Autumn 2017), what protections are provided in Church of England schools for those who hold Biblical and traditional Christian views on sexual morality and on other matters?

The Bishop of Ely to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:

A We do not accept the premise that Valuing all God’s Children is somehow in conflict with ‘biblical and traditional Christian views.’ This is specifically and intentionally a guidance document to help schools eradicate all homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying so that children and young people are able to flourish, free from the fear of teasing, ridicule or pernicious bullying. It is not a guidance document on sexual ethics or the Church of England’s teaching on morality or other matters. Church of England schools continue to promote the Church’s teaching in these areas and whilst pupils and teachers within our schools will hold a range of views on such issues, everyone should be free to do so without fear of any bullying or discrimination.
Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford) to ask the Chair of the National Society Council:
Q65 Has consideration been given to what steps could be taken to defend the freedom of conscience of Christian teachers and others who dissent from the view that a person’s identity as male, female or otherwise is whatever that person says it is?

The Bishop of Ely to reply as Chair of the National Society Council:
A Teachers and others working in a school setting will have deeply held personal opinions and principled views and convictions. Their role in school is not to impose their views on others but create a learning environment where ideas are formed and understanding develops. Freedom of religion and belief ensures that a person’s views are properly respected, but such freedom must be exercised in compliance with school policies and should not excuse any discrimination or harassment in relation to other protected characteristics within equalities legislation.

CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL

The Revd Canon Bob Cooper (Leeds) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:
Q66 Can a statement please be made on the December 2017 publication of the English Churches and Cathedrals Sustainability Review, and in particular on how the positive recommendations for increased resource and support for extended and community use of churches are being taken forward?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:
A The report from this Review begins by recognising that churches “played a central role in their communities through centuries of England’s history”. The Bishop of Worcester as lead bishop and the Church Buildings Council welcome its recommendations that more support at diocesan level, for buildings and for community engagement, is essential to churches’ long-term futures. We are working closely with the government on implementation, and are hopeful a pilot scheme will be funded by the government to allow us to model how this might work in different contexts, and how it will fit into the existing provision that many dioceses already provide to parishes.

What is particularly welcome in the report is recognition that we cannot look after all of our magnificent buildings inheritance on our own, and that it is in the interests of society to ensure they stay open not just as bastions of history, but as resources for the future.
The Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q67 What progress has been made with HMG to discover if the Listed Places of Worship Grant scheme is to continue or has finally been abandoned by the Government?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

A In September 2017, after sterling work from the Second Church Estates Commissioner, the Church Buildings Council received written confirmation from the then Heritage Minister, John Glen MP, that following the General Election the Listed Places of Worship Grant Scheme will continue at its current levels of up to £42m a year until March 2020. This is the end of the current government spending period so no assurances beyond this date can be received but we are in close contact with the officers administrating the scheme to ensure that we have evidence of its benefits.

The Revd Prebendary Simon Cawdell (Hereford) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q68 What plans are there to review the working and content of Lists A and B under the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 and to consult dioceses about the inclusion of items which have been found to be appropriate to add to either list?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

A The Dean of the Arches and Auditor, as Chair of the Rule Committee, has proposed a timetable for making changes to Schedule 1 to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015. This would involve extensive consultation in the third quarter of 2018, followed by consideration by the Rule Committee with a view to bringing the changes to General Synod for approval in July 2019. Consultation with dioceses will include an invitation to them to submit items for addition to (or deletion from) the present Lists. Work by officers of the CBC has already produced an initial response. The element of national consistency introduced in the new Rules was hard won. It is worth taking time for a thorough considerations of the Lists so that they serve the whole church.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q69 Since most grants to fund the installation of disabled toilets and other inclusive facilities such as hearing loops are no longer available, what funding can the National Church make available to parishes, especially to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities under the Equalities Act?
Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

A Officers of the Church Buildings Council have met with senior representatives of the Big Lottery Fund and Heritage Lottery Fund to discuss the issue of accessibility in churches. The Big Lottery Fund has presented at the DAC Conference, specifically encouraging churches to apply for its funds. Their Awards for All fund can cover exactly the sort of equipment and provisions mentioned in the question, with grants of up to £10,000 available through a simple application process.

The Church Buildings Council has produced a detailed note on providing access and meeting Equality Act responsibilities in historic buildings, available on the ChurchCare website.

The Revd Andrew Yates (Truro) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q70 How many dioceses have someone who acts as a Diocesan Environment Officer and how many of these are full-time / part-time and paid / voluntary?

The Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q71 In the light of the Church of England’s desire to fulfil the Fifth Mark of Mission of striving to safeguard the integrity of creation, and sustain and renew the life of the earth, and in line with the call for dioceses to seek the á Rocha eco-diocese accreditation, how many dioceses:
1) Have someone who acts as a Diocesan Environment Officer?
2) How many of these are:
   a. Full-time;
   b. Part-time and paid; and
   c. Voluntary?
3) What action is being taken to ensure every diocese has appointed and resources an Environment Officer?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

A With permission, I shall answer Questions 70 and 71 together.

All 42 dioceses (including Sodor and Man and the Diocese in Europe, have a post for a Diocesan Environment Officer. Eight of these posts are currently vacant. We do not hold a central record of terms of contract but the majority of DEOs are volunteers. Where a DEO is employed, for example in Exeter, London and Leeds there are visible financial and environmental benefits to the diocese. A list of DEOs and links to contact them is available on the ChurchCare website.
As well as providing training and online resources, the Shrinking the Footprint campaign is working with the Church Buildings Council to include DEOs in this year’s DAC conference, dedicating time at that annual event to discussing environmental issues and how closer working can enhance our care for creation.

The Revd Andrew Yates (Truro) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:
Q72 Experience shows that between dioceses there are very different levels of engagement by Diocesan Environment Officers (DEOs) with wider diocesan policy making. Some are very involved while others really struggle to raise the importance of environmental issues. Can consideration therefore be given to what could be done to ensure that each diocese appoints a DEO and enables them to make a full contribution to helping churches play a part in addressing climate change?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:
A We are dedicated to ensuring that environmental issues are considered as part of the mission of the Church, and have a dedicated officer who supports both the Shrinking the Footprint campaign and Environmental Working Group. I am grateful for the wisdom and dedication of the Bishop of Salisbury, as lead bishop for the environment, in chairing that group and giving these issues greater prominence. It is clear that more resource at national level would help, and I am working with the Secretary General on how this might be achieved.

We value the significant contribution made by DEOs and encourage dioceses to improve joint working.

As well as providing training and resources, the Shrinking the Footprint campaign is working with the Church Buildings Council to include DEOs in this year’s DAC conference, dedicating time at the event to discussing environmental issues and how closer working can enhance our care for creation.
Mr John Freeman (Chester) to ask the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

Q73 What advice can the Church Buildings Council give to parishes which wish to remove pews from their church building in order to accommodate increases in the size of their congregations as a result of mission initiatives?

Sir Tony Baldry to reply as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:

A The Church Buildings Council, DACs and Chancellors are all charged with finding the balance between the historic importance of church buildings and the accepted need for some level of change to accommodate changing worshipping practices. To this end the CBC has produced a guidance note, available on the ChurchCare website, on issues of seating, and some years ago held a competition to find the best types of chairs for use in historic churches. Every individual application for removal or alteration of pews is considered on a case by case basis. The key is to start from the point of having a clear mission action plan which gives vision to what a church wants to do, rather than claiming that the pews need to go before any missional outreach can even be attempted.

COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

Mrs Karen Galloway (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:

Q74 Given the recent meetings between our Archbishops and the heads of several autocephalic Orthodox churches, are there any plans to re-establish the Anglo-Orthodox dialogue on theological issues, especially with the Romanian Orthodox Church, certain Bishoprics of which have retained or indicated their interest in re-establishing links with Anglican Dioceses?

The Bishop of Peterborough to reply as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity:

A Internationally the Church of England is represented on both the International Commission for Anglican-Orthodox Theological Dialogue and the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Commission.

Within England, the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox Regional Forum brings together representatives of the Church of England with representatives of the Oriental Orthodox jurisdictions present in England and has been active for a number of years. A suggestion for
a similar body for Eastern Orthodox churches is under consideration. There are existing co-ordinating groups relating to the Romanian and Russian Orthodox Churches.

The Orthodox Round Table, chaired by the Bishop of Southwark, acts as a co-ordinating forum for those bodies involved in Church of England / Orthodox relations.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich) to ask the Chair of the Finance Committee:

Q75 At the July 2017 Group of Sessions, I asked Canon John Spence about modelling the financial effects of increased training of priests, which might well increase costs, and the net reduction in stipendiary priests due to retirements exceeding ordinations, which might well reduce costs. He kindly replied, explaining that the modelling was not simple and was being done over the following three months in advance of any approach to the Commissioners. How has the modelling gone and at what point will the results be available?

Canon John Spence to reply as Chair of the Finance Committee:

A Following discussions with several dioceses last autumn we issued a short questionnaire around their ministry and financial plans and challenges. Last month, Finance Committee discussed responses and how they could be used to shape an approach to the Commissioners to help fund the increased number of ordinands and curates.

In March we have arranged a workshop in place of the usual Inter Diocesan Finance Forum which will include sharing and discussing the results of the survey. Diocesan Secretaries, Directors of Ministry, DBF Chairs and Finance Directors have been invited.

The Archbishops’ Council needs to secure a solution which will maintain diocesan confidence to build on their success in identifying more ordinands. We plan to approach the Commissioners for time-limited funding from 2020. If the number of ordinands continues to increase as we hope, the Council expects to invest several £million of its reserves in 2019 to keep the apportionment increase sufficiently moderate.
MINISTRY COUNCIL

The Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:

Q76 What figures are available to show the following please:
   a) the proportion of men and women acting as selectors on each Bishop's Advisory Panel (after any substitutions have been made e.g. for illness);
   b) the proportion of male candidates who are (i) unconditionally (ii) conditionally recommended for training; and
   c) the proportion of female candidates are (i) unconditionally (ii) conditionally recommended for training?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:
A The information requested is available on the Synod members’ noticeboard.

The Revd Peter Kay (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the Ministry Council:

Q77 Clergy deployment can be affected by such factors as ordinands’ recruitment, availability of title and incumbency posts, rates of clergy retirement – and by the interchangeability of Methodist and Church of England ministries if this comes to pass. What numerical modelling has taken place within the NCIs to inform decision-making around deployment?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich to reply as Chair of the Ministry Council:
A The National Church Institutions (NCIs) provide annual Ministry Statistics to assist dioceses with their planning. As part of the Resourcing the Future exercise in 2014 numerical modelling around future numbers of incumbents was provided to support diocesan planning of future ministry requirements. This has been used also in recent meetings of the Inter Diocesan Finance Forum. In a recent 2017 survey of dioceses about the future requirement and funding for Ordinands and curates, dioceses were provided with modelling of predicted retirements and of clergy and ordinations to assist with their planning and their contribution to the national data on ministry needs. The NCIs also provide support to individual dioceses in thinking about ministerial deployment, particularly through the Strategy and Development Unit and in conjunction with Strategic Development Funding bids and in the peer review process.
REMUNERATION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE

Fr Thomas Seville CR (Religious Communities) to ask the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

Q78 Given the concern for the well-being of clergy which this Synod expressed in its welcome to GS 2017 in July, what steps are being taken to gather data on the reasons why ordained persons, both stipendiary and self-supporting, leave the ministry?

The Bishop of Portsmouth to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

A Clergy cease ministry for various reasons, mainly retirement. In the case of stipendiary clergy, a limited number of categories of reasons for leaving are captured by the payroll system.

Ministry Statistics is an annual report on clergy moving between different forms of ordained ministry. Of the 593 clergy leaving stipendiary ministry during 2016, 240 were reported as being in active ministry roles on 31st December 2016.

There is a difference between why clergy might leave a particular role and why they leave ordained ministry entirely. We need to understand, wherever possible, what leads a person to leave their current post and to note their experience of ministering in that place. Dioceses are encouraged to collect such information locally, not only when people leave posts.

Living Ministry is a longitudinal research project which is already generating rich data relating to clergy wellbeing, including tracking how clergy move through ministry.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York) to ask the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

Q79 Following the implementation of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 (which make provision for clergy to hold office beyond 70), is there any information on the use already made of the new regulations and of the practical effectiveness of the accompanying Archbishops’ Council guidelines?

The Bishop of Portsmouth to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

A These provisions were never intended to make it usual for clergy to stay in full time ministry beyond retirement (as opposed to Permission to Officiate), but to provide greater flexibility and make the provisions more consistent. We do not have exact numbers of cases where these provisions have been used, but ministry statistics are able to show the number of clergy over 70 who remain in office.
When the original guidance was issued, it contained an error, which has now been corrected, to make it clear that the PCC’s consent is required to the extension of an existing term, and not to a new appointment. For a new appointment as incumbent, it is the parish representatives whose consent is required.

We are not aware of any concerns about the practical effectiveness of the guidance, which is kept under review. We shall consider further amendments in the light of any comments.

The Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Remunerations and Conditions of Service Committee:

Q80 Given concerns that the capability procedure under the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations is cumbersome and ineffective, and has in consequence been little used, can consideration be given to replacing the procedure with a more appropriate system in line with the desire to enhance clergy wellbeing?

The Bishop of Portsmouth to reply as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:

A The Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee has considered possible changes to the Procedure and legislation to make it more effective and improve the wellbeing of clergy whose ministry is not flourishing. This has highlighted the need for procedures for dealing with pastoral breakdown and claims of bullying and to ensure that the capability procedure is not dragged out unnecessarily.

The procedure also needs to take account of the wellbeing of parishioners, who expect there to be a means of addressing poor performance. Natural justice also requires that clergy whose performance is questioned are clear how their performance needs to improve, and are given the necessary time and support. Balancing all these competing concerns and obtaining accurate information about clergy performance is not easy.

RACSC will be consulting on a number of proposals, including changes to legislation this year with a view to bringing them to Synod in 2019.
MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q81 What consideration has the Mission and Public Affairs Council given to the effect of bank branch closures, and the declining number of ATMs, on community life in rural areas and market towns, and the ability of individuals and small businesses to access banking facilities for cash and cheques?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A Neither the MPA Council nor its sub-group, the Rural Affairs Group (RAG), has specifically considered the effect of poor provision of banking facilities on rural communities, although the impact on communities more generally when banks close was one factor which the Archbishop’s Task Group on Responsible Credit and Saving considered a few years ago.

Access to financial services is one part of the sustainability of rural communities, and the absence of such services has significant impacts on older people, those without transport and low-income households. The RAG, through the National Rural Officer and the lead Bishop for Rural Affairs in the House of Lords, the Bishop of St Albans, has raised the future sustainability of rural communities with the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs on several occasions and will continue to keep this issue under active consideration.

Canon Linda Ali (York) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q82 What is the Church of England doing, as an institution with a wide reach (churches, schools, etc), to curb the use of plastic within its organisation, with a view to bringing a complete end to its use?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A Public consciousness of the scale of the environmental impact of plastics has been brought to public attention very recently through David Attenborough’s TV programmes. In the overall scheme of things, the Church is not a major institutional user of plastics, although it behoves us to ensure our own house is in order before lecturing others. I hope the Environment Working Group will give thought to what we can do at institutional level, but it is clear that the greatest impact for good will come from the examples set by individual Christians. That said, we think the goal of bringing a complete end to the use of plastics is unrealistic. Plastics have
contributed a great deal to human flourishing, not least in medicine, and our objectives should focus on curbing unnecessary usage and ensuring that disposal methods minimise the environmental impact.

The Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q83 To ensure that no person is excluded from public worship and the pastoral care of the Church, how many dioceses are:
1) certified as Dementia friendly;
2) have a (paid or unpaid) Diocesan Enabler for Dementia Awareness;
3) offer Dementia Awareness training in IME 4-7;
4) offer Dementia Awareness training as part of Continuing Ministerial Education;
5) offer training parishes to enable them to be certified by groups such as the Alzheimer’s Society as Dementia Friendly?

Mr Mark Sheard to reply as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A As far as I am aware, none of this information is currently available. Gleaning comprehensive and comparable information from every diocese is not always straightforward, so I am unable to promise that authoritative figures will be available soon.

However, the Archbishops’ Council is gearing up its focus on its Objective 9 – seeking to make the Church a home for all – and the ways in which we enable people with disabilities, including those with dementia, to maximise their experience of church as home and their participation in the life of the local church is very much on that agenda.

Our strategy may, in due course, involve collecting data from dioceses, but the first priority will be to gather accounts of good practice from parishes and seek to disseminate them across the Church.

Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q84 In the light of the Synod’s recent strong endorsement of the cultural changes identified as being necessary in Setting God’s People Free for Christians to feel more empowered to use their gifts in the wider world, what plans does the Council have to address the apparent negative attitudes evident within the Church towards Christians exercising their gifts as entrepreneurs:

- as expressed clearly within many of the interviews with fifty Christian entrepreneurs carried out last year by Richard Higginson and Kina Robertshaw of Ridley Hall, and set out in
their recent book: *A Voice to be Heard: Christian Entrepreneurs living out their faith*; and

- as suggested by the very low level of support shown by Synod members so far for Sam Margrave’s PMM on ‘Fostering Entrepreneurship’?

**Mr Mark Sheard to reply as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:**

A I cannot answer for Synod members about signatures on a PMM. However, the fate of a PMM doesn’t tell us that the Church is *institutionally* negative about entrepreneurs. No doubt some Christian entrepreneurs feel the church isn’t supportive of their activities, as do others in different forms of work. As an institution, we have not been as good as we should be in affirming Christians in their vocations to secular occupation. There have been many attempts to remedy that deficiency, and *Setting God’s People Free* is the most recent and, perhaps, the most comprehensive, including a focus on “Equipping lay people for their Monday to Saturday frontline ministries”, so that people’s skills are deployed for the glory of God and the greater good of humanity. Where that happens, I, and the MPA Council, are happy both to do our best to support our entrepreneurs and also to celebrate them.

**Canon Peter Adams (St Albans) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:**

Q85 The report on the Presence and Engagement programme debated by Synod in July 2017 noted that one of the achievements of that programme is a network of Diocesan Interfaith Advisors to support local churches. The report notes (para 6) that they “enable P&E to track trends and areas of concern at local level” and “as a point of contact for clergy, bishops and diocesan staff on matters relating to other faith communities.” Can the Synod be advised of the current numbers of interfaith advisors currently in post, as against the number in post five years ago, noting status – full time / part time / voluntary / retired?

**The Bishop of St Albans to reply as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:**

A As of January 2018, there are 46 people acting as interfaith advisers. Records of interfaith advisers in post five years ago are not readily available, however in 2015 there were 42. It should be noted that dioceses approach this post in different ways – some have one formally appointed individual while others have several named contacts, each covering different geographic areas or communities. In some dioceses, interfaith engagement is part of a broader portfolio.
such as social responsibility. At present one diocese has a full time interfaith adviser, and the remainder are part time – mostly in conjunction with a parish role, or on a voluntary basis in retirement.

Dr Samuel Robinson (Exeter) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q86 What proposals are there for the Church of England to acknowledge the 3000 years long deep attachment of Judaism with Jerusalem, and further to acknowledge that it was only after the liberation of Jerusalem in 1967 from Jordanian occupation that the free worship of all three of the monotheist religions has been protected and defended in Jerusalem?

The Bishop of St Albans to reply as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A The Church of England has consistently held that Jerusalem is a unique city sacred to Jews, Christians and Muslims and that this identity should be preserved and strengthened for the benefit of the Holy Land, the Middle East and the entire world. This position was clearly re-articulated when the Archbishop of Canterbury visited the region in May 2017 where he joined with other Church leaders in calling for all parties to uphold the Status Quo agreement and to resist any measure weakening it. More recently, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophilos III, has raised concerns that a Bill before the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament, would unsettle the status quo by restricting the right of Churches to deal independently with their land. This is a matter that several Lords Spiritual have taken up in Parliament and with the Israeli Embassy.

The Revd Christopher Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q87 In his answer to question 63 at the July 2017 Group of Sessions of General Synod the Bishop of St Albans said, “A review of progress made on [the] recommendations in ‘Released for Mission: Growing the Rural Church’ will form part of the future work programme of the Rural Affairs Group, starting in Autumn 2017 within the limitations of the resources available”. Could we have an update on this review, or a suggested timeline for when this review might be able to report back to General Synod?
The Bishop of St Albans to reply as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A

A short review, for internal purposes, of the implementation of the recommendations of Released for Mission: growing the rural church (GS Misc 1092) has taken place, focusing on the work initiated at national level. This has identified that recommendations 2 on training for lay people and clergy in rural multi-church groups, and 3 on discipleship, are a priority for 2018 and following years. The RAG has already met with the Director of Setting God’s People Free to discuss this work.

Because of the need to coordinate this work with that which develops Setting God’s People Free, Germinate: Arthur Rank Centre and other departments it is not possible at this point to give a clear timeline, except to say that Synod will be kept abreast of developments.

Dr Samuel Robinson (Exeter) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q88 In the light of the biblical understanding that by the sixth month (and sometimes earlier) the unborn infant is an autonomous being, what is the position of the Church of England in regard to abortion generally and, in particular, to proposals to allow abortion to be permitted much later than the sixth month without the need for any medical justification? And what steps have been and will be taken to publicise the Church’s position?

The Bishop of St Albans to reply as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A The Church of England’s position on abortion was summarised in a 2005 MPA briefing paper to General Synod: ‘The Church of England combines strong opposition to abortion with a recognition that there can be - strictly limited - conditions under which it may be morally preferable to any available alternative.’

This built upon a 1993 General Synod resolution that stated, ‘In the rare occasions when abortion is carried out beyond 24 weeks, ‘Serious foetal handicap’ should be interpreted strictly as applying to those conditions where survival is possible only for a very short period’.

Consistent with these statements, the Church has commented publicly on abortion in recent years both through press releases and submissions to parliamentary consultations in the context of a range of topics including disability, sex-selection, pre-natal testing and freedom of conscience and will continue to do so in the future.
Mr Clive Scowen (London) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q89 In the light of the Synod’s unanimous resolution of February 2017 calling on the Government radically to reduce the maximum stake permitted for Fixed Odds Betting Terminals and to take other measures to reduce the harm done by such machines,

(i) what action has the Council taken to date to forward that request;
(ii) how did the Council respond to the Government’s consultation on gambling which closed on 23 March; and
(iii) is there a plan to continue the pressure for the changes which the resolution seeks, depending on the actions which the Government in due course proposes in response to the results of the consultation?

The Bishop of St Albans to reply as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

A (i) As Vice-Chair of the Council, supported by MPA staff, I have taken the lead in contacts with parliamentarians and the media, and have worked with the Communications Team to encourage engagement around the dioceses.

(ii) The Council’s response to the consultation has been published on the website https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2018-01/Proposals%20for%20changes%20to%20Gaming%20Machines%20and%20Social%20Responsibility%20Measures.pdf

(iii) We trust that the Government will accept the conclusive case for a £2 maximum stake for FOBTs. If it does not, we shall continue to press for this figure. We shall also continue to campaign for more powers for local authorities, and other key measures mentioned in our full response.

The Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

Q90 Does the Environment Working Group have any plans to liaise with those organising the programme for the next Lambeth Conference to ensure that it focuses on the Anglican Communion’s shared concerns over environmental issues?

The Bishop of Salisbury to reply as Chair of the Environment Working Group:

A During the primates’ gathering at Canterbury in 2017, the Archbishop of Canterbury suggested to all Primates that they each produce letters and illustrations encapsulating what care of creation means in their Province. Plans are being made to display the Primates’ contributions during Creationtide 2018 at events in St Paul’s
Cathedral and at the launch of the Global Climate Action Summit in Grace Cathedral, San Francisco.

These events will see the launch of the second Lambeth 2020 stepping stone - which will encourage Anglicans in link dioceses across the Communion to make their own contributions of letters and illustrations. This will be a worldwide communication bringing us closer to our neighbours and learning from each other about the impact of, and opportunities for action on, climate change. A second event a year later would therefore feature this growing body of shared knowledge and review the issues closer to Lambeth 2020.

CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark) to ask the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Q91 Many women and a significant proportion of male candidates whose papers reach the CNC are being considered not only for an appointment to an office but also for ordination to the order of bishop and Guiding Principle 1 says that orders of ministry should be “equally open to all without reference to gender”. How does the Commission give effect to that principle when some of its members hold theological convictions which would not enable them to support the consecration of a woman to the episcopate?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

A The Crown Nomination Commission as a body of General Synod is committed to working within the Five Guiding Principles. All members of the Commission must confirm that they are committed to the mutual flourishing of all the traditions of the Church of England and thus to the Five Guiding Principles.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester) to ask the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Q92 How does the Crown Nominations Commission ensure the appointment of bishops who will guard and expound the deposit of faith?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

A At the service of consecration all bishops are asked to affirm will you “be diligent in prayer, in reading holy Scripture, and in all studies that will deepen your faith and fit you to uphold the truth of the Gospel against error”. All candidates have therefore either already stated this (if they are already a bishop) or will do so on consecration.
In addition to this, the Crown Nominations Commission explores theological questions with candidates during the interviews. Additionally, people providing references for candidates are asked to comment on the candidates’ teaching ministry, as well as identifying any concerns or issues they think the CNC should explore further.

Miss Deborah Buggs (London) to ask the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

Q93 In November 2014 a list of CNC members for each CNC was published, showing substitutes when individual members of the “central six” were unable to attend for CNCs from 2010 to 2014. Please would you publish a new list to cover 2014 to 2017, and in future could this information be published for each CNC as soon as its composition is known?

The Archbishop of York to reply as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:

A The membership of the Crown Nominations Commission for vacancies since 2014 will be posted on the Noticeboard. Membership for forthcoming vacancies is published on the Senior Appointments website: www.churchofengland.org/aaad/.