

Report of Proceedings 2018

**General Synod
February Group of Sessions**

Volume 49, No.1

Officers of the General Synod

Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

Canterbury

The Revd Canon Simon Butler

York

The Ven. Cherry Vann

The House of Laity

Chair

Canon Dr James Harrison

Vice-Chair

Canon Elizabeth Paver

Secretary General

Mr William Nye LVO

Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

Chief Legal Adviser & Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Secretary to the House of Bishops

Mr William Nye LVO

Legislative Counsel

Mr Christopher Packer

Secretary to the House of Clergy

Mr Jonathan Neil-Smith

Deputy Legal Adviser

The Revd Alexander McGregor

Secretary to the House of Laity

Mr Andrew Brown

Officers of the Convocations

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of Canterbury

Revd Stephen Trott

Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of York

The Revd Paul Benfield

Registrar

Ms Caroline Mockford

Contents

INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES	1
REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2079)	2
DISCERNING IN OBEDIENCE: A THEOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2080 AND GS MISC 1171)	11
DISCERNING IN OBEDIENCE: A THEOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2080)	17
QUESTIONS	31
ADDRESS BY INVITED SPEAKER FROM A MEMBER CHURCH OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION	90
COMPANION LINKS AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION (GS 2081).....	95
APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (GS 2082)	109
FOOD WASTAGE (GS 2077A AND GS 2077B)	111
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS	126
AMENDING CANON NO. 36 (GS 2029D).....	132
AMENDING CANON NO. 37 (GS 2029DD)	133
DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046A)	133
DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046Y) – REVISION STAGE	137
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047A)	141
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047Y) – REVISION STAGE.....	141
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2064A AND GS 2064Y)	142
ADDRESS BY INVITED SPEAKERS FROM THE METHODIST CHURCH.....	170
MISSION AND MINISTRY IN COVENANT (GS 2086).....	174
SAFEGUARDING: PRESENTATION ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND’S PREPARATION FOR THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE (IICSA) (GS MISC 1172 AND GS MISC 1173)	196
RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES (GS 2087).....	216
DIGITAL EVANGELISM (GS MISC 1174).....	228
VALUING PEOPLE WITH DOWN’S SYNDROME (GS 2088)	240

Full Synod: First Day

Thursday 8 February 2018

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby)*
took the Chair at 1.30 pm

WORSHIP

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

ITEM 1

INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES

The Chair: Once again a very warm welcome to all and thank you for the journey you have made and the time you have given. There are a number of welcomes to new members and a couple of other things.

First of all, I think for the first time, we are blessed with the presence of Primates of the Anglican Communion to join with us and observe our business and take part at various moments. I am going to call them out and ask them to stand and may we welcome them warmly at the end. There are just three and they are: Archbishop Winston Halapua, one of the three Primates of New Zealand, and the Archbishop of Polynesia, the largest Province in the world, which is about 99% sea; Archbishop Thabo Makgoba, the Archbishop of Southern Africa, which includes Mozambique, Angola and various other places; and Bishop Humphrey Peters, Bishop of Peshawar and Moderator of the Church of Pakistan. May we please welcome them?

They all have extraordinary stories, you will find, in the tea breaks. It is very rewarding to spend time with them. Archbishop Winston lives in an area where climate change is not a theory but a lived reality. Bishop Humphrey Peters comes from one of the most persecuted Churches on the face of the planet. Archbishop Thabo is leading the Design Group for the Lambeth Conference. He has lived through and been a major participant in the extraordinary experience of transformation in South Africa. It is a great privilege to have them.

Secondly, I do not know if the Bishop of Norwich is here, but I think we are going to record this anyway. I do not think he is. Either that or he is keeping his head very down. In just under two weeks Bishop Graham Jones will celebrate on the Feast of St Polycarp - an interesting combination - the 25th anniversary of his consecration as a bishop. I hope we can indicate our thanks to him now and we can congratulate him when we see him.

I would very much like to welcome new members since our last meeting. I wonder if they would be so kind, if it is convenient to them and they are comfortably able to do so, to stand or to wave, and we will greet them all with applause at the end of the list. It is quite a long list. The Rt Revd Tim Thornton replacing the Rt Revd Nigel Stock; the Very Revd Jane Hedges replacing the Very Revd Dr Frances Ward; the Ven. Joanne Kelly-Moore replacing the Ven.

Philip Down; the Revd Canon Cameron Butland replacing the Revd David Craven; the Revd Brenda Wallace replacing the Revd Jonathan MacNeany; the Revd David Tolhurst replacing the Revd Dr Miranda Threlfall-Holmes; the Revd Prebendary Cate Edmunds replacing the Revd Canon Andrew Godsall; the Revd Prebendary Karl Freeman replacing the Revd Canon Anna Norman-Walker; the Revd Canon Sir George Newton replacing the Revd Canon Martyn Neale; the Revd Canon Paul Rattigan replacing the Revd Amanda Fairclough; the Revd Sally Hitchiner replacing the Revd Canon Phillipa Boardman; the Revd Anne Stevens replacing the Revd Andrew Foreshew-Cain; the Revd Francis Orr-Ewing replacing the Revd Kate Stacey; the Revd Beverley Hollins replacing the now Rt Revd Dr Guli Francis-Dehqani; the Revd Rachel Wilson replacing the Revd Lusa Nsenga Ngoy; the Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby replacing the Revd Canon Dr Stephen Hance; Mr Richard Morgan replacing Mrs Helen Lamb; Mr Stephen Hofmeyr replacing Mrs Anne Martin; the Revd Canon Dr James Walters replacing the Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh; the Revd Dr Philip Plyming replacing the Revd Duncan Dormor; Loretta Minghella replacing Sir Andreas Whittam-Smith; Miss Annika Mathews replacing Mrs Leah Bell. May we greet them all.

We welcome also very much the Rt Revd Anthony Rayfield, Bishop of Swindon, attending during the vacancy in the See of Bristol. You are most welcome. Bishop Lee has speaking rights but does not have voting rights.

That concludes our introductions and welcomes and, accordingly, I now hand over to the Chair of our first debate.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 1.47 pm

ITEM 2

REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE ([GS 2079](#))

The Chair: We come now to Item 2 which is a Report by the Business Committee. For this you will need GS 2079. I am going to ask the Chair of the Business Committee, the Revd Canon Sue Booy, to come and speak to it. She has up to 10 minutes.

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

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

Friends, welcome to the February group of sessions. We are meeting at a slightly unaccustomed time for a London Synod and I want to thank in advance those of you who find staying until Saturday more difficult. We are meeting like this for those who are not here, because we hope that younger lay people may be encouraged to stand for election if Synod meets over fewer working days. The Business Committee would welcome hearing your feedback on this trial after the Synod.

A welcome new feature of this Synod is the presence of our Anglican Communion guests whom Archbishop Justin has already greeted. It is really good to be reminded of our wider context in a similar way to the broader understanding that our Ecumenical Representatives bring us. We look forward to hearing from them tomorrow morning.

I hope you have noticed that GS 2079, the Report of the Business Committee, has a very slightly different format for this group of sessions. We have tried to make it slightly more-user friendly and we hope that you will use it as your 'go to' document for understanding the Agenda. The Business Committee Report is like the Business Committee itself: non-partisan and committed to the creation and management of the best possible agenda for the current and future mission of the Church. The Report is arranged according to the three main areas of our work together. Synod is a legislative body and legislation our primary purpose. An important focus is the way we order our life together. Thirdly, there is the business that we debate because we want to express our concern for the world and our neighbours.

Before I consider the Agenda for this group of sessions, I want to reflect briefly on the importance of our legislative business, sharing a concern aired in a recent Business Committee meeting. This Synod and the Church of England in whose government we share has its basis in law. Our activities are shaped by the Synodical Government Measure of 1969, as is our power to pass Measures which become part of national law. Much of this significant responsibility is undertaken carefully and properly in committee. When legislation comes to the floor of Synod for our consideration, each Synod member has an important role. We are the people who live in and minister to the parishes whose lives will be governed by the legislation we pass. It is not enough, might I suggest, to leave the legal business to those who "understand that kind of thing" and catch up with our friends over a cuppa.

The Miscellaneous Provisions Measure that we are considering tomorrow afternoon is a good example of this. It is our responsibility to ensure that we understand its effects and that the legislation we pass results in the Church we want to be a part of.

The primary function of this speech and the debate that follows is the consideration of what is (and what is not) on the Agenda. Doubtless, you will have questions about this: what is on the Agenda, what is there but not in the form that you wanted and why we felt that the scheduled business was important rather than something else. In our job to choose not the "what" but the "when", the Business Committee considers proposals brought from a number of sources and our Report also offers an indication of future business. In addition to the legislative business I have already highlighted, other work that touches on the way that we order our life together will include the opportunity to ask questions about safeguarding, a debate on the work of the Crown Nominations Commission and consideration of the Anglican Methodist Covenant. Personally, I am particularly looking forward to the debate on Anglican Communion partnerships. This combines the work of the Church with our voice in the world. The things we learn from our partners enable us to speak out on their behalf. This Agenda also offers us opportunities to speak out about food waste and to consider some complex issues arising from scientific developments around embryo testing; exploring and articulating the implications of this for society.

As part of our ongoing work to make Synod more user-friendly, you will find that the "request to speak" form has been updated and, amongst other things, includes a question to ensure the best possible provision for accessibility. Roy

McCloughry, the National Disability Adviser, is here until tomorrow afternoon and I hope that you will take the opportunity to speak to him about any particular concerns. Another new face is that of Jenny Jacobs, the new Head of Governance Services. To help you identify Roy, Jenny, and other members of the team, you will find photographs on the board in the Bishop Partridge Hall. All the Synod staff give outstanding service and you know that I always like to take the opportunity to thank the Synod team, the Chaplain and those who ensure the Continuous Praying Presence.

Another group of very familiar faces at Synod is the sign language interpreters. The grace and beauty they bring to Synod is always special for me. This Synod is the last for Mrs Trudy Field, who has been one of the interpreters since 2005 when Deaf Anglican Together were first welcomed to Synod as observers. Trudy has led the team of interpreters and become a familiar figure to Synod members, chasing information and pestering us for copies of speeches in advance, but always with great courtesy and good humour. Trudy, I know you will not only be greatly missed by the DAT observers but by the whole Synod.

It simply remains for me to remind you to make certain that you have read and observe the security briefings, that you do not leave bags in unexpected places and to move the Report of the Business Committee standing in my name.

The Chair: Members of Synod, may I remind you that in this particular debate you are allowed to talk about the shape and the content of the Agenda, i.e. what is in and what is not. If you want to talk about something that is not in the Agenda and you think it should be, you are free to do that, but you must not get into the substance of that particular subject.

I am going to impose a speech limit of three minutes from the outset. The matter is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): Absolutely sticking, as the Chair has asked us to, to what is in the Report from the Business Committee, first of all, to echo back with thanks what Sue Booy's has just told us about the evolution that is taking place in the way Synod does its business. This Report is entitled *A Guide to the Session*. It is a change in tone. Also, I certainly noticed, and I am sure others have, that section 2 of the Report, page 3, starting at paragraph 11 - let's stick to the Report - helpfully categorises the kinds of things we do. It has been suggested to me that that might be something we could usefully do when we get back home to report back: standing items of business, legislative business, the Church in the world, ordering the life of the Church. That is what we do here in Synod and it is quite a helpful way of categorising it.

Another bit of evolution is the reform of the blue form, which makes it much easier for you and I, if we want to make a speech, to say why we want to do it. I am sure it will make the Chair's job 20 times easier because it will be clearer what people want to say and what they bring to the debate.

Having said all those nice things, can I ask a question about the way Questions are being dealt with in this Report, referring to paragraph 12? I think I am right in

saying we were given the Questions document electronically two days before the Questions sessions happened. I would question whether that is the right decision by the Business Committee and those who organise these things. Questions work best when it is free flowing. Questions work best - and are much funnier - when there is a degree of spontaneity. It seems to me that particularly in this group of sessions, where there are a number of quite tense questions about particular issues, if people get their answers too soon beforehand, they will over-prepare their supplementaries and we will not have such a good time as we might otherwise. I would like to ask the Business Committee if it would think carefully about how the Questions booklet is sent to us and when, so that we get that right in the future.

It also raises the question of confidentiality. If I have it by email two days before the sessions, I can tweet about it - which I have not done but I could have done - I can send it to all my friends, who will get upset about a particular answer and we will have a big shangbang. Can we think carefully, and while we congratulate the Business Committee and its staff for the evolution, about how we pre-fix question time.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Thank you to the Chair of the Business Committee and the Committee itself for all the hard work that you continue to do. Today I wanted to speak about the Church in the world. While I appreciate that we seek to be relevant in respect of our Agenda, and many things happen between setting the Agenda and us meeting here, I wish to highlight briefly a matter and propose a proposal in relation to how we can be more relevant

Last week saw World Hijab Day. At the same time it also saw Amanda Spielman, Chief Ofsted Inspector, and the National Secular Society and one of our headteachers from our Church schools suggest there should be a ban on religious head coverings and this was “against British values”. Many people have been in touch with me concerned about this feeding into the narrative of hate and division. If we ban Muslims from wearing head coverings which do not cover the face, what next: the turban, the kippah; the cross? While it is too late to secure a debate on this issue at this Synod, I wonder two things: first, whether the Business Committee could ask the Presidents to issue a statement on behalf of this Synod to send a clear message that we value the diversity within our Church schools and condemn the vilification of any section of our communities for wearing religious articles. We want to celebrate the role that faith plays in society because our differences make us stronger and we need to stand with others in the faith community against the tide of secularism that would see us erased from history. This is not merely an issue of school uniform policy but an attack on faith in the public square.

Furthermore, I do not know whether the Business Committee may in the future explore the possibility of making available a space within these sessions for us to discuss issues that are more relevant and that come up in the weeks preceding the Synod, possibly by us putting them forward a week or so before and taking a vote on whether to debate an issue, so it would be a small amount of time to discuss something that is particularly relevant to the discourse of our nation right now and right here.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I have no relevant interests in this question and

I hope I will be finished in 30 seconds. I was away in July so I may have missed the discussion, and even the previous paper, but I would like to ask whether the Business Committee could consider whether similar provisions as are in GS Misc 1175, the Code of Conduct, should apply equally to elections to Synod and within Synod. Thank you very much.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): Sections 10, 15, 19 and 43 tell us we now have a Code of Conduct and now we have a Saturday. Hooray for Saturday! However, we have not been given time for perhaps the most important business in the matter of why and how we disagree. Time has been persistently requested and patiently waited for. We plough on with business and issues, but not engage with the grounds for our debate and for our decision making. At the end of Shared Conversations at General Synod, we reminded ourselves again that we need to behave with each other. About 80% of the groups reporting back called for serious engagement with the issue now: the Bible and the theology that lies behind it. After all, we have real issues of disagreement and we are not looking at why we disagree and the grounds potentially for our agreement. We really do disagree. We disagree about sin, what offends or displeases God. Therefore, we disagree about grace and the Gospel and salvation. Members of the Archbishops' Council now resign over that. We disagree about false teachers, whether such a breed exists, and, if they do, who and what they are teaching that is wrong, and yet there are charges of Arianism, Pelagianism and agnosticism thrown around, commenting on our debates over the last 15 months.

November 2016 was set aside for contingency business; no time was given. The House of Bishops compiled its Report, but that proved to be rushed, as we discovered in February 2017. Even in our own diocese we were not given time to discuss it. In July 2017, we plunged in, almost recklessly, to discuss two very complex issues without due preparation, and our thin and slightly intemperate debate only revealed our professional ineptitude both in science and in theology. In November 2017, there was more contingency time, which we had all been asked to keep in our diaries, and there was nothing, despite requests and appeals. For February, we were originally asked to keep four days free and it was cut down to two. Bully for Saturday - which reminds me I am missing a game of hockey on Saturday as a result - but where is the time to discuss Bible and theology and to see why we disagree on that ground and how we may come to agreement? Our Canons, A 5, the Canon of Canons, the Declaration of Assent, Articles - Articles 20 and 21 - the ordinance itself, these are our formularies. They are where Anglicans turn for matters of faith and salvation, and certainly controversies of faith, but we do not talk about the Bible and we do not talk about theology. Please, Business Committee and those with influence, may we have time?

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): It seems that Thomas Hobbes was right. Writing during the tumultuous throes of the Civil War, the father of modern political philosophy chose to entitle his seminal work on social contract theory *Leviathan*. As such, Hobbes describes how large public institutions take on a form and nature of their own, quite independent of the individuals who serve in them. *Leviathan*: how aptly named, that monster of the deep. I would suggest that the Church of England has a tendency at times to become a leviathan as I fear it can take on a nature and form quite different and independent from the boards, councils and even General Synod that constitute it. My overriding concern, which

I aired at the very start of this quinquennium, is that there are times when it feels like Synod is being overly managed.

I would like to ask the Chair of the Business Committee, what is the point of Synod if, having spent time and, dare I say, a good deal of money bringing us together so that we can come to a collective mind on key issues, that our decisions then appear to be shelved, ignored or treated as inconvenient by the powers that be?

I speak of course of both my debate on conversion therapy last summer and indeed the debate requesting that the House of Bishops, not just a small subset who we have not previously heard of, reflect on the request for a liturgy that actively shows that we mean what we say about welcoming transgender Christians. I had hoped that the House of Bishops might have looked to show that they had learned something from the strength of feeling voiced in the Chamber last February, that they might have reflected on how best they could rebuild trust with various parts of the Church that feel alienated and marginalised, that they might have shown a commitment in their deeds, not just in their words, particularly in relation to taking forward the will of Synod, but sadly not so.

Most worryingly, we see the desire to manage, and the decision, despite lots of requests to the contrary, was to have a presentation rather than a proper open public debate on safeguarding, which is why I shall reluctantly be voting against this item. The decision not to enable the debate gives the impression that we have much to hide as a Church. Synod is to be fed a line, and, of course, if we are lucky we might just get to ask a question, but in no way can we shine a spotlight on the systemic flaws such as the inexcusable lack of independence in our reporting systems or the fact that we have a system that fails our victims. No debate, no openness risk leading to no truth and no trust, and, my goodness, we need to rebuild trust.

Synod, we should be better than this, and, indeed, we must be better than this for the sake of those who represent and for our future generations, but to do so we will need a change of heart and a change of culture that seeks to take the will of Synod seriously and to show by our actions that we have listened and understood.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): What I have to say now has all the hallmarks of being an old stager. When I came on to the Synod in 1999, it was a good thing to be able to meet some Synod members who had been members of the preceding body, the Church Assembly, and, for the price of a gin and tonic at the bar, they would tell you about the Herculean struggles they had to create Synod, and what a joy it was to bring the whole Church together in one place to find the mind of the Church and do the will of God.

I am worried that as Synod gets shorter and shorter, we have less time together as fellow Christians; we listen to each other less. Indeed, there is almost a culture of you come with your particular group, you sit with your particular group, you say your things and you do not engage with anybody else, whereas with longer Synods, particularly the residential ones, you found that, as you shared in the work together, people who were poles apart could find common ground in other

areas, and this led to great friendships and a better understanding of each other. The real danger that exists for Synod is there are certain people who are media savvy who have the ability just before Synod to use those forces to define the debate that Synod is about to have, tell the general world what we are going to do and why we should do it and, immediately after, tell the world what the outcome was, and often what they say is nothing to do with what we have done.

On top of that, we are in a process of change, a process of evolution, but, Synod, I say this to you with sadness, we persist in refusing to reform ourselves. One of the things we might do, and I hope Synod considers this, is to go to the dioceses and ask them how they want to be represented here rather than us deciding how we want to be elected, which is not the same thing. Synod, I call on you to urge for longer debates, to spend more time listening rather than speaking so that we truly - and we cannot be the brains of the Church - might have a fair stab at being the mind.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I warmly welcome the Code of Conduct. Thank you to the Business Committee for that. Secondly, those of us who have paper copies have received via our second post two very lengthy, weighty, detailed Reports about two bishops. Those Reports have a very great many recommendations at the end.

This is a plea, please, for the Business Committee to consider whether to send that type of information in advance of the other paperwork, considering that the papers were published well in advance of the dates of this Synod, in order that we may read them properly. The weight of paperwork for this Synod is great. I think we have missed an opportunity in a way both to discuss the recommendations and to absorb them properly. I have to say that I found the content of them distressing, and, therefore, trying to read them straight was extremely difficult.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): My thanks to the Business Committee for the sterling work that it does and the way that it is improving the way that we organise our business. There are a couple of points I would like to raise out of the Report. First of all, in paragraph 38 the Business Committee requests feedback on the experimental way of the tool it is providing - the "running record business done" - which is available to us on the *Members' Resources* webpage. I would commend this. I found it a very helpful document, both as a reminder of what we have done and also as a summary of the actions required and what has been done to follow up on them. My one request is that, as this is a rolling report, could they find some way of indicating in that follow-up section what has changed since the previous issue of the Report.

Then, turning to the forecast of future business on the last page of the Report, everything there is listed as July 2018 and beyond. That means we do not actually know what is likely to come up in the July group of sessions. I realise that the Business Committee is in an impossible position on this - it has no control as to when legislation will be ready to come forward, nor when Reports will be ready for review - so I do have sympathy with the Business Committee in doing any form of forward planning. I do wonder, though, if it would not be possible, perhaps through Standing Orders, to require standing committees and groups preparing reports to at least give a provisional view of when they are likely to come forward for review at Synod. Such a requirement could generate a useful

dialogue with the Legal Office and others who are supporting their work as to whether they can support the proposed timings with the much-valued staff they have available to support that work. I realise that things will change as problems are encountered and new issues arise, but having a provisional view of what will be on the Agenda for the next group of sessions would, I think, be helpful.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): Back in July, knowing that there would be no Synod in November, members may recall that I pressed Bishop Peter Hancock to ensure that we had a significant safeguarding debate in these February sessions. I am sure there might have been a reason for that.

The Carlile Report has spoken of process. With the publication this week of the booklet of survivors' experiences *We asked for bread but you gave us stones*, we have all been given the most harrowing picture of what real survivors of known modern abuse experienced from the Church that should heal them when we get it wrong.

Just before Synod, I enjoyed a full and frank discussion with some senior Church House figures about these difficult matters. We do not agree on everything, and we could not discuss everything, but it was friendly and it was useful, so I have already had my say, but I suspect that the good folks sitting around here will also have a good deal to offer to put some of the problems right based upon compassion, expertise, Scripture, and good old-fashioned commonsense. They need to contribute, too.

Sue, could you liaise with our Archbishops to explore whether, as joint Presidents of Synod, they might use their powers under Standing Order 4(3) to direct the addition to the Agenda of a debate on these urgent and important issues so that we can hear what the representatives of the ordinary people in the pews have to say about these important matters?

The Chair: I see no one else standing, and so I ask the Chair of the Business Committee to reply to the debate. She has up to five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I am going to begin by thanking Stephen Lynas and others for the nice things they perhaps feel obliged to say about us at the beginning of each speech. To answer some fairly specific things:

Nigel Bacon, thank you for your feedback and for the evidence that gives of your careful reading of our Report. We do discuss timings of legislative business with the Legal Department on a fairly regular basis. I am very reluctant to do anything other than say "July 2018 and beyond". I know - and some of you will remember, to my cost - that you can plan a General Synod in December and by February you are moving alterations to the order of business what feels like every five minutes. Planning beyond July 2018 would give me far too big a headache.

Mr Margrave, you return to a question which has vexed this Synod often in terms of being able to respond to things that are very immediately in the public mind at the time of Synod. There are problems with this, not least of which is the occasional under-preparation of speeches and preparatory papers brought to debate. We have tried in recent years to address this. One of the things that we have done is indicate the nature of a motion but not bring the wording until much

closer to the date of Synod, and we have always the opportunity for the Presidents to ask us, as they did quite recently, to introduce a specific item to the Agenda after it has been published. We will continue to look at this.

There were a number of comments and questions on the Code of Conduct which we have noted and will look at in our regular residential meeting which happens next month.

Mr Banting, I agree that we disagree, but we must continue to work and seek together over these issues to meet and to talk not necessarily on this floor but elsewhere. It is important, I think, to note that the teaching document is a large, significant and ongoing process which goes beyond Synod and for which I look forward to being asked to schedule time in the future.

A number of you have talked, as I expected you might, about having a presentation and questions with regard to safeguarding. I would emphasise that the Business Committee schedules what we are asked to schedule. We cannot dictate - much as we might like to. I do anticipate a request to schedule a debate about safeguarding. I can assure you that when that request comes it will receive our serious and immediate attention.

Penny, the reports to which you refer were available in the public domain before they were sent out as part of the Synod paperwork, but it may be that we can look at alerting Synod members to the availability of Reports like this in future.

I would like to say, Jayne Ozanne, that I cannot answer your specific question about the outcome of the Private Members' Motions in July, but those who can may wish to.

Jonathan Alderton-Ford, as another ancient old-timer, I agree! I cannot see you, but I agree with you. There you are.

I would like to use this opportunity to make the point that everyone here is a communicator and everyone here shares a responsibility to listen and to speak in their own diocese, whether that is at collections of deanery synods, whether it is with people in the pew, and actually take on the people who talk about General Synod. I was not at my last deanery synod and I read with horror castigation of General Synod based actually on those two Private Members' Motions which was based on a total misunderstanding of what we do. So, please, do take to heart the need to communicate at a personal level with the people in your dioceses.

If I have not answered your question - time is against me - do come and talk to me in the coffee room.

The Chair: We need to put Item 2 to the vote: that we take note of the Business Committee Report.

The motion

'That the Synod do take note of this Report'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That has been overwhelmingly carried. That concludes Item 2. Please stay in the Chamber for the next item, which is on the Crown Nominations Commission.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 2.27 pm

The Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to give an idea of what is going to happen both with Items 3 and 4, first of all. Under Item 3 there will be a presentation, and then there will be the opportunity for members to ask questions. When we move to Item 4, there will be a take note debate on the Report. I have received quite a number of requests to speak, and so I plan to allow enough time for a proper debate at that point. We also need to bear in mind, everyone, that Questions is scheduled for 4.00 pm.

ITEM 3

DISCERNING IN OBEDIENCE: A THEOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2080 AND [GS MISC 1171](#))

The Chair: So let us move to Item 3 on the agenda, which is a presentation on *Discerning in Obedience: A Theological Review of the Crown Nominations Commission*, which is GS Misc 1171. I invite Professor Oliver O'Donovan, who led the theological review of the CNC, to give the presentation.

Revd Professor Oliver O'Donovan: Madam Chairman, thank you very much, and thank you, members of Synod, for your invitation to present our Report, *Discerning in Obedience*.

The Archbishops appointed theologians to review the CNC, not systems experts, no doubt with the thought in their mind that administrative tweaking would not achieve much unless there was a common understanding of what was to be accomplished. The review was therefore charged first with articulating the role of the CNC in the economy of the Church's life and ministry, only secondly with proposing how it might be helped to work better. Yet we have made some proposals, some of which are for the Archbishops to bring to the CNC, some to be brought to this Synod. They were described by one of the central members as "on the revolutionary side of evolutionary", which, when unpacked, I presume means neither too bland nor too bloody. We shall be content if they strike other people that way, too.

The Archbishops may also have borne in mind that eight theologians from different backgrounds in the Church will proverbially come up with eight different views. Here, however, we defy proverbial wisdom, and I have the privilege of introducing to you a Report on which the eight of us converge as with a single mind. That is not only a measure of how very agreeable my colleagues are, but also of some very clear and consistent messages that we heard from those who took the trouble to visit us or write to us and share their experiences.

What, first of all, has to be understood more clearly about the nomination of bishops? First, that the work of a diocesan bishop is not, as it is often said to be,

a “dual role”, as though a bishop spent half the time concerned with the interests of a diocese and the other half of the time concerned with the interests of the central Church. It is a “connectional” or “communicative” role. The bishop does not eliminate differences or cobble together compromises but interprets. He helps each worshipping community to see its concerns reflected in the life of the catholic whole. Interpreting parish to parish, diocese to the wider Church, wider Church to the diocese, the bishop also interprets the Church to the wider public. All this requires very special gifts and a competent theological culture.

Secondly, the task of nominating a bishop has to ensure that three things happen: first, that there is a continuity in the episcopal ministry as the Church has understood it; second, that the bishop is recognised by the whole Church; and, thirdly, that the Holy Spirit’s gifts are employed to discern God’s leading of the Church. The logic of a body like the CNC, as opposed to forms of open synodical election, such as is practised in some other places, is that it allows those gifts to be exercised by those to whom they have been given.

Two things are commonly said about its work, which we hope we have been able to elaborate and give some greater substance to. One is that it must exercise discernment, the other that it must do so representatively. An act of discernment looks forward; it focuses on the next step to be taken. The CNC is not appointed to decide which of the candidates has been the best archdeacon or parish priest; it is appointed to discover which of the candidates will be the right bishop of the diocese for the next few years. It therefore requires a readiness to receive from God the unexpected leading and the unforeseen gift.

This discernment is not a private one, each member making it for him or herself. It is reached collectively by 14 people with a common faith and different experiences. Reaching it is a journey of exploration which none of them knows the end of from the beginning. It requires special gifts: an imagination that can pick up on other people’s meanings; a patience that can wait until an obscure picture gets clearer. Those who do this task well know where they come from, they know where they are going, but they are also naturally responsive and co-operative, good at finding a common path where one may not seem to exist. They understand Christian people. They understand the candidates, on the one hand, and they understand their fellow members of the CNC on the other.

Fourteen members - six central members elected from this place, six from the diocese, two Archbishops - make the decision representatively on behalf of the whole Church. They bring a huge range of experiences and contributions with them. They express the perspectives of others besides themselves. They engage imaginatively with the needs of the diocese and the needs of the wider Church. For the CNC to represent the Church, it is not enough that it should contain just the right balance of women, men, Northerners, Southerners, ethnic minorities, Conservatives, Liberals, et cetera. It must achieve a communication of perspectives which enables a common path to emerge as the perspectives converge. For this process to work it requires trust - trust of the CNC members in one another, trust of the CNC by the Church and, of course, by candidates.

The first thing to be stated on our recommendations is that there is no one thing that goes wrong with the CNC and badly needs putting right. Talking to people about our work over the last 18 months, we have often been told: “Of course, the

whole problem is..." Sometimes the whole problem is that the diocesan members are confused and at sea, or that they are lining up as a phalanx to defend the diocesan point of view. Sometimes the whole problem is the central members, who are skilled political operators with their cards close to their chests. Sometimes the whole problem is the Archbishops, possessed, it seems, of an awesome spiritual authority that reduces everybody else to a jelly. It is no one of these things that makes the process sometimes - sometimes, not always - difficult; it is the combination of a variety of factors, none of which is beyond modest and sensible correction. So we have proposed modestly and, we hope, sensibly:

First, tackling the culture of excessive secrecy. The work of the CNC has to take place within a surrounding wall of confidentiality - that is essential to trust - but within that surrounding wall we believe that candour and openness should be helped to prevail as much as possible. Intrusive secrecy undermines trust and creates suspicion. Here, we point especially to the secret ballot, which encourages CNC members to wonder what one another are doing, and we point also to the arrangements for interview, where candidates are sometimes smuggled in and out of Lambeth Palace and Bishopthorpe to stop them meeting other candidates. We want to see an open ballot in which everybody declares how they have voted, and, if necessary, explains it, and we want to see the candidates worshipping and eating together with the members of the CNC and each other.

Secondly, we are proposing facilitating the contribution of the diocesan members to ensure they are up to speed when the CNC first convenes. The CNC has to work on a tight time schedule. We hope that dioceses will make use of central resources to encourage their Vacancy in See Committees to take on a role of self-preparation and self-education so that the members who are elected are well aware of what is going to happen and why it is going to happen when the vacancy arises.

Thirdly, we propose giving a distinct voice to the Archbishops. The bishops and the Church, we believe, have a real role in overseeing the succession of bishops, but that role is not to name their successors. It is to ensure the continuity of episcopal ministry as the Church understands it. In this, we see a part that perhaps needs to be played by the Archbishop, who is not in the chair at the CNC, speaking for the needs of the episcopate as a whole. We also propose that the two Archbishops should make a statement jointly to the rest of the CNC, before it votes, that on the evidence presented all the candidates under consideration are eligible for consecration, for membership of the House of Bishops and the doctrine and practice of the Church of England.

Fourthly, deepening the representative authenticity of the CNC.

We want to encourage some fresh thinking among you, ladies and gentlemen, about how the central members are elected to the CNC. This is no criticism of those who have worked in that role, some of whom have made outstanding contributions to the life of the Church, that there is a perception at large that the central members are elected to pursue party agenda. We do not believe most of the time that they do pursue party agenda but there is a perception, which is destructive. If that perception is to change then I think this body needs to tackle

the question of how it elects them in a different way from the way it does now. We have made a few suggestions just to start the juices flowing, but it is up to this body to think seriously about how this body does its business.

On the diocesan side, too, there are concerns about representation. It is the stated duty of the Bishop's Council in a diocese to ensure that the Vacancy in See Committee is representative of the diocese. What that means differs from diocese to diocese and from year to year, one might say - if anything ever improves, problems that we face over being representative in a certain way today I hope we will not be facing in 10 years, but there may be other problems. That is why we have resisted the temptation to try to make general rules, but we do suggest that the Vacancy in See Committee should have a minuted discussion of the representation of the diocese and what it requires before it proceeds to elect the diocesan members. We are also anxious about a tendency of the diocesan administration to dominate CNC representation. We want to see tighter disciplines about that.

There are then special questions about the representative composition of the CNC for the archiepiscopal Sees. Our proposals for Canterbury have been broadly in line with others already mooted in this Synod. For York, we should like Standing Orders to secure the convention that the House of Bishops will elect a bishop of the Northern Province to sit on that CNC. We have also suggested changes to the way the lay chair for York is appointed.

That is a brief summary of what we have done. Questions will now be answered by my colleagues, Revd Dr Jennifer Strawbridge, Fr Thomas Seville and Revd Canon Dr James Walters. On behalf of all the members of the review, I thank the members of the Synod who actively assisted us in our work and the Chairs and Business Committee for the opportunity to introduce the discussion of this Report. Thank you.

The Chair: That was most interesting and helpful. As Professor O'Donovan has said, there is now the opportunity for members to put questions to him, and, as he said, he will be assisted by Fr Thomas Seville, Revd Dr Jennifer Strawbridge and Revd Canon Dr James Walters. Members of Synod, like we have done on previous occasions, I shall take questions in groups of three. I would also like to take this opportunity of reminding people to ask a question, and encourage you, rather than to make a speech. Please, keep your question as pithy and short as possible and, therefore, to keep to the point. That would be most helpful.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): Thank you very much for this long-awaited Report. As someone who has asked several questions about the CNC, I am very glad to see it. I am asking my question as the elected member of Exeter Vacancy in See Committee and as someone who has served on two separate CNCs as a diocesan rep. I wonder if I could ask you to expand a little bit on paragraph 1.5(c) and that is why it is considered that achieving an orderly introduction of women might hide the need for a wide diversity of gifts.

The Chair: Thank you. Professor O'Donovan and his team will bear that in mind. Enid, would you like to ask your question?

Mrs Enid Barron (London): Mine is a very small point of process and I sort of hesitate to ask this against the grand sweep of the theological background, but it is important that process is as good as it can be each level. I refer to paragraph 5.11 of the Report that “a great deal of attention was given to the process of election” and “we are not conscious of a need to revisit it at length”. I have recently been involved in a Vacancy in See Committee and I was very upset to find that I could not vote for our members because I would not be present at a particular meeting. I realise when you are on these committees that you do try to go every meeting, but my son was getting married in the north-west of Scotland in a remote village and the meeting was in London on the same day, and I could not fix that.

As most of our elections are carried out by postal vote, not by an immediate vote on the day, I wonder if we could look at the possibility - and if this was something you thought about - of having a postal vote when we vote for our representatives on the CNC. It could well affect the outcome if several members of that diocesan committee are not around and I think it may well have ---

The Chair: Excuse me. Please can we stick to the question?

Mrs Enid Barron (London): I am asking a question. I am merely explaining why I am asking it, which is that I think it could skew the process if we do not have a postal vote.

Ven. Jackie Searle (Gloucester): Thank you for letting me ask my question which relates to paragraph 4(6). First of all, thank you very much for this Report. I do not always enjoy reading all the Synod papers, but I really enjoyed reading this one and the thought that it has given us.

My question about 4(6) is that little bit at the end about any misunderstanding about lists from diocesan bishops and the Strategic Leadership Development Programme. I would like to understand, please, a little more about why that is necessary, what the misunderstanding might be, what lies behind the comment at the end of that paragraph.

The Chair: Professor O'Donovan and your team, are you ready to answer, please?

Revd Dr Jennifer Strawbridge: With regards to the first question about expanding on why it is that paragraph 1.5(c) talks about the introduction of women to the House of Bishops hiding the general need for a wider diversity of gifts, that was simply to point out that if we only focus on introducing women into the House of Bishops it is very easy to miss the other diversities that remain unrepresented within the House, and so it was not meant to be a slight towards the ordination of women as bishops.

In terms of the question about the postal vote for Vacancy in See Committees, part of the Report talks about the introduction, perhaps, of a debate about representation on that committee before the vote is taken and, therefore, a postal vote would mean that the person could not be present for such a debate to realise the wider representation that might be needed within a diocese, and we feel that a

discussion about that representation is very key before members of Vacancy in See are elected to the diocesan central CNC.

Revd Canon Dr James Walters (Universities & TElS): Just on that final point about the selection of candidates and the Strategic Leadership Development Programme, we were broadly encouraged by and supportive of the work of the SLDP in preparing people for senior leadership. There is no explicit link that has been made between that programme and the lists that are prepared to consider people for diocesan appointment or, indeed, as suffragan bishops, and we think that is a good thing in order to avoid what we describe as the pyramidal model in order to fish from the widest pool possible for people considered by Crown Nominations Commissions. It is in that spirit that we recommend that the House of Bishops as a whole should take collective responsibility for putting people on those lists to avoid good candidates being overlooked by diocesan bishops.

The Chair: We have time for one more round of questions if anyone has a burning question.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thank you for this very full Report. I am interested in your suggestion at 5.10 of the election of the six central members being so-called “in full Synod”. I wonder whether you think this would still be by Houses or whether you are thinking it would be the mind of the whole Synod who would elect three members from the House of Laity and three members from the House of Clergy.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): This is a question about paragraph 5.20. I may have simply misread what you intend. This is about in archiepiscopal vacancies electing bishops from the various Provinces to sit on the CNC. It is not clear to me that you are simply saying these should be existing diocesan bishops or whether suffragan bishops might adopt that role. Suffragan bishops are sometimes long serving, and often long suffering, and there are those who may well contribute to this process, but, unless I read you incorrectly, they are excluded from being eligible.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): My question is similar to something that somebody asked earlier about women. I would just like to add a question about equal opportunities and what about including deaf and disabled people. How would they be involved in this process of election and discernment? I do not necessarily mean that they have to be within the CNC but there should be some part of the process open to them.

The Chair: Thank you, everyone, for those questions.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): Thank you very much indeed. The process of election if it becomes open in Synod, those suggestions I think they were, as Professor O’Donovan said, just to get the juices flowing. One might actually look at different ways of voting. STV serves for some purposes but it does not serve for CNC’s purposes. There is nothing prescriptive about that. That is, as the Report says, over to you for “our” imagination. Yes, let it flourish.

There is no intention with respect to the bishop elected from the Northern Province to be diocesan; it could be a suffragan as well. I think that is in the Report. It just needs to be a bishop from the Northern Province.

How would deaf and disabled persons be involved in the process? Well, from somebody who was particularly impressed by the interview I had with deaf and disabled persons, I think the best way of involving them would be to elect them to be bishops. That is the best way of involving them in the process.

Revd Professor Oliver O'Donovan: I understand there are no more questions to be received, so I would just like to thank the Business Committee and the Chairs for the opportunity again to present the Report and to promise you the prayers and interest of the eight theologians who worked on the Review Group as you set about getting your teeth into the tasks that we have set for you.

The Chair: In order for there to be sufficient time for a meaningful debate, that concludes the question time. Thank you to everyone who asked a question. Once again, thank you, Professor O'Donovan, and your colleagues for all your contributions this afternoon. That concludes this item of business.

ITEM 4

DISCERNING IN OBEDIENCE: A THEOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2080)

The Chair: We will now move straight on to the next item on the agenda, Item 4, which is a take note debate on *Discerning in Obedience: A theological Review of the Crown Nominations Commission*, which is GS Misc 2080, members will need that document, and also I would like to draw your attention to the green Sixth Notice Paper which has a financial comment for our awareness.

I would like to invite the Archbishop of York, John Sentamu, to move Item 4. You have up to 10 minutes.

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

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

Madam Chair, thank you. Before I speak, we had intended to welcome the Bishop of Sheffield for the first time. We welcome you, Pete. So, Madam Chair, I hope the clock starts now.

Now then, beloved in Christ, we come to the take note debate. My first duty, and indeed joy, is to thank Professor Oliver O'Donovan and the rest of the team for the time they dedicated to this review and for the depth of the insights they have provided. Their work graciously demands of all of us - not because it is Holy Writ but because of its theological and moral weight - to hear it, read it, mark it, learn it, inwardly and patiently digest its message (to borrow the words of the 1662 Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent). Why? So that we may discern in obedience the nomination of bishops in the Church of England. Because as a Church of England, by law established, both Catholic and Reformed, the nomination of its chief pastors requires wisdom and insight and cannot be taken lightly. It can only

be realised by walking “in the new and living way which Christ has opened for us through the curtain, the way of his flesh” (Hebrews 10:20).

Archbishop Justin and I were confident that to approach this as a theological rather than a process review would draw out riches for us. Indeed, it has, and we have before us a Report which will be foundational to the way in which we think about discernment in the many areas of the life of the Church of England and, for that matter, in the Anglican Communion, and we are very grateful that three Primates of three Provinces are here with us.

In addition, we do not often get the opportunity to thank those who serve as members of the Commission - central and diocesan - so I would like to do so now. This is a costly calling and this Report reminds us of the complexities involved.

Commission members carry the hopes and aspirations of many, as well as the tensions of the wider Church of England, as they ponder and pray over, say, the next Bishop of Bristol or Truro. Over the last 12 years I have seen how the Crown Nominations Commission carries out this responsibility and I want to pass on my gratitude.

Many issues have been raised in the previous discussion and I would like to start by drawing out some of the themes that have actually resonated with me. Forgive me if I repeat some of the words that you heard from Professor O’Donovan, but a vote will be taken at the end of the take note debate. I will then set out how we ought to progress the recommendations.

The Report notes at paragraph 1.7 “painful points of pressure” on current operations. We are committed to addressing these - some in the short term and some in the longer term - and the comments and ideas of Synod members will be listened to carefully by the various bodies we are suggesting to take the proposals forward.

First, let us turn to the challenge posed to us around “discernment” - a word we use so often. And I quote, “Discernment involves a step of faith enabling us to conceive something that God will bring about, which is not yet objectively visible”. “In order to reach a discernment ... it is essential not to try to know the end from the beginning”. If we do so then we say we are “likely to miss what God intends us to see”.

Secondly, vocation and a reminder that the calling of the Church and the calling of the individual rest together if vocation is to be fulfilled: “The call of God is proved by a convergence of the judgment of the nominators” - in this case the Crown Nominations Commission - “with a personal conviction of vocation on the part of the nominee”.

Thirdly, trust: “If the candidates are to have trust in the Crown Nominations Commission, members of the Commission must also have trust in one another”.

Fourthly, diversity: “To represent others is to be trusted by those who share an angle of vision and to commend that vision to those who have other angles”.

I am sure I am not alone in being alert to the possibilities that these reflections should for us in the wider life of the Church.

We should also note the reflections on the oversight role of the bishop which demands of them to lead with insight and wisdom, with a willingness to challenge and to be challenged; a willingness to change and a force for change. The significance of theological culture; holding together spiritual and administrative gifts; preparation for the gift of leadership; the exploration of the roles of Archbishops, central and diocesan members and secretarial support; and the processes of discerning and deciding and voting arrangements. I am sure that members will wish to comment further on these in the debate.

Now I turn to the implementation of the recommendations. Members of Synod will be aware that a number of Crown Nominations Commission related issues have come together. Sir Philip Mawer made some suggestions about process in his recent review of the Sheffield Crown Nominations Commission; Oxford Diocesan Synod has proposed a motion inviting the Archbishops to initiate a review into the role of the Crown Nominations Commission; and the Archbishops' Council has been invited by the Diocese of Canterbury to consider proposals to enable Synod to extend the functions of the Crown Nominations Commission to include the See of Dover and also to reduce the number of diocesan members elected to the Commission when it considers a vacancy in the See of Canterbury.

This latter piece of work will require a cool head and a compassionate heart review before consideration by this Synod and the Secretary General will need to liaise with both the diocese and the wider Anglican Communion to develop proposals.

With regard to the Oxford Motion, Professor O'Donovan's group has reviewed different methods of appointment around the Anglican Communion. It is reassuring that the group concludes, "Our view of the overall structure of the Crown Nominations Commission is positive. It is capable of serving the Church well" - noting that it rests on "responsible theological grounds". It may be that Synod will wish to revisit the issue of whether or not to have a wider review at some stage. However, at this stage, the Archbishop of Canterbury and I propose to focus on the recommendations of *Discerning in Obedience* and to implement them through existing bodies and committees. We believe that this will be an effective way to bring about the changes identified.

The annex to GS 2080 draws together the recommendations of the Sir Philip Mawer review and of the Report, *Discerning in Obedience* that we are discussing today. It sets out very clearly the areas that each group will be asked to progress and also proposes an oversight from General Synod to monitor the progress itself. To give you an idea of timing, the central members of the Crown Nominations Commission meet in March and will consider the various issues set out in the paper at its meeting. You will also note that some of the recommendations from the Sir Philip Mawer review have already been put in place.

This afternoon, I would like to invite members of Synod to share their reflections - theological and practical - on this Report. I welcome additional ideas and suggestions from the floor which I will refer to the Working Groups identified. Speaking on behalf of those of us who serve as permanent members of the

Crown Nominations Commission - the Archbishop of Canterbury and I, and the two Appointments Secretaries - we will report back to you in July following a meeting of the central members in March.

And so, Synod, I invite you to take note of this report *Discerning in Obedience: a theological review of the Crown Nominations Commission*. Chair, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: I now put Item 4 before members of Synod for debate. I am going to impose a three-minute speech limit from the beginning due to the number of people wishing to contribute to this debate. Item 4 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr David Ison): Chair, may I commend and congratulate the Review Group on its excellent Report. It was very thoughtful and very helpful. I just wanted to make one suggestion coming out of the experience of chairing the Diocese of London Vacancy in See Committee last year.

In paragraph 5.12, the Report notes the failure of our process to elect a BAME member of the CNC. That was despite the fact that the Bishop's Council had co-opted four BAME young people on to the Vacancy in See Committee at the outset in order to give greater representation.

The Report goes on to state correctly that there is no explicit responsibility given to the Vacancy in See Committee to ensure a representative group of CNC members. However, the Report then makes, I think, a rather weak recommendation that we should hold a minuted discussion of what is required for good representation before receiving nominations for the election, and then suggests if this does not work perhaps the election could be overturned. I do not think that is good enough.

The reason for the failure of the London Vacancy in See Committee to elect even one BAME member of the CNC was not because we had not discussed the importance of this; it was because when 51 people are voting, they will put first what they think is most important for them and think that someone else will sort the rest out. The voting showed that the reality was the majority of members of the Vacancy in See Committee held as most important either a particular theological position or the representation of women and did not actually think that BAME representation was necessary or important enough to make it the main priority to vote for. It is not easy for members of a large Vacancy in See Committee to trust each other enough to be honest about what they really think. Nor is it easy for a Committee member who has been elected to represent one of the different groups in the diocese to let go of that representation in order to take on something else, however important it may be for the diocese and the wider Church as a whole.

I would therefore suggest that provision be made to take mere discussion about good CNC representation to the level of decision by giving the option for Vacancy in See Committee to designate one reserved place in the election of CNC members on the basis of a criterion determined by the diocesan statement of needs, subject to the agreement of the Bishop's Council and of the Archbishop of

the Province in order to avoid this being used unnecessarily or perhaps abused. This would require the Vacancy in See Committee to decide as well as discuss and face its responsibility to offer a balanced representation of the diocese for the CNC process.

Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans): Madam Chair, I want to add my voice in welcoming the Report, *Discerning in Obedience*, and thanking Professor O'Donovan and his distinguished team for their work. We might have expected the theology to be of the first rank, but what struck me was the fact that the Report is also practical; it gets under the skin of the whole important process - it is applied theology.

I declare an interest as a current member of a CNC and, indeed, a past member. I should add that I have now been a member myself of eight CNCs and my experience throughout has been very positive. The CNCs that I have been privileged to be part of have worked as one body. Despite that, Madam Chair, I am not proud to be associated with a body that has a reputation for being secretive and the secrecy, as the Report notes, can be overbearing and excessive. It is secrecy within and without. It is, I think, both cultural and institutional, and culture change is not always easy to effect.

I would pick up on just two recommendations in the Report that the Professor focused on in his presentation. The first concerns how the CNC works. The Standing Orders, as you know, require voting by secret ballot. If we are to learn anything from Professor O'Donovan's extensive and helpful discussion on discernment then it must be the case that all our deliberations in the CNC are open. It is very concerning that there appears to be some evidence that there has been voting in some recent CNCs which does not reflect the underlying discussion. All members of the Commission must be required to declare how they intend to vote, and why, including the Archbishops, although they might be permitted to declare their hand last.

The second concerns how central members are elected. A leaflet with 100 words against each candidate is simply not enough. The electorate really need to know who the candidates are and where they stand on key issues, importantly, for example, the Five Guiding Principles. We do elections like this in the House of Laity, we have open hustings, and I want to affirm that as a way forward.

Madam Chair, the twin principles a CNC works to are transparency of process yet confidentiality of deliberation. Unfortunately, the confidentiality of deliberation principle seems to dominate all proceedings. There is not time to unpack this. I believe the Church needs to recover confidence in the CNC process and individual CNC members need to have more confidence in each other. The work programme asserted by GS 2080 in its Annex 1 is to be welcomed.

In closing, I urge Synod strongly to take note of GS 2080 and urge all CNC stakeholders - frankly, that is all of us - to engage with what will be a much needed culture and procedural change going forward.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I was a member until last July of the central CNC and I did not stand for re-election. I am a member of Watchcare. It is very welcome to have this opportunity to discuss the work of the Crown Nominations

Commission. I am very grateful to the whole group for their work and for this close look at the processes of the CNC which is long overdue.

I shall take note of the Report, encourage others to do the same, and I fully support all the proposals that are made in it.

However, in one major respect this Report is a disappointment. The group was commissioned to do this work in the wake of the failure of a particular CNC to appoint and this is described in paragraph 6.9 in really some detail, and I will quote it: "Out of the 14 voting members a two-thirds majority requires ten, which is a high threshold. If that is not reached, deadlock can only be resolved if one or more supporters of the runner-up transfers support to the leading candidate. A special case of the same problem arises when one or more members find themselves unable to support either of the final two candidates. Failing a concession on someone's part, the CNC must begin again from the beginning ..."

In the case in question, these two final candidates were distinguished, very widely respected and admired, and enthusiastically supported by many in the CNC, but still some members were "unable to support" either of them. There are no prizes for guessing the reason. Here we have the nub of the problems which have beset the CNC over the years since the Women Bishops Measure and it explains why so few women have been nominated. It is not necessary for me to name the wonderfully gifted women who have not emerged from the gruelling process described in section 6 and others who have not even wished their names to go forward. You know them.

In my time, the two dioceses have become fully open to new possibilities and they have been richly rewarded, as have we all. Now we have a third woman diocesan bishop, which is all the more welcome because it was so unexpected, as Harriet Sherwood reported in the *Guardian* only the week before. Maybe there was the "concession" - I quote - on somebody's part of which the Report speaks.

The answer to our problem lies in principle 1: "The Church of England is fully and unequivocally committed to all orders of ministry being open to all without reference to gender". I can assure the Synod that, in my experience, reference to gender was only articulated in one case and was very quickly ruled out of order. Despite this, I am fully convinced that in none of those nominations in which I participated were the individuals considered without reference to gender.

The Chair. After Jonathan Alderton-Ford, I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to speak.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): It is with a heavy heart that I am going to vote against this Report, and there are three reasons. First, among our many diocesan bishops, worthy men and women as they are, there seems to be a preponderance of people who have done the job first as suffragans. The process by which you become a suffragan, with the best will in the world, is less rigorous than the way we choose diocesans, and so it should be, but this Report has put a great deal of emphasis on discerning the individual, which means that it has lost sight of the fact that each diocese is different and each diocesan bishop is there for a particular time never to be repeated. It has been right to express concern about the influence of the

diocesan members, but the diocesan members have to live with the consequences of a poor decision in a way that the other members do not. That is why sometimes they can be quite prickly when they go to these events, understandably so.

The other thing that causes concern for me is that we do not give proper understanding in this Report to the state of the Church of England now. It may well be that you have to choose a diocesan bishop who is going to wind up a diocese. It may be that that particular part of the country is no longer well served by the structures that form a diocese. It is not a thing to rejoice over, but the quality and character of the person you want should be for a particular time and particular services.

The thing that amazes me most about this Report is the desire to end secrecy. My opinion, after being on this place for 21 years, is that the CNC has a reputation for leaking like a sieve, and, in the many outrageous gossips there is a grain of truth, that some people, once put in bishop's robes, have been very unhappy people.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby): I would like to add my thanks particularly to Professor O'Donovan and all those who have worked with him on the preparation of this Report and the Church House staff and the Appointment Secretaries. It is a wonderful Report and I can say that in the CNCs we have had since its publication, we have benefited greatly from the way it has spoken. We have used it and emphasised particularly the lucid and quite powerful and moving words on discernment, and they have made a significant difference. I am deeply grateful. I would also like to thank members of CNCs, both diocesan and the central members, who give up huge amounts of time and often huge chunks of holiday in order to participate. We owe them a great debt. I hope that the Synod will take note of this Report with some enthusiasm.

The only question I want to raise is one that will not affect me in any way, which is the provision for the election - sooner or later - of the next Archbishop of Canterbury, should such be necessary. At the moment, the Report sets out - and I have spoken to Professor O'Donovan about what I am going to say - that we should end up with a CNC of 12 for Canterbury and 15 for York. I had the great privilege of being interviewed for Canterbury by 16 - plus the Secretary General which made 17 - in one interview. If you take four off from the diocesan members to bring them down to the suggested one lay and one ordained, you get to 12. The problem, though, goes a little further than that with Canterbury, which is that it does not at the moment reflect the full balance of the Anglican Communion. The work of the Archbishop in the Anglican Communion is quite demanding and extensive. When I was interviewed, the representative of the 84 million other members of the Anglican Communion - about 90% from the Anglican Global South - was the Archbishop of Wales, who is a wonderful man, and who did a wonderful job as Archbishop of Wales, but may not have entirely represented the Global South. My suggestion has been that of the four that we lose from the Canterbury diocesan six should be replaced by one Primate from each of the regions of the Anglican Communion. Conveniently, there are five, so, with one existing plus four more, you would end up with five Primates elected from each of the regions, and you would have a balanced and diverse representation of the entire Communion. By the way, at the Canterbury CNC for the Bishop of Dover, I

very strongly welcomed the suggestion that that should be a CNC process given that the Bishop the Dover is, to all intents and purposes, the diocesan bishop for almost all the time, except when the Archbishop clutters up the territory, which he tries to do as little as possible.

Rt Hon Mrs Caroline Spelman (ex officio): First, I would like to add my thanks to the Review Group for their work and welcome what the Archbishop of Canterbury has just said; that its work is already having a positive impact. As Second Church Estates Commissioner, I am often asked in Parliament about the progress the Church is making to improve the diversity of its clergy, specifically those in senior leadership. At my most recent Question Time on the Floor of the House, Mr Speaker took the unusual step of intervening following my answer on diversity of the clergy, urging the Church to, as he said, "Get on with it".

The Church is certainly not the only institution grappling with this issue. In Parliament, we have made some progress - 32% of all MPs are now female, and that is a record high - but that is in the year of the centenary of woman's suffrage, so we still have a way to go. While I welcome the recent appointments of the Bishops of London, Loughborough and Woolwich, it is clear that the CNC has more work to do in enabling the Church to truly reflect the diversity of the people it serves. I recognise the challenges highlighted in the Report about balancing representation of the Committee, but I feel the CNC must go further than training recognisable unconscious bias.

Ensuring the Church is a diverse body must be a key consideration for the CNC at all stages of the appointment process, because, fundamentally, people want to see people like themselves in leadership. It is a well-known organisational fact that diversity improves decision making. Surely the Church, which has a Gospel imperative for inclusion, should do even more to lead by example in promoting diversity in its leadership? There is already a degree of positive discrimination to enable women to join the Lords Spiritual in the House of Lords, and within political parties we have used a range of measures of positive discrimination, otherwise we would not have got where we are today.

Crucially, for the Church, the gender balance of ordinands is now very good, meaning parity is obtainable in theory, though work is still needed on encouraging vocations from black minority ethnic and other diverse backgrounds. Listening carefully to the presentation of this Report, the important point I thought was the convergence of perspectives in a process which is more open and transparent which will be absolutely key. We live in a world which is mistrustful of secrecy. A new culture of openness will not only assist discernment but inspire greater trust. As the Archbishop of York said, we can miss what God intends us to see. My hope is that these recommendations will improve our vision.

Dr Nick Land (York): I welcome this Report and would like to comment on three areas: theological expertise, leadership and lay involvement. Reflecting on last summer's Synod, many of us wondered where the theological underpinning to our decision making was. This Report helpfully talks about theology being "an air we all need to breathe". This is true in Synod, in our churches and in our bishops. It is crucial that the bishop is a skilled, faithful and articulate proclaimer and interpreter of the biblical and apostolic tradition, and it is right to place a very high value on prospective bishops' theological skills as part of the discernment

process.

This Report also helpfully makes observations about the unique leadership skills required of a diocesan bishop. It is not easy to be both a Christ-like model of servant leadership and to be an effective leader of leaders, but this is what we need. I wonder whether the requirement for a diocesan bishop who can both lead, disciple and care for other leaders, and, where appropriate, be led by them, is sufficiently weighted and reflected in the current implementation plan.

Finally, lay involvement, as Chair of the York Vacancy in See Committee I welcome the York-specific proposals. I also welcome the proposal to strengthen the authority of lay chairs of archiepiscopal CNCs. I think it is fair to say that slavish deference to lay opinion is not one of the besetting sins of the Church of England. It is certainly not a big problem for us in the Diocese of York. It is important that members of the laity are supported and empowered to be effective Chairs of the discernment process.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I speak with particular reference to section 6.1 and 6.2 of GS Misc 1171 and page 12 of GS 2080, which refer to the interviewing of candidates. I myself have been interviewing and appointing staff since the mid-1970s in a wide variety of contexts, from secular, in my own business, in the charitable sector, in Church sectors, including both ecumenical and the Church of England, at all levels, at least at this stage, up to the level of dean. Now I find myself a member of the Truro CNC, and it may well be, since we are only just starting our work, that my comments in six months' time are a bit different.

Over that period of experience, I have seen the growth of highly structured panel interviewing, with lots of pre-prepared, indeed over-prepared questions, which leave little time for follow-up. In my experience I have found that the larger the panel, the weaker the interview. There is a lack of depth, and, furthermore, any even half-decent candidate is able to guess the majority of the questions and themselves come with prepared answers. The similarity with PMQs just along the road can be quite striking at times. This approach can sometimes work quite well when you are appointing from a wide range of broadly similar candidates to a post which is very well defined. However, when you are in a situation of wanting to be much more people-centred, to look at the skill sets that are available to you and not the skill sets that you would like to have, to select between those and allow that skill set to define the job just as much as the other way around, I urge that we begin to look at alternative ways of doing interviewing which allow us to examine the candidates and their skills in as much depth as possible. I am sure there are many ways of doing this. One might be, for example, to have a number of sub-panels, each of which looks at a particular area. Overall, I found the Report not only very interesting in general but informative as somebody just entering into the process for the first time.

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): I speak only because I think there is an omission in the Report, which probably is not going to be brought up in the context of the debate, but I would like it considered before necessarily being dismissed. I was a member of the Perry Commission that reported in 2020 with its Report *Working with the Spirit*. Within that Report we took seriously the notion of *nolo episcopari*, that is that someone might be called to be a bishop who does not want to be and certainly will not put him or herself forward to be so. The

Church, we said, needs to have a facility to be able to discern the calling of God and call that person even if they do not want it. It is something to do with discipleship and obedience. We have ended up with, and I was the first diocesan bishop appointed after interview, is a system that assumes that all the candidates are burning for the job. What is spoken of in terms of discernment is competitive. If we want to stick with that road, that is absolutely fine. Of course, it is reasonable to expect that anybody being interviewed for a post such as a diocesan bishop ought to have some vision for what they are being asked to do, but I wonder if we have lost something along the way and if it might be considered by the group going forward as to how we provide the space or make the space for the possibility of the Holy Spirit wanting to call someone to a post. At the moment, the most we can do is say, "The Holy Spirit is calling you to come for an interview". If you say "no" or you do not want it and therefore are not going to perform competitively at interview, you have ruled something out that the Church might have benefited from.

Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London): Yesterday, the House of Bishops published its official response to the Independent Reviewer's Report on the See of Sheffield. In it, it is noted that: "not nearly enough was done to create an understanding of what the Declaration and Settlement would mean in practice". It reports that a group has been set up to implement the Independent Reviewer's recommendation to form a group to review what has been done and inform and educate clergy and laity of the 2014 Settlement. This is a fortuitous moment to do this work when we are assessing the CNC, since the work of the CNC is key to realising some of the aspirations of the House of Bishops' Declaration.

The House of Bishops' Declaration contains instructions for the CNC at various points and so the CNC is, and will continue to be required to have regard to it and to work to it. It is now the case that candidates for ordination formally assent to the House of Bishops' Declaration, including the Five Guiding Principles. It is fitting that those who have the role of discerning our future bishops are also expected to assent to the Settlement. I refer to paragraph 5.1 in the Theological Report: "Its discernment will have validity for the whole church to the extent that it is reached by bringing together diverse perspectives representative of the life of the church". I suggest that this is most effectively done in a situation where each member of the gathered group has assented to our contemporary statement of theological diversity and assented to the House of Bishops' Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles within.

Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London): I am grateful for the opportunity to thank the Review Group for its thoughtful work. I warmly welcome both the theological review and, broadly, the proposals contained in GS 2080. The Report emphatically reminds us that choosing a bishop is a process of "mutual discernment under God, not simply another competitive recruitment process". How we properly honour that process is the challenge to the Church. Over the past 10 years - that is 40 episcopal nominations - part of my preparation for each CNC meeting was to reread the words of the Ordinal for the ordination and consecration of a bishop. I never tired of them and, whilst I welcomed the proposed use of the *veni creator* at key moments in the process, I would suggest that parts of the Ordinal might also be incorporated, providing as it does a description of episcopal ministry far richer than any role specification produced by a committee.

The Review Group poses the challenge to the CNC to consider how well a candidate has acquired a theological culture and to what extent he or she is an articulate interpreter of the apostolic tradition. This must be fundamental to the work of the Commission, so it will be essential to ensure that CNC members are equipped and resourced to identify such characteristics. As a very late convert to interviews, I remain concerned at the risk that CNC members weigh them more heavily than the other relevant material. The very advantages of the interview are also the factors which risk leading to the interview becoming determinative, and the Commission will need to be careful to avoid that.

The Review Group notes perceptively that the impression can be created that a bishop must be “everything anyone else can be”. In process terms, this leads to the risk that the Commission produces a long list of characteristics with equally sized boxes and prefers a candidate who can place a little tick in every one rather than varying the size of the boxes according to priorities and significance and being willing to consider seriously the candidates who may not tick every box but have a whopping great tick in one or two. This may be the reason why there is a paucity of academic theologians on the bench and a factor in why the House of Bishops is not as diverse as it should be.

There are many references throughout the Report both to diversity and to the importance of that diversity in the representational balance of the CNC’s membership. For me, therefore, it is a little disappointing that there is no suggestion as to how the deliberations of the CNC might benefit from important perspectives not present among its membership. It is not simply an issue of inclusion but of the credibility of the CNC’s processes and decisions. Given the Church’s, frankly, appalling record on fostering diversity in senior appointments - we have gone backwards in all but one category identified in *Talent and Calling* endorsed by the Synod 10 years ago - this is embarrassingly urgent business. Thank you.

The Chair: I am getting conscious of the time so after Andrea, I am going to invite Andrew Nunn to speak, and then I will be looking for a motion of closure on this debate.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester): Thank you to the Professor and the Committee for this Report. I rise to speak in this debate after the speeches of April Alexander and Caroline Spelman because there was mention, as there has been running throughout this debate, of the Gospel imperative for inclusion and positive discrimination. The Gospel imperative, of course, is found at the heart of this Report. It is mentioned in the title of this Report: how to discern in obedience and look at a strong theological review of how the Crown Nominations Commission functions. We find that well set out on pages 14 and 15 of the Report. In paragraph 3.9, this is what is written: “What we look to find in a bishop is the arc of a mature and compelling life of faithfulness to the gospel, the life ‘above reproach’, that will represent the transforming power of the gospel to many outside the church who know nothing else of it. Being ‘well thought of by outsiders ...’”, referring then to 1 Timothy 3:7, in which we see Paul who imitated Christ. Then in paragraph 3.10: “The episcopate has the responsibility of guarding the church’s tradition of teaching, and almost all the questions that come before it for discussion have some doctrinal features even if they are not all

primarily doctrinal questions”, which, of course, is what David Banting mentioned during the business debate earlier today.

A big decision in this review, as we look at the Crown Nominations Commission’s functions is this: how will we as the Church of Christ, the Bride that speaks to this nation, ensure that we do not have appointed as bishops those who are openly flouting the teaching of the Bible and the unvarying teaching of the Church down the ages. This is the Gospel imperative of the Crown Nominations Commission.

Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn): For eight years, I was a member of the CNC and it is lovely to see so many bright, shining faces of some of the Bishops that I was interviewing. I have to say that I never turned to jelly in the presence of Archbishops - thankfully. It was a huge privilege to be involved. I am wearing my red cross today, which I never did at a meeting of the CNC. We are a very tribal organisation, and we know that. We are elected, we stand on certain principles, but the thing that always annoyed me more than anything else was when people would not leave their tribal branding at the door but brought that in. Above all, the CNC is a process of discernment and listening, and we can only do that discernment and listening when we switch off the radio waves of our own tribe that are playing in our ears. We are not there to form the Church in our own image but to form the Church in Christ’s image. That will be different in each diocese. I would encourage whatever processes in the future, particularly for the election of central members of the CNC, to discern people who are able to leave highly held views at the door and instead be open to the promptings of the Spirit for the future of the Church. In that way, we will achieve the very best people, a very diverse group of people on the bench of bishops for the future.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I propose a motion for closure of this item of business.

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

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

The Chair: So to close the debate, that is clearly carried. Thank you. I invite the Archbishop of York to respond to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Members of Synod, there were quite a number still standing and wishing to speak. We would benefit if what you were going to say has been written - please hand it in to the Clerk of Synod - because we would love to hear all the views that would have been expressed.

To Dr David Ison about BAME representation: he wants it slightly tougher. All I can say is that we have listened to your argument. I hope you are challenging not only the CNC but the rest of all the appointment processes in the Church of England. He was elected to represent London. Because the diocesan CNC had failed to have an ethnic Anglican person on it, instead he stepped down and somebody stood in his place who was from that particular ethnic group. So he is speaking with conviction and, as the suffragette said, “Not words. Not words. Actions. Actions. Actions”. So that is really what we need because this, for me,

is what I want to call a spiritual problem, which we need as a Church to address. What you are suggesting will be looked at. We will find a way maybe of doing it, maybe not in the way that you want, but actually you are raising a spiritual problem for the rest of the Church of England; not just the CNC.

To Anthony Archer - secrecy - in fact the Review Group does not want this to continue happening in that way, and I personally, and I am sure the Archbishop of Canterbury, would welcome this. The question of "Yes" when you gather your processes does not need to be secret but confidentiality in terms of deliberation because you are talking about people and human beings. I think what they are suggesting again we will take it very seriously in GS 2080.

To April Alexander: I am glad you are going to take note of the report. You have raised a number of concerns. Again, I want to suggest that since in Christ there is now, therefore, no male, female, slave or free, but all are one in Christ, that will permeate the way we actually do our business and look at other people.

To Jonathan Alderton-Ford: how do we balance the relationship between the diocese, the Church of England, the Anglican Communion and the world? When you are appointing a bishop, it is not just for that diocese; they are going to be a member of the House of Bishops. They therefore have responsibility nationally as well as internationally, and more so in the Anglican Communion. I hope this calling in place and time again is taken on seriously by the Review Group.

Who am I to speak about Canterbury? Of course, we heard from Archbishop Justin suggesting five Primates from the Anglican Communion. Again, this is a matter which is going to be reviewed. We need to look at it and come up again with some suggestions which may help, because the issue has to be that whoever is chosen as Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Metropolitan, has to have within that particular nomination not just the Anglican Communion dimension but actually a national role as well. It needs to be balanced out properly so that we do not think we are simply getting somebody who is just more burdened by the Anglican Communion. Nevertheless, that is quite an important thing.

To Caroline Spelman, diversity of clergy: what is again critical for me, like with David Ison, is we need to be more transparent and open to the work of the Spirit. When that does not happen, friend, you can have bodies in places but actually they do not change things.

To Dr Land: in terms of theological underpinning, effective leadership and lay involvement, yes, you are quite right. In York that happens.

To Michael Todd: yes, the body may be large, but they do not all have to ask questions. In fact, the present practice on the Crown Nominations Commission is that people pair up and about half of the Commission asks the questions while the rest of us are discerning in terms of listening. Listening is just as important as the questions you put. I hope that will actually help. That the body is big does not mean that everybody asks the question. You are quite right, if everybody asks a question the depth will not be there but the rest of us try to discern.

To the Bishop of Leeds: yes, prayer for the unwilling to become willing. They can only do that if the Holy Spirit is also speaking to them.

To Lindsay Newcombe on the House of Bishops' Declaration: you will be glad to know that at the beginning of the Commission everybody must affirm that they accept the Five Guiding Principles. If they do not, friends, then I think the chair of the CNC for that particular vacancy may need to have conversations on whether they can continue to serve. So I actually think the discipline is already there.

Aiden, you were on the central membership of the Crown Nominations Commission for 10 years. You are one of those people that I know read all the papers. You also committed yourself not to do anything which was not about discernment - and for that, again, we are very careful. Secondly, as to the Ordinal, I can see its part, and again you will be glad to know that part of the requirements that are put on the mandatory bits of it, matters come out of that Ordinal now, so the thing has slightly improved after you are always reminding us: "Please, we are not having a beauty parade". Interviews are important, but actually they should not outweigh the rest of the documents we have.

To Andrea Minchiello Williams, in responding both to the contribution by April Alexander and the Estates Commissioner, asking about: "How do we know whether these bishops are going to do this?" Well, in paragraph 5.5 of the Report they say that the Archbishops should make a formal declaration that, "on the evidence presented to the CNC, all candidates under consideration are eligible for consecration under church doctrine and practice, and so eligible for membership of the House of Bishops". For all of us, I think if that did happen - and in fact it already happens in many ways - that probably would answer it. Of course, it will require also members of the Crown Nominations Commission to ask what I call "intelligent questions", but I think this business of the Declaration by the Archbishops would be very, very helpful.

I am very sorry if there is anything that I did not answer, but, the rest of you, may God bless you, thank you. I hope you will take note of this report.

The Chair: Members of Synod, we move to vote on Item 4: *Discerning in Obedience: A Theological Review of the Crown Nominations Commission.*

The motion

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

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: Therefore Item 4 - the Theological Review of the CNC - is clearly carried. Thank you to everyone who has contributed to the debate. We will now move to the next item of business, which is Questions.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 3.56 pm.

ITEM 5 QUESTIONS

The Chair: Synod, we now come to the next item on our Agenda: the ever-popular question time. It is good to see you all here. One or two reminders about the rules for Questions. We do have about 90 questions this afternoon. We may not get through all of them, but I think to do justice to those who have put the questions I would like to get as far through that as we possibly can. I therefore remind those who ask supplementaries that they are meant to be supplementary to the original question and answer and that they should be questions and not statements. How long does a supplementary last? Depending on what sort of Anglican you are: I think a supplementary question, if it lasts about the length of a Hail Mary, eight bars of the Praise chorus or the Collect for Purity from the BCP, would probably be about enough to allow us to get through all the questions tonight! In asking a supplementary question, it is not in order to criticise any particular person or body. The questions are to seek information; not to allow you to critique other people or Church bodies. We come now to Question 1, which is to the Church Commissioners, and - her debut on stage - the First Church Estates Commissioner will reply.

1. *Mrs Susie Leafe (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: 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?

Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The requested information cannot be reproduced within the constraints of the Questions Notice Paper and has therefore been placed on the notice board.

Mrs Susie Leafe: As people do not have the answer in front of them, can I have three more bars?

The Chair: Go on. Go on.

Mrs Susie Leafe: Can I first say thank you to those who collated this information - and there are many pages, thank you - and for their efforts to ensure that the work of the Church of England is funded so generously. My question is one of value for money. These figures show that over the past four years you have spent almost twice as much on the ministry of our bishops and key cathedral staff, without taking into account housing stock costs, as you have spent on the much-publicised strategic development grants. Without wishing to say that our bishops or our cathedral staff are not strategic in any way, and noting that there is a robust monitoring and evaluation scheme for those who receive strategic development funding, what plans do the Church Commissioners have for ensuring similar value for money from their other, greater, investments?

Ms Loretta Minghella: I am very grateful for the question and also to those who collated the data. I am delighted to join you in Synod as the new First Church Estates Commissioner. To everyone who has offered them, I am so grateful for your prayers. If you have not offered them, please do pray for me anyway.

I think it is absolutely brilliant that we have this new stream of strategic development funding. Do not forget that the Commissioners are over-distributing, spending more than the actuaries are telling us that we can really afford in the short term, because the Commissioners believe wholeheartedly that every person should have the chance to grasp how wide and long and high and deep is the love of Jesus Christ. This is our driving mission. We are so grateful to have the chance to support the Church in it. We are an episcopally-led church and we do need properly to support our Bishops. We are, in fact, talking to them one by one at the moment about the block grants that they get to make sure that those are fairly paid, because actually they are rooted in a lot of historic practice and we do need to make sure that it is fairly distributed.

When it comes to cathedrals, I commend to you the draft Cathedrals Report. That, in fact, sort of suggests that the Commissioners are not spending quite enough on cathedrals rather than too much. We will be responding to that Report after our next Board Meeting and deciding how best to respond to the finalised Report after the consultation period. We absolutely agree with you that we do need value, but we need to work together with our colleagues in the Archbishops' Council and with all of you to ensure that we all do our very best with the great resources that are at our disposal. Thank you very much.

2. *Revd Anne Stevens (London)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: In November 2016 the Pensions Board announced it had reluctantly decided to close the Manorstead Nursing Home by 31 March 2017. The Pensions Board has given assurances that in taking the decision it was not the intention to close Manorstead Supported Housing or to sell Manorstead, and that it would be seeking alternative uses for the buildings. Since March 2017 the Manorstead Nursing Home has been standing empty except for the kitchen which continues to serve the residents of Manorstead 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 Manorstead Nursing Home buildings?

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

3. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Pensions Board: 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 (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board: 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 canvass scheme members on how we should respond to that consultation.

Revd Canon Catherine Grylls: Thank you for your answer and for the openness to hearing the view of stakeholders. What is the best mechanism by which stakeholders can respond to that invitation?

Dr Jonathan Spencer: By which stakeholders can respond to?

Revd Canon Catherine Grylls: Your openness to hear the views of the stakeholders on ethical concerns, particularly climate change.

Dr Jonathan Spencer: The Pensions Board and the other National Investing Bodies rely heavily on the work of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group for policy development. In the course of developing new or updated policies on ethical matters they will typically consult quite widely - whenever there is a specific exercise in prospect, there is a natural avenue for consultation there - and, of course, we are always open to individuals approaching us with their views, which we will take into account in whatever way is most appropriate.

4. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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 (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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 November 2017 to co-ordinate 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.

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Thank you, Mark, for the answer, which is encouraging, but it remains very early days in what will be a longish journey of called-for culture change, so please could there be a detailed report on progress with implementation to the Synod in July 2018, supported by a fringe meeting which can focus, amongst other things, on the lessons learned about implementing culture change from the first round of events for the Discipleship Learning

Communities? I, for one, am particularly interested in the fourth of the recommended next steps on pages 26 and 27 of GS 2056, namely the remodelling of the selection, training and ongoing ministerial development of clergy in line with the priority of lay formation and discipleship.

Mr Mark Sheard: I am not going to go into too much of the detail at this stage, bearing in mind the long list of questions ahead of us, but I think you and I would be in exactly the same place in believing that *Setting God's People Free* is crucial for us to achieve the mission that Loretta just so wonderfully outlined for us. That mission will be impeded if we do not progress urgently and thoroughly. I would urge the Business Committee - and indeed yourself, if you have any influence in that area - to try to make as much time available in July for us to explore this further and to report on progress both in full General Synod and, indeed, in a fringe meeting.

5. *Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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 (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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.

Revd Canon Priscilla White: I am no statistician, unlike some others, but, given the phrase "inherently less precise", I wonder how robust statistical analysis from the worshipping community concept can be, and so the question is: what use is made of that measure and how is it driving decision-making?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio): That is a very good question indeed. Thank you very much, Priscilla. Of course the challenge, as you put in your original question, is: "What is meant by 'worshipping community' and the fact that it seems to mean different things to different people in different places?" I think I would almost turn the question back and say that the real value in this data comes in how different those providing the data can see the trends in their own worshipping communities, and I would encourage them to look at it. I heard of a parish recently that was quite appalled to discover that it had a 60% decline in its worshipping community. It then went and looked at the data and saw that actually it had been using completely different measures. My encouragement to you is to look closely at how you submit that data in your parishes and then use it to monitor your own performance - because it means most to you.

6. *Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the Statistics for Mission form, why is there no reference to confirmations?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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.

Revd Canon Priscilla White: Confirmations are a mark in many places - hopefully everywhere - of a significant step in faith. They are therefore inherently missional. Will it be considered to add confirmations to the Statistics for Mission so that they appear in the same place as all those other important missional things, including worshipping community, which will then appear on our dashboards and provide good, robust statistical analysis?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio): I share your enthusiasm. I believe that confirmations are indeed truly missional. It is something we were discussing earlier today. To date there has not been a great deal of request for that. One particular diocese has asked for data on that related to individual churches as opposed to the diocese as a whole. I think you raise a very interesting question. I would not want to take up too much of Synod's time going into details of data definition and how we collect it, but I wonder if you and I might have a discussion offline on that. I would be very interested to hear more from you.

7. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The latest Statistics for Mission have shown that the average church attendance by children, defined as under-16, fell by 22% 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as *President of the Archbishops' Council:* 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.

Mr Graham Caskie: I thank the Archbishop for his answer. In the light of the correlational evidence showing that a father attending church regularly substantially increases the likelihood his children will do the same, how will the Archbishops' Council ensure that this evidence is given due consideration in the very welcome upcoming wide discussion?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: It is a very helpful question. We have in the last few weeks written to all Bishops, through the regional meetings, asking them to have a fresh look at this area. We will certainly take account of that evidence.

I can say from personal experience that I did attend church pretty regularly as my children grew up and that it had a mixed reception, like, "Can't you just shut up for a while?", but, that apart, I think what you say is a very important point. It is one we have to take into account as we begin the work on this. This is an area of huge importance. It strikes me that it should not be too difficult to persuade churchgoing parents to wish to pass on the faith to their children, but it is more complicated than it looks.

The Chair: I have given permission for the Archbishop to answer Questions 8 and 9 together.

8. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Youth for Christ in a report last year, "Generation Z", discovered that 73% 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?

9. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as *President of the Archbishops' Council:* 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.

Mr Graham Caskie: I thank the Archbishop again for his answer. In the light of the urgency of the situation set out in the 2016 Statistics for Mission, when, as a Synod, can we expect to see the first practical steps emanating from this work in order to help convince more Anglican families of their responsibility to pass on to

their children what the Epistle of Jude describes aptly as “the faith that was once for all entrusted to God’s holy people”.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: We can expect action to emerge pretty rapidly in terms of the Church of England - that is to say I would hope within a year or so that we should have the first materials coming out. I think this is such a difficult area because it is the responsibility of families and it is the responsibility of local churches and directives from on high do not always help. What has to happen is people have to have good resources for this. The first one has just been published. Another major resource is being worked on. The way in which we train, encourage and teach people through catechesis is also being prepared and worked on at the moment. I hope that answers your question.

Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich): Thank you so much for the encouraging response. I am so glad that there is going to be a discussion. In the light of the fact that there are many things that clamour for attention, and taking into account that it is not always a thing from on high that helps, is there a plan to make this a specific and explicit priority above other things and for the Archbishops’ Council to major on it?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I cannot answer for the Archbishops’ Council without consulting it first, and I think this question is to the House of Bishops, but I certainly am aware that the Bishops consider it to be an important area and that the new Evangelism Department at Church House has this as a very high priority. It comes within the general priority of evangelism which is within the Quinquennial Goals and the development of spirituality, and I would expect that to be pursued at every level of the Church as a central feature.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Would the Archbishop agree with me that bishops could approach the Church Commissioners with an SDF bid for exactly this sort of work in their own dioceses given the important priority that it is?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Pete, I learned quite early always to agree with you. I certainly agree with you on that. I think it would be good to have bids like that. I do not sit on the SDF board, and so I cannot guarantee what will happen, but I think it would be very welcome.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Is there any evidence to suggest that the more we try to walk alongside people, rather than preach down to them, the more they will be able to recognise that we are recognising that God is working with them and that the unconditional love which is God actually is already active within their families, and therefore we are coming alongside that rather than actually trying to “market” something as it were? Would that help?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: The only words I would want to strike out of your question are “rather than”. I think it is both – “and”. All witnessing and sharing of faith begins with a genuine loving relationship that cares for the whole person without exception, but at some point if people ask, and when people ask, and as you talk, you have to be willing to say something as well. It is not marketing it. It is testimony. It is witnessing and sharing to your own knowledge and experience of the God who has reached out to us in Jesus Christ. It is both - “and”. If we are not walking alongside, then of course, it is a waste of time, but if we are walking

alongside and someone asks us and we do not explain, I go to Peter's first letter (Chapter 3) - this is a very old question - "Always be ready to give an explanation for the hope that is within you". So I think it is both - "and".

10. *Mrs Susie Leafe (Truro) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mrs Susie Leafe: Thank you, Archbishop. How would you respond to the concerns raised by some of those planning to attend Gafcon, who feel that, rather than being listened to as you describe in your answer, they have actually been warned off attending by other senior colleagues?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: All I can say is that when I have been asked I have said, totally openly, that, having talked to numerous Primates about this who are part of Gafcon, notably people like the Primate of Kenya, where Gafcon is acting as a ginger group, a source of prayer and renewal of spiritual life within God's people around the world, and within the Anglican Communion within that, it is a very good thing. I have not warned people off attending but I cannot speak for other people. If you give me examples privately, I am happy to speak privately to people.

The Chair: Questions 11 and 12, again to the Archbishop being taken together.

11. *Miss Deborah Buggs (London) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* How are Companion Links being affected by divisions in the Anglican Communion?

12. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* How are Companion Links being affected by divisions in the Anglican Communion?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 partners through prayer in the hope that fuller relationships will be restored.

Miss Deborah Buggs: Thank you for the response. The list of Companion Links listed at appendix B of GS 2081 does not indicate which links are impaired. Please could it be reissued giving that information?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: I am sorry, which links are what?

Miss Deborah Buggs: The Companion Links mention ---

The Archbishop of Canterbury: You said it does not list which links are something.

Miss Deborah Buggs: Which are impaired. I am thinking of the Liverpool and Nigerian impaired links, or non-existent links.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you very much. It is a very interesting question. I am obviously familiar with that one, having been Dean of Liverpool and having visited Akure while I was Dean of Liverpool and knowing Nigeria reasonably well. I suppose I want to ask the question about how we define "impaired". When I visited Akure, there was a very strong and warm link. There were big questions that were being raised, but it continued to be a warm link. Companion Links are not something that you can categorise that easily in that way because you have to look at the whole range of the connections between the two dioceses over a prolonged period of time. I would be a little reluctant to get into that sort of - forgive me using this term, because, of course, it is unusual for me to do so - slightly managerial approach to it.

13. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 the diocesan bishops have been discussed and agreed by the House of Bishops?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as *Chair of the House of Bishops:* 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.

Revd Canon David Banting: I am not quite sure if the jelly is beginning to melt a little in my supplementary. Your reply suggested that it has not proved necessary for the House of Bishops to consider the guidelines and yet it also says it is welcomed in many, but that is not in all, and also recognises that there is a variety of response, for example from the most encouraging review, very helpful review,

of the London Plan stimulated by the acting Bishop and the new Bishop - most exciting how that might be coming out - but also through to the other end of the spectrum to dioceses I am not allowed to mention, and would not want to, two in your Province - very different responses. What would be necessary to prove it necessary for the House of Bishops to consider guidelines for consistency?

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Well, in the first place I think that is a hypothetical question asking for my opinion and, if I remember rightly, I am not allowed to answer that specifically.

Revd Canon David Banting: Your answer gives an opinion; it has proved not necessary.

The Chair: Mr Banting, you have asked your question; the Archbishop will answer as he sees appropriate.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: Thank you. I have to say, David, in the 40 years we have known each other, I have never noticed jelly at any point, but thank you.

We have a very clear system set out. We have the Five Guiding Principles and, as was hinted at, or was said very specifically in the debate we had earlier on the excellent report by Professor O'Donovan and his team, on occasions where there has been doubt about people's willingness to observe them, both the Archbishop of York and I, where there has been an attempt to say they would not be observed, we have ruled that out of order very quickly. The Five Guiding Principles give us a very clear framework. In addition, there is the Ombudsman, who has proved extremely independent, extremely vigorous and extremely trustworthy.

Where there is evidence that the Guiding Principles and the agreement come to in 2014 have not been observed, there are mechanisms for dealing with it and, therefore, I would say that I cannot envisage, at present, circumstances in which the House of Bishops should revisit that. I yield to no one in my admiration of Bishop Rod, who I would consider as both an exceptional person and a good and wise friend who has helped me a great deal, and many other bishops. If I hear that he has specific problems, and I see him regularly and ask, I do seek to raise them privately with the people concerned, but there is a very clear mechanism and I do not see the need for changing it.

The Chair: We are going to give the Archbishop a breather for a moment or two now. Question 14, the Bishop of Leeds to reply.

14. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

15. *Canon Tony Allwood (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that over 30% of practising Anglican clergy are currently self-supporting ministers (SSMs), 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 (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): When is it planned to hold the next Ministry Division consultation on SSMs?

Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I do not know. I will find out for you.

The Chair: Questions 16 and 17. We are going to need Notice Paper VII. There was a bit of a mess-up in the printing. You should have Notice Paper VII which should have been on your seats.

16. *Ven. Luke Miller (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops. 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 (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) answered on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Archbishops' Secretary of 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 Luke has provided.

Ven. Luke Miller: I am today an erratum. Thank you, Bishop Tim, for your answers. Are there plans to ensure the Pathways system, to which you refer in your answer, collects data in all areas of diversity, including Church tradition, and makes it available to ensure assertions like the one that I have made that only one-third of those in senior positions not being bishops who are unable to accept the ordained ministry of women are speaking to you, that assertions like that can be checked.

The Bishop at Lambeth: I think I can say that there are plans to try to make sure that the Pathways system is as robust as possible, but clearly this depends to some degree on self-identification, and the issue of self-identification in the matter of Church tradition is complex. It may also involve dioceses in getting their data back to the centre and sometimes some dioceses, I am told, do not always get the data back as well as they might.

17. *Ven. Luke Miller (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Ven. Luke Miller: Noting that Sir Philip Mawer's Recommendation 2, to which you refer, applies to the process for appointing bishops and that my concern is for

non-episcopal senior appointments, what aspects of the processes to which Sir Philip refers throw light on those senior appointments which are often advertised and interviewed but which nevertheless seem to result in tiny numbers of those unable on theological grounds to accept the ordained ministry of women to be appointed?

The Bishop at Lambeth: What aspects?

Ven. Luke Miller: What aspects of those things to which Sir Philip refers in his Report, which is focusing on episcopal appointments, would apply to those things which are for non-episcopal appointments?

The Bishop at Lambeth: I think Sir Philip Mawer's Report applies to all appointments actually. I think we can learn lessons on all things. It is just the case that actually in some appointments we are not able to collect the data in the same way as we are in some others.

18. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* 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 (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Thank you for your answer. Sadly, though, it shows perfectly why reflecting on Bishop James' Report and Charter would be significantly beneficial to the House as the Charter assures victims of the conduct that they can expect and hold the Church to account. It is about proving what we want to put the victims first. Can I therefore ask that the Report *Patronising Disposition of Unaccountable Power* and particularly the Victims' Charter, be urgently reviewed and signed by the House of Bishops so that we, the victims, might be given some assurance about how we can be treated?

The Bishop at Lambeth: I am more than happy to give assurance that I will certainly read it myself and see whether I can feed it in. Not wishing to steal his thunder, but I would also encourage Synod members to read the book I think they are being given *Bread not Stones*, as another contribution to hearing the voice of survivors.

19. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

20. *Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Are there any plans to review the operation of the faculty process under Canon C 4 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Wyn Beynon: Thank you, Archbishop, for your clear answer. I believe I speak for not a few DDOs and perhaps ordinands in asking that clear guidance as to what "appropriate enquiries" actually are, so that this is consistent across the dioceses, might be something that could be considered as a first step towards a full review of the directions.

The Archbishop of York: I do not see why the Archbishops and bishops cannot consider what you are saying but I, for one, do not believe that the system is over-intrusive. It is there to protect both individuals as well as the Church. Does it work? Again, we are not all agreed about this but I want to thank God for those willing to embark on it, given their personal circumstances, as part of the process of discerning God's call. As somebody who has been dealing with the faculties, it is hard, it is difficult, but people are willing to go through this. I hope it is done sensitively and with wisdom and understanding and a bit of insight. As one who operates it, at least in my Province, I actually think all bishops are very diligent in the way they do it.

21. *Mr Simon Baynes (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: 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: <https://www.churchofengland.org/about/leadership-and-governance/general-synodb/bishops-information-house-and-college-bishops#na>.

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".

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you, Archbishop, for the answer. You refer to clause 5 of the terms of reference of the Delegation Committee and the duty to "report promptly and regularly on its activities and decisions to the House". Paper GS Misc 1179, which is the summary of decisions of the House of Bishops, tells us in paragraph 5 that the House of Bishops meeting last December "received updates on the decisions of the Delegation Committee", but does not say what those decisions were.

In the interests of transparency, can you please inform Synod what those decisions were, how much time the full House of Bishops spent considering them and what their status is? Were they adopted to become, in effect, decisions of the House of Bishops?

The Chair: I think, Archbishop, we could do without a whole list of them because we have to keep the time down, but if you could give a way to reply.

The Archbishop of York: I think go back to 2015 when the matter was first discussed by the House, the possibility of that actual Diocesan Motion coming and what would be the response to the section on liturgy, and it took a very clear decision, which in fact you now find reported by the Delegation Committee. It again did return and was in the paper. The fact that an item is referred to the House of Bishops Delegation Committee does not mean that the item is treated with any less care or consideration.

The contrary action is true: the House will always have the opportunity to respond on the regular reporting of actions or decisions and it will be for members of the House to raise questions when these reports are actually given. I did see them, I did read them, therefore anybody who says they were not there, well, I cannot speak for everybody.

The Chair: Questions 22 and 23 being taken together by the Bishop of Coventry.

22. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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?

23. *Revd Anne Stevens (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Canon Jenny Humphreys: I can find no reference in any of the recent reports, responses and resources about the history and theology of patriarchy. Will the new group please address this, bearing in mind that the House of Bishops released their response yesterday on the 100th anniversary of some women being allowed to vote; a development in 1918 that was resisted by bishops to a man?

The Bishop of Coventry: Very topical. Thank you very much. As you know, the Faith and Order Commission has produced a piece of work. It is a piece of work that we were working on a little bit before the Sir Philip Mawer Report was delivered and then we responded to that recommendation by Sir Philip. I think we now need to see how that lands and to see what gaps there might be in that work we have done and then, as the Archbishops’ statement says, decide whether anything needs to be taken forward and what.

Revd Anne Stevens (London): It is about the gaps really, though I have only had a cursory reading in the short time available. This is the theological reflection on the Five Guiding Principles that Sir Philip asked for in paragraph 192(a), but there was another request or challenge in 192(b) for theological and pastoral reflection on the way that the principles are impacting on the ground, particularly at parish level. Would the Bishops, therefore, please consider some more work in this area, not only from the Implementation Group but also from the Faith and Order Commission on the theological impact of things such as the shared cure of souls and the validity of the sacraments.

The Bishop of Coventry: As you will see when you have had a chance to look at it a little more closely, one of the chapters does try to deal with, as it were, matters on the ground. It may well be that the House will feel that there is more detailed work that could be done, more case study work. That is quite possible. Again, I would say let us see how the Report is received, where the gaps are and what, if anything, does need to be taken forward to the next stage.

24. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) answered on behalf 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.’

25. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mr Clive Scowen: Have I understood correctly from the Bishop’s answer that the House undertook no biblical or theological or anthropological reflection before issuing the recent statement in GS Misc 1178 in response to the Blackburn

motion passed last July or before the Archbishop commended the guidance to Church schools on transgender issues published last autumn? If that is the case, will the House refrain from making further pronouncements on these issues before they have undertaken such reflection?

The Bishop of Coventry: I sort of have an interest in this because I have a heavy involvement in the Teaching Document. I think there would be a certain wisdom, where possible, to allow that process to take its course. It is a complex process. It is being undergone with some rigour. I can see that that is not always the case and there was a need to produce an updated version of *Valuing All God's Children*. That was a piece of work that the Education Office did. I am not aware of formal discussion in the House of Bishops, but not everything that each department undertakes can have that sort of discussion. I could say more about the document but I do not think you would want an opinion from me.

There was one other point. In terms of the discussion, did you say, Clive, following the statement from the House of Bishops about transgender liturgies? Was that the one you referred to?

Mr Clive Scowen: I referred to that and I was asking for confirmation that no theological or biblical reflection had been undertaken before that statement was issued and asking whether, in future, such reflection would precede the making of such statements.

The Bishop of Coventry: I am sure theological reflection and significant thought was given to that. My memory is that it was not given in a plenary session of the House of Bishops, but I can assure you that bishops do not make statements without thinking theologically about them.

Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds): As part of the rigorous study, what investigations will be made into the emerging subculture of gender questioning amongst children and young people, both within their own subculture through social media and also in the support offered by medical and other professionals to the choices made at such a very young and vulnerable age?

The Bishop of Coventry: That is a very good question. We do have a group led by the soon-to-be Bishop of London on biological and social sciences. That is a very fine group of people with expertise who will give this rigorous thought and then - this is really interesting - that work will be brought into relationship with the work that the other groups are doing. Moreover, what we want to do is not just do that thinking within the groups and across the groups, that is complex enough, but also each group is charged with wider consultation. We are thinking, and it would be very good to have your advice on this, about ways, and exploring ways significantly, about how we can cascade that out. That is an ambitious thing to attempt, but as far as possible so that we can listen in on all sorts of contexts.

26. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

27. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell: I am very grateful for the informative answer given. Has the Committee taken time to look at the theological basis and historic practice and development of the Ministry of Absolution and is the Committee planning to frame the Report in a way which might commend itself to the House of Bishops not only as a document for information but also the basis of a document for teaching about this important ministry in the wider Church?

The Bishop of Durham: The very short answer is absolutely there is major theological reflection on the whole history of the confessional and how that has unfolded through the years. The intention is also to have a fairly major section on what training should therefore flow from it.

28. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd James Newcome) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Thank you, Bishop James. It is indeed unfortunate that no further correspondence has taken place with Her Majesty's Government following the completely inadequate response that pointed us to the very document we just endorsed. A call to ban fixed-odds betting terminals seems to have had far more attention and action by bishops and the NCIs.

Could I ask Bishop James, in the light of the answer deferring the matter to diocesan bishops, what action you have taken in your diocese to ensure that your clergy are aware of the dangers of conversion therapy, particularly in the light of a highly controversial visit by Franklin Grahame which will be happening nearby very shortly?

The Chair: I am afraid, Ms Ozanne, you cannot ask the Bishop what he is doing in his own diocese. These are questions for the House of Bishops.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Apologies.

29. *Revd Peter Kay (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Forster) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

30. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the House of Bishops: 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?”

Mrs Anne Foreman: Thank you very much, Bishop, for what feels like a very encouraging reply, particularly in respect of the forthcoming guidance that the Pastoral Advisory Group is going to make to enable candidates to answer the ordination question that you quote.

May I make a suggestion, please? Your answer on the expectation of dioceses suggests that there is a consistency whereas, as a BAP adviser, I know full well that there is a very wide range of responses. In the light of the work that is going to be done by the Pastoral Advisory Group, could consideration be given to either collecting information about current practice or perhaps piloting with a few dioceses abolishing asking about *Issues In Human Sexuality* and instead putting a question that is about the ordination question, which resonates so well with the 21st century understanding of being human and being sexual; the question about how their lives are lived.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I am sure that will be taken up by that group and I would be very interested to follow that up. I just want to remind us of one paragraph or sentence that is in *Issues in Human Sexuality*, which for me puts this in a better perspective. They write in that document: “We do not think it right to interrogate individuals on their sexual lives unless there are strong reasons for doing so. Ordinarily, it shall be left to candidates’ own consciences to act responsibly in this manner”, so we would want to look at the responses that you are suggesting in the light of that.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I was not clear from the Bishop’s written answer: will candidates be asked if they are willing to live within the guidelines in *Issues in Human Sexuality* until that document is superseded by some new Teaching Document, or are we on a slippery slope away from it?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: They will be asked that question unless the Advisory Group comes back with a different approach. We will just have to wait and see on that.

Mr Clive Scowen: That will be reported to Synod, will it?

The Chair: You have asked your question, Mr Scowen. Thank you very much.

31. *Revd Sally Hitchiner (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Sally Hitchiner: Thank you for the very helpful and enlightening response. My supplementary question is: are there plans to include people who experience gender dysphoria on the Pastoral Care Group for LGBT people as well as people who experience same-sex attraction?

The Bishop of Newcastle: We have had a real issue right from the beginning in recognising that whilst we want to have a huge range of experience represented on the group, we also want a group that is workable, and so we recognised that we cannot have as a member of the group people from every kind of experience. We are completely committed to a meaningful engagement with relevant stakeholders as part of our way of working. I warmly welcome people writing to me and sharing their experience so that our work can be enriched with those perspectives.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Thank you, Bishop Christine. It is good to hear that the group are open to Hearing LGBTI Christians' experiences. Can I ask, what safeguards are in place for those who are extremely reluctant to share what are often highly traumatic experiences of how they have been treated in their churches when they have come out when they know that there are various members on the group who subscribe to the Nashville Statement and the so-called affirmations which proposed the very practices that were the cause of their pain and suffering in the first place? Can they write in complete confidence to just you and will their identity, please, be concealed?

The Bishop of Newcastle: This is a really important question, Jayne. Yes, they can write to me and I would of course always respect confidence when asked to. We are also beyond that in the process of working out proper protocols - ethical protocols - to make sure that experience is anonymised so that we can gain from the experience without betraying the identity of people and increasing their vulnerability. We are very grateful for their courage in coming forward.

The Chair: I do have the power to allow an extra supplementary and I am giving that to the Prolocutor.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I must admit to some confusion and I would say it is a dysphoria because I am concerned - and I would like you to respond not just on behalf of you but on behalf of the Bishop of Coventry as well - that we are confusing matters of gender and matters of sexuality at the outset of this conversation. Unless you can pull those apart you are going to produce a very unsatisfactory document. Could you comment on that, please?

The Bishop of Newcastle: I cannot respond on behalf of the Bishop of Coventry; I can only respond as myself as Chair of the Pastoral Advisory Group. Yes, this is a very complicated issue and we are in the middle of looking with great rigour actually at our terms of reference to try to clarify this. It is important that we do have clarity. Thank you for the question.

32. *Revd Canon Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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' <https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017/1/MarriageAFTERdivorceFORM.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 (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As the Church of England does not 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.

Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby: Thank you for your answer, Bishop. Am I right in reading your answer to mean that clergy should, in pastoral situations of this kind, regard same-sex marriage and civil partnerships as ideally being things entered to be permanent, faithful and stable?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think you are making a leap in the argument that does not necessarily help us understand what we are doing here. The guidance that is there about how we deal with folk who are remarrying after a divorce was put in place on the basis of specific legislation that the Church of England agreed in order to cater for circumstances where people came wanting a church marriage after a divorce. That is there and it has an origin in those places.

Because the Government, in its wisdom, decided that it should legislate for same-sex marriage, it split the understanding of marriage between how the Church of England operates and how the Government operates. My answer gives you how it is possible for people to engage pastorally with some people who have been involved in a same-sex partnership which has been solemnised by the state.

In the end, this is about pastoral nous. When you ask clergy to investigate the circumstances of people who are being married, you need to give them guidance. There is a form to do so. Asking them to use that form in the circumstances in which you outline is, it seems to me, a very sensible way of helping them assess pastorally, if they cannot do it for themselves, what the circumstances of the couple presenting themselves might be.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Since the Church teaches that marriage is the union of one man with one woman, what relevance does a previous same-sex relationship have, particularly with regard to the duty of clergy to marry parishioners who come seeking marriage in accordance with the rites of the Church of England?

The Bishop of Willesden: It has relevance insofar as it gives you a framework where two people have made a commitment which is recognised by the state and where one has then to identify what are the pastoral circumstances that you are addressing. In the end, the reality for most bishops is that we say to our clergy, "You have perfect freedom to solemnise matrimony as being two persons. You don't actually in fact need the permission of the bishop because you can ignore what the circumstances are of any previous marriage or relationship and marry people by banns.

Most of our clergy are sensible and recognise that we have guidance on the matter of the remarriage of divorcees and they go there. What I am saying to you is I would hope that clergy would take pastoral advice. In the end, this is not about us legislating for people; it is relying on the fact that we share the cure of souls with our parish priests and they get on with it, and if they need to ask questions of their bishops they do and we give advice in individual circumstances.

The Chair: Numbers 33 and 34 being answered together.

33. *Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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?

34. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mrs Carolyn Graham: I understood the Bishops had shown a commitment to listen and to talk with rather than about LGBTI people. If that is the case, can I ask whether any transgender Christians were involved in the decision that the House of Bishops Delegation Committee made on this important matter to see how they responded to the new recommendations and whether these recommendations met their needs?

The Bishop of Willesden: Let me backtrack, I think, a bit on the process because there seems an awful lot of misunderstanding both on the blogs and elsewhere about what took place.

The House of Bishops has had a difficulty in how it processes its business in the past. We undertook a governance review to say, "How can it be that we can discuss items and issues that are presented to us in a more full way?" because much of what was going on in the House of Bishops was deemed business that just went straight through. We set up a Delegation Committee. The Delegation Committee, therefore, is not an abrogation of responsibility; it is actually a place where we can chew over major issues under the heading of some of the things that are set out in this paragraph and do it better. The Delegation Committee is not a kind of, "Oh, we're ignoring the fact that it needs to be discussed" approach, it is a way of us processing things better; it is about better governance, not worse.

I slightly regret that people keep calling us on, "Did we pray enough about it?" That is not a particularly mature kind of debate between Christians. All our business is conducted in prayer, we have explicit prayer together when we have our meetings and it is not really for people to say, "Oh, did you pray enough in order to get to the answer that you received and got to?"

The answer to the question you are raising is no, we did not. What we did was we dealt with the request to the House of Bishops. We said that there is an

understanding, and the Bishop of Exeter will be answering in more detail about the theological understanding here, but where we got to is, if people are being initiated into Christ there is one sacrament by which that happens; it is baptism, and that is standard for the Church.

There are people who come to us wanting to be treated in a pastoral way because they have had experiences which made them want to reaffirm their baptismal promises. It is not just about the particular class of folk who are being addressed here; it is about, for instance, people who have changed their faith and then come back to the Christian faith. In all kinds of circumstances, bishops and others who are agents of initiation will say, "Yes, you can renew your vows and we'll give you proper pastoral provision to do that", but again we leave it to local initiative as to how that takes place. No, we did not at this stage consult people.

The Chair: I think you need to wind up; you have been two and a half minutes in answering.

The Bishop of Willesden: I am sorry, but it needs a full explanation, Chair, because it has been so misrepresented out there in social media. So we did not. The Bishop of Exeter will answer you more fully on how we are going to engage in the process of giving pastoral guidance hereon in.

The Chair: I hope he will answer with brevity as well.

Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells): My supplementary was substantially the same as Mrs Graham's, and, in the interests of time, I am not going to read it again, just to note the disappointment voiced by many at both the content and process.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): I am from Norwich, the diocese with episcopal longevity. When the House was considering options, did it consider how long it would take to put bespoke commended liturgies through the synodical process as opposed to encouraging people to use what is already there, and was that a factor in making the decision the House made?

The Bishop of Willesden: No, it was based on the theological principle that initiation into Christ is through baptism.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & St Ipswich): Thank you, Bishop, for your explanation of the process of the Delegation Committee. I think it is quite helpful for the Synod to have that information. The *Church Times* reported that ---

The Chair: We need a question not a *Church Times* report, Mr Lamming. This is the fourth supplementary on this item.

Mr David Lamming: I will shorten it by saying in the interests of transparency, can those decisions, which are based on Delegation Committee Reports, be identified as such and properly reported in the Summary Decisions?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think it is a no-brainer and we ought to do it.

The Chair: That moves us on to questions 35 and 36, to be answered by the

Bishop of Exeter.

35. *Mr James Cary (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What was the theological basis for the House of Bishops' advice on using the Affirmation of Baptism service for acknowledging a gender transition?

36. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 recognised 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.

Mr James Cary: Thank you for the answer provided. How will the House of Bishops ensure that the content of the teaching document that is forthcoming on human sexuality will not be prejudiced by the House of Bishops' statement in GS 1178 that gender transition marked by an affirmation of baptismal faith is "a moment of personal renewal"?

The Bishop of Exeter: Thank you for your question. Picking up on that, and what Bishop Pete was saying, I thought it might be helpful again to talk a bit more about the process and about how we are going forward from here. Following the General Synod debate, one thing I would say is there is absolutely no rowing back on that, because I think we all felt that is was absolutely imperative that as a Church we are welcoming and affirming to transgendered people. I felt that the Archbishop of York's very powerful speech resonated with so many of us there. Going forward, whatever people have thought about the process hitherto, I would say that as Bishops individually we have been listening and engaging with trans people and listening to what they are saying and listening to clergy. They are trying to respond to trans people and the things that are coming towards us. There is a whole variety of expectations and needs. It became quite clear that it is not a case of one-size-fits-all. Therefore, one thing that came out is in the October Liturgical Commission, of which I am Chair, we had a survey of what material we had within the volume of *Common Worship*, all those authorized and commended liturgies that might be available, and made those available to the Delegation Committee. Out of that came a clear sense, as Bishop Pete was saying, that a celebration of an affirmation of baptismal faith was a good way forward, and that should be at the core, and constellated around that what is appropriate in a particular case, for the particular person in a particular situation.

In terms of the guidance, as the Secretary General said in the memo he issued, as we are going forward from this, the next step in that process will be myself and the Bishop of Hereford, who is the Vice-Chair of the Commission, meeting with some transgendered clergy to discuss with them what the shape of that will be, because we really want to get this right. It is really important that it be pastoral, affirming and welcoming. What Bishop Richard and I feel very much is that we need to be talking with and not talking about, so we need to talk together, and out of that refinement later this year we will be able to produce a document giving some guidance on how this particular liturgical rite can be used.

Mrs Caroline Herbert: Further to what you are saying about the guidance, will it make clear that the affirmation of baptism service is about marking spiritual renewal and it is a person's recommitment to bring their life under the Lordship of Christ in response to their faith, or perhaps a renewed commitment of faith, as the Bishop of Willesden said, and it is that faith in Christ's saving work on the Cross through which we have forgiveness of sins? Will that be there?

The Bishop of Exeter: Indeed, yes, thank you.

The Chair: I am very grateful to members of Synod who have been quite succinct in asking questions. Some of my colleagues here at the front have not been quite so succinct in answering - I do not mean you particularly, Bishop - so if we could try to be brief in the answers as well as in the asking of the supplementaries, I am sure Synod will be grateful.

37. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams: How will the Reaffirmation of Baptismal Faith to mark a claimed change of gender affect the name recorded in the baptismal register if a person has changed their name, as they usually do?

The Bishop of Exeter: What is in the baptismal register is a legal record and cannot be altered.

38. *Revd Julian Hollywell (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

39. *Dr Angus Goudie (Durham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): This is slightly back to procedure. I would like to clarify a point made earlier by the Archbishop of York that the House considered the subject of the Blackburn motion when it was first tabled in 2015. Could you clarify whether it is common practice to consider and reach a conclusion of the whole House before a motion is brought to Synod which asks for a cause, as it were?

The Bishop of Exeter: Could you ask that again?

The Chair: I am struggling to see how this supplementary is relevant to the particular question.

Dr Angus Goudie: Thank you, Bishop, for your answer anticipating further encouragement and guidance and also your comments earlier about the great variety of situations that an incumbent might find themselves in. In the interim, in view of the newness of this area for many incumbents, who will be faced with needs outside their experience on how to and how far they may devise a service around a welcome in a new name and gender, will the House read and commend some of the excellent examples of prayers used already, for example those mentioned in speeches back in July or those used in the St Bride's Church Open Table in Liverpool?

The Bishop of Exeter: Thank you for that offer. Certainly, what I can say is that the Liturgical Commission, specifically, as I have been saying, we are taking this forward, and we would like to have a look at what is already available.

The Chair: Point of Order, Prolocutor.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): As we move on to questions about safeguarding and the issues that have created a bit of febrile debate, before we begin might we remember in silence both survivors and those who administer the Church's work in safeguarding before we move on to these potential conflictual questions?

The Chair: I am very happy to do that. We will have a short period of silence to reflect.

40. *Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 judgment 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 (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

The Chair: Question 41. Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply.

41. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the role of General Synod with regard to safeguarding, particularly in terms of policy, oversight and review?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

42. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is the role of bishops with regard to safeguarding and to whom are they accountable on safeguarding matters?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): In the answer the Bishop has given, he recognised the duty of the House that survivors are treated fairly. I wonder if he could comment whether the absence of any treatment of respondents is an omission from the answer or an omission in the duties laid down to the House?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: It is very clearly an omission from the answer. Thank you for clarifying that. Simon, thank you for calling us to pause and pray before we began this part of our questions.

43. *Revd Christopher Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Christopher Robinson: Given that registered sex offenders sometimes seek to find positions of trust from which to form relationships with children and vulnerable adults, should the House of Bishops be so relaxed about the inability to carry out enhanced DBS checks on lay people who robe and are authorised to lead worship in our churches Sunday by Sunday?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I trust that the word “relaxed” is not one that we want to use in terms of being vigilant. It is very clear from the guidance that has been issued by the House of Bishops, and it has been widely accepted, is being taken forward and certainly being implemented, that that is far from the reality in our parishes and dioceses. If there are particular questions about that, and you have raised one or two already, I will gladly receive them and I would refer some of them to the National Safeguarding Team for their further guidance or consideration.

The Chair: For Question 44. I refer you to the Tenth Notice Paper.

44. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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/>.

45. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): In the light of the fact that we now know that it takes on average eight years for a woman to come forward who has experienced some form of sexual harassment - and I am not talking about sexual abuse - and therefore they are ruled out of time and have to apply to the President of Tribunals, what guidelines can the Church offer, please, for how the abuser and victim are supposed to interact whilst those decisions are being made, because it strikes me at the moment we have no guidelines whatsoever, and that is stopping women from coming forward?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I would like to take that forward and speak to you about that as well. I would need to look very carefully at our guidance. If the guidance needs to be strengthened in those areas or is absent and needs to be written, we will undertake that with as much speed as we can. It is an important area.

46. *Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 "victim/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".

Mr Carl Fender: In the Carlile Report, at the very end there was a very clear statement by Lord Carlile that he deprecated the continued use of the titles "victim" and "survivor", and indeed he drew on a parallel Report by a High Court judge into Operation Midland, where he also deprecated the use of those titles. Can I ask what particular consideration was given to that part of the Report?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: This is a question that has come up a number of

times before, and indeed the House of Bishops has looked at this terminology very carefully and it is something we have debated ourselves. I am clear the Church seeks to follow best practice in this area and when we look at practice within the NHS, the police and the education sector and within most local authorities, we have aligned ourselves with the best practice in those statutory authorities. It is a question that we continue to review. It is a question that has not been finally resolved, but that is the situation at the moment.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I wish to come back to the question of the use of language. The paragraph of the Carlile Report that Mr Fender has just referred to is at the end of 292 and he says, "... subject to the replacement throughout the text of the practice guidance of "victim/survivor" with "complainant" consistent with the recommendation described above of Sir Richard Henriques" - that is the Operation Midland Report - "the document is sound for cases against living persons". I take it that the House of Bishops would not want to commend, or to be seen to be commending, a document regarded by Lord Carlile as "unsound" in this respect. Since the use of language ---

The Chair: We need a question fairly quickly.

Mr David Lamming: Since the use of language can indicate an unconscious bias, would the House of Bishops please reconsider in particular that recommendation of Lord Carlile at the end of his Report?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I am very clear and I can reassure Synod on this that all of those recommendations are being considered. To give Synod an indication of the seriousness and the speed with which it is being considered, it is my understanding that an initial report will be going to the National Safeguarding Steering Group in April, with the expectation that some of that new thinking in the light of the review of Lord Carlile will be coming to the House of Bishops in May. Those recommendations are being considered, will be considered and will be brought to the House for further deliberation.

47. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 3,300 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 answer to Question 47 was reissued in a letter from the Clerk to Mrs Kat Alldread on the 26 February 2018 to read:

The Bishop of Bath & Wells to reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 relates to 2016 activity. Reporting methods used by the dioceses may vary so the numbers given are an approximate figure.

In 2016 dioceses reported that they were dealing with around 2600 safeguarding concerns or allegations. Concerns are different from allegations of actual abuse and may cover less serious matters but may include raising issues of neglect or potential vulnerability of children or adults. 53% of concerns or allegations relate to children, and 47% to adults. Around 27% of concerns or allegations raised relate to a church officer.

The National Safeguarding Team has commissioned further work to analyse data for safeguarding concerns or allegations. The results of this analysis will be reported to the National Safeguarding Steering Group in due course.]

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): Bishop Peter, thank you for this answer and on behalf of Synod thank you for the leadership you have shown in this important area. You have our prayers, as do all those impacted by abuse. This answer refers to a specific number of safeguarding concerns and allegations. Could you clarify for Synod that answer by indicating the number of clergy against whom there are these allegations?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: There has been some reporting in the *Daily Mail* and other press today which has perhaps been unhelpful. I only had 150 words and I could have answered more fully. I will address that on Saturday with some more statistics when we have the safeguarding presentation. To answer your question specifically, out of those 3,300 concerns and allegations that have been brought forward, that concerns all forms of abuse and in all contexts, and only 18% of those relate either to clergy or to church officers. Some 82% do not refer directly to clergy or church officers. Although those figures are being produced in the press as evidence that the Church has a significant issue around safeguarding, in many ways it points to another story: that as a Church we are embedded into all our communities. This is about us welcoming people who are perhaps at risk in their communities, or may be a risk to other people, and it is evidence I think that as a Church we are serving our communities bearing in mind that most abuse happens within families, within the home and, indeed, within the community. Those numbers do look alarming, but when we break them down and look at who they relate to and how, there is a more encouraging picture of the work of the Church at the parish level to keep our communities safe.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Is there any way of drawing out of these figures the number that refer to historic cases and the number that refer to current concerns and allegations?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: The word "historic" is not one we would want to use at the moment, but recognising there are cases that are not current in respect of investigation, some work could be done on this. If we can do that by Saturday, I

will endeavour to answer that question in my presentation.

48. *Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr David Ison)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

49. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Miss Prudence Dailey: When did the further information referred to in those statements first come to light and when did the National Safeguarding Team first become aware of it?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: From memory, I cannot tell you the exact date, but I can furnish you with that information afterwards. My understanding is clear that that further information came forward as a result of the publication of the Carlile Report.

50. *Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Julie Conalty: My question was not simply asking for general reassurances about the implementation of the Carlile recommendations, it was specific about what measures were being taken. Those of us with professional qualifications and experience in child protection, risk assessment or working with sex offenders have for decades watched with some degree of despair at what appears at times to be quite an amateurish approach by the Church. Can Synod be reassured that we have professionals in place with the appropriate specialist expertise and also policies and procedures that ensure they will be consulted and their advice heeded?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: Lord Carlile was very clear that the Church acted in good faith, although he made some very clear criticisms of the processes that were followed at that time, recognising at that time the establishment of Core Groups and the establishment of the National Safeguarding Team were very much at their beginning. There has been a reconvened Core Group to look at this and, in specific answer to your question, we are seeking to follow Lord Carlile's recommendations and have been very mindful of them. For example, there was an independent legal adviser and someone to represent the family. Those shortcomings and failings that Lord Carlile has brought to our attention are being addressed.

51. *Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mr Carl Fender. Thank you once again for your answer, Bishop Peter. In light of your view that those who are called to sit on Core Groups have the skills and experience, can I then ask if there is any guidance or training given to those who sit on Core Groups who have to perform the very specific function of that fact-finding role of establishing whether or not an allegation is cogent or not, because that is a very particular skill of sitting on a Core Group? Is there any selection process or any skills search amongst those who comprise such a group to see whether or not they have those very particular skills?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: That is a very appropriate question. Looking back, and that is where we need to start, it is quite clear from what Lord Carlile has said that there was confusion about process and a lack of clarity around process. Guidance has now been put in place for that. More guidance is coming forward to do with posthumous allegations, to deal with those who perhaps have already died. In that guidance, those issues have been addressed. I will look at it again in light of your question and I will come back to you if I am not satisfied with the guidance that we have so far written. There is more guidance to come, I can assure you of that.

52. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: (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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: (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.

53. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Mr Philip French: Thank you for the reply, which is both informative and creative. For absolute clarity, can we take it that the Report as finally published is the Report as finally approved by Lord Carlile and that there were no significant changes except in respect of factual accuracy or to avoid the risk of identification?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: Yes.

Mr Philip French: Thank you very much.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: And it was an independent Report. It was Lord Carlile’s decision as to what went in and what did not, and the approach that was taken was the approach that was both set and agreed with Lord Carlile.

55. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

Revd Paul Benfield: Was the external lawyer there to give advice on due process and, if not, who was to give advice on such process?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I am afraid, Paul, I do not fully know the answer to that. I think I know the answer, but because these are formal proceedings I need

to be absolutely clear. It is perhaps worth stating, so Synod knows, I do not get involved in casework, I do not have a professional expertise in safeguarding, and in these matters I have to be careful that I do not over-intrude in due process. Having said that, I recognise the importance of your question, and it is because it is an important question I will make sure you get a proper answer.

56. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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.

57. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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: Bishop, are you able to at least say whether or not the further information referred to in the media statement issued last week is the information that is referred to in paragraph 5 of the Carlile Report, first published in a free newspaper in June 2016?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I probably should not say more at this stage

because of the fresh information that has come forward and it is not quite clear what that will mean. I would want to say that the question you ask is a serious one. When we are talking about matters of safeguarding, this is an absolutely critical matter, and the question that you ask in Question 57 gets to the very heart of what safeguarding is about, which is about the well-being of all in society, the mission of the Church, and, in particular, our concern, our regard and our care for victims and survivors of abuse. With regard to your particular question, I think it is probably inappropriate for me to say any more than you have in my written answer.

58. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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: Can you confirm, as would appear to be the case from the National Safeguarding Team’s media statement last week, that the independent investigation now being commissioned through the Core Group will be considering only the new information and will not be revisiting the allegations made by “Carol”? Who is being commissioned to carry out the investigation? What are its terms of reference? What, if any, timescale has been set for it to be concluded and a report submitted to the NST? In particular, is someone being assigned to the investigation to represent the interests of the late Bishop Bell and his surviving relatives, as recommended in paragraph 21 of the Carlile review?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I always love a question that has five questions buried in it. With regard to the last of those, I will say yes. With regard to the thrust of your major questions, I have not yet seen the terms of reference for that group and therefore it would be inappropriate for me to hazard a guess. Your questions have been noted and I will make sure that you get a reply.

59. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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: You say that “the victim must be believed” has never been the case. Lord Carlile clearly identified that it had currency in the matter which he was examining, and I could talk about other occasions when I have heard the same.

The Chair: You could perhaps ask a question, which would be even better.

Mr Martin Sewell: You are ahead of me. Be that as it may, are we now unequivocally agreed that this is a misleading and unfair doctrine that has no place in the proper quasi legal processes of the Church? I press the point simply because it keeps reappearing in the courts every few years, so I need you to assure me that its credibility in the Church is dead, buried, with a stake through its heart.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: I would like to draw your attention to the first sentence in my reply to your Question 59 where that makes that point very clear indeed.

60. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: 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 judgment 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.

Mr Martin Sewell: Clearly we have had transparency after the event thanks to Lord Carlile. Beforehand, however, the Church strenuously resisted transparency, giving no information about either the allegations or the Core Group processes and, confusingly, asserted that the law precluded it. After Carlile, shall we see better transparency of process from start to finish in respect of the new Bell allegation than we did with the first? I sense, and am troubled, that we are heading down a similar path ---

The Chair: You are starting to make a statement. We have heard the question and the Bishop will reply.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: The answer is yes, we will take forward seriously Lord Carlile's recommendations, and that means that will improve the way we respond to, assess and manage allegations.

The Chair: The Bishop of Bath & Wells can now sit down for a few minutes. He is probably grateful for that.

Bishop of Bath & Wells: Applause would be inappropriate. Can I draw Synod's attention to this booklet that the Bishop at Lambeth has already drawn your attention to? There is one of these in each of your pigeon holes. It would be very helpful if Synod could collect that as you leave Synod today. Please read it and pray about the matters that are raised by those who have been victims of abuse. I am sure you are already aware that there is an opportunity for us, if we choose to, to stand with them in silence, in prayer and in reflection on Saturday.

The Chair: It is a very moving and quite humbling book to read. Question number 61. Mr William Nye to reply.

Secretary General

61. *Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General: 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 replied as Secretary General: 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.

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry: Does the Secretary General agree that two and a half years since the decision of General Synod just to hold a meeting of members is painfully slow? Does the Secretary General agree that what is needed is a policy group for Church buildings?

Mr William Nye: I do agree that it has taken considerable time to get the member level bodies together, and I regret that. The joint group referred to in my answer is now meeting and I am confident that it will make good progress, chaired as it is by the Chairman of the Church Buildings Council.

62. *Mr William Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Secretary General: 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 replied as Secretary General: 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.

Revd Sarah Schofield (Lichfield): When looking at corporate travel possibilities, could you also consider working with the dioceses to find a way to assist Synod members, and possibly future Synod members who are on low incomes who might not have the available funds to pay out for travel and accommodation and wait for reimbursement. When I did my tax return, I realised that my husband had had to sub me three grand over the course of the previous tax year for Synod, Archbishops' Council and associated things. I am lucky he has a job.

William Nye: Let us by all means look at that and if you have particular things you want to raise with me or Jacqui we would be very interested to hear about your ideas.

National Society Council

63. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: 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 (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: 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 wellbeing of their students.

64. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: 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 (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: 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.

65. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: 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 (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: 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.

Miss Prudence Dailey: Can the National Society Council envisage any circumstances whatsoever under which it might seek to defend freedom of conscience where this conflicted with the policies of a particular school?

The Bishop of Ely: I am reluctant to answer hypothetical questions that do not arise in particular cases other than that I would say our priority always in *Valuing God's Children*, and the purpose behind it, is the protection of children and their safety in school. Of course, we support all opportunities for the Christian faith to be represented in our deeply Christian schools, but our priority in this case is always to protect the children against any kind of bullying, and that includes transphobic, biphobic and homophobic bullying.

The Chair: Sir Tony Baldry has morphed into the answerer of questions as he is going to answer Question 66 and some following ones.

Church Buildings Council

66. *Revd Canon Bob Cooper (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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.

67. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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 £42 million 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 administering the scheme to ensure that we have evidence of its benefits.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford: Would Sir Tony be pleased if the whole of Synod could join with me in thanking the Second Estates Commissioner for a

wonderful piece of work by saying, "Hallelujah!" because it is great that it has been done? Would he agree with me that we still need to maintain the dialogue so this scheme can continue beyond 2020?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry: Of course, 2020 is just the Government spending round. That is why it ends at 2020. I think we would all want to see the scheme continue beyond 2020. Of course, when we leave the European Union, it will be for Parliament to set up new VAT rules, and so we will probably have to engage with Government on that area in some detail.

68. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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 consideration of the Lists so that they serve the whole Church.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell: Thank you again for your full answer. Can you confirm that members of this body will be included in the envisaged consultation later in this year? By what means the mechanisms for changing the rules will be when you come back to Synod in July of next year?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry: Can I just say that in the Faculty Rules we want to be as light touch and as flexible as possible. If anyone thinks that any of the Faculty Rules is not working effectively, please submit your ideas to Church House. In terms of consultation, we will consult widely through DACs and through dioceses and diocesan synods. Essentially, we are open for ideas. We want this to be as light touch and as effective as possible.

69. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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 Chair: Questions 70 and 71 are being taken together.

70. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

71. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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.

72. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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.

Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham): Thank you for your answer and the comment. It is clear that more resources at national level would help and you are working towards achieving them. Could you remind Synod what resources are currently available through the dedicated officer and what you are hoping for?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry: I will have to write to the member on the detail. I will make sure they are put on the ChurchCare website.

73. *Mr John Freeman (Chester)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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?

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: 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.

Mr John Freeman: Thank you, Tony, for your reply and also our discussion in the tearoom. I would like you to carry back to the CBC to consider in its deliberations the value of a Georgian pew when it is holding up the mission.

Sir Tony Baldry: Let us be clear about this: our parish churches exist to fulfil the mission of the Church. What is essential is that the whole process of faculty and so on supports the mission of the Church. Our churches may have some important heritage, but they are not museums, so we have to make sure that our chancellors and others enable us to fulfil the Church's mission. We will all watch with considerable interest the decision of the Dean of the Arches in the Bath

Abbey case. I am not in the business, and I want to make it quite clear the Church Buildings Council is not in the business of preserving church pews just for the sake of preserving church pews.

The Chair: Question 74. Bishop Donald to reply.

Council for Christian Unity

74. *Mrs Karen Galloway (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: 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 Bishops of which have retained or indicated their interest in re-establishing links with Anglican Dioceses?

The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister) replied as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity: 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.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I ask this question on behalf of Karen Galloway who unfortunately is ill and not able to be here as she had wished. In the light of the establishment of the Orthodox Round Table, is it the intention that representatives from the long-standing Archbishops' Consultative Councils for the Romanian Orthodox and Russian Orthodox Churches will still be part of this new initiative?

The Bishop of Peterborough: I may be misunderstanding your question, but the Round Table is intended to welcome in any groups who are involved and interested. It is a forum where people can join in rather than having a formal membership. That is important. If you have a more detailed question that I did not understand, please write to me and I will reply.

The Chair: The next one is possibly our last question number.

Finance Committee

75. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: 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 replied as Chair of the Finance Committee: 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.

Revd Dr Patrick Richmond: Thank you so much for answering such a long and boring question. It seems that there is an expectation of more money being required. If retirements are going to increase because of the age profile of our clergy, is there any expectation that money is going to be saved and that dioceses are not going to need so much of an injection of money, or is that mistaken?

Canon Dr John Spence: I can assure you I never find your questions boring. I think what we are discovering - and I am very grateful that we now have received diocesan replies from over 90% of all dioceses - is some emerging trends around the ageing profile of the bishops and changing retirement ages. There are different stages to which dioceses have been able to complete detailed people planning. We are into an intense period of consultation. I met with some Diocesan Secretaries earlier today. If there is going to be any case for seeking additional funds from beyond those resources available to the Archbishops' Council, it will be essential for us to demonstrate that we have done everything we can to save money along the way and to pool all our resources so that the Church has a whole-Church response in order that we can create, to use the words that the Archbishop employed earlier today, a Church for all the people of England. Talking about boring, can I apologise to those members of Synod who have complained that my tie today is unusually dull. Mrs Spence is in charge of all matters sartorial and I will do better tomorrow.

The Chair: Thank you, Canon Spence. That brings us to the end of question time. We have done very well to get through 75 questions in 90 minutes. Thank you all for your forbearance in being as succinct as possible.

Questions not reached during Synod

Ministry Council

76. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: 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 (Rt Revd Martin Seely) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The information requested is available on the Synod members' noticeboard.

77. *Revd Peter Kay (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Clergy deployment can be affected by such factors as the recruitment of ordinands, 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 (Rt Revd Martin Seely) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: 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

78. *Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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 (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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.

79. *Mr Michael Stallybrass (York)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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 (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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.

80. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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 (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: 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

81. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

82. *Canon Linda Ali (York)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What is the Church of England doing, as an institution with a wide reach (churches, schools, et cetera), to curb the use of plastic within its organisation, with a view to bringing a complete end to its use?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 an institutional level, but it is clear that the greatest impact for goodwill 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.

83. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

84. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 50 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 (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

85. *Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* to ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 Advisers 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 advisers 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 (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith) replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

86. *Dr Samuel Robinson (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What proposals are there for the Church of England to acknowledge the 3,000 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 (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith) replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

87. *Revd Christopher Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith) replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

88. *Dr Samuel Robinson (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith) replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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.

89. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (Rt Revd Dr Alan Smith) replied as Vice-Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: (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/ProposalsforchangestoGamingMachinesandSocialResponsibilityMeasures.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.

90. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: 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 (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied as Chair of the Environment Working Group: 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

91. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: 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 replied as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations

Commission: 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.

92. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: How does the Crown Nominations Commission ensure the appointment of bishops who will guard and expound the deposit of faith?

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

93. *Miss Deborah Buggs (London)* to ask the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: 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 replied as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: 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/.

The Chair: We move on to a time of worship - we have earned that - after which we will be dismissed by the Archbishop.

Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry (Leeds) led the Synod in an act of worship.

The Archbishop of Canterbury dismissed the Synod with the blessing at 5.30 pm

**Full Synod: Second Day
Friday 9 February 2018
HOLY COMMUNION**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Stockport (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 10.32 am

ITEM 6

ADDRESS BY INVITED SPEAKER FROM A MEMBER CHURCH OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The Chair. Synod, good morning. As we come to our business today, we thank the Community of St Anselm for providing, again, the Continuous Praying Presence throughout the day. As you know, later this morning we will be debating our Companion Links and the Anglican Communion, so I am particularly grateful that we have this opportunity and that our Communion guests have accepted the invitation to address us this morning, so that we hear their voices from across the Communion. It is with great pleasure that I hand over to Archbishop Thabo, who will speak and then introduce his colleagues.

The Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa (Most Revd Dr Thabo Makgoba): Thank you very much, Lady Bishop. Again, thank you for pronouncing my name properly. Good morning. In our Province we say, “The Lord be with you”.

(All of Synod): And also with you.

The Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa (Most Revd Dr Thabo Makgoba): And we also say, “God is good”.

(All of Synod): All the time.

The Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa (Most Revd Dr Thabo Makgoba): All the time.

(All of Synod): God is good.

The Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa (Most Revd Dr Thabo Makgoba): That is good. Thank you so much, Archbishop Justin, for inviting us. My colleagues, Bishop Winston and Bishop Humphrey, said I do not need to take the three minutes that I am allocated to introduce them because you so warmly introduced us yesterday that we feel like we are part and parcel of these synodical proceedings.

We were also introduced by the Lord Mayor. They said, because the MC was full of energy yesterday, I would not match the MC in welcoming them. They said, I must not say, “Rise, here comes the Lord Bishop Winston”. Those who were at the dinner will know the proceedings yesterday, but thank you for exposing us to that part of your culture.

Just to respect the five minutes that I have been given on my own behalf, and on

behalf of my brother Bishops and Archbishops from the Communion, soon I hope we will be able to add more sister Archbishops to our ranks but, from all of us, thank you for inviting us to be here. In the language of equality, interdependence and mutual responsibility highlighted in the documentation for your Synod, we regard you nowadays as our sister Church. Of course, it remains true that, historically speaking, you and others among the Anglican Churches of these isles are our mother Churches, so it is a special privilege to be here in England.

Your Grace, thank you for your heart for the Anglican Communion. We really appreciate it. You have energy. That story that you told in your sermon is very apt for us because we feel like you care. You want us to journey together. You do not do things for us. You do not dress us up, we do not dress you up, but you create a space for us to care for each other. We are privileged to have you as our Archbishop in the Communion at the moment.

Archbishop Sentamu, thank you also for your practical solidarity with us when Robert Mugabe was doing his things and you took off your dog collar. It is good to see you properly clad. Being from Cape Town, I am also grateful to be here for another reason. You may have seen that, as a result of changing weather patterns and a three-year drought, there is a real danger of the city running out of water soon and, so, it is a real luxury to take a daily shower. I am probably cleaner today than I was last week. From 1 Peter 4, "Above all, maintain constant love for one another, for love covers a multitude of sins; be hospitable to one another without complaining."

In a new volume of essays on the Lambeth Conference published in preparation for 2020, Cathy Ross of Ripon College said that Lambeth, at its best, has modelled a number of practices. It has, she says, modelled listening both to the world and to Scriptures. It has modelled consultation and it has modelled taking and receiving counsel. To that list, she adds that Lambeth, at its best, has also modelled hospitality and fostering of deeper relationships. In one of the reflections published in the official report from Lambeth 2008, the point is made that hospitality is a key principle for dialogue.

One of the Bishops at the 2008 Conference is quoted as saying that, "The business of dialogue can break down but hospitality will not." The reflection goes on to add, "We need to learn the Benedictine principle of hospitality which is about relationships, making space in our hearts for one another". The point appears in a section on interfaith dialogue, but it is just as relevant to the dialogue that we Anglicans must remain committed to pursuing if the Communion is to overcome the difficulties we face, in particular our differences or disagreements over new understandings about human sexuality.

Many of you will know that in Southern Africa, we call the dialogue that the Communion needs by the Nguni word, *indaba*. *Indaba* means, to borrow another phrase from the 2008 Lambeth Report, "Conversing with gentleness, honesty and integrity". It means patiently consulting with one another and talking the issues through until we find consensus. If we are to find one another and to develop a common mind on the most important matters that divide us, then hospitality will be a key ingredient in getting us there. Of course, hospitality is best represented in the Communion by what you are discussing in Synod today; the Companion Links that you form with other dioceses across the world and the hospitality initiative in

which you will invite bishops from abroad to visit your dioceses in the run-up to Lambeth.

Let me finish by commending, as strongly as I can, both the Companion Links and the hospitality initiative. At a personal level, the visits to your dioceses make attendance at Lambeth more pleasurable. They give us a chance to acclimatise, not least to your weather. They help us to break down the stereotypes we have of one another. If you have visited a British or Irish diocese ahead of Lambeth, you know at least one local bishop when you arrive. Those visits make the Conference to cohere.

In my experience, and the experience of my brother and sister bishops in Southern Africa, the hospitality you offer is not only biblical; it is a practical expression of the experience of being in Communion and, perhaps more importantly, it strengthens mutuality in mission. We look forward eagerly to 2020. Please do not regard us as some nuisance down in the Global South or CAPA. We belong with each other. You are the Church of England because you belong to the Communion. We are the Church in Southern Africa because we belong with you. We are tied to each other's umbilical cord. I thank you.

The Chair. We welcome Archbishop Humphrey, I think, next.

The Bishop of Peshawar and Moderator of the Church of Pakistan (Most Revd Humphrey Peters): Brothers and sisters, thank you for having us, and a very special thanks to Archbishop Justin and Archbishop Sentamu for their kind invitation. Greetings from the Church of Pakistan, which is responsible for episcopal and pastoral care up to Kabul, Afghanistan. Historically, we had an Anglican Church in Bala Hissar in Afghanistan as well, which was destroyed in the Second World War.

If anything happens in the West, it becomes a kind of reaction and the retaliation of the Muslim world we have to face. They burn our churches, blasphemous films and the caricatures about Prophet Muhammad and, then, afterwards, so many things, and we become the victims of that. They burn our churches. They do the suicide bombing. Recently, on 14 December, there was another suicide bomb in one of our churches in Quetta. All the difficulties are there, yet God in his wisdom is keeping the Body of Christ there.

I tell you that 75% to 80% of people in Pakistan, where they are mostly non-Christians, are internally bruised. They are internally injured. It reminds me of John 10:16 that they are also the "sheep" of Jesus and he wants to bring them into there. They are not from the same sheep pen but Jesus is worried about them as well. Maybe that is why God has kept his little Body of Christ in that difficult situation as well.

They need a healing touch. The world of Islam needs someone to wipe its tears. They need someone to hug them and raise them and only the Church has got this graciousness and the grace to embrace them. Trust me, quietly they come to us and say, "What is happening in this world?" Whenever there are suicide bombings, everything, again they come and talk to us.

This has given us a little positive thing that we have developed inroads with all

those people who are called Taliban. Al-Qaeda was made in Peshawar in 1980. Osama Bin Laden was just 20 minutes' drive from one of our churches from where he was caught. The famous Malala Yousafzai, just before she was shot, about eight months before, both Malala's father and Malala were with me. I was visiting my parish in Mingora. Both of them came and said, "Bishop, do pray for us; we are in a difficult situation". This is the context from where I come and from where there is a tiny Body of Christ, but people are looking. Just like Malala's father and Malala herself, "Bishop, pray for us".

The biggest mosque in the Peshawar area, the oldest mosque from the Mughal time, on Friday they have 15,000 to 17,000 people. Every day, they have about 3,000 to 5,000 people praying five times. Even they have become closer to us. Now, it is a little challenge for all of us. Do we want to see the tiny Body of Christ in the rest of the Islamic context having the fate of the Christian herd in Iraq, in Syria, in Lebanon, in Palestine, or do we want to strengthen the Body of Christ in that context, that the Body can beckon, we can offer our shoulder so that people can at least cry and pour out of their hearts? At least we should become a source of healing, a source of joy and source of blessing for them.

As John 17:20 says, God has commissioned us so that people who accept Christ through us they will be also blessed". As we have been commissioned for this particular commission and grace, I think we have to reconsider our callings. We have to rethink our callings. We should become a source of joy, a source of blessing and source of healing for the bruised world, the totally bruised world which is internally disturbed. That is why God in his wisdom is keeping tiny little churches, the tiny Body of Christ all over; but, together, we can overcome. May God bless you all and thank you for having us.

The Chair. Archbishop Winston.

The Bishop of Polynesia and Primate and Archbishop of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand (Most Revd Winston Halapua): Sisters and brothers in Christ, we have an amazing identity. I stand here to share with you the joy of the hospitality. The invitation came from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York. On my way, as I tried to figure out what to say, I suddenly realised what an amazing identity we have in Christ.

Friends, a few years ago we gathered together in French Polynesia to celebrate the 300 years when missionaries came from this body here. Without this body here they would not come. It was the blessing from this body they came. They brought Jesus with them; a new way of finding out our own identity. A few years ago, I was here, celebrating 300 years by the USPG, when you went to other parts of the world. What an amazing identity, the power of this body here; where you sit and stand up and do your sharing, there were others before you and there will be others come after us.

Friends, three years ago, in the year 2015, 196 nations gathered together in Paris. That was unique. Never once the number of nations came together. It was the issue of climate change that brought that new revolution. The outcome of three years ago was this notion here: we can only do it together. The message is we strive for 1.5° Celsius to reduce the warmth of the universe. What an amazing identity and amazing men and women who gather here.

I return to say that 1.5° Celsius was a result of your Synod here when you theologically debated what is mission and the strategy for mission. I stand here to confess I got the document and I took the document and reshaped our strategic plan in the Diocese of Polynesia. This is what struck us: mission is engaging on God's activity in the world. Some of you who sit here were in that Synod. It was the influence of that mission statement. It happened that the Church influenced leaders of the Pacific that we looked again at our identity and marvel at the gift of God.

The largest ocean is the Pacific Ocean. The Pacific Ocean cannot be a *moana* or ocean without the Atlantic, Indian, Arctic and Antarctic Oceans. For us in the Pacific Ocean, the notion of *moana* is interconnected. No ocean can function without the others. We can only be useful for God's activity when we can do it together. I return here to the General Synod of this nation to say, continue with your loyalty and faithfulness to God's mission. What you passed here for the work of God here, little you knew the grace of God overflowed, picked it up by the Pacific Ocean, took it to Paris and then three years ago, we came back with the message: together is the only way forward and no one walks alone.

Have you thought that "together" is the secular word for "Trinity?" The love of God is the community love of the three persons in one God. I was brought up in a kind of theology that believes theology is at odds with science. Friends, science taught us three years ago in Paris, almost 98% of scientists in the world agreed that humanity is the main cause of climate change, the warmth of where we are. Hence, I return today, because my four minutes is over, simply to say the reason why I returned. The missionaries came with Christ and it is our soul. Watch the emphasis. We in the Pacifica receive it and I return and say, three years ago, humanity was the cause of why we have a warm climate today.

I return with a new theology or what we call an alternative way of looking at theology. We cannot claim salvation as humans alone. The entire Creation of God is God's glory, hence I see your faces begin to raise questions and what a robust debate will follow after this. I return to say from Oceania an oceanic perspective. All what God has created, as it is said in the story, and, God behold, it was beautiful. I wonder what is your theology.

Friends, to applaud the hospitality of last night, I picked up because I talk with key people who are part of London. This is what they said to me, "Do you know, once a year on 25 September we say to the City of Auckland, 'forget about your best only for yourselves; bring your best and think of others'." This is my response as a visitor here: why wait for Lambeth to bring out Creation in all the works we do when the opportunity is in front of us? Why cannot we as Synod of the city here of Auckland just rest and pray? Why does the city of Auckland on 25 September not consider a plant each, and you can see how many millions? I can only say that because I was welcomed after the announcement of the new Bishop of London. Hooray. We in Pacifica rejoice because we remember people who were recording debates here on the ordination of women and when I come here and I look up, it is no longer a debate. It was announced last night as one of them. So, friends, what a gift; what a beautiful identity. After all, Paris came with the world together, do you know our identity is the Communion? Without the Communion, this Synod cannot be complete. The Communion cannot be complete without this

Synod; and, friends, what is good to Tuvalu and Kiribati, nations that will not be here in 50 years, is good to this Synod. What is good to this Synod is good to Tuvalu and Kiribati.

For the invitation of the two Archbishops, I would like to say, “*T’osavili*”, the title given to the Archbishop of York. When you came to preach theology, at the end they gave you the title and the meaning of the title is what Jesus said, “Peace to you”. You are part of Pacifica. A few weeks from now, the Archbishop of Canterbury will arrive and I would like to say that the whale will welcome the Archbishop of Canterbury. When a tooth of the whale is presented to you, that is the ocean and, when the cup is given to you to drink, you drink the whole ocean. You are no longer limited only to the Communion here, you belong to the ocean. God bless us in one awesome identity. In Christ, we move together. God bless us all as we continue in the mission of God.

The Archbishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of Southern Africa (Dr Thabo Makgoba): I have been given a minute to sum up what we have said. The heart of what we are saying can be summed up in my indigenous language. We say, “*Lesale le tee, galele*” - “One bangle does not make a sound”. We belong to the Communion. You heard the challenges of interfaith mission and ministry, the challenges of climate change and the challenges of continuing to talk with each other. Let us sound the bangles together as we build this, our Communion. Thank you for having us.

The Chair: That concludes Item 6 and we now move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 11.02 am

ITEM 7

COMPANION LINKS AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION ([GS 2081](#))

The Chair: Members of Synod, we now move to Item 7 on the Agenda. I invite the Bishop of Guildford to move this item. He may speak for up to 10 minutes, but I would be incredibly grateful if he could manage slightly less than that.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): I beg to move

‘That this Synod affirm the Companion Links between the Church of England’s dioceses and other parts of the Anglican Communion; encourage the Diocesan Companion Links to maximise their contribution to the hospitality programme prior to the Lambeth Conference; and call upon the parishes, deaneries and dioceses of the Church of England to make international links a central part of their strategy for mission and discipleship, drawing on the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission Development Agencies.’

I will give it a go. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and what a fantastic introduction to the motion that lies before us this morning.

When I was a young boy, we had a large, square biscuit tin at home from which a variety of Digestive biscuits, Rich Teas and Ginger Nuts used to emerge unfailingly at 11 o'clock in the morning, along with the odd Jammie Dodger on a red letter day. It was only when a friend came to play that questions started emerging about the tin because, while I do not remember five year-old Peter's exact words, I do remember his sense of shock bordering on outrage that my siblings and I were eating were biscuits from this particular source. The reality is that the tin was simply covered with rust - it may well have been a health hazard - and yet it took a five year-old boy from outside our home to see it as it really was.

At first sight, the motion set before us in Item 7 of our agenda might be written off as so much motherhood and apple pie, or perhaps we should say motherhood and Jammie Dodger. Companion Links across the Anglican Union are generally regarded as a "good thing", however complex they might sometimes prove in practice. Diocesan links with Lutheran and Roman Catholic Churches in continental Europe are also applauded. Meanwhile, our parishes and Church schools frequently have international links of their own, sometimes supported by a small but significant percentage of the parish budget in addition to international fellowships on their very doorsteps.

Why debate a motion which, in some form or another, is likely to command considerable - I hope overwhelming - support? There are three obvious answers to the question and perhaps we should name them straightaway. First, and most explicitly in this motion, we have a Lambeth Conference planned for 2020 and this morning's debate is the starting pistol, if you like, for the hospitality initiative which first took off in 2008 and which we pray will be a real success 12 years later. How wonderful to hear Archbishop Thabo on that subject just a few minutes ago.

Secondly, that Conference is being planned against a backdrop of many friendships but also considerable tension within the Anglican Communion, thus emphasising the need for us to work harder at our Companion Links to make not just a little effort but every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Thirdly, another starting pistol was famously fired on 29 March last year when Theresa May triggered Article 50 and the race to Brexit began. Whatever our feelings on that particular subject, this seems an apposite time to reaffirm our bonds of friendship with sister Churches in continental Europe in particular, and to remind ourselves of that wider vision of a great multitude from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages, gathering before the Lamb with palm branches and with song.

Underlying each of these laudable and uncontentious objectives is perhaps the most important question that the Church of the West should be asking of itself right now; a question that lies at the heart of the Report *Setting God's People Free* and that will ultimately determine the success or otherwise of our whole programme of Renewal and Reform. Here is the question: how do we both become and make prayerful confident disciples of Jesus Christ?

In the Church of England we continue to operate a parochial system as the foundation of an increasingly mixed or blended economy and there is much about the parish vision that remains fresh and inspiring. However, the problem with a

parochial mindset is that we can start to believe that the answer to that discipleship question lies within us; that we can figure it out for ourselves “in my parish”, “in my diocese”, or in Archbishops’ Council or here in General Synod, while the reality is that we are so immersed in a set of culturally conditioned values and presuppositions, that we desperately need those from outside to help us distinguish the Christian from the cultural within us, and so to discern the discipleship journey ahead. Even a five year-old from outside of the culture can often see the biscuit tin more clearly than a bunch of intelligent people within it.

It is not just the negatives about a culture that are relevant here either. A fair assessment reveals the rust, yes, but does not ignore the glories of the Jammie Dodger. When Barnabus was sent to the Church in Antioch in Acts 11, he famously rejoiced when he saw the grace of God at work among them and exalted them to remain faithful to the Lord with all their hearts. It is quite possible that the Antioch Christians themselves had become so acclimatised to the warmth of their fellowship that they took it for granted and quite failed to recognise just how special it was. The same could be true of some of the churches in our dioceses. Once again, it took an outsider to see things clearly and to speak words of encouragement and hope.

Here is where the rubber hits the road with GS 2081 and its annex. Here is where, in the words of our motion, we need “to call upon the parishes, deaneries and dioceses of the Church of England to make international links a central part of our strategy for mission and discipleship drawing on the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links themselves and the Mission and Development Agencies”.

In my former experience as a parish priest here in London, we used to organise short-term mission encounter trips each summer, building on our parish links with a church in downtown Donetsk and an NGO in the slums of Delhi. Since then, the London Diocesan Link with Angola and Mozambique, in particular, has grown beyond all recognition, building an effective trellis on which many other parishes have nurtured their own international partnerships. The imbalance of money can be a huge problem here, of course, and so can the paternalism, even colonialism, that is part of the rust on the British biscuit tin, often unseen to ourselves but all too obvious to others. The driving vision of “mutual responsibility and interdependence in the body of Christ”, which so inspired the launch of our Companion Links in the early 1960s, still has a very long way to go. Even the most enlightened of western commentators frequently presume that our culture is innately superior to others, despite all evidence to the contrary, all of which makes Janice Price’s research into three of our Companion Links, as summarised in sections 12 to 15 of the Report, a valuable exercise.

All this, I hope, should lead us beyond the tired old language of “we learned so much more from them than they learned from us”, even if such a sentiment is a marked improvement on our native paternalism. There is something deeper going on here than who learns what from whom, and it is brilliantly expressed in the Psalm with which we began Synod yesterday, Psalm 133, when brothers and sisters dwell together in unity, says the psalmist, it is good, it is pleasant and, above all, “there the Lord bestows His blessing, even life forevermore”.

No one came back from those trips to the Ukraine or Delhi unchanged. That is

the truth of it. While the normal pace of discipleship led members of my congregation from A to B in a matter of years, these mission encounters and the divine blessing that accompanied them led from A to E in a matter of weeks. Yet reading the motion before us, once again it is clear that we have a long way to go before parishes, deaneries and dioceses - even this General Synod - make international links anything like a central part of our strategy for mission and discipleship. Even in the national Church our default position is to marginalise the voices of the wider Church and even our own mission and development agencies - CMS, USPG, Mothers' Union, Christian Aid and others - so promoting the narrow vision of parochial discipleship over the far more exciting vision to be global followers of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

This is no motherhood and Jammie Dodger motion. This is a debate that lies right at the heart of the reform and renewal of the Church of Christ. I much look forward to the contributions ahead and would encourage us in this, and indeed in all our debates, to listen out for the voices that give that global perspective. I therefore move the motion that stands in my name.

The Chair: Brothers and sisters, we have had a wonderfully encouragingly large number of requests to speak in this debate representing so much of the life in our Companion Links in the Communion. From the outset I am going to impose a speech limit of three minutes. I am going to begin, if they are standing, by calling three people to make maiden speeches: Michael Gilbertson, the Bishop of Lichfield and Annika Mathews. After that, I am going to ask Mr Morris to speak to his amendment and move.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Dr Michael Gilbertson (Chester): I do want to support this motion very strongly. GS 2081 gives an encouraging picture of the value of Companion Links, with really helpful pointers as to how they might be developed in the future. I hope that Synod will support it with enthusiasm. As the annex at the back of the paper says, the Diocese of Chester has two Companion Links. One is with the Diocese of Aru and Boga in The Congo, a relatively new link which goes from strength to strength.

The other, which I want to talk about briefly, is longer established. This year the Church of the Province of Melanesia in the south-west Pacific and the Diocese of Chester celebrate 30 years of partnership. It has been a tremendously fruitful link which has greatly enriched our common life. For our part in Chester, we have been inspired by the vibrancy and the dynamism of the Melanesian Church. When I visited the Solomon Islands in 2016, it was a marvellous experience to join daily in uplifting and yet deeply reverent worship. Any of you who have heard the unaccompanied singing of Melanesian congregations will know that they would put most of our churches to shame. At the same time, this is a church which has known real hardship and persecution. Many of you here will have heard of the seven Melanesian brothers martyred as recently as 2003. The Melanesian Church remains resilient and outward looking, campaigning actively on issues from domestic violence to climate change, not just rising sea levels inundating coastal communities but weather patterns disrupting long-established patterns of agriculture, crops rotting in the fields because the soil has become clogged with salt. It is often a challenging message to hear from our sisters and

brothers.

The link is capturing the imagination of our children and young people as well, with a growing number of twinning arrangements between our schools. Teachers from the Solomons have been to the UK with a huge impact in the life of our schools, and just next month, a group from the chaplaincy team at one of our Church secondary schools is flying out to the Solomons. The emphasis in the link is on prayer, fellowship and, yes, learning from one another, encouraged through visits in both directions, very much on the lines set out in GS 2081.

The motion mentions mission agencies and I would pay tribute to Melanesian Mission UK with which we work very closely. It has been a great 30 years and I look forward to it continuing. I want to say thank you to our Melanesian sisters and brothers for all they have given us and, most of all, thank you to God for giving us one another. I hope Synod commends this paper most warmly.

The Bishop of Lichfield (Rt Revd Dr Michael Ipgrave): Madam Chairman, the church of Lichfield was founded out of an international partnership when our first Bishop St Chad came from the Kingdom of Northumbria - your kingdom, Madam Chairman - to the obdurately pagan Kingdom of Mercia. He came after a placement in Ireland alongside his brother St Cedd, who went to Essex to become the first Bishop of Chelmsford (sort of). Diocesan companionship has been part of our DNA from the beginning and remains so now. We are blessed with full, deep and long-standing links around the points of the compass in north Germany, South Africa, South East Asia and the Diocese of Qu-Appelle in the west of Canada. These are real links, populated by real people, praying for one another, visiting one another and particularly in our St Chad's volunteer programme, young people in both directions spending time on placements in other cultures and contexts. The challenge for us, and the opportunity, is to embed our diocesan links in the priorities of our diocese, which for us are threefold: renewing discipleship, multiplying vocations and strengthening evangelism. Our links all play a part in each of those. In partnership with our companion diocese in South East Asia, next summer, marking the 30th anniversary of the link, we will be embarking on a programme of intentional discipleship, following a pattern developed by Archbishop Moon Hing, including an option for advanced intentional discipleship. If you want to know what that is, come to Lichfield.

I am very impressed by the pivotal role played by placements in overseas Churches, and, indeed, placements for people from our companion dioceses in Lichfield in shaping people's sense of vocation. For me personally, two years in Japan following my Title curacy was crucially formative in shaping my vocational path. I believe a worthy way of honouring and carrying forward this motion would be to raise the expectation that all in training for ordained ministry, or in the early stages of ordained ministry, should spend a significant time of immersion in the life of an overseas Church. Most of all, our experience is that our understanding of the Gospel is enlarged and enriched through encounter with Christians living out their faith in different settings. We are evangelized afresh by our companions and they equip us with confidence for our own evangelism here.

The Chair: I now call Annika Mathews for her maiden speech. Annika, you are here as a representative of the Church of England Youth Council and we warmly welcome you.

Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council): I must say I was very excited to see this topic was going to be discussed at Synod and I am glad that members of the Anglican Communion are present today.

My time spent living abroad - for me that was in Romania which I know is not in the Anglican Communion - has broadened my understanding and appreciation of different cultures, and helped me to celebrate the diversity of the world that we live in today. Now, volunteering back in the UK in a community which has a large number of eastern Europeans, my experience has enabled me to be able to understand the challenges facing these communities in the UK and, in a small way, being able to communicate with them in their own language to work towards integrating them into the communities here. I feel very strongly that churches have a great role to play in welcoming and integrating international communities within the UK into the societies they are living in.

Expanding upon contact with diocesan links in the Anglican Communion across the world will - I agree with the Report - challenge, renew and deepen our own faith, in particular hearing accounts from those living in other countries who are under persecution for their faith in Christ, or experiencing, if you visit first hand, those who materially have so little but whose faith in Christ is so great. I think we in this country have a lot to learn from that.

As someone wishing to enter some form of international mission, I would be keen to see more of the Church of England ministry training schemes include time abroad in the different diocesan links in the Anglican Communion, as the Bishop of Lichfield was just talking about, so that those exploring vocations can experience cross-cultural mission whilst retaining important links to the Church of England's practices and doctrines, which I am very proud to be part of.

I wholeheartedly agree that in praying, visiting and learning about other churches across the world in the Anglican Communion which are in partnership with the Church here, that this, as the Report says, will shrink our world and expand our knowledge of who God is so that we can all work together towards the unity of all who are in Christ, reminding us of our responsibility as children of God to support and encourage one another, in particular through exploring global prayer initiatives, as what we do here in this country can really affect those across the world living in links with the Anglican Communion. Synod, I encourage you to support this motion.

ITEM 18

The Chair: I now call upon Shaun Morris to speak to and move his amendment. Mr Morris, you have up to two minutes.

Revd Shaun Morris (Lichfield): I beg to move

'Leave out "call upon the" and insert "commend to"

And

Leave out "to make international links a central part of" and insert "the value

and importance that international links, together with the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission and Development Agencies, can bring to”

And

Leave out “drawing on the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission and Development Agencies.”

I am very much hoping that this amendment will strengthen the motion rather than weaken it. A number of years ago I was able to spend six whole weeks in Sabah Diocese in Malaysia. I learned much; I was encouraged much; I changed much.

Chair, I have a concern with the word “central” in the motion before us. We are calling upon every parish to make an international link a central component of mission and discipleship regardless of their context. That word central caused me to ponder: what are the essentials, what are the non-negotiables, what is the central component of mission and discipleship? We proclaim Christ Jesus. We rightly administer the sacraments. We contend in prayer. We share our lives with those living in darkness. We are people whose hope is in heaven, whose faith is in Christ Jesus and whose love is for all God’s people. That is the centre of our strategy. Christ Jesus is the centre of our strategy. For us then to say that, in addition, we call upon parishes to have an international link at the centre of their strategy, regardless of their parish context, seems incongruous.

I think that “central” devalues the motion and it will deflect people’s attention. My proposed amendment is to remove the word “central” and simply “commend to parishes, deaneries, dioceses, the value and importance that international links can bring”, and leave it to them to work that into their Christ-centred strategies as appropriate to their local context.

The Chair. I now invite the Bishop of Guildford to respond. You have up to two minutes.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): I want to thank Shaun for his suggested amendment following his test drive, as I understand it, of the original motion at a church prayer meeting. I appreciate this is intended as a friendly reworking from a World Church enthusiast, but I DO want to resist Shaun’s amendment, which seems to me substantially to weaken rather than strengthen the original. The problem with the language of “commending” is that it takes us back to motherhood and Jammie Dodger rather than suggesting that a step change is needed in our understanding of mission and discipleship within a global context; that we simply cannot see the rust on the biscuit tin without it. The removal of the motion’s reference to “Companion Links and the Mission and Development Agencies” also seems to me disastrous. It is true that not every parish will be able to organise mission trips to far-flung corners of the earth, but every parish should be able to plug into a Companion Link or the work of one of the Anglican or interdenominational mission agencies and many churches will have international fellowships on their doorsteps. Even in the wilds of Surrey, I have a Nigerian, several Nepalese churches and an Egyptian Coptic Church within a few miles of where I live, and my conversations with their priests and pastors have helped to sharpen my understanding of mission and discipleship, as

well as inspiring many other Christians in the vicinity. If the original language had talked of making international links “the central part of their strategy for mission and discipleship”, I could just about see the point, but “a central part” seems to me absolutely right. I therefore urge Synod to reject this amendment.

The Chair. We now move to debate the amendment. I see three people standing. I would like to take one speech in favour of the amendment and one speech against the amendment. First, if you wish to speak in favour of the amendment, please remain standing.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Miss Deborah Buggs (London): I support Shaun’s amendment because the motion as it stands inadvertently calls into question the penetrating power of God’s word and the transforming influence of the Holy Spirit. I fear that it also undermines the normal activities of God’s servants in proclaiming Christ and promoting Christian growth in holiness and prayer through the day-to-day teaching and preaching of the word.

I know it often seems unglamorous and unexciting, but the normal way of expanding and growing perceptions of God is through the faithful preaching and teaching of God’s word, the Bible, week in, week out. Speaking from personal experience, and one shared by others, my understanding of God was expanded hugely through doing a Bible overview course which looked at several passages from the Bible, starting from the Creation and Fall, tracing through the promises of God in the Old Testament until we arrived at the Gospels, and we saw the Gospel of Jesus Christ, starting in Jerusalem, spreading through Judah and going to the corners of the world. It is this Bible narrative that shrinks the world geographically and historically and expands our view and appreciation of God, leading to whole life discipleship and worship.

The Chair: I call the Archbishop of York.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): When I left Uganda in 1974, my parents said to me: “When you get to England, whoever will listen, thank them for the missionaries they sent. They brought the Gospel of Salvation, which transformed and changed our culture in a very deep way”. The first Bishop - Hannington - was murdered. The Church still was prepared to send another bishop, knowing that he too could be murdered.

Our God is a sending God. Our God is a commanding God. Our God is a calling God, not a commanding thing. As far as I am concerned, we should not command. We should call parishes. The other thing about all this calling is that it is because God so loved the world that He sent His Son. We want to be people who are sending, who are calling, who are summoning, who are renewing everybody else. I agree with the last speaker about preaching and teaching. I do it all the time. But I also want to strengthen our Companion Links because remember, friends, you Anglicans in this country took great risks in going out and sending people who preached the Gospel. Within three years we had murders in Uganda.

Do you still want to see the same faith and the same love? Then our parishes - our parishes - have to take seriously Jesus' command to go and make disciples of all nations. Until that is done, please do not command. Send. Be agitated about it. Be concerned about it. Have passion. Because the world needs saving and you, Anglicans, are all over the world. I rejoice and I thank you for all you did those many, many years ago. Wake up. So resist the amendment.

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

The Chair: Members of Synod, that has my consent. Is that your will?

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

The Chair: We now put the amendment to the vote.

The motion

Leave out "call upon the" and insert "commend to"

And

Leave out "to make international links a central part of" and insert "the value and importance that international links, together with the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission and Development Agencies, can bring to"

And

Leave out "drawing on the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission and Development Agencies."

was put and lost on a show of hands.

The Chair: The amendment is clearly lost. So we now return to the substantive debate on the motion un-amended. I now call Tudor Griffiths, please.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Tudor Griffiths (Gloucester): Last year I had the joy of a sabbatical and wanted to look at the theme of mission and ministry in different contexts. I spent the best part of a month firstly with our companion diocese in Western Tanganyika, and then, almost immediately afterwards, with the other of our link dioceses in California. In Tanzania there was a great sense of partnership. People knew the Gloucester Diocese. I learnt so much about church planting, holistic mission with refugees from Burundi, and I was able to be involved in the life of the diocese by teaching in their theological college. Having spent six years earlier in my ministry in theological education in Uganda, this was culturally familiar turf. In California I found very little awareness of the link and not, frankly, a great deal of interest. My wife and I had a wonderful time there, but if I were to sum up the experience in a tweet it would be: "If you want to learn about God go to Tanzania. If you want to learn about the world go to California".

It is anecdotal, I know, but this experience shows that companion dioceses vary significantly in terms of their value in mission partnership.

My concern is about what is not here in our paper. We have a great deal to learn from Christians in countries where there are no Anglican dioceses. Also missing is an acknowledgement of the stock of experience brought to the UK from Christians around the world. Another related resource that is often underplayed comes from returning mission partners, who bring a tremendous experience of the world's Church. One of the issues I have with companion dioceses is that short-term visits in both directions can give an illusion of knowing a culture, whereas to know it deeply requires immersion and that means time.

Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells): I declare an interest in this debate as the World Mission Adviser for Bath & Wells from 1998 to 2016.

I am a Canon of the Cathedral of the Holy Cross in Lusaka, Zambia, and I was the Chair of our pre-Lambeth Hospitality Planning Group in 2008. We hosted eight bishops and their spouses. That experience of sharing hospitality was a great blessing to us all. We had a lot of fun. The Bath & Wells/Zambia link was honoured to be asked to take part in the research mentioned in GS 2081, especially as it celebrates its 40th anniversary this year. We are very pleased that paragraph 15 says that the connection between mission and discipleship was very evident in the case study. I could tell you many stories that illustrate that, but I hope you will be content with just one.

Several years ago, a young Zambian priest was staying with my husband and me during Lent and he was invited to preach in our church. He said that in his poor, rural diocese the bishop had said to his clergy and lay ministers that they must not encourage their congregations to fast in Lent, food was scarce enough without expecting hungry people to give up eating anything, and there were plenty of other ways of marking Lent - Bible study, house groups, support for others, sharing the Gospel, discipleship. I often remember his words, especially when people say that they are giving up chocolate, wine or biscuits for Lent.

GS 2081 emphasises the importance of the friendships at the heart of the relationships and Companion Links. Many global friendships have grown between parishes and individuals over 40 years within our link. I have shared experiences with Zambian friends in Canada, South Africa, New York, and even in the Holy Land. Some of you here may already be involved in your diocese's link relationship. Some of you may not be sure where your link even is. I recommend you find out and get involved. The awareness of being part of a network of Christians concerned about the same issues helps our faith to grow. We learn that God can teach us to be better Christians through the insights of others in different contexts.

I have one little practical request. In the document on page 3, footnote 3, it says that the full report of the research can be got but it does not give the link. Please could this be sent to Synod? I am sure lots of us would love to read it. So I implore you, please support this motion wholeheartedly.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 7.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Freeman. I would like to hear a few more speeches first but then would welcome that.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): I am afraid I have never been very good at jokes, but I am told that it is the best way to engage people, so here goes. I bought my friend an elephant for his room. He said “Thanks” and I said “Don’t mention it”. Oh, you got it! Good! The problem is that I do want to mention the elephant in the room as I think it is time we talked openly and honestly about some of the issues that can put a great strain on our Companion Links. I am obviously talking about the elephant whose name is human sexuality and which is not mentioned at all in GS 2081, which is strange given that we are constantly told that human sexuality is an issue that deeply affects the Anglican Communion.

My question is whether the issue of human sexuality is an issue which is actively explored by parishes, deaneries and dioceses in their links, or whether it also remains the elephant in the room that no one mentions. Do we go out of our way to ensure that there is a member of a visiting group who is LGBTI so that part of their encounter might be with an openly gay Christian, who for many, from both home and abroad, might be a first? I ask this with paragraph 32 of Annex A ringing in my ears, which states: “Cross-cultural relationships have the potential to challenge our deeply held and often uncritically absorbed beliefs about life, God, church and what is normative”.

What is perhaps even more important is that if we were to ensure that each delegation had an LGBTI Christian then we might bring a lifeline of hope to those within the LGBT communities in our companion dioceses, particularly in Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa, who frequently feel so totally isolated and alone. It will more than likely also enable us to talk more openly about sexual health issues, particularly HIV testing and combating stigma, given that we in the UK have one of the greatest success rates in this area around the world. But for this to happen we will need a culture change at all levels. I appreciate I was perhaps being slightly optimistic in asking the Appointments Committee to consider me as an openly gay member of the Church of England to attend the 2018 Conference of European Churches, but I did so saying I recognised that the area of human sexuality was likely to be a keen area of interest. I am sorry to see that is not included in the Delegation Group.

Synod, in supporting the motion, can I urge you to urge your parishes, deaneries and dioceses to consider some positive discrimination when you put your next delegation together and consider including, ideally, a young LGBTI Christian? Can I also ask you to ensure that you talk about the elephant in the room, please? Talking about elephants, why did the elephant start a stampede? Because he wanted to be heard.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I want to talk about the transformation that a link can bring. I come from Dorchester, where Peter Hannington actually trained in the Dorchester Missionary College, sadly no longer a part of our community. Our diocese has three links, and mine has been mostly with the diocese of Kimberley & Kuruman in South Africa with which our team established a link which began as one of those kind of paternalistic links that is not ideal. It was termed a “parish to project” link. We support a project which feeds children - in terms of what we do within this Chamber, a very ordinary thing. But I want to talk

about the extraordinary learning that has come out of that at two different levels. The first learning was for me in visiting to set up the link with another lay person. The second level of learning was when we decided that we would not take groups of people from Oxford to Kimberley & Kuruman but that we would work - and here I should thank Janice Price - to bring four women leaders of the project to stay with us in Oxford. She is nodding. It was an interminable process, but it worked. The learning in our community was unparalleled.

Yes, we still support the Burning Bush Project, but now every week there is a small group of people in the Dorchester team who meet at the same time as a small group of people in Boegoeberg, a very, very small place in the diocese of Kimberley, and they pray for us and we pray for them. As a diocese, a huge step forward in our learning and a real transformation took place when the leaders of that particular link on both sides undertook to arrange for us a conference where 25 people from each side came together to learn from a collection of people about mission and discipleship, learning not only from those who spoke to us but learning to listen to our own experiences in our own parishes, to learn from our differences, to learn as we prayed, studied, sang and, most particularly, danced together. It was a transforming experience.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): I speak primarily from my experience in Chelmsford, but also as the Church of England representative Bishop on the Anglican Consultative Council. I suppose, like many people in the Synod, I am queuing up to say just how fantastic it is to enjoy these partnership links with churches around the world. I want to say to Archbishop Winston: yes, the dinner last night was good, but the dinner that you gave us at the Auckland ACC - that Polynesian banquet - completely outshone what the Mansion House offered last night. These links are fantastic.

Next week I shall be going to Kenya to celebrate 40 years of our partnership with the dioceses of Embu, Kirinyaga, Meru, Mbere and Marsabit. It was one diocese. It is now five. That in itself tells you about what is happening to the Church in Kenya. Our parishes are twinned. Our schools are twinned. To the Bishop of Lichfield: all our curates have an opportunity to go out to spend time in Kenya. Our toilets are twinned. There is so much I could tell you about it, but that is not really the speech I want to make.

I just want to make this simple, but I think really important point. At the 2008 Lambeth Conference the Kenyan bishops did not attend. I dare to hope it will be different in 2020. But the Kenyan bishops did come to the Diocese of Chelmsford for the hospitality events before the Lambeth Conference. In other words, the friendship that we have with each other was strong enough to bridge what could so easily have become an ever-lengthening divide.

We have learnt a lesson in Chelmsford that the whole Anglican Communion and every Christian community needs to learn, and it is this: you cannot choose your fellow travellers in the Christian way. In following Christ, we find ourselves, whether we like it or not, walking alongside all sorts of people that we would not have chosen as companions if we had drawn up the membership criteria ourselves. As we have journeyed together over many years and built friendship, we have had, Jayne, some really, really hard conversations. The product of those conversations has not been agreement. The product has been love. I simply

want to say that the Anglican partnership links are not a product of the Anglican Communion. Sisters and brothers, they are the Anglican Communion. The object of doing it is not to find that elusive agreement; it is to stick with each other, to walk with each other and to love each other in all our bewildering variety and loveliness.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): Today our primary school is heading for Embu. They are going with a card produced by one of our church members - an accordion card made with pictures illustrating the Apostles' Creed - and we are sending out lots of little Bible booklets and lots of goodwill and excitement. Just the teachers are going, they cannot take the children, but we know that the teachers are going to come back reinvigorated with the simple joy of being with Christians in Embu Province in this church we are going to.

Chelmsford owes a debt to St Cedd and to St Chad. Both of them were motivated by this. The Bible is all we need. Words. Words. They are words of life. They are words of passion. I do not know why we got het up over that earlier amendment. We should be on the same page. Let us go back with the word of God. That is what transforms people and communities. That is where life is and where love is. The rest we get tangled up in. Let the word direct us. That is life.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, a point of order?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure of Item 7.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, I would welcome that motion. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I now invite the Bishop of Guildford to respond to this debate. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): Thank you for so many inspiring examples of how links, both diocesan links and international links more generally, are really making a big impact on the life of our churches. I am conscious that a lot of people wanted to speak and have not been able to. Could I suggest that you write a blog and, if you are on Twitter, could you tweet it? We would love to have your wisdom, too, on this.

There were lots of really encouraging stories of what we might call good practice. It was lovely to hear from Michael Gilbertson the inspiration from the church in Melanesia. He was one of a number of people who talked about children being engaged and schools being engaged in partnerships. I really would very much want to encourage that. If that is not true in your own diocesan partnerships or in your parish international links, if you had not thought to engage local schools in that, it is a brilliant thing to do.

It was great to hear from the Bishop of Lichfield of the St Chad's Volunteer Programme. It was really good to hear of volunteers working both ways around - and, again, I think some really good things to learn from there - and also the way the international links genuinely are making an impact on the strategy for

mission and discipleship and vocation in the dioceses. I think that is probably quite unusual and it is something that I am certainly taking away from this debate to think about how we do that more. It is not something that we have sorted, certainly in the Diocese of Guildford, as yet. I love that we are evangelised afresh by our companions. It is something about really seeing the Gospel afresh - of course the unchanging Gospel. I do not want to go against those who spoke in favour of the amendment. Of course, it is the Gospel of Christ as expressed through the word of God that is unchanging, that is at the heart of everything that we do, but our mission links and our international links so often help us to see what within us is cultural and not Christian and otherwise we find it extremely difficult to do that.

Annika Matthews, thank you so much for your own experience of the international community, both with Eastern European Christians and beyond. I loved your idea. This is something with my other hat on - the vocations work - I am really thinking through: "Can some of our mentoring schemes encourage people to go abroad and not simply have mentoring here or experience here in this country?"

We have spoken about the amendments. Thank you very much to Archbishop Sentamu: "Do not amend. Send". That would be very much my encouragement as well. Sending is at the heart. What is the most important part of a Eucharist service? Well, that is a really interesting question, but there is something about the blessing and then "Go in peace to love and serve the Lord", which seems to be absolutely key to our gathering together around the Lord's table. We come in order that we go. We come in order that we are sent.

Tudor Griffiths, thank you very much for sharing your interesting experience in Tanzania. I think there are a lot of very good things to learn from you there. Yes, possibly the issue of international links beyond our Diocesan Companion Links did not come across quite as strongly in the paper as it might have done, but we do talk about international links more generally in the motion, and of course our international links might be with parts of the world where there are not Anglican dioceses - and that is absolutely brilliant as well. Just one thing that I think I would not agree with is that I do not think we should devalue short-term mission trips. I know there has been a tendency to devalue them. I entirely agree that you do not get immersed in a culture by going there for 10 days or whatever, but, as I said in my opening speech, it can have a genuinely transformative effect on the discipleship of those who go. That is really what it is about. It is not so much about what we are able to offer. It is actually the transformative effect on those who go.

Jennifer Humphreys has a tremendous long-term passion for this. I loved your emphasis on friendship. Just so you know, Janice's full report is on the Church of England website, so do turn to that if you are frustrated with only having an extract of it for now.

Jayne Ozanne talked about the elephant in the room. I do think human sexuality is often discussed in Companion Links once the friendship has been established. I am sure that we will all have heard her idea that LGBTI people should be involved in trips abroad. I do think that it is really important within the context of friendship that, of course, we are able to talk about especially the persecution of gay people in other parts of the world and that, similarly, we are open to being

challenged about our culture and aspects of it: our materialism, the huge divide between rich and poor, our lack of care for the environment, our families breaking down in unprecedented numbers. We do need to hear that challenge for ourselves, as well as issuing challenges to others.

It was really good to hear from Sue Booy about women leaders coming to Oxford from Kimberley. That is just a good reminder to us that it is not all about us going to other places. Do, please, put money in diocesan budgets for others to visit. Of course the hospitality initiative we are looking forward to before the Lambeth Conference. It is a fantastic opportunity to do that if you have not done it for a while.

The Chair: Bishop, thank you very much for managing to sum up so much in the time available. I now put Item 7 to the vote.

The motion

‘That this Synod affirm the Companion Links between the Church of England’s dioceses and other parts of the Anglican Communion; encourage the Diocesan Companion Links to maximise their contribution to the hospitality programme prior to the Lambeth Conference; and call upon the parishes, deaneries and dioceses of the Church of England to make international links a central part of their strategy for mission and discipleship, drawing on the resources of the Diocesan Companion Links and the Mission Development Agencies.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That item is clearly carried. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 11.57 am.

ITEM 8

APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE ([GS 2082](#))

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 8 on the agenda: the appointment of the Chair of the Appointments Committee. For this you will need GS 2082. I am going to call upon the Archbishop of York to speak and then move the motion. He has up to 10 minutes, but five minutes would be even better.

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

‘That the appointment of Canon Margaret Swinson as Chair of the Appointments Committee from 21 June 2018 to 20 June 2023 be confirmed.’

Chair, members of Synod, when a committee works well it is easy to take its seamless work rather for granted. There is a danger of doing so in relation to the Appointments Committee, which Margaret Swinson has skilfully chaired for the

last five years. In that time she has vindicated the confidence that Synod had in her when she was first appointed to this synodically sensitive role.

Archbishop Justin and I recognise that in Margaret we have an exceptional individual who combines a deep knowledge of the Church with a finely-tuned grasp of administration and astute ecclesial judgment. We were delighted to hear that she has indicated that she wishes to serve for a further term and have no hesitation in putting this proposal to the Synod.

As GS 2082 makes clear, under Standing Order 126 the due consultation by the Archbishops of the Archbishops' Council and the Appointments Committee have actually been done and Margaret Swinson is also willing to serve. Because of that particular way, I therefore want to move the motion standing in my name that Margaret Swinson be appointed for a further term. Less than five minutes.

The Chair. Thank you, Archbishop. The motion is now open for debate. I call upon Liz Paver, Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): Chairman, Margaret Swinson: it has been my privilege and pleasure to represent the Archbishops' Council on the Appointments Committee during this quinquennia. Margaret and I go back a long way on Synod, probably 25 years. At that time, as a newcomer, Margaret was already here working very hard for Synod, but I was amazed when she broke through a glass ceiling. She brought her newly born, beautiful daughter to the Synod as a young mum, able to cope with Synod and a new-born both up in the gallery and, then, Rebecca had to stay there but Margaret was often on the floor working in this Synod.

I have the greatest respect for all that she has done over all those years. I think that was a precedent. I hope that we will see other babies up there in the gallery because that will mean that we have got new mums here, new life right within us. Margaret brought that here many years ago. As many of you will know now, the whole thing has come full circle because we have Rebecca's talents on the Archbishops' Council; so things do happen, even in the Synod, because of God's good grace.

As Chair of the Appointments Committee, Maggie has had me also in awe about her encyclopaedic knowledge of the remits of all the Committee's Synod work. When the Appointments Committee meet, they have quite long meetings sometime because her aim, above all, is to give as many voices sitting here in the Synod from the House of Clergy, the House of Laity and the House of Bishops the opportunity to bring their talents and expertise to our work through all those structures. I can tell you that Margaret is meticulous in making members of that Appointments Committee really search themselves to know that they are giving that equal chance for everyone.

My colleague here, the Prolocutor of the Southern Province, was also going to speak but we actually thought perhaps two from the platform is a bit much. He attended Appointments Committee recently and was amazed at the amount of work that goes through that Committee. It is very important. I have no hesitation at all in recommending to the Synod that Canon Mrs Margaret Swinson continues as our Chairman of the Appointments Committee for a further five years.

The Chair: I see no one standing. Archbishop, do you want to respond to the debate?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I could not agree more.

The Chair: Now, I put the motion that the appointment of Margaret Swinson as Chair of the Appointments Committee be confirmed.

The motion

'That the appointment of Canon Margaret Swinson as Chair of the Appointments Committee from 21 June 2018 to 20 June 2023 be confirmed.'

put and carried on a show of hands

The Chair: That concludes Item 8. Please stay for the next motion on food wastage, thank you.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 12.05 pm

ITEM 9

DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTION

FOOD WASTAGE ([GS 2077A](#) AND [GS 2077B](#))

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. We come to Item 9 on the Agenda, which is the Diocesan Synod Motion from St Edmundsbury and Ipswich on the topic of food wastage. Members may like to have GS 2077A and GS 2077B available. I would like to give everyone an outline of how we intend to approach this debate. After the Revd Andrew Dotchin has moved the motion, the floor will be open for general debate. Then I will ask the movers of the amendments to speak to but not to move their amendments before each amendment is formally taken in turn. After that, we will return to the main motion for debate. Bearing in mind that we are short of time, there will be a three minute speech limit when we debate the main motion and a two minute speech limit when we debate the amendments. I call upon the Revd Andrew Dotchin to move Item 9. You have up to 10 minutes.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I beg to move

'That this Synod, mindful of the problems of food poverty in Britain today and the excessive tonnage of edible food wasted by retail outlets:

- a) affirm the Biblical principle of ensuring that the poor and vulnerable are not excluded from the harvest;
- b) commend those retailers who are working creatively with food banks to distribute food that might otherwise be wasted;

- c) urge all dioceses and parishes to work with other voluntary initiatives to lobby for all local food retailers to review their policy on waste food so that the amount made available to combat food poverty is maximised;
- d) request Her Majesty's Government to consider bringing forward legislation that would effectively minimise food waste by food retailers; and
- e) call upon all church members to use food resources responsibly and minimise waste in their own homes.'

If I may ask the indulgence of Synod, could I read you a few verses from the scriptures? "For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it... and threw half of it away".

Imagine the uproar if that were somehow encapsulated in our liturgy. We do have differing approaches to what happens to the remains of the, "Bread, blessed and broken", but whether it is reserved, reverently consumed, or (as is the practice of some parts of the Body of Christ) used to feed the birds, if our meal of holy bread and wine were to reflect what to do with our daily bread, the whole Church would imitate my wasteful actions every time we gathered for the Lord's Supper.

The figures on food waste in our nation are appalling and rehearsing them will not make them any more attractive. The most horrible thing about these figures, however, is not those hobbyhorses of the tabloid press, straight bananas and wobbly carrots (problems for which creative answers are already being found), nor is it food waste in the retail sector, which is mentioned in one part of this motion, but the wanton waste from our own tables. In our homes, it is literally a case of, "taking a loaf of bread, giving thanks, breaking it and throwing half away".

Perhaps each of us may want to reflect for a space on the food that has been left uneaten at meals since we first sat down to gather together as a Synod. It is a sad indictment on our corporate body that, at the end of the July 2016 sessions in York, our hard-working Synod staff were left with 120 packed lunches that had been ordered but not collected. We seem to be so involved in our own lives that we could not even be bothered to collect the food to give away to someone who was hungry. The reasons why we are so wasteful and find ourselves imitating the greedy shepherds of Ezekiel 34 in our physical as well as our spiritual lives are complex.

Unravelling those reasons so that we become once again a Church grateful for the generosity of a caring, forgiving Creator will take time, persistence and a willingness to put the poor of the world and the care of God's good earth ahead of our personal convenience. It will require, at the very least, repentance and needs to be supported by a life-long commitment to change expressed in that most Benedictine and so, by heritage, Anglican of all good habits, *conversio morum*. Half of the world is starving and the other half is obese. Some of us (and, in shame, I count myself amongst their number) are even 'morbidly obese', which in plain English translates as we are eating ourselves to death.

When it comes to our attitude to food and the convenience we demand, we break six (Pride, Avarice, Lust, Envy, Greed and Sloth) of the Seven Deadly Sins. The only sin missing from the list being Anger and, to be honest, changing our attitude to food waste may require a modicum of righteous anger. What is this motion standing in the name of a greener diocese pasturing the greenest county all about? Well, it is about food poverty and food insecurity. Our God-given genius, combined with the generosity of mother earth, has ensured that we produce enough food to finally answer that appeal made 34 years ago by Bob Geldof and Midge Ure. There is no reason why we cannot 'feed the world'. It is a crime against humanity that we do not so do.

This motion is about better care for the environment. We have spoken in this Synod about 'Shrinking the Footprint'. We have signed accords. We have backed initiatives; yet, most of our homes have three full rubbish bins each week. Our churches continue to use wasteful lighting sources and polluting energy suppliers and not all of our parishes have a definite plan to care for the environment. When we cannot hide our shameful waste by exporting it to poorer nations where they may pick over its riches, we make monuments to our greed in mountains of landfill.

This motion is about caring for those who care for us. Suffolk is a farming county and East Anglia is known as, 'the bread basket of England'. How heart-breaking it must be for the farmers and fisher folk of our nation to see our waste. They bring to us the harvest of sea and soil and we turn up our noses, demanding only the ripest, freshest and the most chic, and throw the fruits of their labours away. To ensure we make the best use of the gifts of our food producers, I am pleased to welcome the amendments proposed by Mrs Heather Black as they extend the motion to cover everything from farm to fork.

This motion is about caring for future generations. We have forgotten that we do not inherit the earth from our parents. We borrow it from our children. This world is not ours to wantonly despoil and destroy. It is the gift of God and, through its fecundity and beauty, it is one of the chief ways in which God speaks to all nations regardless of their faith or lack thereof. Destroy it, abuse it and we silence the voice of God in places where the word of the Church cannot be heard.

This motion is about working with others to bring healing to the nations. We must work not only with shops and the supply chain (and our thanks and support go to those retailers who have already made a commitment to reducing food waste) but also work alongside the many charities and community groups who, with us, treasure the world and its people. I would hope in the debate that follows many would speak about initiatives that are happening in their own communities. It is not all gloom and we have many stories of generosity to celebrate and from which we can learn.

This motion is about asking our nation to do something about the mountains of waste food in which we wade every day. For that reason, this motion calls for the Government to take action. Synod, I believe we are pushing at an open door with this request. The Department for Food and Rural Affairs has been exploring the issue of food waste for some years now. Some may say that the current legislative burden is already high and this would not be addressed speedily. Others may say that our request to Her Majesty's Government should be fine-

tuned and outline possible ways forward that have borne fruit on the continent and the USA.

However these issues are eventually addressed, I am certain that our representatives in Westminster will welcome this motion and, whenever legislation comes before them, will be happy to know that they had the support of this Church of and for England. As an aside to that, I would ask you to resist the amendments proposed by Mr Philip French and welcome those proposed by Mr Clive Scowen.

Finally, this motion is not about expecting others to act without doing ourselves. Immediate change on food waste can and must happen in our own homes and churches. Members of the Church of England throw away at least £25 million worth of food each year. £25 million. What good could we not do if that waste was turned into help for the mission of God? I do not know of any diocese who would not mind an extra half a million in their budget.

We will all respond differently to food waste and to the needs of this world, but respond we must, else we give a lie to our claim that our God is a faithful God who provides us with more than we either desire or deserve. I urge you to support this motion. It is not controversial, and I hope not contentious, and in its simplicity provides the answer to a prayer I often use at public occasions when asked to give thanks for a meal: "Lord, to those who hunger give bread. To us who have bread, give a hunger for justice, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen".

The Chair: Thank you. Item 9 is now open for debate. Please remember the speech limit is three minutes, thank you.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Synod, I am sure that we are going to hear of many wonderful initiatives by churches and charities working in and with the communities they serve to ameliorate the challenges of food waste in this country. In my parish school, we use 'Food Share' to provide wrap-around meals, breakfast, and during the day for children and families that are struggling to provide for their food needs.

We are also supporting a 'Community Fridge' project where people can go and collect items without perhaps feeling that they are taking hand-outs from people personally. Later this evening, one of our area Bishops, Bishop Karowei, is leading church teams supporting 'Feed the Hungry' and packing 10,000 meals for children in Burkina Faso. From parish to diocese, we are trying to take some level of responsibility for food waste and, also, however, for tackling food poverty because most of the initiatives that we undertake serve not only to redistribute food that would otherwise go to waste but also to alleviate food poverty.

Food waste and food poverty are both important issues that churches and churchgoers can and should be seeking to tackle collectively and individually in their homes. However, it is very important that we do not conflate the two issues. Redistributing surplus food is a good thing - witness the amazing work of the food banks and Food Share, as I mentioned earlier - but this is not a long-term solution to the underlying causes of food poverty: low wages, rising housing costs,

failures in the benefit system, et cetera.

In the midst of excess and waste in our society, we need to also keep our eyes on the fact that millions of families are struggling to feed their families properly. This is why the Mission and Public Affairs Council has recently endorsed our membership of the End Hunger UK campaign, working with a large and diverse coalition of voluntary organisations that are committed to ending food poverty in this country.

I welcome this debate and I will be commending the motion. However, I also hope that we can find time for a full and proper debate on the Church of England's role in tackling food poverty at every level: national, diocesan, local and individually. Thank you, Synod.

The Chair. Members, after Catherine Pickford has spoken, I invite the movers of the amendments to speak to but not to move their amendments.

Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle): Thank you for this motion and for drawing attention to this important topic. I am sure you are right in the assertion in the summary that, since the latter half of the 20th century, many have prospered but, in doing so, have lost their connection with the soil.

There are also very many who have not lost that connection and I think we can learn from them. Like many clergy in the Diocese of Newcastle, I am a country vicar and farms are a major local employer. At the harvest festival, when we sing, "we plough the fields and scatter the good seed on the land", many of the congregation actually do. The produce that the children bring to the altar is very often grown on the land that their families have farmed.

Farming families, on the whole, are excellent at avoiding food waste. As one farmer's wife told me once, "Once you have raised a hen from an egg and killed it for the table, then you eat everything. That is how you respect the life that has been taken". People who live in farming communities are, of course, in the minority but we can learn from them. Many farms encourage school visits and want to promote education around the farming industry.

As clergy, we have the opportunities in our school assemblies and sermons to strengthen the link between the food which is produced and those who produce it. You refer a number of times - and I wonder whether the link could be sharpened - to the difficulty of food that we do not have to pay for, like 'buy-one-get-one-free' offers. I am sure I am not alone in finding those virtually irresistible and then somehow having to manage to stumble through two huge bags of spinach in the course of three days. Because our society is so driven by money, it can be difficult to recognise that because something is free of charge it does not mean it was free to produce.

The way in which English consumer habits towards plastic bag use has changed beyond all recognition since the new charge was introduced in 2015 is an example of how much behaviour can be changed by a small charge. Plastic bag use has dropped by a massive 85% as a result of that small charge. If we have to pay for something, we ask ourselves whether we need it. If we are offered something we do not have to pay for, we tend to take it anyway even if it will be

wasted.

So, two possible ways of encouraging consumers not to waste food: education, as many ways as possible for consumers to learn about where their food comes from; and examining our attitudes towards food which is cheap to buy or free or charge - both ways of being more intentional about our food use and its consequences.

The Chair: As Philip French, Heather Black and Clive Scowen make their way to the podiums, a reminder that the amendments are listed on Order Paper II. I call upon Philip French to speak to but not to move the three amendments standing in his name. You have up to five minutes.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): I am really grateful to St Edmundsbury & Ipswich for bringing this motion. Food poverty is real, it is pressing and it is a proper topic for this Synod. Let us welcome it and let us vote for it with or without my or any other amendments. Why do I want to move some amendments? For four reasons.

Firstly, to simplify and strengthen the motion we have before us. Secondly, to focus on personal responsibility rather than deflecting that all too easily to others, be they supermarkets or HM Government. Thirdly, to recognise that supermarkets have a really important role to play but it is also a subtle one. Finally, to conserve another precious resource, parliamentary time - surely, under real pressure at the moment.

We are given some very useful statistics in the Report. They show that 71% of the food wasted is in our homes and 2% in retail. Even those figures are after the produce has left the farm gate. They do not include the crops rotting in the fields - sadly, a familiar sight in Kent as well as, I suspect, in Suffolk. Hence, I would like us to frame the motion, as we pass it, in a way that concentrates on our personal responsibility in our households.

The second interesting statistic that is not in the papers before us is that 93% of all the food sold in the UK is sold by just eight supermarket chains, 70% of it by the top four. The supermarkets do have huge sway in this as the brokers between thousands of producers and millions of consumers. They can affect food waste and, indeed, food poverty in many ways for good or ill. Yes, that absolutely includes food that might otherwise be thrown away at the end of the day.

It also includes things like policies that affect the supply of fresh fruit and vegetables at affordable prices to poorer communities. Their packaging, pricing and labelling practices - we have already heard about the 'buy-one-get-one-free' offers - can affect the amount of food we buy and then waste in our homes. Their purchasing practices and the way they specify things can affect the amount of food that is wasted upstream. We could perhaps be more subtle on our call to the supermarkets.

As far as Government is concerned, I am just concerned that our calling on Government with a clause in the motion enables us to be complacent about our own responsibility. If we are going to call on the Government, let us be bolder in our calling. Let us ask for serious attention to food poverty. As we have heard

already, that has got many and complex causes. It covers the gamut from mental health services to benefits policy and many other things.

If I may turn to the specifics of the three amendments I am putting down, let me say a word about each.

Number 19, the first one, is simply to delete a phrase that focuses on food wasted by retail outlets. Yes, there is a lot of food wasted there - 250,000 tons on the numbers before us - but more than 7 million tons are wasted in our homes. Let us concentrate on our responsibility.

Secondly, an amendment, number 22, concerning the wording with supermarkets. Supermarkets supplying food banks is, of course, a good thing, so would be their supplying a night shelter or some other homeless project. We could expand the wording in that sense. However, more subtly, as I have said, there are many other ways that supermarkets could influence food wastage and food poverty. Let us be broader in welcoming things they do well and, by implication, calling on them to do better.

Finally, I have already mentioned an amendment, number 23, which simply deletes the call to Her Majesty's Government. I understand that some people would wish to make that anyway. If you do not feel able to support my amendment, I would urge you to support Mr Scowen's.

The Chair: I now call upon Heather Black to speak to but not move the two amendments standing in her name. You have up to five minutes.

Mrs Heather Black (York): Firstly, may I say that I warmly welcome this debate on food poverty and food waste. I am Chair of Middlesbrough Food Bank, so I am deeply concerned about the impact of food poverty on people's lives and the growing number of people living with food insecurity. Our food bank supported 11% more people last year and this is before we experience full roll-out of Universal Credit in Middlesbrough.

I am also a member of Middlesbrough Food Partnership, part of the Sustainable Food Cities Network. This Network - which I would commend to anyone concerned with the issues we are debating today - helps people and places to share challenges, explore practical solutions, and develop best practice on six key food issues, two of which are food poverty and food wastage. We have developed a local plan in Middlesbrough and, last year, received a bronze award for our work.

It is from this experience that I offer what is a simple but, I think, important amendment to the motion. The problem of food waste is clearly not confined to the retail sector. We have heard from Mr Dotchin, and the supporting notes in GS 2077B helpfully give figures for the sources of food waste throughout the food chain.

The first part of my amendment is proposing that the opening sentence of the motion includes a broader statement around food waste and so to lay the foundation for all the clauses that follow.

The second part of my amendment refers to clause (b). Most food banks provide a three day emergency food parcel of non-perishable food that is nutritionally balanced. Trussell Trust provides clear guidelines about what the food parcels should contain. Food banks do not usually have the storage facilities or capacity to cope with the perishable foods which typically form retail food waste. Most surplus food from retailers can be more usefully used by charities providing cooked meals for people who are experiencing homelessness, refugees, asylum seekers and, indeed, schools, as we heard in the debate earlier.

Again, I propose a simple change to broaden the motion to include food banks and local charities. I hope my amendment is received as friendly and helpful to give a broader scope and practical application to the overall aims of the motion.

The Chair: I call upon Clive Scowen to speak to but not move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to five minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): It has tended to be the default position of this Synod when it does not like something in society to call on the Government to exercise the coercive power of the state by legislating against it. Sometimes legislation is the only effective response, as was the case with the London Diocesan Motion on fixed-odds betting terminals which Synod wisely passed this time last year. Legislation can be a very blunt and insensitive instrument and there are often other ways in which the Government can act more nimbly, sensitively and, as Mr French put it, subtly, and achieve much more than it can by legislating. I believe this is an issue where that is the case, especially as there is evidence that the major food retailers are already engaging with the need to reduce food waste and there is reason to think that they may well be willing to respond to further incentives to voluntary action.

As paragraph 6 of the Secretary General's note (GS 2077B) tells us, the 2017 Report of the House of Commons Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Select Committee concluded that rather than bringing forward formal legislation, the Government should assess how it might further the redistribution of surplus food by additional fiscal measures. It recommended the Government to encourage food manufacturers and retailers to participate in the voluntary Courtauld Commitment to reduce food waste and packaging and encouraged the Government to give small-scale financial support for organisations such as the ones we have just heard about, facilitating redistribution from the retail and food service sector.

This amendment asks the Government to act on those recommendations from the Select Committee, promoting and incentivising voluntary change, resourcing charities, using other fiscal incentives where appropriate and only if necessary resorting to legislation.

ITEM 19

The Chair: We will now take each amendment in turn starting with Item 19. I ask Philip French to move his amendment, Item 19 standing in his name.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): I beg to move

In the opening words leave out “and the excessive tonnage of food wasted by retail outlets”.

I am pleased to move amendment 19 standing in my name.

The Chair: I invite Andrew Dotchin to comment. You have up to two minutes.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Synod, as spoken previously, I would ask you to resist this amendment, please.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 19 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so let us move to a vote on Item 19.

The motion

In the opening words leave out “and the excessive tonnage of food wasted by retail outlets”

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 20

The Chair: Let us now move to Item 20, the amendment standing in Heather Black’s name. Will you formally move your amendment?

Mrs Heather Black (York): I beg to move

In the opening words leave out “by retail outlets” and insert “throughout the food supply chain”.

I move the amendment that is standing in my name.

The Chair: Andrew, I invite you again to comment on this item. You have up to two minutes.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you, Heather, for your amendment. Please support her.

The Chair: Therefore, the amendment at Item 20 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so let us move to vote.

The motion

In the opening words leave out “by retail outlets” and insert “throughout the food supply chain”.

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That item is clearly carried and will be incorporated in a moment.

ITEM 21

The Chair: Let us move to the next amendment, which is number 21, Heather Black again. Please will you formally move your amendment?

Mrs Heather Black (York): I beg to move

In paragraph (b) – after “food banks” insert “and local charities”

I move the second part of my amendment at Item 21 that stands in my name.

The Chair: Back to you, Andrew, to comment, please.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Once again thank you, Heather. I would like to inform Synod that none of the speakers in these amendments has received any confectionary from me received through the FairShare waste food scheme.

The Chair: Item 21 is now open for debate. I see no one standing.

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): Point of order: can I check if Andrew is in favour of that amendment?

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Yes, please.

The Chair: Thank you for that. Let us move to vote then on Item 21.

The motion

In paragraph (b) – after “food banks” insert “and local charities”

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is also clearly carried and will be incorporated shortly.

ITEM 22

The Chair: Let us move to Item 22. Philip French, can you formally move the amendment standing in your name.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): I beg to move

In paragraph (b) leave out “to distribute food that might otherwise be wasted” and insert “and in other ways to minimize food waste”.

Madam Chairman, I move Item 22 standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you. Andrew.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you too, Philip, for your support and your support of Clive Scowen’s following amendment. I cannot

support your amendment but look forward to the others being accepted. I am against this amendment.

The Chair. Item 22 is open for debate. I see no one standing. Let us move to vote on Item 22.

The motion

In paragraph (b) leave out “to distribute food that might otherwise be wasted” and insert “and in other ways to minimize food waste”.

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 23

The Chair. Let us move then to Item 23. Back to you, Philip French, to formally move this next amendment.

Philip French (Rochester): I beg to move

Leave out paragraph (d).

For the third and last time of asking, I move Item 23 standing in my name.

The Chair. Back to you Andrew. You have up to two minutes to comment.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Sadly, I would like to resist the amendment.

The Chair. Item 23 is now open for debate. I see Jonathan Alderton-Ford standing to speak. You have up to two minutes.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I rise to ask Synod to also resist this amendment. The reason we need to have Government involvement in this is that food wastage is not just a British phenomenon; it is a global problem. In 2008, the Royal Institute of Surveyors did a special survey of food production across the globe and found that year-on-year the world produces twice as much food as we need to eat. Much of what is produced never gets off the field; that which is got off the field is not stored properly; that which is not stored properly is not distributed properly; and finally, when it gets to the rich West, we will not eat it if it is the wrong shape, the wrong colour and does not fit inside our plastic containers which we then throw away. Of that which we do buy we throw 50% away. We need to address food wastage properly. Bearing in mind that although in East Anglia we produce most of the food in this country, we still import 40% of our food needs, the Government needs to work with other Governments to address this global problem. As we have just heard, we are a global Church, and, therefore, we need to help our brothers and sisters around the world to solve their global food problems. What Clive Scowen is proposing, and subsequently I would like to support, is we need to work with Government to find our way through this complicated mesh to get this problem solved. I would ask you to resist this and support Clive Scowen subsequently.

The Chair: I am hoping for a motion of closure.

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

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

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

The Chair: Let us put Item 23 now to the vote.

The motion

Leave out paragraph (d).

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 24

The Chair: Let us move to Item 24, the amendment in Clive Scowen's name. Please formally move.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move

leave out "bringing forward legislation that would effectively" and insert "how it might most effectively act to";

And

at the end insert "whether by encouraging voluntary action, taking fiscal measures or, if necessary, bringing forward legislation".

I so move.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Back to you, Andrew, to comment on Item 24.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I heartily endorse this amendment and look forward to finally having a debate and telling the very good news stories that we do have about how we have cared for the poor of our nation.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Even though it is open for debate, I see no one standing so let us move to vote.

The motion

leave out "bringing forward legislation that would effectively" and insert "how it might most effectively act to";

And

at the end insert "whether by encouraging voluntary action, taking fiscal measures or, if necessary, bringing forward legislation".

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. That is great because now we can move back to the main motion as amended, so we are now including Items 20, 21 and 24. We are open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): REfUSE is an organisation in Durham that seeks to work with food waste and use it wisely. They are about to open a restaurant in Chester-le-Street called the Best Before restaurant. It is an absolutely brilliant example of how two young women catch the vision of what they were so disturbed by seeing what was happening outside the back of the main supermarkets in Durham city, the waste. They said, "We have to do something about it", and they are inspiring people all over County Durham to re-think. We need to celebrate entrepreneurs who are coming up with initiatives such as this, as well as looking at the big questions that Government has to offer some advice and direction and, if necessary, legislation.

I was talking to a hill farmer on the way down here on Wednesday who knew that we were going to be debating this. He works also with the National Farmers' Union. He said to me, "Please will you remind Synod that those of us who saw the grass stop growing last August and have had snow on the ground ever since November at the top of Teesdale" - because that is the reality of producing the food for some people in this country - "Please will you remind them that we have not been wasting anything at the top of the hills for the last few centuries because we know you can't waste anything; you have to work with every product that is produced". He said, "Please would you remind Synod that we have to get back to seasonal eating, and to recognise how hard it is to produce the food for many people". I commend farmers like that who actually need to be listened to about how we must not waste things, and some of it will cost us all - like, maybe we will only eat strawberries in June in the future.

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): I welcome this Report and also your call to repentance, Revd Dotchin, in your speech. I want to take an opportunity to remind us that this is not just an opportunity for us to further our mission to love our neighbours practically but also to love them spiritually. Like many of our churches, ours has the opportunity to gather food from local retailers and share that with people during the week. One lady - I will call her Sally - comes along to a social event at the church and at the end of this event gets to peruse the food we have. She finds herself in an in-between situation. She is ashamed to use food banks, she is able to get some food, but at the end of the week there is literally no bread. She loves this opportunity week-by-week to get bread for her young children. She says she feels forgotten. As time has gone on, she has not only taken this bread but begun to investigate the Bread of Life - Jesus Christ - and read His Word week-by-week. I wanted to remind us of what a wonderful opportunity this is, not just to help people practically but to introduce to them the very life-giver and provider that we all know and love. I commend this motion to you.

Mrs Isabel Adcock (Chelmsford): When my children left home and set up their own kitchens I found that when they returned to me they were going through my

store cupboard and fridge and throwing things out. They had found out about best before dates. I very quickly stopped it. I also help to run a local Christian bookshop and coffee shop and for 20 years I have been trying to explain that best before equals quality, not a late use-by or sell-by date. I have even contacted trading standards, who have been very helpful, and I have disseminated that information. It has not worked. People in general seem to treat best before dates as a late use-by or sell-by date. In conversation I have heard that people throw out food that is past its best before date; they consider it is not safe. Then they go and buy new to again throw that out because they have not used it. I come from a generation that was brought up to check by my senses whether the food I use is fit for human consumption. Yes, use-by dates are helpful but even then I smell, taste and look to check. I throw out very little. On Wednesday evening I noticed as I was coming here that I had just finished a pot of mustard. I looked at the best before date: January 2016. It was fine. I know the producers would probably not be happy to get rid of them, as they presumably rely on the sales of replacements, but getting rid of this confusing labelling would save mountains of food, not least through the preservation of food in tins. I understand that that was invented to preserve food to make it last a long time. Honey would not go to landfill after a couple of years. I have read that viable honey has been found in Egyptian tombs. Could we push the Government to abolish best before dates? It would certainly take a lot of pressure off me.

The Chair. After these two speakers I will be calling for a motion of closure. Lunch is rapidly approaching.

Mrs Sue Adeney (Worcester): I come from farming stock. I hate that expression but I do. I keep my own pigs, sheep and hens. The sheep starred in the crib service at Worcester Cathedral and did what sheep do best. As part of the environmental group of Synod's membership, I am struggling with this motion. I was not sure why. There are lots of good things in it, not least our personal responsibility and the things that have been said already in speeches and by Andrew in his presentation. But what is the harvest? Is it the asparagus from Chile in November, the strawberries from Israel in April or the kumquat - actually I do not know where they come from - in the words of Waitrose, "essential" ingredients? Our shopping culture has created an all year-round harvest which complicates life for our producers. Look how long the strawberry season is in this country to compete with overseas markets, or, as I experienced, finding spring onions in the Co-op flown in from Peru as I had watched the spring onions in the glebe field being ploughed into the ground. In this motion, we are being asked to bring food waste, which is part of the harvest, together with food poverty. It sounds a bit like waste for the poor. What I am trying to say is it is complex. Manna and quail were mentioned earlier and was not the instruction to only take as much as you need? What a perfect way to eliminate waste. But we need a huge culture change.

The Chair. We need to stop there, I am afraid, because time is an issue.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I want to thoroughly support the motion and particularly the affirmation of ensuring that the poor and vulnerable are not excluded from the harvest and to give thanks for the work of the food banks and the Trussell Trust throughout the country. In particular, I want to draw attention to the truly shocking situation of 1 million lonely pensioners left to starve in their

homes, highlighted by Frank Field and his group of MPs in January. Between the wars, the Church of England had a massive programme of visiting throughout the country: tens of thousands of people keeping relationships at the fore of our parochial mission and ministry, and when the post-war welfare state introduced state-run social care in the wake of the devastation of six years' of conflict, Archbishop Temple surrendered that imperative to the state saying that they were doing God's work in our stead. Maybe they were, but state-run community action does not, unfortunately, display the same consistency and resolve because it is not driven by the same conviction and passion. I ask whether it is time to re-establish a pervasive programme of visiting lonely old people with food throughout the Church of England with the same resolve as our work in education, so linking it with our work for food banks and eliminating food wastage. This would be a great outcome for this motion, which would ensure that the most vulnerable, lonely, starving old people are not excluded from the harvest and that their families would rejoice in our Christian care for others.

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

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

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

The Chair: Back to you then, Andrew Dotchin, to respond to the debate. You have up to two minutes.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you very much, Synod. I will try not to "waste" your time. There are many stories we have not heard. If you want to tell more, I have invented a hashtag called #TummiesNotLandfill. Please use liberally. Four things to close up. Rosemary, Catherine and Bishop Paul, thank you very much for reminding us that this is not just about food banks; it is in our schools, in our rural communities and even in our posh restaurants. Thank you to Isabel for reminding us of the fridge police. Sue, if you want to know where a kumquat comes from, may I point no further than my friend the Archbishop of Cape Town, who will be able to inform you. When my family was growing up in eastern Johannesburg, our children were horrified to return to England to find that the best before date was the one they had to eat things by. They had grown up knowing you were not allowed to eat it until that date.

Then the other harvest: thank you, Jason, for bringing this up. The small charity shop that runs in one of the churches in the poorer end of Felixstowe has produced baptisms and weddings just by people coming to buy their pound bag full of food without any overt proclamation of the Gospel other than Christian hands at work. That church has had no weddings for 10 years and no baptisms for five; this year we are looking at a different harvest.

Finally, and I hope you would support this motion overwhelmingly, as you go to your lunch, may I wish you bon appétit.

The Chair: Thank you. We move to vote on Item 9 as amended, including Items 20, 21 and 24. It is also on the large screens in the Chamber.

The motion

'That this Synod, mindful of the problems of food poverty in Britain today and the excessive tonnage of edible food wasted throughout the food supply chain:

- a) affirm the Biblical principle of ensuring that the poor and vulnerable are not excluded from the harvest;*
- b) commend those retailers who are working creatively with food banks and local charities to distribute food that might otherwise be wasted;*
- c) urge all dioceses and parishes to work with other voluntary initiatives to lobby for all local food retailers to review their policy on waste food so that the amount made available to combat food poverty is maximised;*
- d) request Her Majesty's Government to consider how it might most effectively act to minimise food waste by food retailers whether by encouraging voluntary action, taking fiscal measures or, if necessary, bringing forward legislation; and*
- e) call upon all church members to use food resources responsibly and minimise waste in their own homes.'*

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That amended item is clearly carried. Thank you very much for your co-operation with the timing. Enjoy lunch, everyone.

THE CHAIR Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield) took the Chair at 2.30 pm

ITEM 10 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. We now move to Item 10 on our agenda. Before I call upon Archbishop Justin Welby to give his Presidential Address, can I invite Synod to join me in a short prayer?

Almighty God, you have given your Holy Spirit to the Church to lead us into all truth. Bless with the Spirit's grace and presence the members of this synod and those who observe. Keep us steadfast in faith, united in love and courageous in action through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen. I now call upon Justin Welby.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Change unsettles. It can unsettle at a personal level. When our first grandchild arrived, I was so unsettled that I could not think of an answer to the question: "What do you want to be called?" I had called my grandfather "Grandpa", and I could not possibly be that old. Unnerved by the change, as well as just having become

a bishop, but equally unnerving, I blurted out, I hope humorously, “My Lord Bishop”. So to my death and for years afterwards I will be Bip. Change unsettles us individually and collectively, throws our compass into confusion, morally, and in attitudes.

In Deuteronomy 8, Moses speaks to the people of Israel about the consequences of their conquest of the Promised Land. It is one of the key passages for the Deuteronomist, whose book is foundational to the understanding of so much of the Old Testament. Moses sets out in stark deep contrast the change between the nature of being a people wandering in the wilderness and of being a settled people in a rich and fertile land. We looked at it this morning. The chapter can be summed up by the words “remember God”.

They are to remember that it was God who brought them out of Egypt, that it was God who preserved them in the wilderness through the miracles of the manna and of quail and through water emerging from rocks. They are to remember that God was the strength that overcame their enemies, and the wisdom that guided them through the wilderness. They are to remember that their very existence in the Promised Land is only by the grace and the gift of God. Once they are in Canaan they must remember and teach each other that they depend entirely on God, and that none of what they have achieved was achieved by their own efforts. Dependence on God alone is the key mark of the community of faith.

Moses sets out this contrast in such remarkable terms because in the settled life of the Promised Land there will be enormous change in their sociology, their geography, their politics, and, thus, a great danger of a massive change to the basic theological premise that they are fully dependent on God.

Change unsettles us. It pulls us away from the moorings of virtue and theological truth. “Traditioned innovation”, a phrase used by the theologian Greg Jones, and of which more later, meant that they would remember, and remembering, would continue in faithful obedience - what I would term “faithful innovation”.

“Traditioned innovation”/“faithful innovation” reoccurs again and again in the Bible. There is not time to go through all the examples, but obvious ones would be the growth of the Empire under David and Solomon, the division of the Kingdom, the fall of the Northern Kingdom and quasi-colonial status under various great powers, the Exile and the Return. And that does not even take us into the inter-Testamental times, or through the ministry of John the Baptist, announcing the most dramatic change which is then seen: the in-breaking of God through incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension and the gift of the Spirit. God produced a cosmic tectonic shift which nevertheless linked perfectly into the history of the people of Israel.

In the Acts of the Apostles, the tectonic shift is worked out in practice. The people of God, the Church formed in the Acts under the apostles, are challenged to adapt to Spirit-driven realities that they could never have begun to imagine by themselves. The greatest challenge was the incorporation of the Gentiles which was hinted at, promised, but never fully understood in the Old Testament prophetic traditions, and was now made real. The Samaritans, the Ethiopian Eunuch, and particularly Cornelius - all in what we now call the Holy Land - opened their lives and committed themselves in faith to Christ.

More than that, Paul is transformed on the road to Damascus and his ministry bears extraordinary fruit in areas of the Jewish diaspora well beyond the boundaries of the kingdom of Israel. Now it began to include even the oppressive Romans, the Pagan, the Greeks, numerous other idolaters and people beyond the law.

With much struggle, yet by the grace of God, the Church adapted without abandoning its tradition. Today we also see ourselves as children of Abraham, welcome as children of God, as Paul sets out so beautifully in Romans 9-11. Never, as the centuries have passed, has the Church had the luxury of remaining unchanged. Through Popes and Reformers, through men and women monastics, through movements of lay people and through bishops, the Spirit of God has disrupted stasis and caused the Church to re-imagine its shape and ministry. Such disruption is ever more true as the Church today hears the voice of its global membership amplified by social media, and is ever less able to live as the church in one country - to misquote a phrase of Stalin's - or one tradition only.

In the Church of England, as every other church, we struggle with change and stability. In 2016 the Faith and Order Commission published an excellent book edited by Loveday Alexander, Mike Higon and Bishop Christopher Cocksworth. It was called *Faithful Improvisation*, on the subject of leadership in times of change. Previously Middleton and Walsh, in a book published in 1993 - *The Truth Is Stranger Than It Used To Be* - wrote: "Christians need to indwell the biblical drama by serious, passionate study of the scriptures. This indwelling requires us to become intimately familiar with the biblical text in order to gain a deep, intuitive sense of the story's dramatic movement and the author's plot intention ... the purpose of the indwelling would be to ground faithful improvisation ... this requires taking the risk of improvisation that is creative, innovative and flexible".

These discussions, and that quotation, point towards a challenge that we deal with here and which is faced by every church, chaplaincy, religious community or any gathering of Christians. How do we reimagine the shape and reality of the Church so as to proclaim the Gospel afresh in each generation, as is said in the Declaration of Assent?

Our Quinquennial Goals call us to spiritual and numerical growth, serving the common good and reimagining ministry. Note the wording. We agreed to reimagine ministry; not to tinker with ministry. I think it is arguable that, although we have made a serious start to reimagining ministry, with numerous reports in every area from rural ministry, through education to the ministry of the laity (so long neglected) and within Renewal and Reform, we have not yet fully lived a reimagining of ministry. Yet reimagining is demanded by the times in which we live, by our experience of Church which is changing and developing, by the impact of an ever more effective contribution to the common good that we are making in an age of austerity and by the nature and turmoil of our society. We are seeing wonderful changes, such as Fresh Expressions and Pioneer Ministry, innovations in training, and so on. However, if I am honest, I often wonder, "Is that it?" Are we sufficiently attuned to the ever present work of the Holy Spirit calling us on?

We hear the voice of the Spirit, as I have said, ever more clearly from overseas as well as at home. We have heard it this morning - and I think many of us were moved near to tears, or to tears - but we hear it with every tweet, with every blog, in a way that historically was impossible. The Church is more one now in its linkage and therefore struggling more to be one in its life than it has ever been in human history. The Anglican Communion is a greater reality through modern communications, and that means that the questions of change are ever more complex, unless we reject our catholicity and the very concept of church as universal.

So how do we rise to the challenge of change in this generation, while, in the sentence I quoted earlier and the FAOC book, developing habits of faithful improvisation?

In times of change, there are two great temptations which afflict all institutions that have long traditions and well-established patterns of action.

First, there is the “throw the baby out with the bath water” approach. People call for radical change. To call for radical change without being aware of the traditions that underpin and secure the structures to which we belong is likely to lead to disaster, typically through division. It stirs fear rather than hope and encourages a bunker mentality rather than a willingness to see transformation.

Within Anglicanism we have always struggled to find a distinct identity, a family likeness. It has been a happy struggle because it has led to us being both catholic and reformed and to experiencing our identity flexibly in different parts of the globe, yet within a tradition. One, albeit little known, attempt to define the tradition - the tradition which has held us at least since the 16th century, in one form or another - is the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1886-88. At a time of great intellectual ferment and immense challenge to the global church, as Anglicanism began to come to terms with the fact that it had huge numbers of worshipping Christians in many different countries, the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral set out the boundaries which still define what is required to be Anglican, which is defined by the Lambeth Conference of 1958, picking up something that was clearly understood before then as being in communion with the See of Canterbury. The elements of the Quadrilateral are the Scriptures, the Creeds, the two Dominical Sacraments and the historical episcopacy, locally adapted. Note those words.

The statement of the Chicago Lambeth Quadrilateral reflects the family likeness by giving broad room for diversity of culture and tradition while keeping ultimate boundaries. The transmission of the historic episcopacy holds us to being part of the universal Church back to its earliest years. The Scriptures anchor us in the revealed purpose and will of God, accessible in our own languages, inspired by the Spirit of God, “living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword”, endlessly fruitful in their direction of the Church and their unfolding of the mission of God.

The Creeds set our doctrinal basis and the Dominical Sacraments reinforce our catholicity and our link with Christ, and the essential point is that we do not invent or create patterns of worship and action; we respond to the prompting of the Spirit. It is a collaborative process.

So one mistake is to imagine we can change everything, and the other mistake, of course, is to imagine that we change nothing.

Any tradition that is incapable of adapting is also one that is doomed to death. Professor L Greg Jones, who I referred to earlier, who was at Duke University in the United States for many years, is involved in some of the training for bishops. In one of the pieces he wrote for them, he says this: "Tradition is fundamentally different from traditionalism. Jaroslav Pelikan, in *The Vindication of Tradition*' characterised the difference when he wrote: 'Tradition is the living faith of the dead; traditionalism is the dead faith of the living'. People who bear a tradition are called to be relentlessly innovative in ways that preserve the life-giving character of [that] tradition".

That rings so many bells, I am sure, in many minds. We all know the expressions we hear at every level in every large institution, every parish church, every work, divine and human, including the Church. "We tried that in [insert whatever date you like, but it needs to be before living memory] and it didn't work". One speaker 20 or 30 years ago summed it up both humorously and accurately by saying that there is a range of approaches to change in churches: at one end there are the traditionalists, who feel that even if something has only been done twice before it must never be changed; at the other extreme are the so-called radicals who feel that once something has been done twice before it is high time it was thrown out.

In the Bible, both in the Old Testament and the New, we find constant issues of adapting to change. To go back to Greg Jones, he quotes a friend of his - a New Testament scholar - whom he asks to react to the phrase "traditioned innovation" as a pattern of thinking. The reaction from his friend was: "The New Testament. Indeed, the whole of Scripture".

What he calls "traditioned innovation", or I think better for us "faithful improvisation" or "faithful innovation", is essential to our understanding of what it means to be a Church today.

Reimagination requires material on which to work; traditions from which to spring. It is impossible to reimagine in a historical or traditional vacuum. We can only imagine what is already in our minds as a possibility, and therefore we draw on what we know and see and have experienced. The gift of one another and of sharing possibilities together - of which we spoke this morning - embedded in a deep reading of the Scriptures, triggers imagination on a cumulatively far greater scale than anything we can do by ourselves, and thus collegial working as God's people enables new possibilities, greater imagination, all securely anchored.

We fear those either who seek to lock us in to a pattern of ministry that lacks innovation or those who want to abandon the tradition. The greatest problem with either is that they deny the way in which God has worked through the Church when the Church has gathered itself most effectively to deal with deeply changed circumstances. When the Western Roman Empire collapsed, when the Eastern Roman Empire was overrun a thousand years later, when the Church had divided in the Great Schism and then again in the Reformation and innumerable times since, on each occasion new life has sprung up when Christians have prayerfully found ways of "faithful improvisation", held in love for one another.

What does it mean for us when we seek to reimagine?

It means that Scripture, our history and our tradition remain key parts of our thinking, along with reason. It also means that in reimagining collectively what it is to be God's people, and to exercise ministry through lay and ordained, through every part and person within the family of Christ, we require faithful improvisation which is full of love for one another, and so sets a future for the Church at the centre of God's will.

Such a future will demand immense sacrifice. It requires our willingness to be more concerned about opening our doors and throwing down barriers and boundaries than protecting our frontiers and keeping the enemy out. It requires sacrifice because we follow the one who sacrificed by giving his life on the Cross, who was God himself but did not count equality with God something to be grasped.

Yet that sacrifice is held in the context of a tradition and a faith which has taken us from Cross to empty tomb, from empty tomb to the Mount of Olives and ascension, and from ascension to the upper room of Pentecost, and finally will take us to the fulfilment of the coming of the Kingdom.

"Faithful innovation" and "faithful improvisation" must both cause us to look afresh at our structures and our habits. Our development of the ministry of all the baptised, as opposed to meaning only the ministry of the ordained or licensed, requires innovation, not a few tweaks. Our approach to safeguarding needs culture change. Our renewing of vocations, and their development and support, requires both clear tradition and huge innovation. We must innovate, within the tradition, in our attitudes to episcopacy. The parish system and its links to natural communities, the issues of buildings, our attitudes to inclusion, all require faithful and faith-filled innovation and improvisation. It cannot be done quickly.

But if the Church is to be available to God, it must be understandable to people with whom we minister, among whom we live, simply, whom we love. It must stand clearly for its history, live out of its traditions, and yet see the Promised Land and be willing to give all and risk all to get there.

No institution exists by right. We must re-earn our existence in each generation as the physical institution. That means change. But the questioning of ourselves, our attitudes and structures, must be in love, and faithful to the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the Catholic Creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. We must reimagine, but do so improvising afresh in tune with the Spirit.

If that is truly our aim, we cannot either be traditionalist nor radically abandoning our traditions. We have boundaries and limits set by God himself, to which we are called to adhere out of love for God and Jesus Christ and out of love for one another right around the world, and indeed in love reflecting the love of God for the world itself. We have a mission given by God - a call to make disciples - from Christ Himself, which must overthrow all particular interests and all personal desires. If we may develop a love filled, faithful improvisation, we have the certain

hope of a Church renewed and revived, serving the Common Good, lifting up the Glory of Christ and revealing the Kingdom.

The Chair: That now concludes Item 10. We move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 2.57 pm

ITEM 500
SPECIAL AGENDA I
LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
AMENDING CANON NO. 36 ([GS 2029D](#))

The Chair: Members of Synod, we now come to Legislative Business. We begin with the enactment of Amending Canon No. 36 and Amending Canon No. 37, both of which received Final Approval from the Synod at the July 2017 group of sessions. I am happy to report to Synod that Royal Assent and Licence has been given in respect of both Amending Canons. Under Standing Order 68, once the instrument of enactment of the Canons has been read to the Synod, the motions appearing on the Order Paper in relation to them must be put to the Synod and voted on without debate. I therefore firstly call upon the Registrar to read the instrument of enactment.

The Registrar: “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, maturely treated upon by the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the General Synod of the Church of England in their Synod begun at Westminster in the year of our Lord 2015 and in the 64th year of the reign of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth II, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of her other realms and territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith, being Canons entitled respectively Amending Canon No. 36 and Amending Canon No. 37, both of which received Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence on the fifth day of February 2018. We, being the Presidents, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of York and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity of the said Synod, do hereby declare and testify our consent to the said Canons entitled Amending Canon No. 36 and Amending Canon No. 37. And in testimony of such our consent we have hereunto subscribed our names as hereafter follow. Dated this ninth day of February in the year of our Lord 2018 and in the 67th year of the reign of our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth II”.

The Chair: I move Item 500, “That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 36” be made, promulgated and executed’ without any debate.

The motion

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 36” be made, promulgated and executed.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 501
AMENDING CANON NO. 37 ([GS 2029DD](#))

The Chair. I move, from the Chair, Item 501, “That the Canon entitled ‘Amending Canon No. 37’ be made, promulgated and executed”.

The motion

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 37” be made, promulgated and executed.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. I now, therefore, sign the Instrument of Enactment, after which it will be signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity. The Canons will now be sent for proclamation in the diocesan synods. That completes these two items of business. Thank you, Synod.

THE CHAIR *Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn)* took the Chair at 3.03 pm

ITEM 502
DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE ([GS 2046A](#))

The Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. We come to Item 502, the report of the Revision Committee on the Draft Ecumenical Relations Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 38. Members will need the report of the Revision Committee and the draft Measure and Canon. I call on the Chair of the Revision Committee, Professor Joyce Hill, to move the motion, “That the Synod do take note of this Report”. Professor Hill, you may speak for not more than 10 minutes.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): I beg to move

‘That the Synod do take note of this Report’

Chair, it might be helpful if I were, first, to say something about the way the Revision Committee has gone about its work. As introduced, the draft Measure and draft Amending Canon covered a fairly wide range of subject matter. What that subject matter had in common was that it came out of phase 2 of the work of the Simplification Task Group. We had, in effect, a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure and Canon.

In the light of submissions received from members of the Synod and from within its own membership, the Revision Committee took the view that it would be sensible to divide both the Measure and the Canon to form separate pieces of legislation. Each divided part would then deal with a particular area of the Church’s life and ministry.

The Measure and Amending Canon before the Synod today represent the first

fruits of the Revision Committee's work. They contain provisions relating to ecumenical relations that originally formed part of the larger Measure and Amending Canon which received First Consideration last year. While most of the submissions the Committee received were concerned with the Church Representation Rules - no surprise there because there are so many of them - a small number related to the ecumenical provisions.

Our consideration of these submissions and of the relevant provisions of the Measure and Canon are set out in our first Report. We accepted some of the submissions and made amendments accordingly. We also rejected some submissions. One of the amendments we accepted was to paragraph 12 of the new Canon B 43. That paragraph sets out the conditions which have to be met before a bishop can establish a local ecumenical co-operative scheme.

Unlike the existing Canon B 43, the proposed new Canon did not make it a condition that the bishop obtain the consent of the incumbent or Parochial Church Council of a parish that would be affected by a scheme. The intention had been to leave such matters to a code of practice. The Revd Paul Benfield proposed that the Canon be amended to make the obtaining of the incumbents and PCCs' consent mandatory or, in the case of a cathedral, to make obtaining the consent of the chapter mandatory.

We took the view that a scheme would be unworkable if it did not have the active support of the incumbent and PCC or cathedral chapter and that obtaining their consent should, therefore, be mandatory. We made an amendment to the Canon to that effect.

Another of the amendments was made in the light of the submission from the Archdeacon of Southwark who chairs the Steering Committee for this legislation. She was concerned that the form taken by a particular provision in the new Canon B 43 would, unintentionally, have the effect of restricting the existing range of duties which a member of another Church can be invited to perform in the Church of England.

The resulting amendment will ensure that it continues to be possible to invite a member of another Church to say morning and evening prayer, read the Scriptures, lead intercessions, preach, assist at baptisms and weddings and in the distribution of Holy Communion, even if there is no equivalent service in that person's own Church.

We also accepted a number of amendments which made minor improvements to the provisions of the Measure and Canon, both in terms of their operation and their drafting. They are all set out in the Report. We rejected a proposed amendment that would have resulted in a member of the Salvation Army not being permitted to preach at a service of Holy Communion, confirmation or ordination.

We understood Fr. Benfield's rationale for proposing that amendment. The Salvation Army did not celebrate those services itself, and he questioned whether it was appropriate for a member of the Salvation Army to preach at such a service in the Church of England, but the Committee took the view that this would put the Salvation Army at a particular disadvantage when members of other Churches

which did not administer confirmation or ordination, for example the Baptist Church, were already allowed to preach at confirmations and ordinations in the Church of England.

The Committee, therefore, decided to retain the provision which would bring the law, so far as the Salvation Army was concerned, into line with existing provision for other Churches. We also rejected a proposal to substitute a different expression for, "local ecumenical co-operative scheme". Clive Scowen had proposed that it should be replaced with, "local ecumenical partnership". However, we were advised that this new descriptive term had already been agreed ecumenically and had been adopted in the legislation at the request of the Council for Christian Unity.

The intention is that our legislation should not prescribe what particular ecumenical initiatives are actually called. We expect them to be known by different names in different places. "Local ecumenical co-operative scheme" is simply a generic statutory term for these types of arrangements in the Church of England's legislation. It is not for the Church of England to prescribe for other churches what ecumenical initiatives should be called, and we were content, for our own legislative purposes, with the expression we had.

Some other proposals were rejected because they were not legally necessary. Subject to the amendments described in our Report, the Committee was entirely supportive of the draft Measure and Amending Canon which we now return to the General Synod. This is not the last you will be hearing from this Revision Committee. Since we approved our first Report, we have already met on two further occasions to deal with the Church Representation Rules.

Owing to the large number of submissions received on the Rules, and, indeed, the large number of Rules themselves, we will be meeting on several more occasions, including next Monday, before, I hope, we shall be able to return that part of the original Measure to the Synod in July. My fingers are slightly crossed behind my back on that, but I think we might manage it. Chair, I move that the Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: Thank you so much, Professor Hill. The motion is now open for debate. I remind members that under Standing Order 57(6), which you will all remember, it is not in order to debate a matter which is the subject of an amendment on the Order Paper; is that clear? Yes. Those who wish to speak in this debate, would you now stand or indicate, please. You have to up five minutes.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): Firstly, I would like to warmly thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for the ecumenical work he is doing and the bridges he is building across denominations. That work is noted widely in ecumenical circles and I personally am very grateful for the efforts made. I did have to speak to my Ecumenical Church Council about the proposed rewording of the names. You might be amused to hear that when I said they might be a local ecumenical co-operative scheme, they reported they only have Sainsbury's.

I belong to, and my church belongs to, a covenanting group of churches, which has Anglican, URC, Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches together. For over

10 years, we have been sharing intercessors and people to speak the Scriptures for us and readings and preachings during, particularly, the week of Christian Unity. We have Lent lunches together and we also have Lent courses together. It came as a bit of surprise to find out we have been doing this without it being approved. I would want to point out to most people here who are not involved necessarily in ecumenical ventures that many of us at grassroots level are doing a great deal that is now passing through the legislation.

We also have some difficulty sometimes in reconciling the sets of rules and information we receive from our sponsoring denominations, in my case the Anglican Church and the URC, so I am glad to see some release that we can actually look at other forms of guidance other than the Anglican Church guidance.

I was going to refer to the Salvation Army friend that I have who reports to me that every time he eats with me he is having Holy Communion, but I find that unnecessary. Every time he eats with anyone, he is in communion. Thank you for this Report. I am welcoming all these recommendations. Thank you for the sanguine explanations. Thank you to the Revision Committee. I am very well aware that Church Representation Rules are a major obstacle here. Although we are not due for radical change, I do hope a bit of ripping up of a few of them will be suitable. I hope that we can arrive ourselves by July with the final version of this.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): This is just a clarification. I am really glad that this is a smaller version of the Canons than we had before. Thank you to the Revision Committee because our problem under Simplification part 2 was that we found that we were trying to revise something that was almost unintelligible and, so, this is a much better piece of work. Thank you for that.

I think I would like to ask a question about the code of practice because the devil is often in the detail. If we know yet who is doing the drafting on the code of practice and how we ensure that they are continent in so doing that would be very helpful. My experience, for instance, with the code of practice for BMOs, was that it was produced and became completely unusable and we shall be bringing back a revised version of that. Can we learn from the mistakes on the code of practice on BMOs and bring back something that is short, succinct, intelligible and usable, please?

Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford): Thank you for all of this. It is all very good. I support it all. It is a point, and I hope it is not too technical, but I do not quite understand it, so I raise it. It is in the Amending Measure 2046A, clause 2, where you are amending 5(a). I am at 5(b)(1). This is the bit where the bishop can designate people as long as the bishop is satisfied that they do not, “promote any doctrine which is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter”. Being a lawyer, I just want to be sure that we are all quite happy with what an “essential matter” is and it is not going to be the subject of argument in due course.

The Chair: I see no one else standing. I, therefore, call on Professor Hill to reply to the debate. Professor, you have up to five minutes, if you need that time.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): Probably not, but thank you very much. I

am glad to have the positive comments that have been offered by people who have spoken. There is some work here for the Bishops to do. That is part of the answer. The Bishop of Willesden was asking about a code of practice. Ultimately, that is the responsibility of the bishops, but an early draft is already in existence being drafted by the CCU. It will have to be, obviously, considered by the bishops in detail.

In relation to the question asked last, the third contribution to the discussion, the answer to that question is that it will be for the bishop in question to take a view on it when the situation arises. As far as Penny Allen's comments are concerned, I do remember, I think correctly, that when we had the First Consideration, I think, Penny, you raised the question of a sense of unease that we were going to have ecumenical co-ops. As you know now, that is not intended to be the case. The titles that individual groups want to use is up to them to choose.

Our purpose in all of this, as I think the various speakers to the debate have recognised, is that we have tried to simplify and to bring up-to-date. I do appreciate that the devil is in the detail, but the code of practice that will underpin this is currently in preparation and will go to the bishops for their final view.

The Chair. Therefore, Synod, I put to you the motion, "That the Synod do take note of this Report".

The motion

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

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 506 DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE ([GS 2046Y](#)) – REVISION STAGE

The Chair. We come now to the revision stage for the draft Measure. I would remind members that amendments and other motions appear on the Order Paper. Where no notice has been given of any amendments to particular clauses and no members have indicated that they wish to speak against those clauses, I give my permission under Standing Order 58(4) to the clauses being taken en bloc.

Those of you who are new to Synod might like to listen carefully to this next bit because this is where all the fun begins in our life. As this is the revision stage, we will need to use the 40 member procedure under Standing Order 59. Where an amendment is moved by someone, other than a member of the Steering Committee, and is not simply consequential on an amendment that has already been passed, the mover has not more than five minutes to speak to it.

I will then call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply. If the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places, or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken.

We begin with clauses 1 to 3 of the draft Measure. No notice has been given of amendments to these clauses and no members have given notice of an intention to speak against any of these clauses. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 506, "That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure".

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I do, indeed, move that clauses 1 to 3 stand as part of the Measure. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: This, therefore, is now open to debate. Anybody wishing to take part? I see no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 506, "That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure" to the vote.

The motion

'That clauses 1-3 stand part of the Measure'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 507

The Chair: We now come to clause 4 of the draft Measure and I invite the Bishop of Sodor and Man to move his amendment to that clause, Item 507. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man (Rt Revd Peter Eagles): I beg to move

Clause 4, page 4, line 17, leave out "including the Isle of Man" and insert "except the Isle of Man (as to which, see subsection (8))".

And

Clause 4, page 4, line 22, at end insert — "(8) If an Act of Tynwald or an instrument made under an Act of Tynwald so provides, the provisions of this Measure extend to the Isle of Man subject to such exceptions, adaptations or modifications as are specified in the Act or instrument."

Thank you, Chair, and, thank you, Synod, for giving me a couple of minutes, which is all I need, to move these amendments to clause 4, which deals with the extent of the draft Measure. At page 4, line 17, for "including the Isle of Man" substitute, "except the Isle of Man (as to which, see sub-section (8))". And page 4, line 22, at the end insert, "If an act of Tynwald or an instrument made under an Act of Tynwald so provides, the provisions of this Measure extend to the Isle of Man subject to such exceptions, adaptations or modifications as are specified in the Act or instrument".

The context is the unique position of the Diocese of Sodor and Man in relation to Church legislation. The Isle of Man is not part of England or, indeed, of the United Kingdom; it is a separate jurisdiction with its own laws and constitution. Legislation passed by this Synod often has to make special provision to ensure that it fits into the legal environment of the island.

In some cases, a Measure extends automatically to the Isle of Man without any modification; for example, if it deals with the national institutions. In other cases, a Measure does not extend to the island at all; for example, if it deals with cathedrals, as the legal status of a cathedral appeal is quite different from that of English cathedrals.

In most cases, a Measure will need to be adapted in its application to the Isle of Man. This is achieved by including a provision for permissive extension; that is, providing that it can be extended to the island with modifications by a Measure passed by the diocesan synod, approved by Tynwald, the Manx Parliament, and assented to by the sovereign. Which of those formulae is adopted in a particular Measure is a matter for discussion between the legal office here and legal officers in the Isle of Man.

The original version of this Measure, which received First Consideration in February 2017, included a permissive extension clause which clearly was satisfactory. The version before you today provides in clause 4(6)(b) for its automatic extension to the island; that is, there will be no opportunity to adapt the Measure in its application to the Isle of Man to ensure that it fits in with the Manx legal requirement.

That has a consequence in that the substitution of "local ecumenical co-operative scheme" for "local ecumenical project" by clause 1(4) makes the Manx legislation on mission initiatives and Bishops' Mission Orders unworkable so far as it relates to initiatives with an ecumenical element. The Measure, instead of facilitating ecumenical initiatives, will make them impossible as far as the Diocese of Sodor and Man is concerned.

The solution that we propose, which I understand is acceptable to the Steering Committee, is to revert to the original permissive extension clause, so that the changes made by the draft Measure and consequential amendments to Manx legislation can be introduced in the Isle of Man at the same time, thus avoiding the difficulty I have mentioned. "*Gura mie ayd, eaghtyrane. Gura mie eu, coyrle agglish*". Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Synod. I beg to move the amendments standing in my name.

The Chair. It is always good to hear from another part of the Anglican Communion. I now call upon a member of the Steering Committee to reply. You have not more than five minutes - in Manx.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): The Steering Committee wholeheartedly, and somewhat apologetically, accepts the Bishop's amendment.

The Chair. This amended item is now open for debate. Those wishing to contribute? No, no. Therefore, I put the amendment at Item 507 to the vote.

The motion

Clause 4, page 4, line 17, leave out "including the Isle of Man" and insert "except the Isle of Man (as to which, see subsection (8))".

And

Clause 4, page 4, line 22, at end insert — "(8) If an Act of Tynwald or an instrument made under an Act of Tynwald so provides, the provisions of this Measure extend to the Isle of Man subject to such exceptions, adaptations or modifications as are specified in the Act or instrument."

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 508

The Chair: I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 508, "That clause 4 [as amended] stands part of the Measure".

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I beg to move that

'That clause 4 as amended stand part of the Measure.'

Thank you, Chair. I do so move, "That clause 4 [as amended] stands part of the Measure".

The Chair: Would anybody like to say anything at this point? In which case, I put Item 508, as amended, "That clause 4 [as amended] stand part of the Measure".

The motion

'That clause 4 as amended stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 509

The Chair: I now invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 509, "That the Long Title stands part of the Measure".

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I beg to move

'That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.'

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair: Anybody want to debate the Long Title? I see no one standing. I put Item 509, "That the Long Title stands part of the Measure".

The motion

'That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That completes the revision stage of the Draft Ecumenical Relations Measure. The Measure now stands committed to the Steering Committee in

respect of its final drafting.

ITEM 503

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 ([GS 2047A](#))

The Chair. We move on to Item 503. As Professor Hill has already spoken to the Report, which covers the Revision Committee stage for the draft Amending Canon as well as the draft Measure, I invite her to move Item 503 formally.

Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds): I beg to move

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

I do so move.

The Chair. Is there any debate on the draft Amending Canon? No. So, I do not think you need to reply, Professor Hill, to that. I put Item 503 to the vote.

The motion

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

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 510

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 ([GS 2047Y](#)) – REVISION STAGE

The Chair. Notice has not been given of any amendments to the Amending Canon or of any intention to speak against any of its provisions, so I invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 510, that paragraph 1 of the Canon stands part of the Canon.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I beg to move

‘That paragraph 1 stand part of the Canon.’

I do so move.

The Chair. Does anybody want to speak to that? No. Therefore, I put to Synod Item 510, “that paragraph 1 stand part of the Canon”.

The motion

‘That paragraph 1 stand part of the Canon.’

was put and carried by a show of hands.

The Chair. That completes the revision stage of draft Amending Canon No. 38. The Canon now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting. Thank you.

We now move on to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 3.31 pm

ITEM 504

DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE ([GS 2064A](#) AND [GS 2064Y](#))

The Chair. We come now to this afternoon's treat, the bundle of joy that is the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. For this business, members will need the Report of the Revision Committee, GS 2064Y, the draft Measure, GS 2064A and Order Paper III. I now call on the Chair of the Revision Committee, the Archdeacon of Oxford, to move the motion at Item 504 "that the Synod do take note of this Report". The Archdeacon may speak for not more than 10 minutes.

Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford): I beg to move

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

Chair, as you have suggested, you can imagine my excitement when the envelope came inviting me to chair the Revision Committee. It is always a privilege, but then reading the title "The Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure", my heart slightly sank. In fact, it was far more interesting than I was imagining. The big picture here is simply to enable the mission and ministry of the Church. If you like big picture, just remember that and switch off. If you like detail, here we go.

As only three submissions were received from members of the Synod, the Revision Committee was able to carry out its work with just one meeting and can now report. A key provision in the Measure is clause 1, which will enable the Church Commissioners to make grants to the Archbishops' Council. This is an important provision because it will mean that, for the first time, the surplus in the Church Commissioners' General Fund will be capable of being applied for any purpose which furthers the work of the Church of England. As matters stand, the Church Commissioners can apply their funds only for specific limited purposes that are set out in various Acts of Parliament and Measures. The new power to make grants to the Archbishops' Council will enable the funds generated by the Commissioners to be used to support the work and mission of the Church of England more generally. That is because any grants made under the new power could be applied by the Council to its much wider-range objects, which are "to co-ordinate, promote, aid and further the work and mission of the Church of England". Who knows, there may even be funding for archdeacons' development alongside bishops and deans, and for much else besides.

The Revision Committee was satisfied that this was not an untrammelled power to spend the Commissioners' funds. It is only income, not the Commissioners' capital, which will be capable of being granted under the new power, and any grants could only be made from the surplus of their income after the Commissioners had paid any amounts which they were under a statutory

obligation to pay.

It was against that background that the Committee considered a proposal from Keith Cawdron that the new power to make grants should be subject to a sunset provision. Mr Cawdron proposed that a provision should be inserted into clause 1 so that the grant-making power would expire after seven years unless renewed by a further Measure. The Committee considered this carefully, but felt it would have significant implications for the effective use of the grant-making power. It would mean that it was only temporary and would therefore prevent the Church Commissioners from committing to the provision of any grant to the Archbishops' Council beyond the end of the seven-year period. It would mean that the Council would, in turn, be unable to commit to funding beyond a limited period; a period that would become increasingly shorter as the sunset date became closer. The Committee felt that would significantly reduce the effectiveness of the new power to further the work and mission of the Church. For those reasons, we rejected Mr Cawdron's proposal for a sunset provision.

After discussion, we also rejected his further proposal that the Commissioners should be subject to a special reporting requirement on the exercise of this new power. The Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council are already required by statute to make annual reports in which their financial transactions are identified. The Commissioners' Report has to be laid before both Houses of Parliament as well as before this Synod. We therefore did not consider that any additional reporting requirement on this one issue was needed.

The Committee then spent some time on clause 4 of the Measure. Indeed, we lived up to the old adage, "Wherever two or three clergy are gathered together, there funerals will be discussed" - at great length. This clause 4 is the provision which widens the scope for the provision of funeral ministry by clergy who have authority to officiate within the Church of England but who are not necessarily attached to the deceased's parish. The Committee supported the increased flexibility that this provision provided, given that many of those for whom funeral ministry is sought are not tied into the parochial system and it would be to the detriment of the mission of the Church if that resulted in their not receiving the Church's ministry. As we know, the number of funerals going through the Church has been declining in many areas. However, we rejected a proposal from Keith Cawdron to remove the requirement that the member of the clergy who was asked to officiate at a funeral does seek the goodwill of the deceased's minister. We thought that this provision reflected a similar requirement relating to the baptism of infants, for example, from outside the parish. We also noted that a requirement to seek goodwill did not mean that goodwill had necessarily to be obtained, which could be impossible given time constraints. We accepted a different amendment proposed by Canon Paul Cartwright which we considered would further the rationale of the provision. As amended by the Committee, the provision now requires a member of the clergy to have, so far as is practicable, informed the relevant minister and sought his or her goodwill. We considered that this was a helpful way of framing the requirement, and is intended to ensure that the deceased's parish priest, wherever possible, is informed about the death so that he or she can offer pastoral care. Significantly, it does not impose any obligations on the family of the deceased or on the funeral director, only on the member of the clergy who is to officiate.

The third provision of significance on which the Committee received submissions was clause 9, which makes amendments to the Constitution of the General Synod. Those amendments were originally intended to provide a secure statutory basis for provisions contained in the Standing Orders of General Synod that enable the Presidents to alter the timings of groups of sessions or to cancel a session or group of sessions of the Synod. Mrs Debrah Mclsaac raised a number of questions about these provisions and the Committee has addressed them fully in the Report. That led Mr John Freeman, a member of the Committee, to propose that the power of cancellation should be exercisable jointly by all six of the officers of General Synod - Presidents, Prolocutors, Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity - rather than by the Presidents alone. The Committee noted that it was already the case that the group of six had authority to take certain decisions on behalf of the Synod as a whole and agreed that the group of six was the appropriate group to take any decision about cancelling a meeting of the Synod. The Committee therefore amended clause 9 to that effect.

The other matters considered by the Committee included some drafting amendments, the most substantial of which relates to clause 7, and considerably simplifies the provision it makes about the binding effect of decisions taken by the Court of Arches and the Chancery Court of York. At the suggestion of the Church Commissioners, we inserted two new clauses to make minor improvements to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011. We also made some corrections and minor improvements to the existing provisions of the Measure.

Ladies and gentlemen, our revels now are ended. The journey is over. Thank you to all who have made submissions and to the members of the Committee for giving up their valuable time in this way. Remember in the land of the just, where the first shall be last and the last first, miscellaneous provisions are kings. I move that Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: Archdeacon, the party is not over quite yet because the motion is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes. May I remind members that under Standing Order 57(6) it is not in order to debate a matter which is the subject of an amendment on the Order Paper.

Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): Mr Chairman, members of Synod, Miscellaneous Provisions Measures share some of the characteristics of doctoral theses: they are detailed, they are dry as dust, but they are essential if vital requirements are to be met, in the case of doctoral theses the needs of scholarship and in our own case the need to keep ecclesiastical law simple and in best condition.

My congratulations to the Revision Committee on the excellent job they have done, slightly sad as I am that the ingenious drafting fiction formerly contained in clause 9(3) whereby Synod was to be treated as having met twice when it had in fact only met once has been replaced by the more prosaic, though probably preferable new 1(b) in clause 9(3). I want briefly to touch on clause 7 about the provincial courts and to welcome the revised drafting now recommended by the Revision Committee.

Each of the two Provinces of Canterbury and York has a similar but separate system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in respect of faculties and clergy discipline. In

the Province of Canterbury, the appeal court is the Arches Court of Canterbury and in the Province of York, it is the Chancery Court of York, each comprising myself as Dean or Auditor respectively, and in faculty matters sitting with two Chancellors, in disciplinary matters sitting with four others, two lay and two clergy. Happily, each appeal court sits relatively infrequently. Where there is a previous decision of the same appeal court, the appeal court will normally follow it, thus providing a measure of certainty to the law. The lower courts will also normally follow the previous decisions of the Province's own appeal court or risk being overturned on appeal.

In the very rare cases where there is a conflict between previous decisions of the two appeal courts, it has generally been assumed that the most recent decision by whichever appeal court will be followed. This approach was sanctioned, albeit obiter, by the Court of Arches back in 2005 in the case of *St Nicholas, Sevenoaks*. However, in August 2016, doubt was cast as to the correctness of this approach in a commendably thorough judgment of the then Chancellor of Durham in the case of *Sam Thai Chan*, who held that the only relevant precedent in each Province was that of its own appeal court.

The aim of clause 7 is simply to affirm the position as stated by the Court of Arches in *St Nicholas, Sevenoaks*. Both Archbishops were consulted before its introduction. The benefit of the revised wording is that it omits any express reference to decisions being binding so that the effect of previous decisions, whether they be persuasive, highly persuasive or binding, together with the approach where there are conflicting decisions of appeal courts, can be worked out in case law, but on a basis set by this Measure that it matters not whether the previous decision is a case decided in the Court of Arches or one decided in the Chancery Court of York. Normally, it would be the more recent decision that would be followed, but there may be cases where this would not be appropriate, for example if there were material factors considered in the earlier decision but not taken into account in the later decision.

I urge support for clause 7 in its revised form and for all the proposals of the Revision Committee.

Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich): As I was listening to your excellent presentation, I suddenly realised that in clause 4, Conduct of Funerals, we might have missed lay ministers who conduct funerals. If so, may I propose an amendment that it should read, "a clerk in Holy Orders or lay minister, who is authorized to officiate in accordance with the Canons of the Church of England, may perform a funeral service ..." et cetera, et cetera.

Mrs Julie Dzeigiel (Oxford): I wish to speak specifically in support of clause 1, but I will start by saying that I was a member of the Steering Committee for the last Miscellaneous Provisions Measure. It was a joy and an enormous education to me, and I have used that experience enormously since then. I think these are wonderful things. However, as this Synod knows, I am a parish treasurer and I am also now a member of the Archbishops' Council Finance Committee. I think I am unique in experiencing finance from the coalface all the way up to the top of the Church.

What concerns me sometimes is that those layers do not always work together. I

support clause 1 wholeheartedly in that it will help all of the Church to be one Church and that we do not see Church Commissioners as “them” - they are “us” - and we do not see the layers as separate. Please support this Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, specifically clause 1.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I should say that I am a Church Commissioner because I am going to speak about clause 1, too. I warmly welcome clause 1 to improve the capability of the Church Commissioners to support the work of the Church of England. The need for this was brought into sharp relief by the need to make special arrangements to provide funding for digital transformation. It underpins the fact that there are things which we can do as one body much more effectively which help the whole productivity and efficiency of the Church. I would particularly draw attention to my Private Member’s Motion, which you kindly passed a year ago, dispensing with the principle of subsidiarity for matters which are purely administrative. There may well be quite a few areas where a small amount of investment will bring huge benefits in releasing both time and money for mission. However, I should say it has been a key principle throughout the nearly 20 years during which I have been a Church Commissioner that we need to focus on areas of need and opportunity.

I think we need to remember this, and I know my colleagues in the Church Commissioners all remain diligent to ensure that we will look to real outcomes for proposals which are put forward. In summary, I welcome this strongly and I hope we will look for creative ways to make use of this clause for the real benefit of the Church of England as a whole.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): I am Deputy Chair of the Church Commissioners. Again on clause 1, if I may, just to clarify for Synod, this does not mean more money; it means the existing amount of money that our distribution formula tells us that we can satisfactorily disburse to Church purposes being spread over a wider range of purposes. It does not generate an extra pound note or pound coin. It gives us greater freedom as to how that money is used most effectively to the ministry and mission of the Church.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I, too, am a Commissioner and I will be begging for more and more money. The clause needs to pass so that we behave like one Church and not the Commissioners on one side, the Archbishops’ Council on another and the parishes on another. This is a very vital clause and I will be in the board asking for more.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I should have spotted this earlier. I have been sitting there puzzling about clause 5, which is the power of permissive delegation between bishops. We are using delegation much more these days in order to spread the workload. It is a very important power which is exercised well, not merely through area schemes but generally across the Church of England. I want to query whether this particular clarification obfuscates more than that clarifies. It says that you can delegate any functions which are not conferred or imposed by or under an Act of Parliament or Measure. Does that mean the converse is not true: that is to say you cannot delegate things which are specified in a Measure? We have always taken it to mean that when a Measure says diocesan bishop and powers are given to a diocesan bishop, that can include other bishops by default. Does this clause make that delegation clearer or

make it more difficult? I am not understanding what the clause is intending to achieve.

The Chair. I see no one standing, so I call on the Archdeacon of Oxford to reply. He has up to five minutes.

Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford): Thank you, Chair, and thank you, everyone, for your really interesting and encouraging contributions. First, the Dean of the Arches & Auditor, I am most grateful to him for his warm welcome, especially over clause 9, and his approval for clause 7. We did enjoy the original slightly more complex but inventive version of clause 9, but we were a little worried about the reputational risk to the Synod with the phrase “legal fiction”, so we have avoided that, we hope. Thank you, too, for your encouragement and approval for clause 7.

Sally Gaze asked a very helpful question about lay ministers and funerals. Clause 4 deliberately applies to clergy who may be approached directly by members of the public, particularly imagining hospice and hospital chaplains for whom this is quite a common and often appropriate ministry. Lay ministers are covered in clause 4(7), so I do encourage you to read that. If people think that lay ministers should be able to be approached on this slightly more freelance basis for funerals rather than under the authority of a clergy person, you are very free to write in to the Ministry Division and make that point and they would need to consider it. But do look at clause 4(7).

It is good to hear people from my own Diocese of Oxford: Julie, a treasurer, liking clause 1; and Gavin Oldham, a Church Commissioner, also liking clause 1; and hearing from the Bishop of Manchester and the Archbishop of York. It will really open the possibilities of using the same amount of money, so let the fun begin, but it will be somewhere else. Thank you for your support and encouragement for what is a really important clause 1.

The Bishop of Willesden, this is a more complicated question about clause 5. Delegation for this would normally be by diocesan scheme, I think, under the Pastoral Mission Measure of 2007. This is designed to fill a gap. I hope that is a helpful answer, but that is the answer I have. If you would like further on that, I guess the Steering Committee will begin to take over from this point. We considered it as filling a gap and we were quite happy with it as it stood. I am happy to move that the Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair. I put the motion at Item 504 to the vote.

The motion

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

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. We move seamlessly to the revision stage for the draft Measure. Notice has been given of nine proposed amendments. I would remind members that amendments and the motions appear on Order Paper III. Where no notice has been given of any amendments to particular clauses and no members have indicated that they wish to speak against those clauses, I give my permission

under Standing Order 58(4) to the clauses being taken en bloc.

We shall again need to use the 40-member procedure under Standing Order 59. Where an amendment is moved by someone other than a member of the Steering Committee, and is not simply consequential on an amendment that has already been passed, the mover has not more than five minutes to speak to it. I will then call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply. If the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Point of order: I wish to move under Standing Order 60 (1) that the Measure entitled Miscellaneous Provisions Measure be recommitted for revision in Committee.

The Chair: Prebendary Cawdell has indicated that he wishes to move under Standing Order 60 that the Measure entitled be committed for further revision in Committee. He may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): That is an exceedingly generous allowance. Thank you, Chairman.

The Chair: Up to 10 minutes.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Events do not always chime with Synod timetables. We have had a clear example of this recently in yet another case of historic church bells being silenced unreasonably and against the general will of the local population - in this case in Sandwich - by the use of a noise abatement order following one complaint. This is simply the latest in a long line of such occurrences, often as a result of members of the public buying property near to a church and then seeking to complain about the noise of bells being rung as they have done, often, for centuries. The Government has acknowledged that there are concerns about this, and I understand that the Chair of the Church Buildings Commission will be writing.

I have put down a Private Member's Motion, which I hope will be available for signature shortly, in terms which I have also checked with the Chair of the Church Buildings Commission. This would enable Synod, through the Church Buildings Commission, to consult with Government and, indeed, to then bring forward legislation as appropriate following such consultation.

Bell ringing has a long and noble tradition in our country and, along with our many chiming clocks, is an audible reminder of the Church's presence in a great many places up and down the land. My motion now, along with the other steps that I have outlined, gives Synod a chance to register its views on the seriousness of this issue. It is also intended to strengthen the hand of those liaising with Government to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to protect this much-loved tradition and practice.

The Chair: I invite a member of the Steering Committee to reply to Revd Prebendary Cawdell's procedural motion.

Ms Josile Munro (London): The Steering Group must strongly oppose this motion to send the Measure back to the Revision Committee. First, it is not clear what form any legislative provision that would meet Revd Prebendary Cawdell's concerns should take. It is not simply a matter of exempting the church bells from provisions relating to statutory noise nuisance in the same way that aircraft noise is excluded. Aircraft noise is subject to its own separate statutory regime. Bells are not. Any amendment to the legislation dealing with noise nuisance would need to strike a fair balance between the rights of churches and the rights of the public. Deciding how to strike that balance is very tricky and needs to be resolved by Government and Parliament. It cannot be resolved by the Revision Committee of this Synod.

The Cathedral and Church Buildings Division is already in touch with Government about this, as reported in last week's Church Times. The Government has already said that it will bring forward new planning guidance relating to this issue. There are plans for a further meeting with the Government in the next few months. We will keep you posted on that.

Secondly, we are concerned that the recommittal motion would hold up this Measure. You have already heard how useful it would be, certainly on the grants side of things and in a number of other areas. If it is recommitted it is unlikely that it will return to the Synod for final approval in July. It would have to wait until February 2019. Some of the provisions of this Measure are important ones - as I have already said, the whole thing around the Church Commissioners to make grants. Please, do not pass the recommittal motion and delay implementation of this important Measure so that the Church is continuing to carry out its mission.

The Chair: The motion for recommittal is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you for calling me. I had not intended to speak on this one, but, as I listened to my good friend over there, I suddenly realised that actually what he is trying to do is strengthen the hand of the Church nationally.

In your ongoing conversation, here is an opportunity for us to say: "We're a bit fed up with being picked on. It is rotten what is going on". Synod has a chance now, by his move, to send an important message about what is happening in Sandwich. I do have a vested interest as my brother lives there and he is one of those outraged people in Sandwich. They have listened to the bells for many hundreds of years - of course, he has not - but nonetheless there is a chance here just to do this.

Actually, folks, is it really going to matter if we wait just 12 months? Is it really going to change anything that much? It also gives us a chance to perhaps take a bit more reflection over some of the things - complex things - which are before us. So I do hope that the Synod will vote with the Canon because I think it is a good idea.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I, too, had not intended to speak. I am always very keen that we strengthen the hand of the Church in negotiations with Government, but we have no indication here that Government is opposed to us or that we need to strengthen that hand. We have every indication that it is sympathetic to our cause and dialogue will continue. But I must say to you that the price of delaying this piece of legislation for 12 months is very considerable indeed. That clause 1 issue will be crucial as I work on your behalf with all parties to secure a long-term funding arrangement which will enable many of the things we want to do to continue, and I could not progress on that if I were still waiting for legislation to be passed in February 2019. The price of delay, ladies and gentlemen, is very considerable indeed, and I must urge you to reject the motion.

The Chair: I see no one standing so I now put the motion, “That the Measure be committed for further revision in committee”, to the vote.

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

ITEM 511

The Chair: So we now return to clauses 1 to 3 of the draft Measure. No notice has been given of any amendments to these clauses and no member has indicated an intention to speak against any of these clauses, so I call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 511: “That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That clauses 1-3 stand part of the Measure.’

I do so move.

The Chair: Item 511 is now open for debate. I see no one standing. There is no debate to reply to. So I put Item 511 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clauses 1-3 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 512

The Chair: We now come to clause 4 of the draft Measure. I invite Mr Keith Cawdron to move his amendment to that clause at Item 512. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): I beg to move

Clause 4, page 2, line 27, leave out “and sought his or her goodwill”.

I was very struck at the beginning of our Synod by the comments in the Business Committee Report and comments made by Sue Booy, introducing that Report, about the importance of our legislation and of taking care as we consider what is put before us. I want to suggest to the Synod that this applies particularly when we find ourselves presented with something that says to every minister of the Church of England: "You must do this..." I suggest it behoves us to ask, when faced with such a provision, "Is this necessary? Is it workable? Are we making the requirement clear?"

It is in that context that I draw your attention to draft clause 4.1(b) of the draft Measure, which the Archdeacon has already referred to. This provides - I summarise - that any Anglican minister who is taking a funeral for somebody who was living in another parish, I guess most obviously at the crematorium, must "so far as is practicable inform the minister of the parish where the person lived [yes, excellent] and seek his or her goodwill". My amendment suggests that we should take out that clause "and seek his or her goodwill", because I think I would like to ask what does it mean? Any clergyman with this in front of them must surely say, "What are you requiring me to do? What will happen if I don't do it?" and, in this particular case, "What will happen if I seek that goodwill and the message comes back 'You don't have it'?"

I raised this with the Revision Committee and, as the Archdeacon has commented, they said that being required to seek goodwill is not the same as being required to obtain it. So we know what it does not mean, but I still feel that we are lacking some suggestion of what it does actually mean and that clergy would be right and fair to ask us: "What are we requiring all clergy to do?" A phone call? An e-mail? Before you have agreed to take the service? Before you have spoken to the family? The morning of the service? There is no definition, and I think there is a lack of clarity there. I do not think we should be legislating things which do not have fairly clear meaning.

The Revision Committee also suggested that there is a parallel with the same form of words being used as we now do over baptisms. Well, it does seem to me that funerals and baptisms are rather different. In baptisms you do not have funeral directors, you do not have fees, and you do not have secular alternative competing providers. I think we need to look at the provision for funerals, if you like, in its own right.

I am concerned, as I have said, that it is not clear. I do not think we need it, because there is the suggestion now that they are required to tell the parish priest, and I am also concerned that if it is actually used we may find ourselves with some problems. Can you not imagine a funeral director saying when approached by a family, "Well, if we ask that minister to take the service, we know they have to ask for the goodwill of a minister who you may well never have met or heard of and if that goodwill isn't granted then we may have a problem"? "Wouldn't it be much easier," the funeral director may say, "to have less hassle than the Church of England gives us and go for a secular celebrant?"

I believe we have got it right to say that they need to inform the parish priest and that will enable us to avoid the parish priest being marginalised, which is obviously the fear that underpins this, but I do not think we should leave in a

provision which is unclear, ill-defined and may have harmful consequences. I urge you to support my amendment.

The Chair: I call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds): The Steering Committee does not support this amendment at all. The requirement in clause 4(1) of the Measure is for the member of the clergy who is asked to conduct the funeral to “have, so far as practicable, informed the relevant minister and sought his or her goodwill”. “Relevant minister” here means the deceased’s incumbent. Expressing the requirement in this way was the result of a careful consideration by the Revision Committee. It is not an onerous requirement, but it is an important one. The deceased’s own incumbent should have a right not merely to be told that another member of the clergy is going to conduct a funeral; he or she should also, as far as practicable, be given an opportunity to say whether or not he or she is happy about that. There might well be circumstances which a deceased’s family are not aware of that would make it more appropriate for the deceased’s incumbent or another member of the clergy to conduct the funeral. Simply telling the deceased’s incumbent that somebody else is going to conduct the funeral would not only be discourteous; it would fail to deal with the sharing of potentially important information of a pastoral nature.

If we see the parish as the primary unit of mission - and we are about caring for all in our communities - the occasional officers, and especially funeral ministry, provide an opportunity for the relevant minister to build relationships with the bereaved not only at the time of the funeral service but in ongoing contact. A requirement simply to say to a deceased’s incumbent, “I’m taking this funeral”, will encourage the crem cowboys, who often are more concerned with the number of services they can conduct rather than the ongoing pastoral care of the bereaved.

We must not forget the problems that this will also create in relation to the submission of fees to the relevant diocese, as often it is the responsibility of the incumbent or the parish to ensure their submission to the diocesan Board of Finance.

For half a century Canon B 22 - the baptism of infants - has included a requirement to have sought the goodwill of the relevant incumbent where a minister of another parish intends to baptize a child. We believe its meaning is clear. We are not aware of it having caused confusion or difficulty. There is no reason to think that an equivalent requirement in relation to funerals would do so either. The requirement is helpfully qualified by the words “so far as practicable”. If there is simply no time to seek goodwill, or if no response is forthcoming, the requirements of clause 4(1) will still have been met. The requirement “so far as practicable” to have sought the goodwill of the relevant minister should not be problematic and, as a matter of policy, has much to commend it. The Steering Committee does not support this amendment and we ask you to do the same.

The Chair: As the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, it will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, otherwise indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue. Are there 40 such members? There are not 40 such members and so the amendment lapses.

ITEM 513

The Chair: I now call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 513: "That clause 4 [as amended] stand part of the Measure".

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

'That clause 4 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.'

I do so move.

The Chair: Item 513 is now open for debate.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): In 25 years as a reader I have taken only two funerals. Both were at the request of persons concerned and in a crematorium. On the first occasion a colleague with no Church links asked me to take the funeral of her father, who had taken his own life. The second was my aunt, who, when she knew she was dying, asked me to take her funeral. I now know what no one told me at the time: that both funerals were doubly, and in the first case triply, unlawful. Two of those illegalities are now being addressed. Amending Canon 37, which we have just enacted, has dealt with the issue of those who have committed suicide. Subsections (5) to (7) of clause 4 of this Measure will make it lawful for lay ministers to take funerals in crematoria and cemeteries, but, as it stands, clause 4 will still not make it lawful for lay ministers to take funerals at the request of the deceased or their relatives, yet I suggest that lay ministers are altogether more likely than clergy to be asked by folk who do not know the Church but who do know them through work or family connections to take funerals and to provide Christian ministry which would not otherwise be provided. Of course lay ministers must operate under the supervision of the clergyperson to whom they are licensed, but, as currently drafted, clause 4(1) would not allow lay ministers to take a funeral at the request of persons concerned, even with the consent of their incumbent and with the goodwill of the incumbent of the place where the deceased lived.

Because this issue was not raised with the Revision Committee I cannot move an amendment, but I want to ask the Steering Committee to consider the matter very carefully as to whether it can bring forward a special amendment at final drafting stage to enable lay ministers, with all the appropriate clerical consents, to take funerals where it gives an opportunity for Christian ministry that would not otherwise exist because of their connections with the deceased.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I just want some advice from the table at the back really and just to make a comment about the clause as we now have it. In respect of the phrase "so far as practicable", does that have any legal weight? What does it mean in law to have that in the clause? In relation to that, because we are going to have something where the clerk/minister conducting the funeral actually has some responsibility to inform the relevant minister, does that mean we are going to see some greater effort to try to crack down on those who do not follow this pattern and take funerals, as we know is already happening, without any relevant concern for the pastoral care of the families concerned? We are obviously in a situation at the moment where we are losing funeral ministry for

many different reasons. One of those is that we simply will not enforce any discipline against those who flout the rules so flagrantly at the moment.

Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson (Chelmsford): May I draw the attention of Synod and of the Steering Committee to the particular difficulties which hospital chaplains have with this question of liaison with parish clergy about funerals? This applies particularly to instances where they have been requested by parents to take the funeral of a baby. The hospital chaplain may well have been present at the birth, may have baptized the child, may have been present very shortly after the death of the child. Whilst I believe that the death of an individual, once registered, is information in the public domain, such details about the death of a baby inevitably, almost always, discloses details of the child's mother, which leaves the chaplains potentially in breach of their duty of confidentiality towards the NHS Trust which employs them. I wonder if it is possible at final drafting to address this delicate issue.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I want to go back to clause 4(1)(b). What I understand the Steering Committee to be saying is that the "so far as practicable" clause applies both to informing the relevant minister and also to seeking their goodwill. I think as currently written it is ambiguous. I think in the final revision it would be good to make it absolutely crystal clear that that is what we mean. If that is the case, what happens if the incumbent minister says "No"? We will need some guidance on that.

Mr Geoffrey Hine (Carlisle): I have been a reader since 1995. At the moment, I serve in a group of six parishes which are in vacancy following the death of our incumbent. I share the ministry of six churches with an ordained priest, but fortunately she is in full-time employment and so virtually all the funerals come to me. I have conducted 30 in this deeply rural area in this last 18 months. I simply want to throw this into the mix because in rural areas and areas where there is a great shortage of clergy, which we have in parts of the North West and Cumbria, where I am, I know there are a number of other readers doing a considerable funeral ministry as well. In one week I had three, and on one day I had two. Seeing as I am supposed to be retired, I am thinking of going back to work. Life was easier then.

The Chair: I see no one standing, so I invite the Steering Committee to reply.

Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich): I just want to support Clive's suggestion about going back to the Steering Committee, looking again at clause 4 with regard to lay ministers, but I also want to say that in the interests of faithful innovation we should not just restrict that to readers, we should be aware that dioceses are probably going to be looking at whether there are other ways of authorizing lay people to special funeral ministry, and that, if we do so do in the future, those people also should be obliged to liaise with incumbents if they take funerals of people who are outside the parish where they mainly focus their ministry.

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): I just want to speak very briefly because I note that clause 4(1)(b) has come under renewed fire. As a lawyer, I am not generally one for advocating ambiguity in the law but, in support of that clause, it strikes me that it is entirely appropriate in this case to have a requirement to which there is no penalty. As a parish priest, I would think it appropriate that if a funeral were to be

taken of one of my parishioners - for whom I have a legal duty of care - that somebody taking a funeral in that case does not just have a requirement to let me know that it is happening but to ask for my goodwill so that I can at least explore the pastoral implications of that. If I am just being stroppy and saying "No" then I am quite happy that they ignore me, but they should at least be required to talk to me first so that we can discharge our duty of pastoral care to our parishioners.

The Chair: Mr Hind, and then I am conscious, Synod, that we have a lot of business before us. I am entirely in your hands, but if anybody were minded to put a motion for closure it would give us the opportunity to test the mind of the Synod.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): It is sometimes useful to pause at key points just to see whether or not we can future-proof things. Putting together what we are talking about now and what we will be talking about later this afternoon, I just wonder whether some inventive or innovative drafting could be done for clause 4(7)(b), which talks about a "a duly licensed deaconess, reader or lay worker", replacing it with something which is more suggestive - by "suitably authorized minister" - so that it can allow for any transitional period, should we have Methodist ministers who are able to serve within our Church, and whether or not that is clear as to whether or not they will be counted as clerks in Holy Orders or whether they will be counted as not clerks in Holy Orders. I am just trying to get through something which might prevent us from having to revisit this almost immediately in a few months' time.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure of Item 513.

The Chair: Mr Mason has proposed a motion for closure on this item. That has my consent.

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

The Chair: I now invite the Steering Committee to reply. You have up to five minutes.

Ms Josile Munro (London): Clive raises an interesting question about lay people. We, on the Steering Committee, ask Clive to write to the Ministry Division, who can consider it - as it is a policy matter - and they may be able to make an amendment which will come to the final approval. So if he can write to the Ministry Division, we will work it out from there.

I apologise that I do not have all the other names, but I know somebody asked about the clergy seeking goodwill. This means really in the ordinary English language and really it is not about seeking a veto. I know that people are concerned about funerals and the issue about the loss of us, as the Church of England, doing funerals, but we are not in the position of cracking down on anyone, so that we cannot do.

The only other thing I need to say: somebody mentioned the issue about confidentiality. If a mother does not give permission then obviously we will not go ahead and ask; so be it. In relation to the Methodist issues, those are going to be picked up elsewhere.

The Chair: I now put Item 513 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clause 4 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 514

The Chair: I now invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 514, “That clauses 5 to 8 stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That clauses 5-8 stand part of the Measure.’

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair: Item 514 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 514 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clauses 5-8 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 515

The Chair: We now come to the excitements of clause 9 of the draft Measure. There are a number of amendments to this clause. The first amendment is Item 515 in the name of Mr Clive Scowen. I invite him to move his amendment at Item 515. He has up to five minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move

Clause 9, page 7, line 29, leave out from “after” to end of line 30 and insert “for the words from “as it may provide” to the end substitute “as the Synod or the Joint Presidents may provide.”

Chair, I will speak, if I may, to 515 and 517 and 519. They are, in fact, all part of one package but, because they strike the text in different places, they have been separated. These amendments seek to build on and improve both the original draft that we saw in July of this clause and the amendment made by the Revision Committee.

As the draft currently stands, Synod can fix the dates and places for its meetings and, in addition, the Presidents can fix dates and places if the Synod fails to do so or fix dates and places in place of those fixed by the Synod, effectively overruling

Synod's decision.

The Revision Committee's amendment provides that if the effect of that is a cancellation of a meeting fixed by the Synod, only the group of six, the Presidents, the Prolocutors, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, can take that decision. There are, it seems to me, two problems with this as it stands.

First, there is no express power given to vary dates or places, only to cancel, though arguably a power to vary could be inferred. Secondly, there is no definition of, "cancel." Is putting the dates of Synod back a week a cancellation or merely a postponement? What about putting Synod back two months, is that a cancellation? It seems to me that it is unclear precisely when the new rules which the Revision Committee has put in, requiring the consent of the group of six to a cancellation, actually applies.

My amendments seek to bring clarity. They make it clear that both the Synod and the Presidents have concurrent powers to fix or vary dates or places or to cancel a meeting of the Synod, but that the power to vary or cancel may only be exercised by the body which fix them. So, Synod can cancel dates it fixed; the Presidents can cancel dates that they fixed, or vary them. In the case of the Synod, their power may be exercised on their behalf by the group of six, as the Revision Committee proposed.

Chair, I invite the Synod and the Steering Committee to accept these amendments as being clarifications which make workable what the Revision Committee has desired and without derogating from what they have put in place. I move 515 but, as I say, 517 and 519 are bound up with it as all, really, one amendment.

The Chair. I call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply.

Ms Josile Munro (London): We on the Steering Group are going to treat Item 515 separately from 517, so, this I am speaking on, is just on Item 515 and I do hope Clive still moves 517 whatever happens to 515.

The Steering Committee does not support 515 specifically. We are against 515 because, in our view, it would upset the balance of power between the Synod itself and the Presidents in taking decisions about the meetings of the Synod.

The provision in clause 9(2), as it stands, retains the position where the initiative for deciding these matters normally lies with the Synod itself. The Presidents will be able to make provisions instead of the Synod doing so, but the Synod remains in the lead.

Mr Clive Scowen's proposal would put the Presidents on an equal footing with the Synod in taking decisions of this sort. Whoever got in first, the Synod or the Presidents, their decision would prevail. We think it is preferable for the default position to remain that the Synod, in response to the proposals from the Business Committee that normally takes these decisions, leaving it to the Presidents to take decisions in the light of what the Synod has previously decided. This is to the standard of our constitution.

The Chair: As the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, it will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate that they wish the debate to continue. Are there 40 such members? No, there are not 40 such members, so the amendment lapses.

ITEM 516

The Chair: The next amendment to clause 9 is Item 516 in the name of Mrs Debrah Mclsaac. I draw members' attention to the rubric on the Order Paper following the text of Item 516; if Item 516 is carried, it will not be possible to move Items 517, 518, 519 or 520. I invite Mrs Mclsaac to move her amendment at Item 516. She may speak for not more than five minutes.

Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury): I beg to move

Clause 9, page 7, line 31, leave out subsection (3).

This is a straightforward point, but I think it is an important legal one and I think we should take a few minutes to get it right. I want to try and pick our way through what the problem is that this Miscellaneous Provisions Measure is trying to sort.

The constitution of the General Synod is in Schedule 2 of the 1969 Synodical Government Measure. It provides that Synod shall meet at such times and places as Synod decides - more currently, as the joint Presidents direct. That is all well and good, but then the Standing Orders go on to say that the Presidents may do various things, including cancelling a session or a group of sessions.

What the Legal Department are trying to sort out here is that Standing Orders cannot be contrary to the constitution. Here is where the little problem arises because that Standing Order is not exactly consistent with the constitution, so they need to put it into the constitution itself. That is what this whole thing is about.

The problem is that, in tidying up that problem, something very critical has been left out. The Standing Orders, at the moment, provide that the power to cancel a group of sessions can only be exercised in circumstances of special urgency or importance. That has not been carried across into what is before us. The examples given to me by the Legal Department are, for example, the death of the sovereign or a national emergency. Those are the circumstances in which a group of sessions would be cancelled.

Clearly, it does need tidying up because we have got a bit of a so-called constitutional problem, but not by conferring a blanket authority. As it is drafted now, we could find our session cancelled because, for example, it conflicted with Wimbledon. It is not just one session that could be cancelled; both of the obligatory sessions in a year could be cancelled and it could be done year after year after year. It is just, I think, a drafting mistake that has happened. It is not severable. I understand it is not severable, and that is why I propose that it is deleted and move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: A member of the Steering Committee to reply.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): The Steering Committee does not support this amendment. The amendment would remove subsection (3) altogether. We understand that Mrs Mclsaac accepts there should be a power to cancel meetings of the Synod, but she wants the question looked at further. In particular, she wants the legislation to spell out circumstances in which a power of cancellation could be used. We think this would be impracticable.

It is incredibly difficult to predict in advance the potentially wide range of situations in which it might be necessary to cancel a group of sessions. There might be a terrorist attack which meant that access could not be gained to Church House or York University. There might be a national emergency or a period of national mourning.

Under clause 9, in the form it has been brought back by the Revision Committee, the power of cancellation is no longer with the Presidents alone but, instead, lies with the group of six - the Presidents, Prolocutors, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity - and, in the instance Mrs Mclsaac mentioned, I do not think all six will be invited to Wimbledon at the same time and, so, I am quite sure one of them would have drawn attention that that is a lousy idea.

All the Houses are, therefore, represented in taking any decision to cancel. We think that is a more effective safeguard against the mischiefs of the power to cancel a meeting of the Synod than attempting to tie down the types of situation in which a cancellation might be necessary. It is for these reasons that we are unable to support the amendment.

The Chair: The Steering Committee does not support the amendment and it will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or otherwise indicate they wish the debate to continue. Are there 40 such members? There are not, so the amendment lapses.

ITEM 517

The Chair: I now call Mr Scowen formally to move Item 517.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move

Clause 9, page 7, leave out lines 32 to 35 and insert:

"(1A) The General Synod may vary the time or place of, or may cancel, a meeting for which it has provided under paragraph (1).

(1AA) The Presidents may vary the time or place of, or may cancel, a meeting for which they have provided under paragraph (1).

(1AB) The power of the General Synod under paragraph (1A) may be exercised on its behalf by the Presidents and the Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations and the Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity of the Synod acting jointly."

Chair, I do move, but if I might just say this. I do think the Steering Committee will need to think again about subsection (1) which, as unamended, I do not think is consistent with what I am now moving. I do move it and I hope Synod will pass it and that the loose ends and the inconsistencies will then have to be tidied up by a drafting amendment at final drafting.

The Chair. A member of the Steering Committee to reply?

Ms Josile Munro (London): Thank you, Clive, for this. The Steering Committee does support this amendment. It is a helpful development on the amendment that was already made by the Revision Committee. The inclusion of a power to vary the time or place of meeting of the Synod alongside the power of cancellation is useful. It also seems right, in principle, that the body which made the provision relating to the meeting of the Synod should be the body which has the power to vary the provision or cancel the meeting. I know Clive has mentioned the earlier item and we will look at that again at the final drafting.

The Chair. The Steering Committee supports the amendment and so debate on the amendment at Item 517 can now continue, if needed.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): I am slightly troubled by what is at the top of page 5 on our Order Paper. We have heard a lot of talk about the group of six and, for those who have not quite worked out who the group of six are, they are the two Archbishops, the two Prolocutors from the Northern and Southern Houses of Clergy and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity. This amendment appears to have invented some new people, the Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity.

Now, I am very proud to be a Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Clergy of Canterbury and I know Jane Morris feels the same about her honorific role, but I do not think these other people in the House of Laity exist under those titles, unless something was dug up that I do not know about and I am happy to be corrected.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): To help Prebendary Lynas out, as the former Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity, I would like to say that there is a confusion between our constitution and our legislation. In parts of our legislation we are described as the Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity; in others, we are described as the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.

The Chair. I see no one standing, so I put the amendment at Item 517 to the vote.

The motion

Clause 9, page 7, leave out lines 32 to 35 and insert:

"(1A) The General Synod may vary the time or place of, or may cancel, a meeting for which it has provided under paragraph (1).

(1AA) The Presidents may vary the time or place of, or may cancel, a

meeting for which they have provided under paragraph (1).

(1AB) The power of the General Synod under paragraph (1A) may be exercised on its behalf by the Presidents and the Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations and the Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity of the Synod acting jointly.”

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 519

The Chair. As Item 517 was carried, Item 518 will not now be moved and so we move directly to Item 519. I call Mr Scowen to move his amendment at Item 519.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move

Clause 9, page 7, line 39, after “(1A)” insert “or (1AA)”.

I do so move.

The Chair. Because Item 519 is consequential on Item 517, which has already been carried, the 40 member procedure does not apply. I first call on a member of the Steering Committee to speak in reply and the matter will then be open for debate.

Ms Josile Munro (London): Thank you, Chair. The Steering Committee ask the Synod to agree this amendment.

The Chair. Item 519 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 519 to the vote.

The motion

Clause 9, page 7, line 39, after “(1A)” insert “or (1AA)”.

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 520

The Chair. We move now to Item 520 and I call Mrs Mclsaac to move that item.

Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury): I beg to move

Clause 9, page 7, line 39, at end insert:

“(1C) A power of cancellation under this Article may not be exercised if, as a result, the Synod would not meet in session at all in the year concerned.”

The argument about Wimbledon was not very warmly received but some of us who are going west, at any rate, may find our journeys home difficult tomorrow

because of the rugby. You may be more influenced or interested in that. The second motion is to ensure that Synod meets at least once a year. If there are no reasons that need to be given for the cancellation of sessions, then we should at least preserve a requirement that a group of sessions is convened annually. I, therefore, move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair: A member of the Steering Committee to reply.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): The Steering Committee does not support this amendment. We think that imposing restrictions on the power of cancellation as proposed would have the potential to cause serious practical problems. Suppose one group of sessions had had to be cancelled because of a terrorist attack or national tragedy, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that something equally serious might happen which meant that it would not be right for the next group of sessions to go ahead.

If Mrs McIsaac's amendments were carried, there would be no option for cancelling the second group of sessions. This cannot be right. The safeguard the Synod needs is already provided for. If the reason for cancellation were not serious enough, the Presidents, Prolocutors, Chair and Vice-Chair or Prolocutor (or whatever they are known as) of the House of Laity would not all agree a cancellation. If they did not all agree, then the cancellation would not happen. For these reasons, the Steering Committee does not support the amendment.

The Chair: The Steering Committee does not support the amendment at Item 520 and, so, it will lapse unless 40 members are standing or otherwise indicate they wish debate to continue. Are there 40 such members? There are not, so the amendment at 520 lapses. That disposes of the amendments to clause 9.

ITEM 522

The Chair: I, therefore, call on a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 522, the motion "That clause 9 stand part of the Measure".

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

'That clause 9 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.'

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair: Item 522 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 522 to the vote.

The motion

'That clause 9 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.'

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 523

The Chair. A member of the Steering Committee to move Item 523, “That clauses 10 to 14 stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That clauses 10 to 14 stand part of the Measure.’

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair. Item 523 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 523 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clauses 10 to 14 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 524

The Chair. We come now to clause 15 of the Measure and I invite Mr Scowen to move his amendment at Item 524.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I beg to move

Clause 15, page 12, line 3, leave out “a service is” and insert “one or more services are”.

Clause 15, page 12, line 6, leave out “a service or services” and insert “the service or, if there is more than one, as many services as is practicable”.

Last attempt. Thank you, Chairman. Just a year ago, we passed a Measure which sought to improve communication with those affected or potentially affected by draft pastoral schemes and Orders. It did that by requiring the contents of the scheme or Order to be announced at every service during the consultation period in the churches concerned.

Now it is proposed in this Measure to row back from that and make an announcement at just one service all that is required. Of course, it could be done more often but the requirement in this section, as it currently stands, is for just one service. There is legitimate concern, I accept, at the practicability of what Synod passed last year and a fear that it might build delay into the process and, as anybody who has ever had anything to do with pastoral schemes and Orders knows, the delays involved are already quite sufficient.

My amendment seeks to respect that concern from the commissioners and to avoid delay and it does that by making the requirements subject to the criterion of practicability; but, subject to that, to restore the expectation that, so far as practicable, the announcement should be made at every service or as many

services as possible rather than at just one service.

If we are serious about improving communication and genuinely want as many people as possible who may be affected by a draft scheme or Order to be aware of its contents, we need to ensure that an announcement is made at as many services as is practicable, particularly given that we know that even committed members of our churches are not often in church every week. That can be done without delaying the scheme or Order-making process. That is the purpose of this amendment and I invite Synod and the Steering Committee to support it.

The Chair. A member of the Steering Committee to reply.

Ms Josile Munro (London): The Steering Committee supports this amendment. We feel that it is an improvement on the existing provision given at clause 15.

The Chair. Admirably brief, Ms Munro. As the Steering Committee supports the amendment, debate on the amendment at Item 524 can now continue if needed. Item 524 is open for debate but I see no one standing. I put Item 524 to the vote.

The motion

Clause 15, page 12, line 3, leave out “a service is” and insert “one or more services are”.

Clause 15, page 12, line 6, leave out “a service or services” and insert “the service or, if there is more than one, as many services as is practicable”.

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 525

The Chair. I now call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 525, “That clause 15 [as amended] stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That clause 15 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.’

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair. Item 525 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 525 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clause 15 [as amended] stand part of the Measure’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 526

The Chair. I invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 526, “That clauses 16 and 17 stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That clauses 16 and 17 stand part of the Measure.’

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair. Thank you, Ms Munro. Item 526 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 526 to the vote.

The motion

‘That clauses 16 and 17 stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 527

The Chair. I invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 527, “That the Schedule stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That the Schedule stand part of the Measure.’

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

The Chair. Item 527 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 527 to the vote.

The motion

‘That the Schedule stand part of Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 528

The Chair. I now invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 528, “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”.

Ms Josile Munro (London): I beg to move

‘That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.’

I do so move.

The Chair. Thank you. Item 528 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 528 to the vote.

The motion

‘That the Long Title stand part of the Measure.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. That completes the revision stage of the Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. The Measure now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting and that concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Stockport (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 5 pm

ITEM 505

SEE OF RICHMOND - PETITION FOR CHANGE OF NAME TO SEE OF KIRKSTALL ([GS 2085](#))

The Chair. We move now to Item 505, See of Richmond - petition for change of name to See of Kirkstall - for which you will need GS 2085 and the annex attached. The draft position is at Annex 2. Before I call the Bishop of Leeds to move this item, although I am assured that this does not constitute a vested interest, in the cause of complete transparency I want to let Synod know that 28 years ago this week I got engaged in the ruins of Kirkstall Abbey. I assure you I will nonetheless chair this item with complete impartiality. I call on the Bishop of Leeds to move Item 505, “that the petition to Her Majesty in Counsel for the name of the See of Richmond to be changed to the See of Kirkstall be approved”. He has up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nick Baines): I beg to move

‘That the petition to Her Majesty in Council for the name of the See of Richmond to be changed to the See of Kirkstall be approved.’

I think this is what we call an item of traditioned innovation. In a Church that talks endlessly about mission and puts increasing energy into making it happen, it is easy to miss the discrepancy between what you we think we are doing and what those outside the Church think we are about. The first rule of communication holds that it is not what we say that matters most but what people hear. In other words, our effectiveness is to be judged not by the missionaries but by the missioned, if I may put it that way.

In the Diocese of Leeds this became acutely clear to us when in discussion with two young men from the firm that did our visual identity work in 2016. Our vision statements sounded good and clear to us, but these two guys asked us what was our offer to them. They had little or no connection with the Church, which was why we chose them - and they challenged us. Looking through their eyes, we realised very quickly that we were talking to ourselves when making statements such as - and this was our dynamic - “Confident Christians, Growing Churches,

Transforming Communities". That is a good aspirational dynamic which is useful internally for keeping our discipline and prioritising our reach and resource, but meaningless, or at least unattractive, to those with whom we wish to engage.

In December 2010, the Dioceses Commission proposed a draft scheme that, having been amended significantly with overwhelming support from the General Synod in July 2013, came into being at Easter 2014. The new diocese replacing the dissolved Dioceses of Bradford, Ripon, Leeds and Wakefield comprised five episcopal areas each coterminous with an archdeaconry. The diocesan bishop was to be also the area Bishop of Leeds for the Leeds Episcopal Area. The Dioceses Commission has been strongly supportive as we have gone about creating the Diocese of Leeds. Our timeline was clear from the outset of Easter 2014: by the end of 2014 we had to be legal, viable and operational (we just about made it); to have reviewed the shape, vision and systems of the diocese by the end of 2015; and to have created or migrated into a single diocese with a single administration office and financial systems and so on by the end of 2016, in order to begin 2017 as a single diocese with confidence to plan for the future from a firm structural foundation. We have done all this, but only because of the extraordinary commitment of a number of the people involved. The size and complexity of the task made it clear very quickly that it was impossible for the diocesan bishop to do both roles - diocesan bishop and area bishop of Leeds - and stay healthy. In due course, the Dioceses Commission, with the support of the Archbishop of York, agreed to the revival of the long-dormant See of Richmond in order to have a bishop committed to the Leeds Episcopal Area, that is, bringing the same degree of attention to clergy and parishes that was the case in the other episcopal areas. Paul Slater was duly consecrated as the Bishop of Richmond and has got to grips with the area and the city with strategic vision, with missional energy and structural wisdom. I am pleased he is in the gallery now, although in mufti.

However, people in Leeds, not least the business, public authorities, media and civic communities, struggle to make the connection between Richmond and the City of Leeds in the title of a bishop, assuming that he is based in Richmond and for Richmond. Lovely though Richmond is - and it is - the name is misleading. No amount of explanation seems to help clarify the remit and purpose of the role. This is why I, with the support of the Leeds Diocesan Synod and the Dioceses Commission, bring this motion to the Synod today. If the original scheme was intended to enhance the longer-term mission of the Church of England in this part of Yorkshire, as indeed it was and is doing, then we need one more change in order to remove an obstacle to that mission.

Here I come back to my opening remarks. Our satisfaction with internal nomenclature is less important than how those outside see us and understand us and what we are about. It is about the mission of the Church and how a change of name will assist our credibility and identity outside the Church of England in this city and region. What makes organisational sense in the diocese - mostly - appears to make no sense beyond it. This is not a motion about how bishops should or should not be distributed in any diocese. That was agreed by the Synod when we revived the See. Rather, this motion is specifically about the name; a sort of missional tidying up.

Kirkstall is an ancient area of Leeds, originally a town in its own right, and the

ruins of Kirkstall Abbey are a feature of the area, despite Leeds having driven a road right down the centre of the nave and the chancel, knocking out the east wall, now restored - as a new ruin.

We recognise that a change of name might add short-term confusion as we change yet another name, that is to add to Knaresborough which became Ripon and Pontefract which became Wakefield only a year after the diocese began, where we had to live and work with the confusion of that. I will say nothing about West Yorkshire and the Dales and Leeds. It will be for the longer-term benefit of the diocese's identity and public recognition. It will remove an obstacle in public perception and enable the Bishop to drive mission in Leeds without the inhibition of a title that does not make sense on the ground or in the circles with whom we are trying to establish strong relationships. This is not just about messing about with words and titles; rather, it has only to do with our mission to reach a significant city with the good news of the Gospel without the unnecessary hindrance of titles that make no sense outside the Church itself.

I thus bring this proposal that we request the consent of General Synod to agree to petition her Majesty the Queen to allow the name of the See to be changed from Richmond to Kirkstall. I move the motion in my name.

The Chair. Thank you. This item is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Canon Professor Michael Clarke (ex officio): I am going to start almost where you did. I think I am one up on you. My wife for the first 20 years of her life celebrated school summer holidays with trips to Kirkstall Abbey, a couple of miles down the road. For what purpose? To look at new ruins or old ruins or whatever? No, to roll in the mud. Kirkstall Abbey was well known for having a pool of soot-laden mud in its curtilage.

Madam Chair, I am delighted to rise and support the proposition that Bishop Nick has just been outlining. The Dioceses Commission worked long and hard with that new diocese as it emerged and helped it and encouraged it to make changes as the early months went on, to learn from the enormously large step which they had taken. Bishop Nick has outlined the early stages of the iterative journey. He came to see us two years ago to talk about the possibility of changing the names of Richmond and Kirkstall. I have to say we were initially sceptical: was short-term gain going to outweigh the complications of long-term loss? The more we talked, however, the clearer it became to us that there was a serious case to be made. Kirkstall is 50-plus miles from Richmond. Richmond as a country market town does not seem the obvious place for the missional activity of the new diocese to be led from, and so we are here today with this proposition. I strongly urge Synod to support the new diocese and encourage them in the job they have started. Bishop Nick outlined the timetable which they have followed which many considered to be outrageously pressured three or four years ago, but of which, through the work of Bishop Nick and his colleagues, short shrift has been made. In days when local identity is going to become more and more important, it is timely to take this action this afternoon. I strongly support the motion.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Some people

may say, “The new Diocese of Leeds is changing its name from time to time, from Yorkshire and the Dales, eventually becoming Leeds; why didn’t you at the beginning create this See and you went for Richmond?” The truth of the matter is this: when the diocese came into being there were a lot of things that were not known. The Bishop of Leeds being the area bishop of that particular episcopal area, it became very clear that, if he was going to grip what needed to be done, he would need an assistant bishop to do the pastoral care for that particular part. The easiest and quickest way of doing it through the Dioceses Commission’s agreement was to revive an ancient See. By the way, those have been revived from place to place, including Beverley and York, without needing to go through all the elaborate legal stuff which takes time while the work actually needs to be done. The boat was sailing but it was leaking and the quickest way of making sure it gets into port is to get people on board who will at least allow it to steer and sail it properly. The Archdeacon was made Bishop of Richmond. The name change is because of the clear sphere of work of where he is going to be focused. We are not simply changing a name. We could have done it, but it would have taken a long time, and, in the meantime, the pastoral ministry and care would have suffered. For those reasons, I want to encourage Synod to give it great endorsement so that there is no doubt that what is being created at the end of the day is mission. That is why we changed the dioceses and created them into one so that they can be more effective and they can deliver mission and ministry. It will take me time to get used to Kirkstall because Richmond rolls off the tongue very easily, but that is my prejudice. We welcome you there, Sir, and, Synod, please endorse what is being asked so that there is no distance between where the ministry is taking place and where the pastor lives. Thank you very much.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): As a mere lay member from the Southern Province, I hesitate to intrude in this debate, but could I make the observation as a cricketer that I hope that in those years when Headingley hosts a Test Match that calling the diocese Kirkstall will get it a higher profile on *Test Match Special* when there are references to the bowling being from the Kirkstall Lane end.

The Chair: I do not see anybody else standing so I give the Bishop of Leeds the opportunity to reply.

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): Just very briefly, as I said earlier we have been very grateful for the strong support and understanding of the Dioceses Commission. The Archbishop of York says the boat was sailing but leaking. I think perhaps a better way of explaining it might be that we were just sailing under the wrong flag. “West Yorkshire and the Dales” was a title that we were allowed to use by Synod, but it was never the legal name of the diocese. In response to David Lamming, it is not the diocese that would be called Kirkstall; it is just this particular suffragan See.

The Chair: I now put Item 505 to the vote.

The motion

‘That the petition to Her Majesty in Council for the name of the See of Richmond to be changed to the See of Kirkstall be approved.’

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. The Bishop of Leeds is now at liberty to submit the petition to Her Majesty in Council. That completes this item of business. We will now move to the next item.

THE CHAIR *Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn)* took the Chair at 5.18 pm

ITEM 11 ADDRESS BY INVITED SPEAKERS FROM THE METHODIST CHURCH

The Chair. Synod, we now move to Item 11. This is a presentation under Standing Order 120. When I was growing up in a village outside Leicester we had a Methodist chapel but it had the name “primitive” on the outside, so my mother never let me in, she wanted something more sophisticated for me in the Church of England. I am absolutely delighted to be able to introduce the Revd Gareth Powell, who is Secretary of the Methodist Conference, and the Revd Ruth Gee, Chair of the Darlington District and President of the Methodist Conference 2013-2014. You are very welcome. This is how welcome you are.

Both Gareth and Ruth are going to address us. Because we have a debate on the next item coming up immediately afterwards, the Business Committee has decided there is not going to be an opportunity for questions following the presentation, but we are delighted now to listen to you both.

Revd Ruth Gee: My colleague Gareth Powell and I are very grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York for their invitation to address the Synod. I am happy to be among you. However, it is a matter of deep sadness for me, and I believe for many of you, that our Churches are not in communion with one another. It is a matter of deep sadness because I believe that we are called to be one, and, until we are one, our mission and our worship are fundamentally impaired. It is a matter of deep sadness in relation to these two Churches, and to the whole Church of God, wherever there are distinctions and divisions that mean we are less than we can be and less than God intends us to be.

I stand here today hoping that we will take further steps on our journey together as partners in covenant; further steps towards our unity and the unity of the whole Church of God. I stand here today as a Methodist nurtured in a parish church in a Wiltshire village, ordained as a presbyter in the Church of Christ, serving as Chair of the Darlington District and a former President of the Methodist Conference.

The proposals that we are considering seek to enable our two Churches to enter into communion with one another. At the heart of this is the sharing of the ministry of the historic episcopate and the interchangeability of ministry. Reception of the historic episcopate would mean that, for the first time, the Methodist Church in Britain would ordain presbyters as bishop. This is a profound and challenging development for us, but the Conference has already stated that it is willing to receive the sign of the historic episcopate on the understanding that

the partner Church acknowledges that the Methodist Church has been and is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and that different interpretations of the sign exist.

The Church of England made this acknowledgement in the Affirmations of the Covenant. The Methodist Church exercises a corporate and connexional form of episcopate. All those exercising a particular ministry of personal oversight do so under the authority of the Conference.

The President of the Methodist Conference is the senior presbyter in the Methodist Church and shares in leadership with the Vice-President, the senior lay person. Their leadership is collaborative and embodies the oversight of the Conference. In this partnership, and under the authority of the Conference, the President lives out the calling as a presbyter in the service of all the Methodist people.

When I was inducted as President in 2013, my predecessor handed me a Bible and a cross. The small leather-bound Bible was carried by John Wesley and the handing of it from one President to the next is a powerful symbol of continuity. The symbolism of the cross needs no explanation. So began a year of service as the personal representative of the Conference, a year of service rooted and grounded in the Scriptures and wholly dependent upon the grace of Christ. I hope that describing something of what this means in practice will clarify why it is proposed that the President of the Conference be ordained in the historic episcopate as a model of personal episcopate, coherent with the theology and understanding of the Methodist Church, and a model that can be recognised by Anglican churches as the historic episcopate locally adapted. The President and former Presidents preside at the ordination of presbyters and deacons at the Conference in the context of Holy Communion. It is the Conference that resolves that candidates should be ordained and since the earliest times of ordination in the Methodist Church, there has been a clear intention to ordain to the presbyterate in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. The same intention has always applied to the ordination of deacons.

If these proposals are accepted by both Churches, from that time all ordinations at the Methodist Conference would be by a bishop. It would, however, be a misunderstanding to assume that the personal episcopate of the President is only expressed in terms of being the one who ordains. The President exercises a ministry of visitation. I travelled around the Connexion and embodied the unity of the Connexion (or connexionalism). I visited most of the districts, offering pastoral oversight, preaching and teaching. I prayed and shared communion with many people, lay and ordained. I visited partner Churches in Kenya and Bolivia and was received as the personal representative of the British Methodist Church, and as the successor to John Wesley.

As President, I was responsible for the stationing of presbyters and deacons between Conferences and I gave permission for some who wished to resign from full connexion in the Methodist Church. I represented the Methodist Church in ecumenical, national, public and civic events. I made statements as the representative of the Church and was actively involved in complex, sensitive justice and peace issues. Sometimes public statements were made jointly with the Vice-President. Sometimes one or other of us spoke or acted on behalf of

both. Others, particularly the Secretary of Conference, hold particular responsibilities of oversight and speak and act under the authority of the Conference. I presided at the celebration of the Eucharist in Conference and in churches around the Connexion. I was chief pastor to the pastors. Crucially, I was responsible, with others, for teaching and guarding the faith and for leading the Church in mission.

As a former President, I am still called upon to represent the Conference in the wider Connexion, in my case primarily as Chair of the Methodist Council, described as “the Conference between Conferences”. Former Presidents and Vice-Presidents continue to embody connexionalism as they chair connexional panels and committees and participate in many ways in the life of the wider Connexion.

In the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity in 2014, I was invited to preside and preach at a service of Holy Communion in Ripon Cathedral. Standing with the Bishop of Ripon on that occasion is a memory that I hold dear. Bishop James said the occasion was “a practical expression of personal and collegial relationships that are developing and flourishing through the Covenant between our Churches”. “This”, he said, “is about doing something in order to be part of the answer to Jesus’ prayer that “they may be one that the world might believe”.

If the ordination of a President Bishop into the historic episcopate and the welcome of presbyters and priests serving in either Church as eligible to serve in both Churches enables such sharing in worship and mission to be normative, then I pray that we will be able to take this next step on our journey together. Thank you.

Revd Gareth Powell (Methodist Church): Mr Chair, members of Synod, we have heard about the ministry of the President of the Conference. As the Secretary of that same Conference, my accountability is to both the President and the wider continuity of the Conference itself - a body that I must observe is not shy in telling its officers what it thinks; a point that I think Mr Nye will be familiar with. That is no bad thing, of course, for what the Conference does, and I observe this Synod does for that matter, is to draw together something of the diverse strands of our respective churches. We gather for conversation. As the early Methodists would have put it, we gather for a conversation about the state of the work of God. Now, the Conference and the Synod find themselves discussing something of our own nature and our own order so as to be alert to the wider work of God in creation. Any consideration of these proposals in both our churches will take root and will have credibility and bear fruit only when we see them in the wider context of the whole Church of God. Any ecumenical conversation about the ordering of common life has to enhance our witness as the people of God.

John Wesley was indeed interested in Methodical ordering, but for the sole reason that grace-filled church order enables boldness and freedom in celebration and proclamation. That is why he was a Reformer. The Methodists themselves were not always grateful for such enthusiastic reforming.

So what, I wonder, would Mr Wesley make of the Methodist Conference and the General Synod in 2018? Well, he would not sit quietly in the gallery merely observing. He would point to the core of our calling as followers of Christ. He

would observe that the wider challenges of mission and ministry for both of us are astonishingly similar. He would see a not entirely unfamiliar parish system that enables interaction in every community in the land, and he would see a Methodist circuit system, albeit extending into Scotland and Wales, that equally covers every community and offers the possibility of genuine sharing of resources across socioeconomic boundaries.

He might puzzle at the inability to make the most of such overlap, to take the presence seriously, to be more effective in our nurture of human souls. "What possibilities it offers," he might cry, "for the preaching of the word and the celebration of the Sacraments." "You are, both of you, somewhat smaller than you used to be," he might remark, "but that does not detract from your task of faithfulness, for what riches you carry as the people of God".

He would observe that the ability to articulate the Lord's song in a not always very familiar land is constantly before us, and how our wider global communions - in each case both roughly the same size and scale - could help us in that respect if we had the courage to listen with attentiveness to the whole inhabited earth. Having some awareness of each Church, he might press us as to why in our closeness we still stumble in some of our efforts to live in unity.

If I had to respond to him, I would have to admit that it does indeed appear that we have an all too easy acceptance of the scandal of our disunity. Of course, greater unity would lead to more effectiveness in mission. Our disunity very obviously leads to duplication of God's precious resources. But that is not why we have come to this point. Our calling to unity is about more than church ordering. It is about faithfulness to Christ. Complacency in the face of our disunity hinders not only our mission but, rather, it impairs our witness to Christ, it impairs our ability to live in the image of God and to be effective channels of the Holy Spirit, for faithfulness to God is all that Mr Wesley ever sought. Our pains at separation, and, if we are honest, our anger at past actions by both Churches, reveal curiously just how close we have grown.

John Wesley had an abiding suspicion of any corporate body for which he did not set the agenda and write the minutes. He had an even greater concern for any follower of Christ who did not seek to reflect the depth of holiness encountered in the living God. He was nervous of any ecclesiastical structure or office, not so as to make a non-conformist point but, rather, because he feared that the Conference which he had himself so lovingly nurtured might lose awareness of its calling to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land.

The last word must, I think, go to a hymn writer - an Anglican as it happens, though with impeccable Methodist credentials: Charles Wesley. May it be our prayer, for surely it will form our pastoral strategy, and in all our debating it will remind us of our calling: "Oh may we ever walk in him and nothing know beside! Nothing desire, nothing esteem, but Jesus crucified! Closer, and closer let us cleave, to His beloved embrace; Expect His fullness to receive, and grace to answer grace". Amen.

The Chair: Thank you. We are enormously grateful to both of you for what you have just said.

ITEM 12

MISSION AND MINISTRY IN COVENANT ([GS 2086](#))

The Chair: We are now going to move on to Item 12 - Mission and Ministry in Covenant - for which you will need GS 2086. I have to tell you, brothers and sisters, that we have had just short of 50 requests to speak in this debate, which I think is a really positive thing and shows how important this debate is to all of us here in the Synod. We also have four amendments to the main motion to work through. After the motion is presented and moved, I propose that we then move into the first part of the debate, I will then take the amendments in order, and then we will return to a debate on the amended or un-amended motion. I invite the Bishop of Coventry to move Item 12. Bishop, you may speak for up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth): I beg to move

‘That this Synod:

- a) welcome the report Mission and Ministry in Covenant (GS 2086), produced by the faith and order bodies of the Church of England and the Methodist Church in response to resolutions passed by the General Synod and the Methodist Conference in 2014; and
- b) call on the Faith and Order Commission to report back to the Synod at the next group of sessions on work carried out jointly with the Methodist Church to address the areas for further reflection outlined at paragraphs 26-29 of the covering note from the Faith and Order Commission to GS 2086.’

Chair, members of Synod, past President, Secretary to Conference, General Synod gave the Faith and Order Commission a task in 2014 to be carried out jointly with the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Church. The Report we are debating this afternoon is our response to that assignment from Synod and Conference, as explained at paragraphs 6 to 11 of the covering note.

The Commission’s responsibility is to the Catholic faith and order of the Church of England and its expression in the eternal gospel of grace in Jesus Christ in every age. We are confident that these proposals are faithful to the oneness of the Church, to the prayer of Jesus, to the international ecumenical agreements about the historic episcopate and the ministry of churches that do not yet bear it, to the principles for unity enshrined in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, articulated at successive Lambeth Conferences, and that they do not, as other churches have assured us, cause difficulties to our other ecumenical relationships.

We are confident that our proposals are faithful to the holiness of the Church. They seek to sanctify us in the truth of our common life in Christ and His Father. They work towards healing a tragic division in the Church of England that John Wesley fought hard to avoid and which brought such anguish to his brother, a tear in the fabric of our Church caused by multiple complexities from

ecclesiastical immobility, in the face of a great renewal movement and geopolitical realities following the American War of Independence.

We are confident that the proposals are faithful to the catholicity of the Church. They allow Methodism to receive that which it lost - the precious gift of the historic episcopate - and they allow for both Churches to reconcile in the new ecclesial reality of being in communion. They are a vital step towards full visible union in communion. They restore the relationality between the bishops of one Church and all the ministers of another.

We are confident that these proposals are faithful to the apostolicity of the Church. They serve the apostolic mission and activate the apostolic authority of bishops. They will bring new missional opportunities for those - and only those - who want to opt in to them.

At the same time, FAOC is conscious that these are sensitive theological matters that require a common discernment and deep corporate understanding, so, following the stages of carefully conducted consultation, we now propose a period of clarification and further deliberation in which senior members of both Churches can work on carefully targeted areas.

Dialogue between two Churches never happens in a vacuum. It may help, therefore, to listen in on the international dialogue between Roman Catholics and World Methodism. In 1991, the Singapore Statement of that dialogue said: "Mutual recognition of ministry will be achieved not only by reaching doctrinal consensus but also will depend on a fresh creative act of reconciliation..."

The history of our own relationship with Methodism is unique. Nevertheless, the report before you offers a fresh, creative act of reconciliation in three dimensions:

(i) the Methodist Church, in a bold action of humility and expectation, will embrace the historic episcopate into its life and order;

(ii) a new relationship of being in communion will be declared to exist between the churches, best demonstrated, the Report suggests, eucharistically;

(iii) bishops in the Church of England will be able to receive into the orbit of their ministry ministers previously ordained under the episcopate of Conference who now serve in a Church ordered in the historic episcopate.

The report recognises that this third dimension, though not without precedent, is one that should only be permitted in special circumstances, the need to be carefully justified. It contends that those conditions are in place and it appeals to the established principle of bearable anomaly. That language is not popular among some Methodists, and some in the Church of England have been critical of it for a number of reasons, and it may well prove not to be the best language, but let me stay within its terms and point to some unbearable anomalies which the proposals are trying to overcome:

There is the biblical and dominical anomaly - the scandal, as the Secretary has already reminded us - of the body of Christ being divided. Well, this is seeking to mend one of those tears.

There is in Anglican terms the historical and theological anomaly of a Church without the sign of the historic episcopate. That will be sorted.

There is the ecclesiological anomaly of, on the one hand, affirming, as we do in the Covenant, that the word of God is authentically preached and the sacraments duly administered and celebrated by Methodist presbyters - in other words, that they are emphatically not lay people - and, on the other, requiring them to be ordained to serve in the Church of England. That will be sorted.

I know that some feel deeply that, despite the precedents of the Church of South India and Porvoo, in solving these anomalies another one is created that cannot be borne because it undermines the episcopal ordering of the Church so fundamental to our identity. The Report does not share that view. Nevertheless, I recognise that further clarification is needed to show why the proposals, far from understanding the apostolic role and authority of bishops, safeguards and promotes it. That is why I am not opposed to the Bishop of Portsmouth's amendment that calls for further elucidation in this area. Confident at the same time that this work can be done successfully, I also welcome Sharon Jones' amendment.

Dear friends, we have some serious theological work to do in this very important debate. I am delighted that so many people want to speak. The history is long, the issue is complex, the Report tightly packed. Permit me, if you will, to suggest three principles to structure our deliberations:

Think church. These proposals concern reconciliation between Churches, the reception of the historic episcopate by the Methodist Church and the Church of England's Declaration. Think celebration - Eucharistic celebration of being in communion with the Methodist Church. This reorders our relationship and takes us a vital step towards full visible unity.

Think bishops. All Methodist presbyters, however ordained, will now be in an ordered relationship with their own bishops. That is not without ecclesial effect. It means that I will be able to say to a Methodist presbyter who I want to deploy in the Diocese of Coventry, sent to me by a bishop in his own church: "I recognise in you someone exercising a ministry in an episcopally ordered church with whose bishops I am in communion. By the grace of God and prayer of the Church, a prayer that is always for the work of the Holy Spirit, I receive you into relationship with me so that the ministry that is mine may be yours also, and I set you among the people of this parish to share in my ministry". I wonder is that such an anomaly.

Think of the Covenant we made before God with the Methodist Church in 2003 that bound us to achieve a united, interchangeable ministry, and weigh the risks of not taking this journey forward.

The motion is modest. It asks nothing more of us than to say: "Yes, we want to keep moving forward in this direction". I move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Synod, the motion is now open for debate. As I have said, so many people are wanting to speak that we are going to have a three-minute speech limit

from the very beginning so that we can get in as many people's contributions as possible. If you are wishing to speak, please stand or indicate. Canon Cameron Butland for a maiden speech, followed by the Bishop of Ely.

Revd Canon Cameron Butland (Carlisle): On 27 November 2011, three denominations came together and signed a declaration - the Diocese of Carlisle, the Cumbrian District of Methodism and the North West Area Synod of the United Reformed Church - and said: "We are going to co-operate and make our priority mission. We will deploy our ministry and we will use our buildings in that mission".

Five years later, a Covenant was signed between those three original denominations and also the Salvation Army committing ourselves to mission. Not only that, four other denominations - the Roman Catholic Diocese of Lancaster, the Society of Friends, Church of Scotland and also the Baptist churches in Cumbria - came together and said that, together in our 600 faith communities, we will witness to the priority of telling everyone in Cumbria about the good news of Jesus Christ and encouraging them to know Him themselves.

The impact in just 18 months has been incredible. Our work with teenagers and young people has grown colossally through our Network Youth Church. Our Fresh Expressions in just 18 months and working together across the denominations have shown major growth. One example is Mountain Pilgrims, a church fellowship literally without walls, a roof or even a level floor, people coming together on the fells to walk alongside one another and express their faith in Jesus Christ.

This report is called Mission and Ministry, and that is what we are called to do. As the Secretary of the Methodist Conference reminded us, it is all about being Christ's disciples. I would urge Synod to support this motion and to support the ministry and mission of the Church so that we may more effectively witness to the good news of Jesus Christ in all our lives and in all our communities.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Over the last 30 years we have spent a lot of time as a Church, and a lot of time as a General Synod, discussing order: who can be ordained, who can ordain, and what that means for the flourishing of the whole Church and the serving of a fresh Great Awakening, as before led by people like John and Charles Wesley. We have spent a lot of time working out what church unity might look like in a Church where there has been difficulty accepting the orders and sacramental ministry of others and what we mean when we talk about the "highest degree of communion possible". After a lot of heartache, we came to a way of resolving that around the question of women's orders. We agreed as a Synod that we would hold to Five Guiding Principles, of which the third says: "Since it continues to share the historic episcopate with other Churches, including the Roman Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church and those Provinces of the Anglican Communion which continue to ordain only men as priests or bishops, the Church of England acknowledges that its own clear decision on ministry and gender is set within a broader process of discernment within the Anglican Communion and the whole Church of God."

We have noted the centrality of our understanding of the historic episcopate to our very identity as a church within the wider Church. The FAOC Study Guide to the

Five Guiding Principles published this month notes the third principle - both that the Church of England does not own the historic episcopate and that “therefore any significant change in the way that episcopate finds expression... must be in dialogue with those churches with whom it shares the historic episcopate...”

The proposals in front of us now do not seem to me to take this understanding either sufficiently seriously or sufficiently ambitiously. We are part of a wider Church. Our prayer and ambition that all may be one carries both joy and cost. That ambition for unity is not about taking baby steps, hesitant as we are trapped in guilt and anxiety about past institutional failures, which I do not at all wish to deny; it is about holding out a wide and generous vision of the tradition we have received and which we inhabit variously in our own generation so that we may proclaim the Gospel afresh to it. My concern about these proposals has nothing to do with being hostile or inhospitable and everything to do with how we are to inhabit generously and hopefully an understanding of what it means to be an episcopally-ordered Church.

I welcome the Bishop of Portsmouth’s amendment and hope we might follow that in giving ourselves the time, without the promise necessarily of proceeding to legislation, to work together and to be as ambitious as possible about how we live out and receive that historic episcopate, with a goal, surely, to prepare ourselves over time for the only worthwhile prize: one Church and one College of Bishops.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I speak in favour of the motion for three reasons. First, the motion requests further work. This will be hard for both Churches, but little is gained by avoiding what is difficult. Hard and prayerful thinking may lead us to a fuller understanding of ourselves before God of the three-fold order of ministry, of how Methodism exercises episcopate and of the dominical command to unity. These are worth having.

Second, the covenant already affirms our shared membership of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church in which the dominical sacraments are duly administered and celebrated and in which the word of God is authentically preached. If we move forward, and if we are faced with so-called “bearable anomalies”, we do so with a high degree of agreed ecclesial authenticity. Anomalies will be time limited and not without successive effect. The whole arrangement will be permissive and not compulsive, borne only by those who wish to bear it.

Third, we have here the prospect of moving closer towards moving closer, towards embracing some of our fellow Christians within that expression of catholic order which is the historic episcopate as we understand it and which, as such, Methodism in England currently lacks or with which it has had a very long break. Such episcopacy is not a universal panacea. Not all Churches recognise our episcopacy. But for some of us here today at least, the historic episcopate, locally adapted - and, yes, often locally flawed, present company of course excepted - is for its locality and beyond a great blessing, expressing for the particular and more widely the catholic whole. There is work to be done if we are able to recognise an episcopacy which Methodism can recognise as authentically Methodist, but let the attempt be made. If it is not of God, God will tell us. If it is, grace upon grace.

Miss Fenella Cannings-Jurd (Salisbury): I would like to speak against this Report in its un-amended form, not because its intentions are bad but because its suggestions and vision for the future of ordained ministry do need further thought. I am all for unity with our ecumenical partners, but there is a difference between working together in unity, honouring our differences and diversity, and the notion of unity set out in this paper, which seems to see unity as needing to obliterate our diversity for the sake of future stability. The diversity of opinion in this room and the wider diversity and breadth of the Church of England is joyful and part of our identity. As much as we all may occasionally think it would be easier if we all agreed, our Church is what it is because of this diversity.

To pass this Report would indelibly change this. Not only would it reject that catholic understanding of the nature of episcopacy and priesthood that the Church has long honoured, even among those who think differently, who would fundamentally say that our very identity as the Church of England was up for sale. I believe in unity, I believe in ecumenism, but at what cost? I hope that we can find a better way of honouring the complex identities of both the Church of England and the Methodist Church with a different vision of unity; one that better respects catholic beliefs. Synod, we can do better.

The Chair: The Archbishop of York and then we will be moving to look at the amendments.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Chair, the Methodist and Anglican representatives have thought deeply both about the Methodist tradition of connexionalism and about the role of the bishop as a sign of unity in the Anglican tradition.

They have outlined the ways in which these concepts of the order of the Church actually converge. Their proposals are reached with the promise of greater mutual understanding and co-operation. It is made quite clear that the meeting of a tradition of personal episcopacy with one of connexional responsibility can occur without violation of what is important and enshrined in each.

To speak of personal ministry to the unity of the Church does not imply any separation of the bishops' work from the institution of the Church, local and central, the local communities that comprise it and the ministries of leadership that take its mission forward. It is precisely in the enabling them to work well with one another and in ensuring communication among them that a personal ministry of the bishop is realised.

Similarly, to speak of connexions that link community and community and the mission frontier to the central organisation of the Church does not rule out the work of a special leader called whose distinct ministry is to be a common point of reference for different ministries, referring them to the authoritative standards which they all have in common.

Indeed, in the recent review of the Crown Nominations Commission, the Methodist term "connexional" was drawn upon in describing how the bishop serves unity not uniquely as an individual but through their relation to the whole Body, and I quote, "We should be speaking, rather, of a communicative or perhaps borrowing a Methodist term 'connexional' role for, although a

communicator may speak now to one or to another person, the role of communicating between them is one role not two”.

This point, of course, was emphasised by Professor Oliver O’Donovan in his opening introduction to our debate. However, the document before us is a little light in elaborating on how the role of a bishop will be practically interpreted in the Methodist Church after this year’s Presidency of the Conference. We are led to understand that former Presidents do, as a matter of existing practice, contribute significantly to the work of leadership.

If the form of this extension of ministry could be spelt out further by the Methodists, it will meet any criticism based on an interpretation - not clearly intended by the present document - that the British Methodists will consecrate their bishops only for a single year’s term of office. Nevertheless, I wholeheartedly support the direction of travel of mission and ministry in the Covenant. I believe that the time has come for the two Churches’ traditions, Methodist and Anglicanism, to consult the people of God, the *laos*, the laity.

A mute button must be switched off for the sake of the Kingdom of God and the urgent need to reconnect our two Churches’ traditions with England. All has to do with God’s mission. It sets out the agenda and we must decrease, step out of the way, so that Christ may increase as the Head of the Church. Let Him be the Head, not opposite views of any nature of ministry. Friends, the time has come for the laity to speak; so, send it out, let it not be more in places that are talking and are talking and are talking.

ITEM 25

The Chair. We now move to the first of the amendments on the Order Paper, Item 25. I invite Prebendary Simon Cawdell to speak to and move his amendment. You have three minutes, Simon.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I beg to move

In paragraph (a) leave out “welcome” and insert “note”.

Chair, my title post was one of, if not, the oldest Anglican Methodist LEPs in the country. Christchurch with St Philip, Worcester Park in Southwark Diocese was at the cutting edge of ecumenical development in sharing both the building of Methodist heritage and having a joint Sunday congregation which was ministered to jointly by both Anglican and Methodist clergy. The richness of the experience was a joy, held back often only by our respective denominational structures. The depth of ecumenical co-operation between our Churches enriches us both.

Nonetheless, the experience also taught me the differing emphases of ministry between Anglican and Methodist expressions of ministry, one of which was as clergy appointed to the cure of souls in the whole parish, and the other which had more of an emphasis on congregational chaplaincy as a matter which needs to be perhaps considered further.

Moving further into the Report, concerning the differences we have in ministry, there is a lacuna I find extraordinary which is to accept a discussion on the nature

of the diaconate from the paper, effectively consigning it to the “too difficult” pile. This is a concern and a pity. In discussing mutual ministry, it seems odd not to talk about the fact that, in the Anglican tradition, all clergy are specifically ordained as deacons prior to priesting.

The sense of service is not absent in the Methodist tradition, far from it, but, having worked alongside a Methodist permanent deacon, there could well be things that Methodism has to teach us in the specifically evangelistic nature of this office and it needs exploring as a significant gift. Further, from conversations with Methodist colleagues and congregation members, they would also be clear that they know why they are Methodists.

One of the issues here is their view about episcopate and bishops. The differences we have in patterns of authority are not minimal. I wish to place before you the works of a Methodist colleague I have consulted about the paper, which I extract with permission and, I hope, fairly. I quote here: “In some haste to draw our denominations closer together, the writers of this document seem to be valuing uniformity rather than valuing our diversity and the historic episcopate is a key stumbling block for Methodists.

“Methodism struggles to give power to one individual. We are ordained by conference and under the discipline of conference. Now that the Church of England has women in ministry, we are somewhat closer together than we were 25 years ago, but I am still aggrieved that my ordination is not accepted or acceptable to Anglicans and I really resent being seen as an anomaly, as this document suggests.

“I think this document with its emphasis on fudging the historic episcopate is doomed to failure and I could not vote for it, but I hope both denominations will work wholeheartedly in finding our way forwards to sharing our ministry as far as possible.”

Chair, I wish to be clear that I do accept my colleague’s ordination and I do wish to honour the work which our Methodist colleagues have as closely as possible, but to honour that we should note rather than welcome.

The Chair. I now call on the Bishop of Coventry to respond, please. You have three minutes as well.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Simon Cawdell, for the amendment. You raise a number of points. In three minutes I cannot respond to those, I do not think, on the diaconate or on the question of sequential ordination. Your point that the historic episcopate will not be an easy thing for Methodism to embrace is important to hear. The Methodist Church has a momentous step to make.

On the point about the anomaly, the Report is very clear that no Methodist minister is an anomaly, but in terms of the way in which the Church of England responds to those who have been previously ordained before the historic episcopate has been received, that, in technical terms, is an unusual thing to do. It is not without precedent, but it is not the normal way we do things and it has to be carefully justified and I refer to that.

I cannot quite see the point of sort of lowering the temperature, as it were, to note. You are still wanting further work to be done and so let us let that work be done and let us welcome this Report and not simply note it; welcome the huge amount of hard work that has been done, careful work, creative work and, I would say, consistent work, consistent with work with the Covenant in 2003 and the volumes of work done by the JIC. I cannot bring myself to accept the amendment.

The Chair. Thank you. Item 25 is now open for debate. Would those wishing to speak please stand.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Gavin Collins (Portsmouth): Thank you, Chair, for calling me. I speak from a deep personal interest and a lifelong personal commitment to ecumenicism. I am an archdeacon in the Church of England; my sister is a Methodist local preacher, and I have a twin brother who was a Baptist medical missionary in Angola.

Like my sister, I too started my ministry by becoming a Methodist local preacher. When I discerned a possible call to ordination in the Church of England, I was worried that my selection conference would be suspicious of my Methodist roots. My very wise vicar said that I should not worry as the selectors would regard me as, "one of John Wesley's boys who has come home".

Throughout my ministry, my commitment has been to unity, seeking to take seriously Jesus' priority for the Church in his prayer in John 17. As well as unity, we as Anglicans have so much to learn from and be enriched by our Methodist brothers and sisters. I am a charismatic evangelical, but in worship when I find myself singing of the deep, deep love of Jesus for the twentieth time in a row, I find myself yearning to return to my rich Methodist heritage of theology brought alive through hymns. It is not just the hymns; John Wesley's passion for the Gospel, for evangelism, for the poor, for social justice, for Christians to take seriously Christ's call to living distinctively.

In the Report before us, our Methodist brothers and sisters are making huge strides towards us. They are contemplating the prospect of fundamental changes to their understanding and practice of church leadership and episcopacy. From out of a desire to come back into full unity, our Methodist brethren have walked by far the greater part of the journey that separates us. For those who are unsure about this Report, I urge you to remember that Luke 15 shows us that, when a brother who was distant returns home, there are two possible reactions: you can welcome them back with a celebration or you can stand outside in begrudgement and pique.

Synod, as the main motion acknowledges, there is a lot of work still to be done, but I urge you to resist this amendment and join the celebration in heaven at the prospect of family restored.

The Chair. Claire Potter, and then I would be really grateful if you were so minded for a motion for closure from somewhere.

Revd Dr Claire Potter (Ecumenical Representatives): Mr Chair, thank you for

calling me and for the hospitality of the Synod in allowing me to be here and to speak. It was, indeed, an act of great grace on the part of both Churches when the Covenant was signed in 2003. The wisdom of that Covenant was that it was not a scheme of unity that relied on a single decision in or out, it deliberately started a journey. That surely needs to be welcomed and not just noted.

I would like, just quickly, to highlight some of the gifts that Methodism is already bringing to the table, which, I hope, too, can be welcomed and not just noted. Many people will have experienced a Covenant service in recent weeks in Methodist churches and in others. This is an annual act of worship that many people have come to see as important. It is a service of assurance and grace and challenge.

The preface to that service includes the words, "The Covenant is not just a one to one transaction between individuals and God but the act of the whole faith community". Covenant is what we are engaged in here, a promise that includes everyone. As we have already heard, other gifts from Methodism can be found within the documents of this Synod itself.

I am gratified to discover that the Archbishop of York, as well as myself, pricks up his ears when he hears a Methodist idea within Church of England debates. We have heard him mention that review in the Crown Nominations Commission debate yesterday as we heard that word, borrowed from Methodism, the "connexional" role. There, in the middle of a debate about bishops, we find an expression that owes its origin to Methodism; now, surely, that is significant.

Secondly, this time last year in the February group of sessions, there was a debate on the Report, *Setting God's People Free*. In the very first paragraph, John Wesley made an appearance. It is stated that his empowerment of lay people was an opportunity that had not been fully grasped since his time. Our emphasis on the significance of lay ministry is another gift that Methodism brings to the table.

Methodism's view of ministry is rooted in our understanding of the nature of God and of the ministry of the whole people of God. Relationships that matter are not always straightforward. Does this one between our two Churches matter? The fact that we are here today with this Report before us and the great history that it stands on suggests that it does.

It will not be easy for all Methodists to accept the ordination of a President Bishop. It will not be easy for all in the Church of England to bear the anomaly of welcoming those of us who are Methodist presbyters, not ordained episcopally, to serve as ordained ministers. As the Report states, we are, in fact, all bearing another anomaly right now, that of our disunity. How long can we go on living with that?

The Chair. Point of order, Mr Freeman.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Mr Chairman, a motion for closure on this item.

The Chair. That has my consent; does it have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair. We move to a vote on the amendment before us, Item 25.

The motion

In paragraph (a) leave out “welcome” and insert “note”

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 26

The Chair. I invite Dr Andrew Bell to move the amendment, Item 26 on our Order Paper. Andrew, you have three minutes.

Dr Andrew Bell (Oxford): I beg to move

In paragraph (b) at the end insert “and to report on work that has been carried out on remaining doctrinal differences between the churches, or how it is envisaged that such differences are to be addressed.”

200 years ago, the Methodist Church reluctantly separated from the Church of England. One factor precipitating that separation was that John Wesley, responding to a shortage of priests in the American colonies, ordained preachers with the authority to administer the sacraments.

The matters of episcopacy and interchangeability of ministry are well addressed in GS 2086 and they have received much attention inside and outside this Chamber. There is little mention of any other matters of differences between our two Churches. But, contrary to the impression that seems to prevail, this was not the only reason for the separation of the two Churches. There were, and there still remain, other doctrinal differences.

In particular, Methodism embraced, and continues to embrace, Armenian theology and a view that we can achieve in this life perfect love or Christian perfection. Wesley’s Articles of Religion abridge our 39 Articles. For example, Article 13 on works before justification and Article 17 on predestination and election are specifically omitted. These are not trivial matters that can be just ignored. I am not claiming to have surveyed all the differences in doctrine, practice or ethics or changes that might be required of either of us.

We are reminded that it is clear the direction of travel is towards full unity - Commitment 1 in the 2003 Covenant. We commit ourselves as a priority to work to overcome the remaining obstacles to the organic unity of our two Churches on the way to full visible unity of Christ’s Church. I applaud that aim as long as it is true unity of faith that we are looking to achieve: the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

In order to travel towards such unity, we need to be clear about the obstacles and bends in the road that we will have to negotiate. Establishing an organisational Church unity without dealing with differences in doctrine or practice will not achieve true unity through belief in Christ and will not enhance the unity for which

Jesus prayed, as recorded in John 17, “That they may be one, that they may be in us [that is the father and the son], so that the world may believe that you have sent me”.

Synod will require to understand the theological issues and how they may be addressed. That is the reason for my amendment, which simply asks the Faith and Order Commission to report back on these matters and which, I hope, can be seen as friendly.

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Coventry to respond. Bishop, you have three minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, and, thank you, Dr Bell, for this suggested amendment. I love talking about doctrine and I would do it for the next thousand years. I do think we have done quite a lot of thinking about doctrinal differences between the Churches. I have brought them with me. This is the work of the JIC, a huge amount of work.

These matters you raise are not trivial, but they have been given a fair bit of attention, like Christian perfection, Calvinism, Armenianism, lay presidency and the diaconate. A huge amount of work has been going on over the years in these. It is all there to be seen and engaged with. We are not at this point talking about establishing Church organisational unity in the sense of a full visible unity.

As we move to that stage, there may well be some further clarification of some of those doctrinal issues that are there. We will, of course, remain committed to our formularies. There is a lot of finely nuanced theological work that has happened that interprets those sort of, as it were, classic differences that I think could easily be magnified.

I am not inclined to support this amendment. I think it would dissipate the focus. I think the focus at this point needs to be on carefully targeted areas, some of which are already identified in the Report and some of which have become even clearer as these last few weeks have progressed. That is why I am much more sympathetic to the much more targeted piece of work that is being requested by the Bishop of Portsmouth. I would much prefer to stick with that.

I would want to say though that in terms of discipline, just to be very clear about this, ministers would be under the discipline of the church that they are serving in; so a presbyter serving the Diocese of Coventry would be under my discipline, the discipline of the Church of England, just to clear any doubt over that.

The Chair: Thank you. This item is now open for debate. Canon Angus MacLeay followed by Ian Paul. You both have three minutes.

Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester): I declare an interest. I was a member of the Anglican Methodist Formal Conversations which reported in 2003. I rise to support the amendment by Dr Bell and the concern expressed for more careful consideration of areas of doctrinal differences. In mission we need to be flexible on certain things and inflexible on other things.

My concern is that we have got things the wrong way around. We are apparently

flexible on doctrine, giving little consideration in all our discussions to the faith once and for all delivered to the saints, which includes some of the things raised by Dr Bell in his speech. However, we are, apparently, inflexible on matters of church order, requiring Methodists to make all the changes to fit in with Anglican traditions where the New Testament is commendably less prescriptive.

For example, why would we not be willing to embrace the Methodist practices of lay presidency and presbyteral confirmation which have served Methodism well over the years? Should this not at least be an opportunity for us to question some of our own traditions for the sake of the Gospel to the nation? Our aim should surely be for the sake of mission to be inflexible on the unchanging Word of the Lord and much more flexible on issues relating to church order and ministerial interchangeability so that the Gospel goes out with renewed vigour in this generation.

The Chair. Dr Paul and then I might be looking for a friendly motion.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): It seems to me it is a pity we are not debating this motion in January since it appears that the challenge that we are facing at the heart of this debate is whether we can look in both directions at once as the Church of England, in one direction towards Methodism and, dare I say it, beyond then to other free churches and in the other direction to Rome.

I have been quite surprised, particularly as a former Roman Catholic myself, at some of the issues that have been raised and some claims that have been made; for example, that Anglican understandings of ministry are the same as Rome or that episcopacy is essential to Anglican understandings of the Church. I think Diarmaid MacCulloch and Alex Ryrie, as noted historians, are quite right in pointing out the variation in understandings of episcopacy both in the early Church and at the Reformation and in the Church of England and, therefore, changes in variations in understanding of the status of presbyteral ministry.

A historical awareness also points to greater flexibility in the Roman Church than many suppose. I think the Report is quite right when it says that Anglican ecumenical documents have repeatedly emphasised that the historic episcopate is not essential to being a true Church. We are not Reformed and Catholic in the Church of England as if the two issues were jostling together side by side, we are Reformed Catholic and there is a difference.

Part of the root of our difference, and the fact that some of us find it easier to look in one direction and some in the other, goes right back to the Tractarian movement. In Tract 90 we read: "It is the duty we owe to the Catholic Church, and to our own, to take our reformed confessions in the most Catholic sense they will admit: We have no duty towards their framers". The difficulty is many of us in the Church of England think we do have duties to the framers of our Articles. It seems that it was not Roland Barthes who first discovered the death of authorial intention; it was the Tractarians in their interpretation of the Articles.

If we cannot work more closely with our Methodist brothers, what hope do we have in working with newer churches with whom 50% of Christians who are worshipping on a Sunday are attending? I live in a city where the vineyard church, with an attendance of 1,400 on a Sunday, have the biggest social

engagement and have just planted their thirteenth congregation in the Nottingham area. We have a Gospel to proclaim and we owe it to ourselves and to others and to our nation to do everything we can to work together to proclaim that Gospel faithfully.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Freeman.

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

The Chair: That has my support, Synod. Does it have your support? Would you indicate, please?

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

The Chair: I now put Item 26 to Synod.

The motion

In paragraph (b) at the end insert “and to report on work that has been carried out on remaining doctrinal differences between the churches, or how it is envisaged that such differences are to be addressed.”

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 27

The Chair: I now call upon the Bishop of Portsmouth to move Item 27, the amendment standing in his name. Bishop, you have three minutes.

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster): I beg to move

After paragraph (b) *insert-*

“() invite the Faith and Order Commission, in consultation with the Methodist Church, to explore and elucidate further the relationship between episcopal ordination and eucharistic presidency, as this touches on the full visible unity of our two churches.”

Chair, Synod, I offer this amendment so that we are specific in the conversations and discernment going forward. I have not been involved in the work, “Mission and Ministry in Covenant” and have only just joined the Council for Christian Unity, though, like very many of us I have been involved at local level joyfully as the Covenant has developed since 2003.

I am in favour of these proposals as an authentically Anglican and Catholic approach to the reconciliation of the Church. These proposals are grounded in the most Catholic of premises, that the Communion of the Church is based on bishops in communion with one another and presbyters in communion with their bishops.

We have reached the place now where we are within touching distance, but a gap remains. It is clear that the proposal to permit for a transitional period the ministry of those Methodist ministers in full connexion at the time the scheme comes into

force to minister by invitation in the Church of England has aroused misgivings and concern.

The motion before Synod calls for further work to be done - hard work, as the Archdeacon of Southwark described it. This amendment highlights in that further work the issue that has proved most controversial. As we consider how best to take steps towards greater unity, reconciliation between our Churches, it is always important that we also attend to the risks to unity and peace within our own Church and take care to enable confidence in those steps among the broadest possible range of voices in our Church.

This amendment gives the necessary and specific focus. I am grateful to the group from the Faith and Order bodies, to the Co-Chair, the Bishop of Fulham, for bringing this Report to birth, and to the Joint Implementation Commission that, since the signing of Covenant, has encouraged Anglican Methodist unity. We need to continue with clarity and with honesty and I move this amendment to enable that. Thank you.

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Coventry to respond. Bishop, you have three minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you to the Bishop of Portsmouth for your thanks to those who have done the heavy lifting on this piece of work, and if I may echo those myself.

As you see, the motion recognises - and I tried to underline that in my speech - that there is some further work to do here. The Report acknowledges that. It does not say that it is all done. There is some further work to do on what this really means for the Methodist Church and what it means for an Anglican bishop to receive a Methodist presbyter and how relationships can be ordered at all sorts of levels. There is work to be done.

Why I resisted the second to last amendment was because I feel we are quite clear about the sort of work that needs to be done. I am keen to keep the focus on that work so that we stand some chance of achieving it. I think the Bishop of Portsmouth's amendment adds a bit more specificity to that.

These are really deep and fundamental issues of concern - and I think it is well expressed - about the relationship between episcopal ordination and Eucharistic presidency. What I like about this is it puts that in the context of what those questions look like when they are in the context of the full visible unity of our Churches: a definite journey in that direction that is very close. I agree that there are some gaps here and they may be gaps of perception. As I talk to my colleagues in the House of Bishops, some of whom have real concerns about this - and, Bishop of Ely, thank you for your speech, I recognise there are concerns - my own view is that gap is not quite as big and it is something to do with perception. It will be down to this group - and I am grateful to the Bishop of Lichfield who is prepared to take on this extra work on our side - to say is this a gap to do with perception or are there some further proposals that can close that gap, and, if there are not, what do we do about that? I would like to accept it.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: a motion for closure.

The Chair: I think I would like to hear just one speech. Fr Thomas?

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I declare an interest. I was among the Working Party which produced *Mission and Ministry in Covenant*. I say first that I would be happy to vote on the original motion without any amendments. I am a member of Forward in Faith and I am quite aware that, rather curiously, 50 years on from the last attempt to reconcile ministries, and in that context a move towards one Church, the Catholic movement – so-called - divided into two. I am quite aware there are various Catholic movements in the Church of England - my goodness - and I think all three are dividing. I think that is very unfortunate.

The issue, it seems to me, has been described as a problem without a solution and it would be much easier at one level if we all regarded Methodist ministers as simply lay people. I hope all of us here regard that as absurd and irreligious. Since 1920 and the Lambeth Appeal, the Church of England has confidently asserted the goodness and spiritual efficacy of ministries which have not been ordained by bishops in historic succession. That is almost 100 years. However, we have never solved the problem of what one does when reconciling ministries which have not been episcopally ordained.

It was described by that famous bull - that bull who used to go around with his own china shop, namely Colin Buchanan, whom some of you will recall and who is, happily, a thriving bishop in the Leeds Diocese - as an issue needing to be tackled, and now we have a chance to do it. I do not think it is a big issue because when a Church recognises a Church, it recognises its ministries, and the rest of it is really celebrating and marking the adoption - that was Colin Buchanan's phrase - of those not episcopally ordained into the family. I like the reference to the family: Methodists belong to us and we belong to the Methodists. It was not just Colin Buchanan who argued in those terms. It was Graham Leonard, it was Eric Maskell - in my view, the greatest English theologian of the last century - and Jim Packer. The two Evangelicals are alive and the two Anglo-Catholics have died. You can draw your own conclusions on that. There is no qualification of the Church of England's commitment to apostolic succession in this document. None.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): Point of order. I believe there is ambiguity in what is proposed in the amendment. I would like, with your liberty under Standing Order 26, to speak to a possible amendment to this amendment.

The Chair: I am sorry, that does not have my permission. I heard another point of order.

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

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

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

The Chair: I now put Item 27 to the vote.

The motion

After paragraph (b) *insert-*

“() invite the Faith and Order Commission, in consultation with the Methodist Church, to explore and elucidate further the relationship between episcopal ordination and eucharistic presidency, as this touches on the full visible unity of our two churches.”

was put and carried on a show of hands.

ITEM 28

The Chair. I now invite Canon Sharon Jones to move her amendment standing at No. 28 on the Order Paper.

Revd Canon Sharon Jones (Manchester): I beg to move

After paragraph (b) *insert-*

“() affirm its confident hope that any outstanding issues between our churches may be resolved quickly and satisfactorily and look forward to the day when, on the basis of work already completed and accepted, our ministries will be fully reconciled.”

I am a member of the Council for Christian Unity. Synod members, I welcome and value this motion and the request for jointly agreed study and discussion material. Yes, we need further study, particularly on ecclesiology and our understanding of episcopacy, not least because we are generally woefully ignorant about the Methodist Church. However, I think the motion does not go far enough in dispelling the interpretation in many places that Synod is employing delaying tactics. These proposals should not be a surprise to anyone who has taken seriously the Covenant to which we have already agreed. The problem is that it has not been high, if at all, on most people's agendas for a very long time. This has become obvious through some of the ill-informed and unfortunate statements being posted on social media. There is deep concern among many Methodists that the motion before us lacks enthusiasm, lacks hope and has no sense of urgency. It has been perceived by many as, among other things, being one of procrastination or disinterest, it being batted into the long grass again to be forgotten for as long as possible.

It really matters today, Synod, how our debate is received by the Methodist Church, among those who are our co-workers for the Kingdom of God. We should not underestimate the enormity of these proposals and the tone of our debate for them. We need today to send out a clear message that we are serious and enthusiastic about welcoming and exploring ways of working increasingly closely with them and bringing to fruition work already begun. We are called to humble ourselves and acknowledge the grace of the Holy Spirit in those who are not Anglicans and not of our tribe. We are called to a life of love and service, so the amendment is simple really: let us study in the expectation of learning that we are not ourselves the sole possessors of the truth. Please, Synod, embrace this motion with both joy and generosity and, together with my amendment,

encourage the whole Church in confident hope and haste.

The Chair. I invite the Bishop of Coventry to respond. Bishop, if you are minded to accept this amendment, can you be brief, please?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Yes, I am minded to accept it. I think you are right, these matters have not been high on the agenda. I am really confident we can do this. I think it will be a lot of fun. It will not take a thousand years. I will say that we need it quickly, yes, but also carefully. I do not want people to feel too rushed over this, because we need to take the time it needs, but this is the thing: we need to keep the momentum going. That is the key thing. You raise a very important point about a signal to the Methodist Church. We have discussions among ourselves, and these are serious matters for us, but our brothers and sisters in the Methodist Church are contemplating a massive change to their polity, and if we could give a signal I think that would be well received. I hope we will.

The Chair. Point of order?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Was that a yes?

The Chair. I have assumed it was. What was your point of order?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Motion for closure on Item 28.

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

The motion was put and carried on a show of hands

The Chair. I put to Synod Item 28, the amendment.

The motion

After paragraph (b) *insert-*

“() affirm its confident hope that any outstanding issues between our churches may be resolved quickly and satisfactorily and look forward to the day when, on the basis of work already completed and accepted, our ministries will be fully reconciled.”

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair. We resume our debate on the amended motion, which you will see very helpfully on the screen.

Mrs Lucy Moore (Winchester): I guess my interest is because I am part of the Messy Church Network. I just want to say that we are the Body of Christ - not Messy Church, we are a tiny part of the body of Christ, but nor is the Anglican Church the whole Body of Christ. We are the Body of Christ and we delight in unity within that Body. I hugely welcome this paper and this discussion. I hate the idea that any part of the Body of Christ is amputated, which is a little bit how it feels. If we can bring things back together, how amazing that would be. I think it is amazing from the Messy Church point of view. It is happening already and

there is unity at the grass roots. We all know that churches are working at a local level in huge communion with each other, and that is to be celebrated. In a way, this would be theory catching up with practice. I would hate the big, complicated stuff around episcopate - I cannot even pronounce it - to lose the value of what is happening at the grass roots.

The second thing is I think it is missional. What the Archbishop said today about "church must be understandable" is really important. When people who are new come into our churches, as they are coming in their thousands into Messy Churches, things need to be as easy to understand as possible so that they can appreciate, and we can appreciate the mysteries that really matter. The differences between our denominations are unimportant mysteries which need demystifying.

A church in Lincolnshire was running an ecumenical Messy Church and the minister was approached in the street and told, "Here, what's this I hear about you doing things together; we thought you hated each other?"

The third thing is I think it is about discipleship, and as more and more Messy Churches do communion, the more people who can help make that available, the better. I would love to see our sisters and brothers from both sides girding up their loins, purple or not, and galloping down the road towards each other.

Mr Keith Leslie (Salisbury): I must declare an interest. I am married to a Methodist local minister. On receiving the envelopes of papers, I was sorting through them when I mentioned to her, "Synod is debating Mission and Ministry in Covenant, the closer unity of the Church of England and the Methodist Church". An arm came around and picked up the papers and away she went. I had lots to sort through so I carried on. The paper was returned, well-thumbed and, I might add, well-annotated. She said, "You had better get it right this time". My pointing out to her that on earlier occasions I was not a member of Synod did not get me very far at all, but she said, "It's part of your history", and, members of Synod, it is part of our history.

I am a street pastor and I go out twice a month. One night, at 2 o'clock in the morning, I met a young lady - I will call her that - aged 21/22/23, wearing four inch heels and a dress no bigger than a tea towel, and I did not have to stand too close to her to realise she had been drinking brandy and sours all night, and, along with many other things, she said, "You Christians are too busy arguing to worry about God". That has stuck with me. Some might think that and, I assure you, a lot of the people aged 18 to 30 I meet on the streets do think just that.

But it is your history, the girl on the streets, the theology of the apostolic succession; the possibility of the unity of the Church of England and the Methodists, added to which is the concept of a bearable anomaly. They are a long way apart, but are they? I would argue if we use this afternoon, we must link them by supporting this amended motion; that the Church of England and the Methodist Church actually work towards true unity. It matters most not to the members of the Church of England, not to the members of the Methodist Church, but to those who are not a member of any church at all.

The Chair: The Archbishop of Canterbury and then I would be really happy to

hear a lovely motion for closure.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Justin Welby): I think it has been an exceptionally good debate. I have not been a member of Synod for as long as many of you, but it has been a wonderful debate. I was enormously struck by Fr Thomas' powerful and passionate speech. I do not want to say again what has already been said better by others. I want to support this motion very strongly indeed. It seems to me that in voting for it, we respond to the Word of God, to the Scriptures, where there is a clear command to unity in diversity. In responding to this paper positively, we respond to the spirit who is already working in both our Churches, bringing us together, as we have just heard, in everything from street pastors through food banks, through the enormous commitment of the Methodist Church to *Thy Kingdom Come*, so we pray together, we worship together and we serve the poor together. We must respond as the Spirit is leading us and as the Word commands us. Of course there is much to do. There are serious questions and the amendments recognise that, but if we do not support this paper, that will not be done, and I believe we are disobedient both to Word and Spirit.

The Chair: Mr Freeman, your point of order.

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

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

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

Revd Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Point of order. As it such an important vote, could we possibly have a vote by Houses?

The Chair: We have not got there yet. Hold your horses. I need to invite the Bishop of Coventry to respond. I will give you four minutes. How is that? That is my generous nature.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): It is still not very long, Chair. Forgive me for not responding to every speechmaker in order. May I thank everybody for this debate. As the Archbishop of Canterbury has said, it has been a great debate. There are a few themes that have come across to me. It has been very good to hear about some of the togetherness on the ground. Cameron Butland, thank you for the Carlisle experiences. Lucy Moore, thank you for the Messy Church experience. Archbishop, thank you for reminding us of *Thy Kingdom Come* and the enthusiasm with which the Methodist Church and the Church of England are working in all sorts of creative ways. There has been, of course, a fundamental theme about identity and the place of the historic episcopate in the life of the Church of England and our commitment to the succession of that episcopate.

The Bishop of Ely has spoken about that. Jane Steen spoke about that in terms of a blessing; the blessing of the historic episcopate. And thank you to Fr Thomas as well, with his clear understanding and the understanding I share that there is nothing here to diminish the fundamental commitment to the historic episcopate. That is an area that clearly needs some further elucidation. I love the image of

the family restored. Thank you very much, Gavin Collins, and Archbishop, for that reference to unity and diversity. We are not talking about flattening the diversity of the Churches. I do very much thank you again, Gavin Collins, and underlined by Claire Potter: there is something about a mutual exchange of gifts.

I am your servant here as the Chair of the Faith and Order Commission, but I do declare an interest. I am totally committed - well, not totally, there is a slight reservation - to John Wesley's holistic approach, the way he combined the Catholic spirit with an evangelical passion, with a deep openness to the Spirit, with a commitment to social justice. These are wonderful things.

When Rowan Williams first asked me to take on the joint Chair of the JIC, I said, "I will do it for John", and I did it for Charles too, but especially John. We are bearers of history. Keith Leslie, thank you very much. Your wife is absolutely right; we have to get it right this time. These two amendments have helped the motion. There is further work to do and the Archbishop of York has referred to one dimension of that. That is a matter of clarification for us Anglicans, I think. The Bishop of Portsmouth has focused on a very specific area that needs some further thought, and elucidation, exploration, clarification. Sharon Jones, at the same time, is encouraging us not only to send out positive signals to the Methodist Church that we want to keep the momentum going. We are serious about this business of seeking to fulfil the Lord's Prayer for the unity of the Church. I share Fr Thomas Seville's confidence that we can do this. There is some hard thinking further to do, as Jane Steen has reminded us, but I think we can do it and do it successfully and close that gap that the Bishop of Portsmouth referred to. Is that enough?

The Chair: It sounded good to me. Thank you very much. Thank you for the quality of the debate this afternoon which I think has been very good. Point of order.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Could we have a vote by Houses?

The Chair: If I see 25 people standing, then we will have a counted vote by Houses. I do see 25 people standing.

The vote on Item 12: In the House of Bishops: those in favour 35, against 2, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy: those in favour 131, against 23, with 13 recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity: those in favour 124, against 34, with 11 recorded abstentions.

The motion

'That this Synod:

- a) *welcome the report Mission and Ministry in Covenant (GS 2086), produced by the faith and order bodies of the Church of England and the Methodist Church in response to resolutions passed by the General Synod and the Methodist Conference in 2014;*

- b) *call on the Faith and Order Commission to report back to the Synod at the next group of sessions on work carried out jointly with the Methodist Church to address the areas for further reflection outlined at paragraphs 26-29 of the covering note from the Faith and Order Commission to GS 2086;*
- c) *invite the Faith and Order Commission, in consultation with the Methodist Church, to explore and elucidate further the relationship between episcopal ordination and eucharistic presidency, as this touches on the full visible unity of our two Churches; and*
- d) *affirm its confident hope that any outstanding issues between our Churches may be resolved quickly and satisfactorily and look forward to the day when, on the basis of work already completed and accepted, our ministries will be fully reconciled.'*

was carried on a counted vote by Houses.

The Chair: Thank you, Synod, for that. We now move to our closing worship and I would encourage you, if you are able, to stay. The closing worship will be led by Tim Hind.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells) led the Synod in an act of worship.

**Full Synod: Third Day
Saturday 10 February 2018
WORSHIP**

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 9.38 am

The Chair: Good morning, members of Synod. Before we begin our day's proceedings the Archbishop of Canterbury wishes to say a few words.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Good morning, Synod. We have a longish day today, finishing at 4.00 pm, and hugely important things to look at both this morning and this afternoon. I realise that for some there may be temptations to slip away at lunchtime, but it is noticeable that the Down's syndrome debate this afternoon has attracted a great deal of public attention. There was a package about the issue of Down's and how people are treated and loved and cared for this morning on Radio 4, and *Thought for the Day* touched on it. I would like to encourage people very much to make every possible effort to be here until the end of the day. I think it would be a tragedy if the Church seemed to indicate by having a half empty Chamber that it did not care sufficiently on that subject. I realise that this requires sacrifices from people - and, as I said on Thursday, everyone is hugely grateful for the time that is given by Synod members - but please do try to stay right through the day so that every one of the really important, and often painful, subjects that we will deal with during the course of the day is given full respect. Thank you.

ITEM 13

SAFEGUARDING: PRESENTATION ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND'S PREPARATION FOR THE INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE (IICSA) ([GS MISC 1172](#) AND [GS MISC 1173](#))

The Chair: We come now to Item 13. This is an opportunity for Synod to hear an update on the Church's current work on safeguarding at national and diocesan level and to hear the experiences of a range of church leaders. It is also an opportunity for Synod to hear how the Church is preparing for the independent inquiry, as this is likely to receive considerable media coverage prior to the July Synod.

The presentation will be introduced by the Bishop of Bath & Wells, the lead bishop for safeguarding. A short film, *Survivors' Voices*, will be shown. The survivors whose voices are featured have given their permission for this film to be shown at General Synod. I would want to thank them for affording us the opportunity to hear them. However, they have not given permission for the film to be broadcast more widely, and so for this reason the Synod webcast will not show the film. I would remind both members and visitors that no form of sound, video or photographic recording is permitted during this - or any other part - of the Synod's proceedings.

After we have heard from several speakers, there will be a short time for questions relating to the subject of the presentation. I remind members that this is not an opportunity to make speeches. It would help us to use this time most effectively if questions could be as clear and brief as possible. I hope that members will understand that, whilst there are important and legitimate concerns to be expressed, this is not an appropriate forum for raising detailed or complex queries about specific cases. Such matters could more helpfully be addressed to the Bishop of Bath & Wells or the National Safeguarding Team.

These are difficult, challenging and sensitive matters. I know that members called to put questions will be mindful of that and that there are survivors of abuse here today. If anyone wishes to speak to a chaplain or a member of the National Safeguarding Team, they will be available throughout the day.

Before we proceed, I invite the Synod just to observe a moment's pause. God, who didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people, by the sending to them the light of thy Holy Spirit, grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort, through the merits of Christ Jesus our Saviour, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

I now invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to introduce the presentation.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Synod, good morning. First of all, can I say a particular thanks to the Business Committee for scheduling time for this very important presentation? Reference was also made by Sue Booy to the possibility of a debate in July. I very much hope that once we have opened some of these areas we will be in a much better position to think what the content and the nature of that debate might be. I am pleased to introduce three people who will be speaking to us and who also form part of our panel for questions afterwards: Bishop Rachel, the Bishop of Gloucester; Bishop Martin, Bishop of Chichester; and Sir Roger Singleton. I am very grateful to them not only for being here but for being prepared to help us with our thinking and to answer the questions that we may have.

As our Chair has already said, a DVD video is about to be played. This was commissioned by Bishop Sarah Mullally as a consequence of, and in response to, the Elliott review. It was particularly produced for the College of Bishops. It is being used for training purposes.

Just to say to Synod, and to re-emphasise, if there are people who find these words, this debate, the matters being raised, difficult, please do feel free to leave the Chamber and to seek those who are here to pray with us, to speak with us and to listen to us as chaplains. We now listen to the video.

A video entitled Survivors' Voices was played to the Synod.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner): Responding to the safeguarding failures in the Diocese of Chichester has been a formative, life-changing experience for me and for my colleagues. Preparing to give evidence to IICSA - the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse - next month has been a

demanding task, and we have welcomed the opportunity to review what has been done to identify and address the failures of the past in our diocese.

I want to pay tribute to the work of our diocesan safeguarding team, led by Colin Perkins, and to the support that he has had from successive diocesan secretaries, Angela Sibson and Gabrielle Higgins. Creating a diocese in which safeguarding best practice is uniformly a top priority can only be done by determined and effective teamwork. Here are some observations on the experience of seeking to achieve that in the Diocese of Chichester.

First, survivors are people, not, as Andrew Graystone said to us earlier this morning, a problem to be solved. Nobody should underestimate what it takes to make an allegation, to relive the abuse, to undergo the inevitable processes of forensic enquiry, and to face again the devastating possibility of not being believed.

Second, how much do we invest in safeguarding? This must include funding accessible and good quality training - and may I say that the Church of England's new online C1 training is really excellent - and it must also include ensuring proper resourcing for our response to survivors with the care and support they need. We cannot expect to be taken seriously if we talk about safeguarding but fund it inadequately, especially at diocesan level.

Third, we have to be capable of learning from others about what we have done wrong and how it happened.

In Chichester our safeguarding team, among others, has helped us to learn from survivors and a wide range of people that:

There is never an excuse. Nothing excuses the criminal misuse of power in sexual abuse, which can destroy so many aspects of life, including faith in God and membership of the Church, that were in store for an abused person.

A prolonged period of denial, particularly by the Church when we fail to face up to our responsibilities in this matter, can reinforce the damage done by the abuse itself. It becomes a double abuse. For that we must now be aware that there is also no excuse.

We cannot hide behind formality and status. Communication must be obviously authentic and from the heart. No matter how much drafting a lawyer has had to do, legal phrases and piety are no substitute for being honest and human and genuinely sorry.

We must never privilege the institution of the Church above the inviolable dignity of a human person, especially a vulnerable person.

Abuse takes many forms. It is never safe to imagine that only a certain sort of person abuses or that you can predict who is vulnerable and who is not.

The consequences of abuse are manifold; first, for the victim, of course, but also for a congregation, for a local community, and for others, such as a spouse,

children, parents and close friends of an abuser. We also have a duty of care for them.

We have also benefited in Chichester, sometimes uncomfortably, from the capacity of investigative journalism - at its best - to give a voice to the voiceless and to say in public what we might not have wanted to hear.

Finally, where do we find hope?

Well, having to rebuild trust with statutory agencies and other partners has, I hope, made us look at ourselves more honestly and more humbly. It has made us realise that others might have higher expectations of us as a contributor to society than sometimes we have had of ourselves. It has helped us realise that safeguarding is one of the demands of the gospel of Jesus Christ and a matter of evangelical practice; and robust, regularly updated policies, training, and fairness and consistency in safeguarding practice, are vital for dispelling fear. Fear is dangerous. It is what makes people secretive and deceptive. It is why we tell lies to ourselves and to others.

The experience of serving in Chichester for the past five years has deepened my attention to Jesus Christ in the scandal of the cross as the interface between human degradation in an extreme form and the divine beauty. This is where the absence of God is hollowed out within us. We sit in the dust of shame, where familiar words can be heard with new power and force. They are spoken by a scarred and risen Lord who says to us, whoever we are, "Do not be afraid".

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek): I am aware that when we talk about safeguarding it engages our hearts, our minds and our guts and that, depending on our own experiences, our antennae will be set at different angles, so I do hope that, when we come to questions, people might ask questions that might clarify what you have heard. I have been asked to say something brief about the Diocese of Gloucester. I look forward to contributing more in response to questions later.

It was not long after I arrived in Gloucester that Peter Ball, a previous Bishop of Gloucester, was finally convicted of horrific abuse. You have the Gibb Report.

As I have previously said publicly, I am deeply ashamed and sorry for that legacy, just as I am deeply ashamed and sorry for the abuse that people have suffered across the Church, which has so often been compounded by a wholly inadequate response and a lack of compassion and understanding.

I do believe that now in Gloucester I have the privilege of working with a committed and professional team - and that is not intended to sound defensive.

The starting place is the big picture of the good news of the Kingdom of God and the truth that every person is a unique individual with a name, made in the image of God. Transformation, flourishing and reconciliation are at the heart of who God is, yet all of us live amid prolific broken relationship, including abuse of children and adults, neglect, misused power. To quote St Paul, "creation is groaning", longing for the "freedom of the glory of the children of God" made possible

through Jesus Christ, that day when perfect relationship will be restored - with God, with one another and with all creation. Therefore, safeguarding is integral to our mission and ministry. It is not an “add-on issue”.

In Gloucester we were encouraged by our SCIE audit. We are proud of our joint working between cathedral and diocese, yet, like other SCIE audits, it flagged up the ongoing challenge of getting safeguarding embedded in every parish.

As Bishop, safeguarding is one of my major responsibilities, yet I am acutely aware that the place where most day-to-day safeguarding takes place is in our worshipping communities. Clergy and volunteers from all sorts of backgrounds and experiences are working together. What we ask of nominated safeguarding reps can feel overwhelming. We are trying to work hard at a culture of encouraging and thanking because safeguarding is paramount to living the good news of Jesus Christ. Our training from our diocesan safeguarding advisers is excellent, but I also know that good training does not automatically make a place of worship safe. The message we underline is that none of us can abdicate our responsibility for keeping ears and eyes open. This is not always someone else’s responsibility.

Two key things we are working hard at in Gloucester are relationship and communication.

When safeguarding is lived well from the perspective of a victim or survivor, or as a worshipping community, or as an offender with an agreement, or someone who has had an accusation against them - when it is lived well - there is good relationship and strong communication. This includes listening and saying what you are going to do, by when, and doing it. When safeguarding is weak and people feel diminished, ignored or uncertain, there is poor relationship and unsatisfactory communication.

Communication and strong relational links are crucial at every point across that network of relationships as safeguarding advisers, bishops, survivors, clergy, volunteers, offenders with agreements, respondents - the list is long - and it must include external agencies and networks:

Our safeguarding board has not only an independent chair but also a LADO - a Local Authority Designated Officer - a police officer and someone from the adult safeguarding team. The diocesan Director of Communications sits on both the board and the response group (called a “Core Group” in many places). Her remit is not merely public statements but also to probe the how, the why, the when and the who of communication.

That brings me to my final point, which is our commitment to be aware of every person and perspective in every safeguarding situation. This is particularly important when the response group - the Core Group - meets. Too often people’s suffering has been exacerbated because someone in authority has been standing too firmly in one position and has not been willing to stand in the shoes of someone else.

There is much more that I could say, but hopefully other things can be said in response to questions.

Just to summarise, the key messages we are working at in Gloucester are that: safeguarding is a Kingdom issue and integral to Christian mission and ministry; it is the responsibility of all of us; relationship and communication are key - and this must include external agencies; the communication officer is vital; and there must be attention to every person in any safeguarding situation.

Sir Roger Singleton: Members of Synod, thank you for the opportunity to share with you some thoughts about how the Church can move from having a rather shameful record in the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults to one where it can be quietly confident that it has done all it reasonably can to ensure that best practice becomes universal practice.

In recent years, the Church has done some useful work. Nationally it has developed a comprehensive set of policies and guidance. There is a National Safeguarding Team and much strengthened safeguarding teams in dioceses. There are extensive packages of training. Work with victims and survivors has made a little progress, although an enormous amount remains to be done, and a system of independent assessment of diocesan safeguarding has been developed.

Despite all this activity, there is a common theme that runs through reports of audits, reviews and inquiries, and that is the continuing need for culture change within the Church. This can be found in Dame Moira Gibb's recent report on Peter Ball, in the Archbishop of York's preface to the Cahill Report regarding Peter Waddington, in many of the audit reports of diocesan safeguarding arrangements, in the recent publication, *We asked for bread but you gave us stones*, in the Faith and Order Commission's publication, *The Gospel: Sexual Abuse and the Church*. I quote from it: "Changing the culture of the Church so that safeguarding becomes fully embedded within it as an outworking of the Gospel is a key objective".

What do we mean by culture? There is a whole academic literature on the nature of culture and theories of cultural change. These adorn our business schools and institutes of management, but I find it helpful to opt for a simple definition. Culture is how many people in an organisation think, feel and act.

Within the many theories of cultural change, a recurring theme is the need for strong leadership. I can just imagine that those of you in leadership positions are groaning inwardly at this point. How many times have you been told that you need to provide leadership in what seems to be an ever-lengthening list of issues: spiritual, theological, mission, pastoral, human resources, buildings, health and safety, and, I am afraid, I have to add safeguarding to that.

I am heartened by the positive affirmation which our Archbishops, diocesan bishops and deans continue to give to the importance of creating and sustaining a safe Church, but we need to extend the concept of leadership further if we are to protect children and vulnerable adults adequately. It is the actions of people in parishes and the commitment of parish clergy and parish senior laity which are also critical. The experience of this, while improving, is still variable. I believe a tipping point has been reached where most clergy are informed, supportive of their parish representatives (well, sometimes) and willing to tackle reluctant

church wardens or PCCs, but ambivalence, even hostility, continues with a minority, who appear unable or unwilling to accept the need for sensible proportionate measures or who minimise the impacts which physical, sexual, emotional or spiritual abuse can have on people's lives or who believe that the complainants are simply out for the money.

A second consistent theme of the literature on culture change is the need to define specifically what you are trying to fix. If all we do is talk vaguely about the need for cultural change, we will still be debating it in 10 years' time and not very much will have changed. Cultural change can be brought about by leaders determining in every community in which they serve, whether secular or religious, the differences that need to be made.

Let us just step outside the immediate context of the Church for a moment. During my years as Chair of the Independent Safeguarding Authority - that was a Home Office agency whose remit was to decide who should be statutorily barred from working with children and vulnerable adults - I noted that schools, clubs, foster homes, care homes which were least likely to contain abusers, were those where leaders were familiar with the signs of abuse and neglect, where leaders had some understanding of how abusers behaved, by grooming or exercising power and influence over their victims, where organisations had open and acknowledged channels for concerns to be appropriately expressed, where children and young people could talk about the good things which helped to keep them safe and who they would talk to if they were worried about their own safety or that of a friend. And when abuse did occur, in those sorts of good institutions, the victim or survivor received prompt and attentive responses and the support of an independent and trusted friend.

Returning then to the Church environment, actions which might contribute to culture change include:

Improving the consideration given to the annual safeguarding report at the PCC meeting, so there is an educational element about abuse and safeguarding;

Improving the effectiveness of the archdeacons' articles of inquiry into safeguarding, so they are not just a tick-box exercise - do they have a policy and is there a poster in the church porch - but explore what training has been provided, are there any circumstances of current concern and, if so, what is being done about them;

Grasping the nettle of dealing with clergy, readers, priests with PTO and lay readers who persistently fail to attend training opportunities or speak disparagingly about reasonable safeguarding measures;

Including in ordinands' training and continuing ministerial development awareness of the exceptional imbalances of influence and power which those with the sacred trust possess;

Including in all interviews of clergy and lay employees a rigorous exploration of attitudes to abuse, safeguarding and ways to respond to victims and survivors;

Ensuring that the occasional ludicrous stories about the application of the vetting

rules do not become an excuse for dispensing with DBS checks on those whose role really requires them;

And providing those victims and survivors who are prepared to share their experiences with sensitive and appropriate opportunities to do so.

Each church community can develop its own list of behaviours and attitudes which need to change, and think through ways of bringing these about, because once we are clear about the differences we wish to achieve, the somewhat amorphous concept of cultural change can be translated into tangible actions which, with determination and persistence, can be progressed.

In summary, I am fundamentally optimistic that the Church recognises the need for cultural change and wishes it to happen. However, analysis should not be confused with action. I hope that leaders throughout the Church, from the glories of Church House to the tiniest rural parish, which is where I come from, and in whatever context, leaders exercise judgment and influence and jurisdiction. I hope you will convert the overall objective of culture change into practical, pragmatic steps which can be taken. I believe that is the road to achieving a Church which has learned from past failures and can look forward to offering safe and welcoming communities, especially to children and vulnerable people. Thank you for listening.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Synod, I would like to begin by thanking you for your prayers for me as I have sought to serve as the lead bishop on safeguarding over the last 18 months. I am also grateful for those around me who have helped me to fulfil this task and have picked me up and dusted me down every so often. I include in that not just members of Synod but also some of those who are themselves victims of abuse, some of whom are in the gallery today. I am grateful to you particularly for the courtesy you have shown me.

I also want to record my admiration for the increasing professionalism of the people we now employ across our dioceses and nationally to give us good quality advice and guidance in what are often difficult and complex situations to manage.

More importantly, I want to pay sincere tribute to the victims and survivors of abuse, regardless of their age or the circumstances in which the abuse took place, or how long ago it might have happened. I am humbled by their courage. Telling their story helps the Church improve its safeguarding responses, but it requires them to relive their experiences. On behalf of Synod, I want to acknowledge the pain that is evident in the experiences of the survivors who have contributed to the *We asked for bread but you gave us stones* leaflet. That leaflet raises important issues and ideas for the future and about how the Church might respond to survivors, and I will certainly be considering those. For too long, the Church has not responded well to those who allege abuse within our church communities. This is now changing and further change is needed.

So who are we? The Church of England is in a unique position in our country. We provide services to children, young people and vulnerable adults. We have a presence in every community. We have a calling and a purpose, a mission to share the Good News of Christ with all, a particular concern for the poor and, as

the established Church, we have influence and power. We must discern how to use this influence wisely and ensure that we do not misuse our power. Safeguarding is integral to the mission of the church and to the Gospel message. It is essentially about promoting the wellbeing of all. It is about protecting those who are vulnerable - children, young people and adults - at risk of abuse. It is also about preventing abuse from occurring in the first place. Safeguarding is your responsibility, my responsibility, everyone's responsibility, regardless of what role we may have. Good safeguarding practice must be embedded within all of our Church bodies and communities across the whole Church. We cannot operate alone. We must collaborate with our statutory, voluntary and ecumenical partners. Safeguarding is about partnership with the wider communities that we seek to serve and transform. What good safeguarding looks like is defined in our policy *Promoting a Safer Church*. Synod, I hope each of you have read it. If you have not, I say to you that it is both an easy and essential read for you.

How are we working to embed safeguarding in all we do? Our National Safeguarding Framework on the slide in front of you outlines a number of key foundations, and each of those, taken together, are an essential factor in building a safer Church. This is about improving the consistency and the quality of our safeguarding practices and arrangements.

What do we have in place? I think it is fair to say that we started from a very low base, particularly nationally, but there has been approximately a five-fold increase in resources since 2014. Every diocese now has a professional skilled safeguarding adviser and most have a safeguarding team.

As Synod members, what are you going to do? Can I suggest you take time to get to know them and to encourage them and to see how they are? This is not easy work. They need to be supported and they need to be valued. All dioceses should now have arrangements in place to provide support to survivors. The National Safeguarding Team has commissioned independent research to help identify ways to strengthen that support, where we have often been very weak. With the Roman Catholic Church, we are now moving forward with the Safe Spaces Project. I am pleased to say the newly appointed project manager is with us today. All dioceses should also have in place individuals who can support those who have been accused or who are subject to safeguarding allegations. This is about a holistic response to safeguarding.

Synod has taken steps to improve consistency through legislation, strengthening the powers to suspend or risk-assess, for example. There is now a duty to have regard to House of Bishops' guidance on safeguarding. The frontline of safeguarding is the parish and the diocese and the National Safeguarding Team is producing a parish safeguarding handbook to support this.

Many of you will have attended safeguarding training in your dioceses based on the national framework. I will pause for a moment to let you digest the figures. They do not include face-to-face training delivered locally in your dioceses. Every diocese has now been independently audited in respect of their safeguarding arrangements. I believe we remain the only denomination to have done this in England. We are now extending those independent audits to all cathedrals and to the Archbishops' Offices. Furthermore, the House of Bishops has asked for more work to be done to strengthen independent oversight and scrutiny.

What is the scale of safeguarding activity? Some who were here on Thursday will have seen these figures already, but it is worth reminding Synod of my response to a safeguarding question on Thursday. It tells the story of the Church as the ears and eyes of our local communities. It highlights our role as a community of faith that is prepared to welcome all, even those who are a known risk to others, but to do so with safeguards in place. There are challenges for us to face: the need for greater consistency in what we do, the complexity of our structures and aspects of our culture that Sir Roger has already referred to, which have and continue to stop people from reporting abuse or which undermine our desire to respond well.

Whilst I strongly believe that we are making progress, we need to accelerate the pace of this change. This has been made clear to us in recent independent learning lessons reviews, by Dame Moira Gibb and Lord Carlile. In July, I hope we will think further about these matters in a debate on safeguarding. We need to ask ourselves the question: how do we embed safeguarding as part of the mission and culture of the Church and how can we accelerate the pace of change?

Let me now for a moment turn to IICSA, the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. The Anglican Church is one of 13 investigations into how well institutions have protected children from sexual abuse and how well they have and are responding to adult survivors of abuse. How we approach the inquiry says a lot about the Church; about who we are and how we strive to be as Christians

We need to listen with humility to survivors' stories and acknowledge past failures where they have occurred. We must - and we are - approach the inquiry with openness and transparency. We must approach it with a genuine desire to learn and to improve. Within the Anglican investigation we are currently one of 39 core participants. To date we have disclosed over 25,000 documents and submitted 36 witness statements, with more to follow. The first public hearing begins on 5 March with a case study of the Diocese of Chichester. It is expected to last three weeks. The second public hearing takes place at the end of July on Peter Ball and a further hearing is expected in 2019.

Synod, make no mistake, this will not be an easy couple of years. We will hear deeply painful accounts of abuse, of poor response and of cover-up. We will, as our friends in the Anglican Church in Australia did, feel a deep sense of shame. We must face this together as a whole Church, not because we are concerned to protect our reputation but because we believe it is God's Church. We believe in a message of hope. We believe that this Gospel message can and will transform lives and bring people, including those who have been abused, into a place of wholeness and healing.

What can we do to reduce abuse from taking place in our churches? Bishop Rachel has outlined a number of things. We can take steps to create open, healthy and protective communities. We can make sure that children have a voice and are visible and a valued part of our Church life. We can talk to young people about their online and social media safety. We must be rigorous in ensuring that we recruit safely to all roles within the Church and provide people with guidance as to how to act safely. We can ask questions about the pastoral

support that we give to people who are affected by safeguarding matters.

Finally, Synod, how will we know when we have got there? All of these things on the slide, and more. More importantly, and I direct your attention to it, when we hear direct and positive accounts from survivors. In saying this, I am acutely aware that there are survivors in the Assembly Hall who cannot testify to this and remain deeply mistrustful, suspicious and angry towards the Church. We simply cannot walk away from our safeguarding responsibilities or hand them on to someone else. We are all responsible and we need the courage not just to admit our failures but to make the progress that is needed. Synod, thank you.

The Chair: We come now to a short period of questions relating to the presentation. May I remind members that speeches are not in order and that it would be helpful if questions could be clear and brief? I intend to take questions in groups of three before inviting the speakers to respond. Would those who wish to put a question, please stand.

Ms Kashmir Garton (Worcester): Given that the independent review into Bishop George Bell acknowledges at point 94 that dioceses have a high degree of independence, how will future changes and practice guidance from the Church ensure such guidance is applied and followed consistently and adhered to by all dioceses?

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I have two questions. What separate processes and guidelines are given to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) from the police to work to when they are to do an independent inquiry into the claim which could or would lead to a substantiation?

Secondly, how does the signing of a safeguarding arrangement by someone who is the subject of an accusation avoid infringing the principle of innocent until proven guilty?

The Chair: The fact that I could not count in calling speakers was relieved by Canon Banting providing two questions, though he will be the only person allowed to do that.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): I will try to make my answers brief so that we can have as many questions as we can. With regard to the first question, there is much that can be said. Most of it is captured in our practice guidance, which has been strengthened, given special status and improved rigour through the Discipline Measures that the Synod have passed, so that is one but a very significant way of addressing that.

With regard to the LADOs, that is quite a technical question with regard to their briefing and terms of reference. I think, technical questions I will try and respond to afterwards. With regard to the signing of safeguarding agreements, we do need to make sure that all parties are treated fairly, openly, transparently and faithfully in these procedures.

Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr David Ison): I do not know if I am alone in being struck by the parable that we had enacted in front of us at the beginning of this session, whereby we had people sharing their vulnerability and their courage,

followed straight away by a response which was well meant but intellectual and did not meet that vulnerability. My question is, how can we respond institutionally as a Church to these matters with heart?

Revd Jenny Gillies (Chester): I am really excited to hear what has been said and I agree wholeheartedly with what has been laid out and the importance of parishes and, also, the use of professionalism. I think that is absolutely vital in safeguarding. I have a question about how we build trust in our parishes, in our clergy and in our laity so that we actually do not break down what we are intending to build.

What I mean is, as we professionalise this whole situation, it seems to me that we begin to remove trust from parishes and that what we are actually trying to do means that, in the end, it becomes the domain of “pass it on”, or, “do not deal with it because it is the work of professional people”. How do we build and engender that trust that means that parishes can act and be more engaged and more responsible?

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): The Carlile Report in paragraph 291 makes reference to the triage system for emails going into Lambeth. Given how difficult it is for someone to come forward with a disclosure or to seek help in a slightly vaguer way, can we have some assurance that both emails and telephone calls to Lambeth, to bishops’ offices, to diocesan offices will not be brushed off by switchboard operators who say it is “none of our concern”?

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek): I will try and respond to that first one. I am very sorry to the Dean of St Pauls if he felt that we were lacking heart. That is certainly not intended. It is a hard one, how do you build a culture of vulnerability? I would want to say it starts with me. I think we all have to take responsibility for being willing to be vulnerable and something that I try to live is my own vulnerability. I think it is part of our training as well when we are training people. It is not about giving people the right answers; it is about how we share our stories. Here in this Chamber, if we were sharing our stories, being willing to be vulnerable, not saying that we have all the right answers.

There is also something in there for me about wellbeing, particularly when I am working with clergy, with lay leaders, how are we encouraging them to take responsibility for their own wellbeing so people can say, “I am struggling, I am finding this difficult”? I think it is a culture that runs beyond our safeguarding. It is about how we create a culture of vulnerability within which we can live all these things in our mission and ministry. That is not a technical answer, but I hope it says it starts with me and creating the right environment.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): The second question was the one about trust and I think Rachel’s answer about vulnerability and listening and care and appropriateness is an appropriate answer to that second question. With regards to the support and the response that survivors and others may receive from our offices, I think I want to refer back to a slide I gave you earlier which said that our investment in safeguarding has risen by five times in terms of resources since 2014 and there are now specialist trained professional safeguarding advisers embedded in both of our Archbishops’ offices.

I think you heard me also say there will be a SCIE audit of our cathedrals and our Archbishops' offices. If there need to be improvements, I am sure they will be brought out through that. Just to say that, as a result of the Elliott review, there was a request and a demand for better training for clergy and diocesan officers. I think about 700 people since September have been through that C4 training. Part of that has been directed very specifically at how we can respond more effectively and appropriately to those who contact us. Many of those who are involved in our administration and serving us in that way have also been part of that ongoing training.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Given the extent to which our culture is nurtured by the clergy in theological colleges and courses of varied traditions and which are independent institutions, is it possible to hear what means are being provided to ensure that not only training in safeguarding but awareness of culture, dynamics of power and ministerial responsibility are being established across all different colleges and courses?

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Under Standing Order 19, may I make a brief point of personal explanation before I ask my question?

The Chair: I trust you, Prolocutor, to understand the Standing Order. I would be grateful if you could keep it brief.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): In 2016, the figure of 3,300 safeguarding allegations or concerns was disclosed in answers to questions on Thursday. I think my own risk assessment was included. While I am well-recovered from the trauma of suspicion and investigation, the press reports made statements concerning 3,300 cases of sexual abuse in 2016, which will have caused considerable distress to many whose risk assessments, like mine, had nothing to do with that sort of allegation.

I am elected as Prolocutor to speak for the clergy in Synod and, so, on behalf of those clergy and others who have been tarred by such inaccurate reporting, with who knows what consequence, may I say through Synod to the press gallery: please report accurately, check your facts and think of the people behind your stories.

Can I move on to my question then, which relates to complainants and respondents alike. To the Bishop of Gloucester particularly, why does it remain the case that comms officers are members of Core Groups? I can fully understand the need to have good comms advice available to Core Groups, but the current practice guidelines rather direct dioceses to the conclusion that comms officers, who have no specific safeguarding expertise, are making decisions on safeguarding matters. Surely, it would be better to avoid any perception, however inaccurate, that issues of diocesan or Church reputation are taken into consideration in safeguarding decisions if comms officers attended in a solely advisory role without any input into safeguarding decisions themselves?

Mr Peter Hart (Chester): The Bishop of Gloucester mentioned the importance, and quite rightly, of the work being done at parish level and I hope that we do that in our regular training. It is quite simple to identify the people who work with children in Sunday school or a youth club, whatever. We always find ourselves

stumbling over vulnerable adults and identifying who those are. In fact, is it all of us? I wonder if you could say a little bit about that, about how we can actually approach that and make sure that we are dealing with that aspect properly?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Once again, I hope my replies will be brief. I perhaps should have made it clear that, as well as the safeguarding audits and the safeguarding training and responsibilities being extended to the Archbishops' offices, to diocesan offices and cathedrals, TEIs are also engaging - and I am pleased to say very effectively and very strongly - with this. Sorry, TEIs are our theological educational institutions. That is our colleges and courses. Archbishop, thank you.

Simon, thank you for the clarification that you have made. I am sorry there has been distressful misreporting in the press. I apologise to you and to others. I hope Synod heard me say that, when I was speaking about those numbers, they included all forms of abuse not just sexual abuse and these were allegations. That point needs to be made very clearly. Rachel is going to respond to communications and then Martin is going to say something as an answer to our last question.

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek): Thank you, and thank you for asking for that clarification. For me, this probably is a bigger subject about how people understand communications officers. I think the communication role is really important. It is not someone making a decision. Everyone who is part of that group is part of the training - so she has been through the C4 training with us - and I see her role as really crucial in helping us be challenged about communications. It is not just about media statements. It is about who we communicate with, how, when, why, because that is her professional role, which she brings to that and I would always want her there. There is a bigger question for me about how people understand their communications officers within dioceses.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Martin Warner): Thank you for the question about vulnerable adults. It is an important question and, for those of you who have not yet done C1, it is very well covered in that online Church of England training. I think, very simply, everybody might be a vulnerable adult. The danger with thinking only some people are vulnerable adults and not others means that we actually label those people and think of them as "them" not "us".

Throughout a person's life there may be phases of life when, actually, we are very vulnerable. In those cases, we can also be targeted and the subject of abuse. Therefore, I think keeping our minds open to the wide diversity of the ways in which people are abused - and, remember, abuse comes in many forms; sexual, physical, emotional, financial, social, online, et cetera - these are all categories which we, as a Church, need to be attentive to that people might suffer from and be damaged by.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Thank you very much for all of the contributions this morning. It sometimes feels like we drown under practice guidance. I explain to volunteers quite regularly, as safeguarding lead at Derby Cathedral, that they have to go through one, two and sometimes three different rounds of training. Can the National Safeguarding Team please give us some

sense of how things can be made comprehensible, not just for an organisation with the resources of a cathedral but at parish level as well, and to streamline some of the things which makes it easier for a volunteer to be valued as a volunteer as well as get the rigorous safeguarding training that they require. It feels a little disproportionate sometimes.

Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester): My question is, can the spouses of clergy people who have had extramarital affairs be considered under the banner of “spiritual abuse” and provided for appropriately?

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): One of the most distressing things I hear from victims is that it is not the abuse that made them lose their faith in Christ Jesus; it was how the Church treated them; not the people in the pews but people like us in this room. My question is can you illustrate to us one practical thing that will be done better by the time we reassemble in York, something experienced tangibly by the victims that will have made their lives a little better? “It is by their fruits ye shall know them”, so I want to know something about that.

Sir Roger Singleton: I will have a go at the first and the third questions. I think anybody in any agency developing policy is caught, if you will forgive the expression, between the devil and the deep blue sea. On the one hand, there is a wish to be comprehensive and to cover absolutely everything. On the other hand, there is the danger of that saying “more is less” coming into play.

Homing in, I understand that the National Safeguarding Team is working on a parish handbook which will focus particularly on the needs and the responses of people in parishes. I would hope that that could be applied equally to cathedrals and to other similar institutions. It is quite a difficult challenge to make sure you have covered everything but, at the same time, to home in on those things that are particularly important for a specific audience.

I am afraid I have now got so excited about that, I have forgotten what the third question was. Oh, one practical thing. From my experience of listening to victims and survivors both within and outside the Church, perhaps particularly outside the Church, I think the provision of a source of support that is trusted by the person who is making the disclosure and who can sit and stand alongside them, sometimes perhaps acting as an honest broker, not seen to be part of the Church hierarchy, if you will forgive that general expression, but someone who does know their way around Church institutions and can provide practical assistance as well as a listening ear, I think that in the context of safeguarding we could all do more to provide a resource of people who might be able to command the confidence of people who are disclosing abuse.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): With regard to the second question, if I might make a general comment and then answer it specifically. The general comment would be that everybody who is a survivor of abuse, and, indeed, everyone who is affected by safeguarding matters needs care and support and that needs to be individual and tailored to those particular needs and situations.

Specifically, with regard to the question about clergy spouses, Synod may be aware that each diocese has set aside people who are often called bishop

visitors, who have been given a particular responsibility to care for clergy spouses. My colleagues on the House of Bishops will know that I wrote to them all fairly recently to ask had they received safeguarding training and were they aware of the particular issues that clergy spouses might be meeting in regard to safeguarding and to make sure that each diocesan Bishop was meeting with their advisers to give them the support and the care that they themselves needed. If you want to know more about the work of bishop visitors, please do ask me later.

Miss Judith Rigby (Canterbury): Given that there was much information in Bishop Peter's slides, could they be made available to all Synod members, please, to aid us in our individual response to take what we have heard and experienced here back to our dioceses and, as we have just been challenged, to aid us in our response to survivors?

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): I was going to make the same point on that one. My second point, which I do not think has been covered, is how can the National Safeguarding Team encourage bishops who are constantly struggling? We are not sole traders. We have to relate to public authorities, the police and are often frustrated by having to take the rap for things that are not our responsibility, where months can go by, where we are told either to do things or not to do things. We cannot go public on it and we see the suffering that that engenders as well, either for those who have had allegations made against them or for those who are, in the end, proved innocent. We simply do not do it on our own and I think that element needs to be taken into consideration. I would like to know if any work is being done, particularly in relation to the police and others, to try and make this work better.

Miss Rhian Ainscough (Leicester): I just wanted to clarify, from the final presentation, it was said that "most" dioceses have a dedicated safeguarding trainer, but why is this not all at the moment, given the importance of training?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): With regard to the paperwork, you saw that I was taking things out of my presentation. One of the things that went out, Judith, was that I was going to say that the presentation that I made would be made available to all Synod members, so certainly that is intended.

With regard to the question about the length of processes, I know this is something that the Archbishops are themselves both deeply aware of and very anxious about. It is frustrating and more than that for many people. With regard to our own internal processes, there is a review taking place about our own CDM processes, looking at that.

With regard to our relationships with external bodies and secular and statutory bodies, we have to continue to press. It is, I know, and many of you know, deeply unsatisfactory and deeply frustrating, but we are grateful to them for the work that they do, and I suspect if we were in their shoes they would also say that they have similar frustrations. We must be careful that we do not turn our frustration onto others with whom we need to work in co-operation. I do apologise, I did not hear the third question, could I ask that you might repeat that?

Miss Rhian Ainscough (Leicester): It was just to clarify why only some dioceses

have got a dedicated safeguarding trainer and not all of them?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Because I think it is very new. I think we are just trying to catch up with ground. I said that we had not had the resources in place we had. Speaking for my own diocese, we recruited somebody; and within the first nine months she did face to face training with over a thousand people. It is extraordinary.

I do not know the numbers, so please do not quote me entirely, but I expect that we are looking at 25,000 to 30,000 people who have been given additional training in the last few months. I can try and get the figures for you. The National Safeguarding Team does not necessarily hold those figures, but what I would want to say is that there is a very encouraging take-up of training and training is being done much more regularly, much more thoroughly, much more rigorously and much more professionally, and I am grateful for the dioceses who have invested in that.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford): I kind of do not want to ask this question, but I think we need to address the existing culture of broken trust. Given that so many promises have been made in the past and so many apologies - heartfelt apologies - offered, and given that neither the external Elliott or Carlisle Reports have been properly respected, in what way can we have a robust structure of accountability, ensuring that the re-abuse of survivors by the Church will actually stop and today's promises will actually be delivered?

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Bishop Martin helpfully reminded us that survivors are people, not a problem to be solved, and spoke of the problem of responding to those who face the devastating possibility of not being believed. I wonder if we could be given some information about how those people are responded to in circumstances where, initially, they have to be treated seriously, and a need to investigate the particular complaint that has been made before saying, "Yes, we accept it"?

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Chair, I spoke at the start of Synod about my concern that we are being overly managed and we heard from the Chair of the Business Committee that she can only consider what she is asked to consider. I would like to ask Bishop Peter why a presentation was requested and not a much needed and widely called for debate on safeguarding so that we can air our concerns, proposals, experiences, such as the need to reassess how we safeguard adults, particularly women suffering from sexual harassment and abuse and not just vulnerable adults, which Bishop Martin has clearly defined as someone who lacks the basic life skills; or, indeed, the critical need to ensure we put victims first by considering an independent reporting body; or, indeed, a victim's charter as Bishop James Jones has called for in his Report, *The Patronising Disposition of Unaccountable Power*, which was commissioned by the Government and is for public institutions like ourselves?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): With respect to Canon Harper, I think I would like to not agree with the premises on which you began your question. I would want to say that the reports that the Church receive, which are learning lessons reports, are respected. We do take them very seriously. How do we build trust? We build it by being open and being truthful.

With regard to the second question, it was both hypothetical and, yet, also, particular with regard to particular matters which it would be inappropriate for me to comment on.

With regard to the third question about why we are having a presentation and not a debate, people may know that I called for a debate and wanted a debate. I am pleased that we are having a presentation. The reason is that I am hoping that we may have a debate in July and, in principle, I am very much for that. The difficulty is that at least 12 different people have told me the motion they want to debate, and I hope after today we will really have a clearer sense as a Synod because we have listened respectfully, and we have heard each other. It may well be that the particular issues that you have are the issues that others do not want to debate, Jayne. My difficulty is, if we put a motion before Synod, it would have either been so bland it would have said nothing or it would not have addressed the issues that are facing the Church.

We have months now to think about how, Synod, with integrity, with prayerfulness and with determination will return to this subject. I cannot promise. It is down to the Business Committee. If we return to this in July, I hope that we will gather up those broken fragments that have been part of our discussions today.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): May I ask a question regarding our Church schools and, in fact, the schools, in general, in all parishes in this land. We all have to have safeguarding policies. There will be many, many Synod members who are governors. That training is often given locally. Has consideration been given to some specific training for our Church school headteachers and governors that can be cascaded to all? We want them to be beacons in what they give for our children in all aspects of their work.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds): Recognising that you have said that the Church of England will listen to those who have brought complaints, and following Bishop Peter's comments on wanting to be open and truthful, what weight will be given to any suggestions that may be brought by the survivors to improve the process of safeguarding in the Church of England such as the establishment of an independent body to oversee policy, practice and procedure and some complaints?

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): Money has been described as the "sacrament of seriousness" and this is a question about the financial bottom line and our commitment. Bishop Peter has reminded us that spending centrally in the area of safeguarding has risen by five times in recent years. What is our best estimate as to whether or by how much investment in this area will need to increase over the next period? How are we planning for this in budgeting terms?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): With regard to the question about schools, I will take that to my colleagues in the DBE, the education department, but to reassure you that head teachers are already particularly trained in these matters. I will follow that up with other colleagues.

With regard to the work on independence, I am pleased that we are now actively beginning to recruit a new Chair for the National Safeguarding Panel. Part of that

answer is going to be listening - and listening more attentively and diligently - to survivors. With regard to future work, the House of Bishops at its last meeting asked us to give particular thought as to how more independence can be built in to the life of the Church.

The third question was about resources. I think there are many people here who are better qualified than I am to make these decisions. They will have noted that. It is a matter for parishes. It is a matter for dioceses. It is a matter for the national Church. It is a good question that has been raised. It is appropriate that it was raised in this debate. If we are to seek to take forward our plans and our ambitions, money and people and training and prayer will all be part of that. We must attend to that properly.

The Chair: I think this will be our last set of three questions. Can I ask if there are three people who have not yet had an opportunity to speak during the current group of sessions?

Revd Canon Deborah Flach (Europe): I have the impression that there are people in the gallery who would like to ask a question but do not realise that they cannot ask questions as they are sitting in the gallery. Is there some mechanism by which their questions can be put to Synod?

The Chair: I am afraid it is not possible at this stage, Canon Flach.

Revd Canon Deborah Flach (Europe): Can I run upstairs and get their questions then? Are you giving me that "I don't agree with you" look?

The Chair: There is afterwards a meeting in room 4 at which the Bishop of Bath & Wells ---

Revd Canon Deborah Flach (Europe): That is not the same thing.

The Chair: --- the National Safeguarding Team and others will be available. Thank you.

Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury): How are we planning to evaluate the very large amount of safeguarding training that is being rolled out, both in terms of individual learning and the impact on the wider culture of the Church of England?

Ven. Justine Allain Chapman (Lincoln): I wholeheartedly support the open direction in which the Church is moving. Like most of us, I am deeply shocked and saddened that it has taken us so long and that there is so much still to do. My question is about the title we use of "safeguarding". I wonder whether our training materials in their branding might explicitly connect safeguarding to pastoral care and our call to love our neighbour. As an archdeacon, I come across too many churchwardens and clergy who see safeguarding as professionalised and compartmentalised and not core to their life as Christians and in communities. Perhaps a strap-line on the Parish Safeguarding Handbook which connects explicitly to our biblical injunction to care for one another might ease that.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): With regard to the first question, room 4 is designed to be a private meeting for the survivors, but they do hope that some members of Synod will come to listen to the questions and the experiences that they have, but please do respect that afterwards.

With regard to the change of culture, how do we measure the impact, Jane? I am grateful for the work of IICSA - and I do say that very honestly. I think those are the questions that they will be asking us. They will be asking those questions in a few weeks' time. I think this is an area that the Church will need to attend to as we learn lessons through IICSA.

The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek): Again, I can only speak from my own experience. I do want to actually just touch on that question of training. It is a really key question. How do we know that our training works? It is something that the House of Bishops was musing on. In terms of pastoral care - I absolutely agree - I think the language used of "safeguarding" makes it sound as if we are always being reactive. I go back to where I started from. This is about the Kingdom of God. It is part of all our mission and ministry. So I think how we bring the language of pastoral care in there is really important.

I talked about trying to create a good culture at local level. One of the things we have begun to do is to each year call together our nominated safeguarding reps for a social event, to thank them, to talk about their own care and to talk about with churchwardens that this is about how we all care for one another. It goes back to that question about vulnerability; that we should not just be expecting everyone to have ticked the boxes and then think that we have trained them. How do we go on caring for one another? That language should definitely come in to our handbook.

The Chair: I invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to make any concluding remarks.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Friends, I do not want to say much. I want to thank Synod for the way in which it has engaged with this. I want to particularly thank those who have come from survivor groups, and who are themselves victims and survivors, for their patience in listening to our debate and our considerations.

There are two things that I would like to do as a result of this debate. One is that I shall read very carefully the words of all that was said in the questions. Also, I am aware that there were at least half a dozen people who wanted to ask questions. If you have questions that unfortunately we were not able to address this morning, if you would like to send those to the National Safeguarding Team we will make sure that those are considered.

(Interruption from the gallery)

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Thank you. Members of the Safeguarding Team will have heard that. I heard what you said. Those on the floor of Synod will have heard it as well.

The Chair: Before we conclude this item I invite the Synod to pause for a short period of silent prayer. That concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 11.12 am

ITEM 14

RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES ([GS 2087](#))

The Chair: Brothers and sisters, we now move to Item 14 on our agenda: considering the life of our religious communities. Before I invite the Bishop of Manchester to speak to this motion, we are going to be shown a short film about the life of religious communities.

A film entitled *The Importance of Religious Communities* was played to the Synod.

The Chair: I now invite Bishop David to move and speak to the motion in his name. Bishop, you have up to seven minutes.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): I beg to move

‘That this Synod, mindful of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s priority for the renewal of the religious life:

- a) note the historic importance of religious communities in the life of the faithful of the country;
- b) celebrate the many new expressions of the religious life through Recognised and Acknowledged Communities; and
- c) call on the Business Committee to introduce a new Canon to the Synod by July 2018 to provide a framework for religious life in the Church of England.’

Those were my words on the video. I assure you it was not me playing the piano!

I had just turned 18 when, having discovered that Jesus Christ was real, alive and risen, I decided I should probably go to church. I had been sent to Sunday school as a child in a parish where the vicar’s wigs seemed to change to match the liturgical seasons, but nothing had prepared me for a church served by three men in brown robes! From that moment the Franciscan movement would not let me go. A fellow student at theological college was a friar, and the inner city Birmingham parish where I did my main placement included a house where three Franciscan sisters worked alongside women at risk from the sex industry. I discovered that St Francis had set up a special community - his Third Order - for men and women who had work and family obligations that they could not just walk away from but who wished to follow Jesus after his example. Despite being warned by one young Australian sister that it was all “elderly women in twinsets and pearls”, which was not quite the image I was trying to cultivate for myself, I could not shake off God’s call to this form of the religious life any more than I could have discarded my call to ordination or to marriage.

People who turn to the religious life normally do so for a combination of three reasons: the charism, the community and the rule. Through these we seek to achieve both a deepening of our own spiritual journey and a greater serving of Christ in the world. Our rule gives us a framework for Christian living, a discipline that we are accountable to each other for in the wider community, and where we are strengthened by knowing that others have the same discipline. Our community, whether we live together under one roof, meet monthly in a private house, or say our daily prayers over Skype, is a place of gathering, mutual support and shared study of our calling and common life. Our charism is the work that God is seeking us to do for his Kingdom.

The 19th century revival of monasticism in the Church of England gave birth to orders that worked in education, healthcare and on the global mission field, as well as providing space for those who wished to explore the enclosed contemplative life.

The Advisory Council that I chair was first set up in 1935. Since the 1940s it has produced what is now called the Handbook on the Religious Life. We may not have the snappiest title, but, as I said in the video, we do what it says we do. On behalf of the wider Church of England we recognise communities that maintain the common life in its traditional monastic form, and we acknowledge communities which, like my own, interpret that tradition alongside commitments to family and to outside work.

It is this latter category in particular which has seen a remarkable outpouring of God's blessing in recent times. New communities are springing up as men and women come together to address, for God's sake, the prevailing ills of our time. Existing organisations, such as CMS and Church Army, are discovering that the bonds of community strengthen their capacity for mission. Whereas the 19th century orders came largely from the Anglo-Catholic revival, today's new communities are as likely to emerge from evangelical or charismatic parentage. However, whatever their churchmanship background, they tend towards an embracing of diversity of tradition, both within the Church of England and ecumenically, and they gain strength from Archbishop Justin's decision to make prayer and the revival of the religious life one of his three key priorities.

Synod, the purpose of this debate is to seek your willingness for us to bring before you in July a Canon on the Religious Life that will pave the way to create a clearer framework for both traditional and new monastic communities than the relative informality the present arrangements allow. Our intention is to work on the precise wording of such a Canon in the light of today's debate. It will be drafted to stimulate good growth and not to constrain the Holy Spirit. It will help both individual communities and the wider Church discharge the responsibilities that fall to us in order to best safeguard not only the members of those communities themselves but also those with whom their work puts them into contact. Once we have a Canon on the Religious Life it will be much simpler to refer to monastic communities in our other Canons so that the vital work they do can be properly supported and framed.

Law alone is never enough. Canonical recognition of the religious life will sit alongside the work of the Advisory Council, a new version of the handbook and

the oversight provided by those bishops who act as visitors to individual communities.

These are not matters on which the Church is minded to legislate hastily. The 1897 Lambeth Conference set up a committee under the chairmanship of the then Bishop of Oxford in order to reflect on the growth of monastic orders across the Communion and to identify where the balance lay between the “freedom [for organisation and development] essential to the due exercise of special gifts”, which these communities were seen as providing to the church, and the way such liberty “must be so regulated as to ensure the maintenance of the Faith, and the order and discipline of the Church”. We found a copy in the Lambeth Palace library! By today’s standards it is a refreshingly short report, just three or four pages. It gets to the point, highlighting the principal challenges facing the religious life and the Church. The Committee reported back to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as President of the Lambeth Conference, a year later in 1898. Much of the work identified was able to be progressed informally, but not all. We are not quite sure what the Archbishop did with it thereafter.

Support for this Motion will pave the way to our framing the religious life with the right balance of freedom and accountability appropriate for the present generation. It will allow us to build on over 150 years of experience of the revival of monasticism in our Church and to go with the grain of the Holy Spirit as new communities are born, grow and mature. I beg to move the motion that stands in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop David. Item 14 is now open for debate. There will be a speech limit in the beginning of five minutes. That may change later.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Thank you, Chair. Thank you to the Business Committee for giving time to this item. I am very grateful that this attention is being paid to religious communities. I am very grateful to the Advisory Council and to Bishop David for all that he does. I just want to make three or four very brief points in addition to what he has said.

First of all, the history of the Church demonstrates that a vibrant life of religious community is indispensable to renewal of spiritual life. It is almost impossible to find a period in the Church where there has been a renewal of spiritual life without in some part of the Church a renewal of religious community in one form or another, often, if you will excuse me for repeating myself again, with some kind of faithful improvisation. Therefore, if we are to see a deepening of our spiritual life in the Church of England over the next many years, it is, I would argue, essential that we pay attention to this subject.

Secondly, there is a huge variety of religious community and religious life. We see it in the past, in everything from the groups set up by the Wesleys at the time of the initial growth of Methodism in the 18th century, through to what we would all recognise as the great longstanding traditional religious communities. I myself am a Benedictine oblate and have been so for very many years. In the rule of St Benedict, which I read a little bit of every day, and in the example and the support coming from the community that I go to on retreat, I find strength to live out my own vocation. But that is only one variety. There are the Franciscans and the new communities. There are longstanding and new communities. All are

equally important. They have different vocations and charisms. They are remarkable.

At Lambeth we have the presence of the Chemin Neuf community, which helps lead the Community of St Anselm. Chemin Neuf is a Roman Catholic community of ecumenical vocation. It has within it single people consecrated to life-long celibacy. It has married couples. It has houses led by women. They have Roman Catholic priests in the houses. It has an enormous variety. It reaches out in evangelism, in renewal and in reconciliation. It is a very remarkable example of the variety of religious life.

What we are finding in this country is that by the grace of God, and in great generosity, many of the longstanding communities have been supporting, advising and sharing wisdom with the new communities. I would want to pay tribute to that generosity of spirit.

If we look at the motion, it talks about three things: noting and celebrating - well, that all seems pretty obvious, we can do all that - and legislating. Well, that is a very Anglican way of celebrating, is it not? But legislating is important. It gives this aspect of our spiritual lives, of our common life together, a prominence so that vocations are discerned. I think vocations to the religious life are often simply overlooked rather than ignored - and that is for both longstanding and new communities. It gives importance to the structure. Tragically, we know from our history right back through the centuries that abuse and corruption are also part of some religious life at different periods in history. Sin creeps in. Legislation is important. In the renewal of our religious communities, we give the opportunity and the opening in both the longstanding and the new communities to the witness that in Christ is our salvation and in dedication to Him is the fulfilment of life to the uttermost that is possible, and we give the witness that in serving and following Christ with all that we have there is a full and abundant life.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): I speak as the leader of the Church Army mission community as well.

I think it was Steve Jobs who founded Apple who said that some of the greatest vision is borne in the greatest frustration. I arrived as the leader of Church Army 11 and a half years ago and found myself having to follow a board decision I profoundly disagreed with. It was one that caused a great deal of pain. It required Church Army evangelists to leave when they committed the crime of becoming a priest. I remember being deeply uncomfortable with this on lots of levels and desperately wanting to change it, but for 122 years whoever sat in my seat held different views on this matter and the issue bounced like a ping-pong back and forth. Every time it did, it left a generation of people injured and wounded. I wanted to do something different, something that would take Church Army to a new place where nobody would ever have to address this question again. I wanted some sort of ontological change in Church Army.

I did not know what to do, so I did what I always do when I do not know what to do: I took George Lings for coffee. Having a cup of coffee with George Lings, he said: "My dear boy, what you are talking about is an order where it doesn't matter whether you are lay, ordained, young or old, male or female; what matters is that you carry the DNA of the movement, that you carry the charism of the founder".

He gave me a whole lecture on the role of Mission Orders through history to change the Church. Of course I am very proud that most of them were Celtic as well! Because orders are church but orders are also on the margin and on the edge of church. Orders are places where the radical and the difficult and the pioneering can be done slightly easier than what the institution finds it. Britain was not evangelized by the parochial system. It was evangelized by the mission orders and the Mission Orders.

So I went to see Rowan Williams and had a little conversation with him about this. He had a little twinkle in his eye when he said: "Mark, maybe it will take a Northern Irish Protestant to lead Church Army into the most Catholic thing in its history".

So we took Church Army on a journey. To my astonishment, 94.5 per cent of my Evangelists agreed with me that becoming a mission community was the right thing to do, and six years ago, in the crypt of St Paul's Cathedral, London, just 25 feet from the grave of Wilson Carlile, our founder, we founded our mission community.

Growing up in Northern Ireland you learn something very profound, which is that you cannot build a future until you acknowledge the past. So we began our day with a service of repentance, where I led Church Army in an act of repentance, apologising and repenting for the pain we had caused our ordained brothers and sisters, and a whole bucket load of other people, and my Chair, Bishop Stephen, pronounced - almost - a Church Army absolution. Bishop Stephen then led us in the most wonderful, joyful launch of a new community.

I wrote to every evangelist that we had thrown out. I took adverts out in the Church press to say sorry. I can tell you today that since then I have restored Church Army commission to 73 clergy, each one of which has been a story of transformation and healing. One elderly priest had to go to the undertakers to collect his uniform so that I could commission him again. One brother was on his deathbed, with days to go, and we commissioned him and he died the following day, telling us that he could go home, back to God, as a reverend captain.

Becoming a community has changed us. We took our offices from a tower block in London to a new home in Sheffield, with a chapel and gardens and a library and bedrooms - come visit - because you have to have a home for a community. I wanted to create a home and not an office.

Church Army is, of course, an organisation with millions of pounds of assets and staff, but I often say that we are not an organisation with a community; we are a community with an organisation. We did it because we are a bunch of activists, and people who are evangelists need to learn to be: to be still, to pray, to retreat, to have a rule of law, to have a liturgy, to have prayer. We have become more intentional about our prayerful life, more intentional about our rhythms, more intentional about nourishing and encouraging each other in our charism, because you cannot give to others what God has not given to you. Becoming a community has enabled Church Army to be what I believe Wilson Carlile called us to be.

So I welcome this debate. I welcome this motion. Like Archbishop Justin said, paragraphs (a) and (b) are fantastic. I just wish paragraph (c) had said: "We love

what you do. We are going to give you a shed load of money to help you do it even better". But instead we are being offered a Canon. Hey-ho! Orders by definition are messy. They are less orderly than an institutional church. So please, if we are to have a Canon, can it help us continue to be light touch and permission-giving, empowering and releasing, helping us do the new and the edgy and be more radical and prophetic - edgy, inspirational and, indeed, innovative. I support.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Gavin Kirk (Lincoln): I declare an interest as the Warden of the Community of the Holy Cross, a community of Benedictine Anglican nuns in Costock. It is poignant that I am here speaking to you on this subject this morning when they would like me to be there celebrating Sister Mary Bernadette's golden jubilee of solemn profession, but she decided that it would be good for me to be here.

In the 16th century, when the monastic orders in this country were dissolved, Parliament had to pass a piece of legislation it was not expecting: to give former monks and nuns legal identity - those who were still alive that is. There is a sense in which we are now completing that circle in seeking to give canonical recognition to the monastic orders which have been so much part of the life of the Church of England for the last 150 years.

Part of their contribution has always been to be countercultural. From the Desert Fathers to the Community of St Anselm and new monasticism, the monastic way of life has been countercultural. Because it is ordered it can very quickly become an enculturated society of its own. That is part of its strength and also part of its institutional weakness, because how does it relate to the rest of the Church?

This proposal will give some answer to that question. The religious life is prophetic in the way that people give their lives, give their all, in order to be disciples of Jesus Christ in a particular way. As such, they are an example to all those of us whose commitment might be - and in my own case I sometimes worry - is slightly less than wholehearted. They are prophetic in ways that we do not always imagine. The first women who could own property and who could elect the person who leads them were women in the Church of England. The first women who were icons of Christ in their communities were the Superiors of the Anglican women's religious orders, presaging the developments that have been achieved in recent years. Alongside being prophetic they hallow time by punctuating the day with prayer: for the world, for us, for themselves. In their poverty, they underscore our dependence upon God. In their relentless hospitality, they enable others to be resourced and refreshed. Yet their existence is still not yet formally recognised at the deepest levels of the Church. There is, as has already been adduced, little publicity or encouragement often to consider religious life vocations. They are usually dependent upon one bishop for their connection to the Church. I welcome this move to affirm and support this vital resource in the life of our Church, and I encourage Synod to do the same.

Revd Canon Patricia Hawkins (Lichfield): I am enormously supportive of both this document and of the proposals that are made in it, but I would just like to suggest a correction to what I think is some rather clumsy phrasing in paragraph 15. I know this will not appear in any legislation, and forgive me if it seems a bit

pedantic, but I think it is important. Although I understand the point that is being made in paragraph 15, I think it is extremely important that we do not give the impression that those - and it will always be a few - who are called to the contemplative life are in any way disengaged. I have had the privilege of knowing a number of enclosed monastics, and, to a woman, they have all been, shall we say, idiosyncratic, you can also spell that perhaps eccentric, but some of the most grounded, aware and spiritually engaged people I have had the privilege to know. I am very aware how much my ministry as an active member of the Church draws on the reposit of their prayers. It is nothing to do with the main thrust of the document that I support, but let us not go away with the impression that somehow to be enclosed is to be disengaged.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I welcome this proposal very warmly. I share a great debt of gratitude to the Archbishop of Canterbury, along with my fellow religieus, for the focus on the importance of communities for scriptural renewal in the Church, for renewal of the Church indeed.

That brings me - and sorry to be pedantic for once - to questions of language. For a long time, distinctions have been made in the Advisory Council for Religieus between “acknowledged” and “recognised”. I do not think I am short of a couple of brain cells, but the distinctions are pretty obscure, and I have to remind myself constantly what they refer to. In any Canon I hope some attention is going to be given to the language used about the various kinds of communities, because there are various kinds of communities and various ways of describing them. Canon Pat Hawkins has very helpfully identified the importance of the contemplative life and contemplative communities.

Arguably, the strongest, and I think the greatest example of a missionary community, of which there is no example in the Church of England, is the Charterhouse. Some of you may have seen that great film *The Great Silence* which is about the Carthusians, who are silent. It has never needed a reform. Most religious communities need reform and probably more often than they actually get. The Charterhouse - no. They come in all shapes and sizes. My own community comes in a mixed shape, largely monastic and largely Benedictine, but we probably find the term “monastic” best used of communities which are a bit like me, a bit like the Benedictines, rather than those like the Franciscans who really do give up everything and are very peripatetic; they wander around. Most Franciscans would not like to be called monks. There are some of my brethren who would not like to be called a monk, but that is another matter. I would like some care in our use of language. There are quite a few people among people like me who jibe at the term “new monastic” because we find it quite hard to recognise excellent communities as actually monastic. There is a big difference - an important difference. I correct myself.

I welcome this Canon and look forward to a succinct light-touch formation - thank you Canon Russell. We want regulation and some recognition, but we also want our own responsibility and ability to hear correction and advice from you all.

Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn): Last February, I was with the Bishop of Southwark and the Archdeacon of Southwark travelling around Zimbabwe and when we got to Manicaland I said to Bishop Christopher, “Would you allow us to make a detour?” because we were going near Penhalonga. I

have always wanted to go to Penhalonga and St Augustine's. He very graciously allowed us to turn off the road and find this amazing church, St Augustine's, which is still a large school. It was established by the Community of the Resurrection. I owe the shape of my priesthood to the Community of the Resurrection. It helped form me as a priest, but the religious life has helped form me as a Christian as well. The church I went to did not produce many vocations to the priesthood; it produced lots of vocations, for some reason, to the religious life, and every part of the year some sister or other would return to the church to visit her family while she was on vacation. As a little chorister, I used to look through the lattice in the choir stalls at these nuns' feet trudging past making their way to the altar rail in their sandals and rather traditional habits. That touched me deeply.

What I give thanks for particularly is that missionary zeal that was in so many communities that were founded in the 19th century, that gave so much energy to the Church but also helped form us in schools, in theological colleges, in so many ways; serving communities, being out there. I hope that whatever happens in the future with new expressions of the religious life that that missionary zeal, whether it be exercised in a life of prayer or outside of community walls, is something that we recover as well because the Church desperately needs that. It can help us form ourselves into whatever God is calling us into next. I cannot thank religious communities in the Church of England enough for helping create whatever you see before you now: the best and perhaps not always the best aspects of me, but thank you so much.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I would like to bring to the attention of the Bishop of Manchester the Melanesian Brotherhood. Our links with them are one of the benefits of the links the Diocese of Chester has with the Province of Melanesia. It is an order where you generally join at quite a young age, probably when you have left secondary school. It was formed by one of the local retired policeman who had to give up because he got injured. They train as novices, they become brothers; they have vows of chastity, obedience and poverty. They will do anything you ask, which is always useful. Normally they return to their families subsequently. It is that kind of life, that kind of order that I would like the Bishop of Manchester to consider. We have had five of them in the UK who we have assisted through university. They have BAs in theology, which they certainly could not have got out in Melanesia, and one of them became the first graduate of Chester University to become a bishop. It has been a very fruitful link and those guys have benefited from it. Bear that in mind please, Bishop.

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester): I just wanted to speak on this because I am fully in support of it. Leicester is creating a community called the Tree of Life and the diocese is very much looking forward to the input that that can bring into the rhythm of life of the whole diocese. When we are looking at what God is doing in the world, we cannot do that if we cannot recognise God. We need to be able to recognise where God is working in the world, and that only comes from deep presence with God, with that prayerful time of being with God, recognising God's spirit. We cannot be Church without that, so to have this kind of legislation to help more communities grow and be established is incredibly important because we all need to be reminded, yes, we need to do things but that grows from the deep faith and relationship with God. If we want to see God working, we need to know God. We need to recognise the Holy Spirit and that comes from prayer and study together.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): I stand in this debate to support this motion wearing several hats, but with one conviction. I am a visitor of the Society of the Precious Blood in Burnham, a semi-enclosed group of Augustinian sisters who basically pray before the Blessed Sacrament. I have the very grand title of Worldwide Bishop Protector of the Society of St Francis. I am also, as we heard earlier, Chair of the board of Church Army. I recognise and delight and am very involved in many, many ways in which the religious life renews our Church.

I want to wholeheartedly support Archbishop's Justin's priority for the renewal of the religious life. In fact, dear brother, I urge you to make it even more central to all that you are doing, because although we have all sorts of plans to renew and reform our Church, and rightly so, it seems to me to be that the most interesting thing that God is doing in the Church today is the renewal of the religious life. This is bearing fruit in all kinds of ways up and down our country, especially with young people who are wanting to live together in community under a rule of life and with a shared mission. My own eldest son is living in one such community in Toxteth.

Neither, however, must we make the mistake of a previous age where bishops and abbots ended up being at odds with each other. I say this as a bishop because usually abbots were more powerful than bishops, but that is not the only reason. We need to support these fledging communities as well as established communities, and part of our support will be getting out of the way. That does not mean I do not support these proposals; I do. I think they are modest but important in enabling the religious life to flourish in all its forms. I certainly agree with Thomas Seville that we need to be very careful about the language that we use. Also, In the light of our previous discussion this morning, I want to mention how important it will be for safeguarding that we get these things right for all religious communities.

Finally, as was hinted at by my dear brother Mark, with whom I work in Church Army, let us remember that Europe was not evangelized by vicars. The parochial system that we have inherited is a consequence of evangelization, not its cause. In the main, the evangelization of Europe happened through religious communities. It seems to me that it may well be likely that the re-evangelization of Europe will happen in a similar way. Therefore, let us get the legislation right, but, most of all, let us do all that we can to support what is a beautiful work of the Spirit in bringing renewal to our Church.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): I support this motion very strongly and I think it will help us greatly. I just want to add a little note of caution for those who come to draft the Canon. It was said that the religious life was re-established best, at least for men in the Church of England, where it was done first under Fr Benson - in Cowley. Benson said that he did not wish to establish an institution and indeed, had it been left to him, the Society of St John the Evangelist would probably have faded within one generation. It was Fr Congreve, whom I have studied and I hope that some work about him will come out soon, who saved them for the second generation. He had a number of themes, including how to live in community. He was the go-to person for communities both of men and of women during the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. His work and his writing will

help us in forming new communities which will actually work. He has lots to say about the spirituality of nature and aesthetics, about mission and how we can balance just being with doing rather a lot and bringing lots of people to faith while not letting going of the need simply to be attentive to waiting on God and his work. He has much to say about war, as the son and uncle of many generals, and much to say about the Boer War and the First World War, a voice largely drowned out now by war poets.

He spoke also about old age and not about the extension of middle age, which we tend to talk about when we speak of the third age, and how to die, how to decline and how to fail. The elephant in the room perhaps is that so many of those 19th century communities which he sought to help have indeed faded, as Benson said that they probably would.

In drafting a Canon, the note of caution I would introduce is let us not bind things around with so much institutionalisation that we cannot allow the Holy Spirit to let flowers bloom for a time and when their season is done to fade and to go. Let us not prop things up unnecessarily with complex legislation, but allow the mission of God's Church to flourish amongst those who live the dedicated life under the vows of poverty, of chastity and of obedience.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): Point of order. With a sense of déjà vu and noting that John Freeman has spoken, I wonder if you would accept a motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: I would like to hear Mark Pilgrim and I would like to call Sister Anita, who was standing, and after that I would welcome a motion for closure.

Revd Canon Mark Pilgrim (Bristol): I stand to support this motion wholeheartedly and to emphasise that the impact of the religious life on the wider Christian community can be very profound indeed. In my own case I seem to have a pathological aversion to being identified with any particular group or party apart from the Church of England and priesthood. My contact with religious life started at the age of 15 with possibly, Bishop David, the same Australian Franciscan Sister Alison. I encountered her in a pub in Chislehurst in Kent swilling a pint of beer and recommending that as a way of mission. It affected me profoundly. I went as an atheist at the age of 18 to the Taizé community and found faith there and became an ecumaniac. As a youth officer for Bristol Diocese I had the delight of leading young people in a pilgrimage from Bristol Cathedral to the Hillfield Franciscan house in Dorset over four days, and it made a profound impact on those that travelled that road. To this day I go to Mucknell Abbey Benedictine house outside Worcester where traditioned innovation, with ecumenical participation amongst male and female religieux living together for a generation, is profound. In my own parish context in Bristol, I have a new monastic community, or at least a fresh expression now exploring adopting a rule of life. The whole impact of the religious life is profound, whether you want to be part of it or not. I wholeheartedly look forward to further work being done on this through this Synod.

Sr Anita Cook (Religious Communities): Community of the Sisters of the Church. I am currently serving as a licensed priest in the Diocese of Bath & Wells. I am a member of the Advisory Council and also the handbook group, which Bishop

Peter referred to. As we know in Acts we have the description of community in the early Church. It is surprising that in this debate it sounds like everybody knows about sisters, brothers, nuns and monks being in the Church of England, but it has been described as the best kept secret, not only in the Church of England but also I would say in the Anglican Communion. We have been around for a while and, regarding General Synod, we have had officially elected representatives since 1970. Having that provision to elect representatives is, I think - and I am sure everybody here would agree - a major recognition.

Having elected representatives here led to the Anglican Church of Canada having religious serving on their General Synod. What we do in this Synod has implications in the rest of the Communion. The religious communities provided the chaplaincy team at the 2008 Lambeth Conference and communities like my own, where we have Provinces in Australia, Canada and the Solomon Islands as well as here in the UK, provide a living expression of the Communion. And it is a great delight that we have the three Primates from the Communion with us at this Synod.

Communities have been serving the Church in this particular expression of living out our baptismal vows for centuries. As we have already heard, from the Archbishop and Bishop David and from others, we have in this Synod people who are wider members of the traditional recognised communities who serve as oblates, tertiaries, associates, companions and friends, and they share in the prayer and the outreach of our communities, because at the heart of every community is the commitment to a life of prayer, both individual and coming together for corporate prayer, though that is expressed in many different ways.

Many communities have an active outreach ministry as well as providing hospitality and space for people to come apart for a while. I urge you to support the Canon when it comes before you. God calls some to make this commitment to living out our baptism and following Jesus by making a life commitment in what is known as the evangelical counsels. As an American Franciscan brother put it in *The Solomons*: "No honey, no money, no messing about". It is a radical way of Christian living, the opposite of the "me" culture. Please pray that more people will respond to God's call in their lives. I ask you to share the secret that many more may know about it.

The Chair: I see no one standing, so I now call upon ---

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of order, Chairman. Would you accept a motion for closure on this item?

The Chair: I see no one standing, so we have no need of a motion for closure. I now call upon the Bishop of Manchester. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Thank you very much, Chair, and, thank you, Synod, for a very helpful debate this morning. Thank you, Archbishop, for reminding us that the vibrant life of a religious community is not just a kind of optional extra for the Church; it is indispensable for the renewal of the spiritual life in the Church as a whole. Thank you for reminding us of the different charisms and vocations that there are within religious communities.

On the enclosed communities that Pat Hawkins referred to, perhaps the words were not put very felicitously. I will not say that we are disengaged, but it is a different form of engagement that enclosed communities have. It is a way of engaging with the world very deeply, but from within the cloister, within the enclosure. That is really quite an important part of the monastic tradition.

Mark Russell suggested that we perhaps should have shed loads of money. There are shed loads of money. Most religious communities are born very poor, but a number of those that come to the natural end of their life, as we have heard reference to several times this morning, do actually have quite a legacy to pass on.

What I am very keen is to see that, wherever possible, such communities give at least a substantial proportion of that legacy to any new communities that come into being. We have a group called the Religious Communities Development Trust, which I chair, which is able to receive donations that we can then spend on helping new and sometimes traditional communities, established communities, which are falling on hard times. So, there is money; it is just in various people's pockets.

Gavin Kirk, please pass on our greetings to sister on her golden jubilee today and thank you for reminding us that communities have been prophetic and were some of the first bodies where women elected into positions of responsibility and authority. If we look at some of the great women abbesses of the first millennium, they were stand-out people. Long before women had the right to vote for Members of Parliament or stand for Synod, women were elected as superiors in our religious communities.

Fr Thomas Seville took us into the area of wording, of language. We have set up a special working party within the Advisory Council to look at language. We are not going to get it perfect. Language never stays where you want it to; I think Elliot reminded us of that. The words - they slip, they change and they will not hold a particular meaning necessarily. We cannot promise that words will be ossified to refer to a particular thing for ever, but we are sensitive to matters around language and we will consider that, probably alongside the Canon. I do not want the Canon to become something that is very technical and very wordy. As several people have said this morning, it needs to be something that is simple.

Andrew Nunn, thank you for some very moving accounts of the religious life there. John Freeman, yes, the Melanesian Brotherhood and that taking of a very formal traditional vow but only for a set period of time, as has often been the case in the Buddhist monastic communities. Of course, Melanesians - some of them among our great martyrs of the recent decades - are great witness to us all. There was a reminder that for some communities such as, for example, the Community of St Anselm at Lambeth Palace or the Lee Abbey Community in Devon, you do not stay in gathered community for the whole of your life; you spend a time, a deeply formational time, that fits you for mission and ministry in the Church thereafter, the Leicester Community of the Tree of Life that Shayne Ardron mentioned being another such.

I always feel particularly protected when the Bishop of Chelmsford is around me as my bishop protector. Yes, getting out of the way, supporting the fledglings.

We are not here to try to over-institutionalise, as Luke Miller reminded us as well. Archdeacon Luke also mentioned issues around second generation. That is often the critical moment for any religious community: how they make that translation from the original first generation to the second when you have to have rather more attention to structure.

Mark Pilgrim reminded us that at Mucknell we have a mixed community, which has at one point had a Methodist member, I seem to recall as well, and many new communities are ecumenical. Sister Anita reminded us that we have elected reps at Synod and what we do here makes a difference. Thank you for all those comments. Somebody also put on Twitter - I am afraid one of my own diocesan synod representatives here - that watching me on the video was like the old Saturday morning matinee at the cinema and he wondered whether I was going to be followed by a western. Well, we have been talking about the frontiers, we have avoided a gunfight and I hope we are now going to have a happy ending. Thank you, Synod.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop David. I now put Item 14 to the vote.

The motion

‘That this Synod, mindful of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s priority for the renewal of the religious life:

- a) note the historic importance of religious communities in the life of the faithful of the country;*
- b) celebrate the many new expressions of the religious life through Recognised and Acknowledged Communities; and*
- c) call on the Business Committee to introduce a new Canon to the Synod by July 2018 to provide a framework for religious life in the Church of England.’*

was put and carried on a show of hands.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 12.08 pm

ITEM 15

DIGITAL EVANGELISM ([GS MISC 1174](#))

The Chair: We now begin Item 15 on our Agenda, for which you will need sight of GS Misc 1174. There will be an introduction to the item by William Nye, followed by a presentation of about 20 minutes, after which we will have some time for questions. To indicate that you wish to ask a question, would you please either stand or raise your hand. Thank you. I invite Secretary General William Nye to address Synod.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. I will be very brief. Many members of the Synod will recall, I am sure, the set of workshops and presentations that we had on the Saturday afternoon of the Synod

in July last year. One of those workshops, which was very well received was on the then very embryonic work of the Digital Team in the Communications Team in Church House.

Eight months on, we are very grateful to the Business Committee for offering the opportunity for the team to be given a bit more time to talk about how their work has developed with a particular focus on digital evangelism. I am pleased to introduce our Head of Digital, Adrian Harris. Adrian will do the presentation and we will be pleased to take questions afterwards.

The Chair. I now invite Mr Adrian Harris, Head of Digital Communications at Church House to address Synod. You have up to 20 minutes.

Mr Adrian Harris (Head of Digital Communications): Good afternoon, Synod. I am delighted to be speaking to you today and sharing details of the first full year of the work of the Church of England's Digital Communications Team. As the background paper accompanying this presentation outlines, this is a three-year programme of work. I have a short presentation and will speak for 20 minutes. I am really looking forward to hearing your comments, questions and thoughts as we seek to harness the power of digital and social media to bring more people to faith in Christ and to help Christians to grow in their faith. This presentation will focus on three areas: (1) Why is digital evangelism important? (2) What have we delivered so far? (3) What plans do we have for 2018?

I want to start by taking you back to Christmas and sharing more about *#GodWithUs*, our national Christmas campaign. I am going to show you the most popular film we put together as a team. All of this was done in Church House, filming on location at All Saints, High Wycombe.

(Video played)

We produced this 90-second clip and a much shorter 20-second version of it. As you can see from the statistics - this is taken from Facebook - the video did particularly well with age groups who are parents with children. This was a deliberate part of our advertising targeting and it helped reach around 300,000 people in total. The aim of *#GodWithUs*, which we launched at the beginning of September 2017, was to: (1) share a Christian message from the national Church on social media with Christians and those we believe are open to the Christian faith; (2) encourage people to attend a local Church of England church service in December; and (3) To take people on a discipleship reflection journey through Advent and Christmas by phone and mobile.

We are thrilled that the campaign, as you can see on the screen, had a reach of 6.8 million across England. It is important to note that some people may have seen this content more than once, but it is a significant step forward on our Christmas 2016 campaign. We have had really positive feedback from churches who took part in the campaign who saw increased attendance as a result of it.

Working closely with Church House Publishing, a key partner for Digital Communications in Church House on digital and print resources, we produced:

- This booklet, *Your Christmas Journey* reflection resources - for social media and in print - working closely with author John Kiddle, Archdeacon of

Wandsworth, and Soul[food] in Birmingham Diocese.

- We created resources to equip local churches such as posters and logos.
- We produced three films to encourage people to attend Church at Christmas in 90-second and 20-second formats.

The results of the campaign were:

- 2 million reflection views received;
- 98,000 copies of the booklet sold and distributed to local churches;
- 844,000 views of the *Your Christmas Journey* reflection videos;
- 1.5 million page views of the new *A Church Near You*.

Bringing print and digital together had a huge impact and this is a model that we are repeating for Lent 2018. I am now going to show a family prayer we shared on social media with a small amount of targeted spending. It received more than 200,000 views on Facebook alone.

(Video played)

It was wonderful to see local clergy, churches and lay people sharing this prayer on social media. This video did particularly well with mothers and grandmothers. As an aside, our regular prayers and collects are among the most popular content we share on social media. When the London Bridge terrorist attack happened last year, the simple video materials we made available reached over 1 million people, showing the power of social media to connect people with God and to bring comfort and peace at a moment of national tragedy.

Here, on the screen are just three of the comments we received on *#GodWithUs*. We had over 30 pages of feedback on *#GodWithUs* from the survey we shared. The average open rate of emails we shared for people who signed up was 45%, more than three times the industry average.

You may be wondering why the Church is investing in digital and social media. This recent Ofcom report sums it up well. Some 89% of the population use the internet regularly, 66% use their mobile phones for the web and 57% use social media regularly.

The figures on this next slide are global but, again, show why digital and social media are important for the Church:

- 330 million active users on Twitter;
- 800 million active Instagram users;
- 2 billion monthly active Facebook users.

Christmas is just one example of how the Church is starting to use social media to, ultimately, bring people into their local church.

The work of the Digital Communications Team at Church House is part of Renewal and Reform - a growing Church for all people and for all places. Digital communication sits in the communications department but is also part of the new Evangelism and Discipleship Team. This will enable us to maximise our output with colleagues across Church House.

The team is made up of myself and four colleagues, all with extensive digital, social media, video and graphic experience and with a passion for making disciples. We have three areas of work:

- Evangelism;
- Discipleship;
- The common good.

These are underpinned by the Church having a strong and growing social media presence and transformed national websites. All our work is focused on supporting, equipping and enabling local churches. We are very much at the start of our digital journey and our aim is to try initiatives out, take risks for the Gospel and work at pace in such a fast-changing area.

Audiences sit at the heart of our work. The groups you are seeing on screen are not made up! As you can see from this slide, there are nine groups we are initially aiming our work at - some not that surprising to this Synod chamber!

Putting these audiences together came about following a research exercise last January with nearly 2,000 Christians and non-Christians. We used surveys, focus groups in Carlisle, Birmingham, London and Blackburn, one-to-one phone interviews and reviewing analytics to help understand expectations and frustrations and how the Church could really harness the power of digital and social media.

The clear conclusion was that our digital presence needed to better support people who lead and go to church regularly but pivot to engage occasional attenders and those who are open to the Christian faith across the country.

The first major area of change I want to take you through is the relaunch of the Church of England website. We are delighted to have moved from what someone attending a focus group in Carlisle accurately described as a “bad intranet,” see left, to what you now see on the right:

- Simpler navigation, over 250 new images, a better search engine, improved accessibility, mobile first and a clean design;
- A transformed Our Faith section that explains Christianity in an engaging way with lots of video content;
- New Faith in Action films that bring to life the work of the Church. These are already being used by local churches and dioceses from their social media accounts and websites;
- A streamlined prayer and worship section, including liturgical and prayer resources. Prayer features at the heart of the website with the day’s collect and other prayers now far more visible;
- A new life events section better explaining baptisms, confirmations, weddings and funerals as well as vocations.

Again, the partnership with Church House Publishing and lots of colleagues across Church House has been key. In just seven months, we fully audited and rewrote content for the site.

With, their Graces, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Church of England websites now all live on the same platform, there is a huge amount more

we can do to serve those who visit the websites. They all have a similar look and feel and there is now an opportunity to reach people by phone and by email.

The age demographics in this chart you can see are really encouraging and show that there is a broad level of interest and engagement with work clearly planned for 18 to 24 year-olds. We can start to see the impact change has had with a 20% increase in the number of page views, partly attributable to having a site that is mobile first, but also with content that better meets the needs of those who are searching.

Another big change has been the relaunch of *A Church Near You*. This has huge potential. It is one of the Church's key resources and a vital way for us to equip local churches. We have moved it from looking like what you see on the left, which served the Church very well for seven years, to what you now see on the right.

The site receives more than 13 million page views annually. We now have, with the new site, over 12,000 church authors registered, an encouraging number when you consider there are 16,500 Church of England churches. As with the Church of England website, we conducted research with 1,800 *A Church Near You* authors before starting this development work. This really helped us to shape the strategy.

We have made the site mobile friendly and added features that local churches requested such as personalising the home pages for churches - as you see on the screen - and having up to five editors. The proof of all the local churches' hard work can be seen from the December 2017 statistics.

The number of page views is up 50% on December 2016. Churches added 22,000 more services in December 2017 than December 2016. As you can see, this is an unsurprising statistic but an encouraging one. The peak in traffic was on Christmas Eve, which just shows how important the site is at Christmas.

Another encouraging figure from the pie chart on the bottom right is that 69% of people who went to *A Church Near You* are first-time visitors and, again, the age demographics are very encouraging. As a Synod, and as a Church, we should take heart from this.

This year, *A Church Near You* development will focus on:

- Switching on a local church website capability - this means that churches can appoint a website at their *A Church Near You* page. There might be a small charge of several pounds a year for churches to buy the domain name, but the site will be provided by Church House free of charge, saving churches hundreds of pounds every year;
- We are going to continue to improve the editor experience as well;
- There is going to be a greater sharing of the analytics so that churches can see how their church pages are performing. Again, with the data we are seeing, lots of churches get thousands of page views every year and they just do not know it;
- Churches that are not listed, such as Fresh Expressions, can be added to the site and this is where, Synod, we really need your help with this to ensure that all Church of England churches are listed on this key resource.

Another new area of work is training local churches across the country in how to get the most from social media and how to write for the web and social media. The Digital Communications Team have trained 300 parishes and we are well on track to reach our goal of 500 parishes by July 2018. As the pictures show, it is great to see a range of clergy, lay people and diocesan employees signing up. The feedback we have received has been really encouraging. Some 70% say they feel more positive about digital and more than 70% feel excited to try out the skills they have learned.

What is ahead in 2018? One of our biggest focus areas is *#LiveLent - Let your light shine*. This is a Lent journey through the Gospel of John, offering a chance, a short daily reflection, a pause for reflection and a prayer and a challenge to act. We are working closely with the *Thy Kingdom Come* team on this. As with Christmas, our aim is to bring together print and digital to equip local churches. The full range of resources for *#LiveLent* will include:

- This printed booklet *#LiveLent: Let Your Light Shine* from Church House Publishing. We had some figures yesterday. Church House Publishing has already sold 30,000 copies of this booklet;
- There will be daily reflections on social media; we are producing an App for Android and IOS, including all the daily reflections' material for free;
- There will be email and text sign-ups which proved very popular over Advent and Christmas for *#GodWithUs*;
- Additional downloadable resources, including group sessions, logos and posters.

Synod, I urge you to take your phone out and get involved in Lent by texting LENT to 88802 to take the Lent journey with the Church of England this year.

We also have Digital Labs taking place two weeks today, which will bring together Christian creatives and techies who have skills and passion to help people grow the faith of existing Christians and to bring more people to faith. We are going to partner with those attending to bring some of those ideas generated to reality. Synod, you can get involved by liking our Facebook page, which I hope you have already done, and following *#CofELabs* on Twitter.

Finally, I want to close by sharing one of my favourite Faith in Action journeys. This is a film of a young adult called Joyce talking about her faith journey. We have recorded 20 films like this and have plans to release more in 2018.

(Video played)

As you can hopefully see from this short presentation, we have lots of exciting opportunities ahead to share good news, grow people's faith and bring more people to faith by harnessing digital and social media. Synod, how can you help us? Please like and follow us from our social media accounts now on the screen, share our content and send photos and videos of what your church is getting up to in the community.

We are one year into this three-year journey. It was great to see the work of the Digital Communications Team and local churches get recognised at several national award ceremonies over the last few months. We picked up three awards

at an industry event this week for some of the initiatives I have just talked through. Synod, many thanks for your time and I look forward to any questions you have and welcome your thoughts and comments.

The Chair: As well as being invited to take out your phones, I now invite you to pose any questions that you have.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): It is just to congratulate you on all that you have done so far. I work as a lay minister in a church which has embraced the digital age. Looking ahead, I believe that the Church is planning some special commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the end of World War I. I do not think we know much about this yet. I would just like to know if the digital team is going to produce some special resources for this. It would help in parish evangelism, outreach and discipleship. So it is a question about material that may help us in the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the end of the Great War.

Mr Andrew Williams (Coventry): I would like to add my thanks for all the work that has been done. My query is around what happens when the people you have had the initial training with, when you are really excited now and using the latest things – what training and help is going to be given to keep this going forward? The only thing worse than no social media or no website is out-of-date social media and a cobweb site.

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): There is some great stuff going on. It is very exciting to see it. I am just wondering in what ways the team is seeking to capitalise on good work that is being done or capitalise on what is happening in the media generally in positive ways. For example, the series *A Vicar's Life* offered a really positive picture of a church as attractive, relevant and Gospel-centred. Another example is the series *Broken*, which I did not see but heard great things about, about which a course has been written for Birmingham Diocese by Paula Gooder. It seems to me that responding to things that are already out there is another way in which we can take our digital evangelism forward.

Mr Adrian Harris (Head of Digital Communications): On the question about World War I, there is a group formed across Church House, and a range of resources will be made available on the new website to commemorate that.

On the second question about social media and how we continue the work from the training, we are working with local dioceses. Once we have done the initial batch of training, we are happy to go back. What we have been really encouraged by is the way that churches are picking up what they have learned and putting it into practice. I think it has been really heartening for us that people have not just come to the training; they have actually taken the skills that they have learned and carried on working with them.

On the third point, about content that is already out there, Hereford Diocese - I am sure the Bishop of Hereford will be delighted to hear this - has worked really closely with us on *A Vicar's Life*. They recorded lots of extra footage. What has been brilliant is that we have been able to partner with Hereford and to share a lot of that content nationally. We have run a lot of targeted social media advertising

as part of it as well. So things are getting more joined up. I think *A Vicar's Life* is a good example of that.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): It is fantastic stuff. Thank you enormously. Given that there are difficulties, could you tell us a little bit about what is being done about the under 18s and how we are going to engage with children and teenagers through social media? Their usage is much higher than the figures you have given us.

Miss Lucy Gorman (York): Adrian, thank you for that. It is really interesting. Mine is possibly a slightly simple question. You mentioned about training in parishes. Is there any way we can find out when that will be in a parish near us? It is something that we are looking at at deanery level at the moment, and it would be really good to tap in to what you have to offer.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Wonderful! It helps us get closer to being a Christian presence in every community. I guess my question is: "What could you do with more?" If, when the General Synod stage is packed down later today, a big bag of money was found underneath with a letter offering it to digital evangelism, what would be your dream as to how the foundations that have been built in the last year or two could really get built on further?

Mr Adrian Harris (Head of Digital Communications): On the first point about partnerships, there is absolutely a lot more that we want to do with that. We absolutely want to do a lot more with partnerships. We are investigating particularly that 18-24 bracket. I think there are moments in the year, such as when people go to university, where at the moment there is just so much more to do. I think from our side we are really at the start of that journey. We are reaching out to organisations to look at that in more detail.

On the second point about training, we work with the diocesan comms teams to book in the training. We are happy to look at sharing that more widely, perhaps putting it up on our social media accounts, but we liaise with the diocesan comms teams on that. We will have words with them about perhaps cascading that a little more.

On the third point - and thank you for that question - I was trying to think up something very profound on the spot about that. I think, again, it goes back to us having partnerships with other organisations. There is lots of great Christian discipleship/evangelism work going on outside the Church and in a lot of dioceses. There is the work we have done at Christmas and with Lent, partnering with Soul Food in Birmingham, who do a lot of text messaging, reusing what has already been done. Our aim is that with everything we do we do it well and we do it thoroughly. I think the Labs event in two weeks will bring together a whole load of very creative and technical experts with a passion for the Gospel. There is a huge amount we can learn and do as a result of that.

Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): Madam Chair, may I have an answer to my question about children and young people, please?

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Sorry, Bishop Paul. I am sure Adrian meant to say that children and young people are absolutely essential. Some of the work

that has been done has been very much targeted towards 18 to 24s. I think there is a real question as to how we can do things which engage with teenagers. One of the great challenges we have is that we have all kinds of wonderful things which work really well for children in key stage 1 and key stage 2, but how do we engage with them at key stage 3 and key stage 4 and in the sixth form? We have to be very careful to be ethical and appropriate in what we do in digital engagement with young people, but surely in this generation the digital and social media aspect is so important in connecting up what churches do, what schools do, what families do, and what the young people themselves are doing. Both Archbishops have written recently to all bishops encouraging conversations in all the dioceses about how churches, families and schools come together to support the faith journey of children and young people. Whatever answers there might be that come up from the dioceses - and I am sure there will be all kinds of fabulous ideas coming up - in this generation we will want a digital aspect to implementing whatever ideas come through. The Digital Team is absolutely ready and waiting to help with that.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): I am very impressed by the innovation that we see in this work, but I would just like to, I suppose, remind the Digital Communications Team about the needs of deaf people, who may not have full access, or access is sometimes denied for them, because they do not have English as a first language. Subtitles are very good - and they are improving - and we have a lot of apps available now for deaf people to be able to access more and more through technology, but it would be also good to see the Communications Team working with British Sign Language and putting that as an accessible means. For example, an interpreter or somebody using sign language on the website would be very useful. I would just like to ask whether that is something that is being considered to make the resources fully accessible.

Revd Sir George Newton (Guildford): Thank you for your presentation. I am now more connected than I was half an hour ago. A question. I can see why a number of the things that were shown appeal to mothers and grandmothers. Is there more work being done on things that will grab and connect with men?

Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester): I have a Banksy drawing on my wall. It is a man and a woman cuddling but actually they are looking over their shoulder and looking at their mobile phones and they have not really embraced at all. Will you have a theological background to make sure that you do not buy in to the “me, me, me” culture, with a “me, me, me” gospel, which is a narrative I picked up from the conversation certainly yesterday. We do not have a “me, me, me” gospel. It is about Christ. It is not about me and my God. It is about God and me. You need that theological correction so that we do not just buy in to the “me, me” culture. That is my question.

The Chair: Mr Harris, Mr Nye, would you respond?

Mr Adrian Harris: I am very happy to have further conversations about how we can improve our accessibility. In terms of our output, every video that we put out we put subtitles with. Again, there is more that we can do. We are very happy to talk about that.

Another big change we have made with the new website is that, for the Archbishops, The Church and A Church Near You, they all have an A++ accessibility rating. That is just one below the top. Our sites were nowhere near that before. There has been some movement, but there is definitely more we can do. I welcome the conversation on that.

In terms of more content for men, yes, absolutely. We want to investigate that. I think because we are a year into the journey it has been fascinating to look at the statistics from our Christmas campaign and to see what has worked with different audiences. But absolutely - we are looking at that.

In terms of the theological oversight, we work with a range of people across Church House. In terms of our resources as well, we work with clergy and lay people from across a range of traditions, whether that is for Lent, whether that is for God With Us. Again, we are very much at the start of the journey.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): My question goes back to that of: "How do we know what the young people want and how can we contact them?" It will not have gone beyond the observation of Synod that we have 10 wonderful young people here, who have come to visit us, to listen to us in session, see what we are doing. We are talking about your time in this. Please, you heard it. I am sure they will want you to tell them or tell us. When you leave here, get on your social media and get in touch and let us know how we can better do it. Thank you for coming today.

Revd Bill Braviner (Durham): I declare an interest also as a member of Disability & Jesus, Churches for All and other disability networks. I just want first of all to congratulate the team on the progress it has made in such a short time on the quality of the websites and the social media and on the accessibility of them. It is not perfect, but it is a heck of a lot better than it was. I know we have fed in already to Adrian little suggestions about font weight and font colour and things that can help the sites to be even more accessible. My question really is this. What work is being done, or is planned, in engaging with parishes and across the Church to ensure that accessibility is built in, to give parishes the opportunity for the A Church Near You template to be accessible by default, and to work with disability groups around the Church - and across the churches - to make sure that all of the wisdom and all of the good experience that is out there can be fed in to help our Church online presence be as good as it can be?

Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle): Cumbria is the first ecumenical county, and so for us A Church Near You might, for example, not just be an Anglican church; it could be a Methodist church or chapel, a United Reformed Church, or indeed one of our partner denominations. Is it possible for us to include on A Church Near You churches other than simply Anglican churches?

Mr Adrian Harris (Head of Digital Communications): On the first point, we really welcome thoughts and comments. Research sits at the heart of everything we do. Again, we are very much at the start of this journey, but qualitative and quantitative research goes into all of our major campaigns. As I say, we are very much at the start of the journey on that.

In terms of the second question - around accessibility and how we can improve that - I think having A Church Near You, having a website offering that will have that A++ accessibility, will enable churches: (a) to save money, because they will not need separate websites unless they are very large churches; and (b) to fold into a site and a site system that is very accessible and probably far more accessible than lots of local church websites at the moment. So it is about the national Church equipping local churches. I welcome ongoing conversations. I am very happy to talk outside of this.

I defer to the Secretary General on the third question.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): Thank you for your question about *A Church Near You* in an ecumenical context. It is a really interesting one which I think we need to do a bit more on.

A Church Near You lifts the data that we have on Church of England parishes. Because it lifts Church of England parishes, although it is great in many ways, it is still actually lacking some things. I was looking the other day and found that a number of significant Bishops' Mission Order churches in the Diocese of London, as it happens, do not feature yet on *A Church Near You*. We need to work on getting all our Anglican churches properly onto ACNY. We also need to get anything that is licensed in any way in the Church of England.

I can completely see the point, particularly in Cumbria, with the relationships you have with the Methodists and the URC, but we also need to recall that any time you look at *A Church Near You* page, it says "the Church of England" because it is showing what the Church of England does. So we need to work this through. There may be something special needed in Cumbria, but in a sense we have to get our own house in order first. We are happy to look into that further.

The Chair: Can I remind you to keep your questions as brief as possible, please? We are five minutes away from adjourning and there is lots of interest.

Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): I want to ask a question about digital evangelism. Whenever I conduct confirmations I try to ask the people who are being confirmed what has brought them to faith. I rarely hear anything about social media. What I normally hear is people saying, "I was impressed by a friend's faith. They invited me along", or, "I joined a group where we started exploring faith". In other words, it is a very incarnational approach. I remember when we used to be putting posters around parishes ---

The Chair: Would you put your question, please?

Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): My question is this: when you are giving training on how to use social media, will you also include the vital importance of how we befriend and invite people personally, not just relying on social media by itself?

Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark): I am very interested in trying to get the spread of this out as widely as we can. What I would like is something - a 15-minute presentation on a video or something - that I can take to our deanery synod. It

will reach many, many more churches if we all do that than we are capable of doing just by looking at it here today.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): Last year I asked my eldest daughter to do some research for me which involved her looking at the websites of about 100 to 150 of the largest parishes in the Oxford diocese. As a 23-year-old, she was very taken by the poor quality of those websites. I wonder if nationally there could be any resourcing for parishes to up their game with their own websites.

The Chair: I invite you to respond. You have four minutes left.

Mr William Nye (Secretary General): I will deal with the first question, if I may. Bishop Alan, I completely agree. I think it would be very rare for people to come entirely to faith from nowhere solely in a digital way. On the other hand, for most of the generations represented in this room, leaving aside teenagers, the idea that there would not be a digital aspect to the life of the institution and the family we are hoping they are going to embrace would be crazy. About a year ago, someone said: "It's too late. You've missed it. Other people are doing it. There's no point doing digital stuff". I know that is not what you are saying. That would be like saying: "Oh well, we missed books in the 16th century so we won't bother with books afterwards". I think it is really important that we have the digital element but that it is connected.

To come to your particular question, yes, other things that we can try to support parishes with which are about other forms of evangelism and discipleship absolutely need to have that personal and incarnational aspect, and we need to join up what we are doing digitally to that. Adrian's team also works as part of a wider Evangelism and Discipleship Team based here in Church House which is trying to make sure that all those things come together as far as possible.

Mr Adrian Harris (Head of Digital Communications): On the second point, I hope you have been focusing on my presentation, but, if you follow #Synod, we have been live tweeting the presentation, and we are going to make the whole thing available this afternoon online. We will share it so that you can take it back to deaneries and to diocesan discussions.

On the third point about parish resources and parish websites, it is all part of our plan that by the summer of this year you will be able within A Church Near You - for free, but with a small charge for a website domain name - to turn your church page into a church site. That is something we will be offering from the summer.

The Chair: Synod, thank you. Lunch is upon us, and I am afraid we must adjourn. Thank you, Mr Nye. Thank you, Mr Harris. That now concludes this item.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm

ITEM 16

VALUING PEOPLE WITH DOWN'S SYNDROME ([GS 2088](#))

The Chair. Good afternoon everyone. Welcome back. It is nice to see that so many members are here for this important debate. We come to our last debate in this group of sessions, Item 16 on the agenda, Valuing People with Down's Syndrome. Members may like to have GS 2088 available. I feel it is important to say at this point that the Synod Chaplain, the Revd Michael Gisbourne, and his team are on hand if anyone would like to speak to them privately about anything that is raised this afternoon.

I would like to give everyone an outline of how I intend to approach this debate. After the Bishop of Carlisle has moved the motion, the floor will be open for general debate before we work our way through each amendment in turn. After that, we will return to the main motion as (or not) amended in the debate. In order to be as fair as possible to the many members who have put in requests to speak - there is a large number - there will be a three-minute speech limit when we debate the main motion. Before I open the debate, let us have a moment's silence.

I call upon the Bishop of Carlisle, James Newcome to move Item 16. You have up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): I beg to move

'That this Synod, valuing all human life equally and celebrating the advances in medical technology which help alleviate human suffering:

- a) affirm the dignity and full humanity of people born with Down's Syndrome;
- b) request dioceses, parishes and the NCIs to work to review their activities and the provisions they make for people with Down's Syndrome and their families, to ensure a real welcome for all;
- c) support the continued development of ante-natal care including access to information that new, safe screening techniques provide; and
- d) call on Her Majesty's Government and relevant professional bodies to ensure that parents who have been told that their unborn child has Down's Syndrome will be given comprehensive, unbiased information with regard to this condition.'

Introducing this particular debate is a huge and a humbling privilege. I do so in my capacity as lead bishop for health and social care, which includes medical ethics. I would like to record my own gratitude to those who have brought this really important issue to our attention.

First, a word or two about what the debate is not. It is not about the ethics of abortion. The Church of England's position on that contentious topic is clearly stated in paper GS 2088, paragraphs 34 and 35. That position is both

straightforward and nuanced; principled and compassionate, and, although the motion today has partly been prompted by some people's concern that the abortion rate for those diagnosed with Down's syndrome could increase to nearly 100%, the rights and wrongs of abortion itself are not the purpose of our discussion.

Secondly, it is not a regressive attack on medical discoveries and advances, in this case non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT as it is known). In fact, quite the opposite: we welcome NIPT as a useful non-invasive procedure which will protect many women in the so-called high-risk category from invasive procedures such as amniocentesis with its associated danger of miscarriage

Thirdly, it is definitely not an attempt to tell women what they should do when faced with a desperately difficult personal decision. This motion is not designed to prejudge the response of individuals. Rather, the debate this afternoon is an affirmation of one of the most important Christian doctrines: our belief that every human being is made in the image of God and is therefore of unique and eternal value. That includes people with Down's syndrome. It has massive implications both for the welcome we offer in our church communities and the support we provide for parents with Down's syndrome children. This is a call for love and for practical assistance, and on countless occasions the Christian Church has well demonstrated its ability to provide both.

What is more, if, as I hope, this motion is overwhelmingly supported, the Department of Mission and Public Affairs is fully committed to following it up both within the Church and with external partners, to facilitate the greater inclusion of people with Down's syndrome in both Church and society. It will be able to do so more fully and more actively and with far greater authority than at present.

This motion is also a demand for really comprehensive, unbiased information and counselling, not only about the reality of Down's syndrome and its implications today but also about what NIPT is and is not. For instance, the fact that if the test is positive it still requires invasive testing before a diagnosis can be confirmed. We are not telling people what to decide, but we do want the decisions that are made to be properly informed and we do not want Down's syndrome to be automatically presented as bad news.

This is also a reminder of the huge advances that have been made during my own mother's lifetime - 90 years - with regard to those who have Down's syndrome. Back in 1929, life expectancy for a Down's child was nine years. Now it is 60 years, although, admittedly, with a significant risk of dementia over 50. There have been extraordinary medical and educational developments in recent decades, which mean that many children with Down's syndrome are now fully involved in mainstream secondary and sometimes tertiary education. With proper support, they can go on learning throughout their lives. We are concerned that everyone, and I include here medical staff, is aware of the amazing progress that has been made.

Let me add my own brief gloss to all this by mentioning a comment I heard on my car radio while driving beside Lake Windermere. That is a slightly irrelevant detail, but I hope it may provoke a touch of envy among my more urban colleagues. The comment came from a presenter of the PM programme on Radio

4 who was interviewing the mother of a child with Down's syndrome and who had picked up on the fact that we would be debating this subject today. "Isn't it worrying", she said, "that the Church should be discussing this topic?" To her eternal credit, the interviewee, who was brilliant, said, no, she thought it was marvellous "because the Church stands for values and justice". But the journalist was expressing a secular viewpoint which is exactly what this motion sets out to challenge. In fact, there are three aspects of that outlook in particular which we want to question given that the choices we make as a society express the broader values we are handing on.

One is the contemporary emphasis on independence as an ultimate virtue and value. This motion subscribes to the ideal of interdependence, which is fundamental to St Paul's image of the Church as a body and which informs several of our ethical stances, including on assisted suicide.

A second is the inherent contradiction between a secular celebration of diversity and the unintended consequence of getting rid of anything which is inconvenient or uncomfortable, which of course results in the erosion of diversity.

Connected with that is a third issue, namely an inability to face or cope with suffering. I need to make it absolutely clear that the reference to human suffering in the motion's first sentence is not meant to imply that people with Down's syndrome are suffering from the condition, but it does refer to some of the difficulties, such as cardiac and respiratory problems and issues with eyesight and hearing, which often accompany Down's syndrome, as well as the sometimes grave challenges facing parents. Christian theology offers a way into this which our consumerist culture finds it quite hard to understand.

Of course, the parents of Down's syndrome children experience great joys as well as great heartaches and challenges. We heard about some of those at a fringe meeting here only yesterday, not least from the wonderful Sally Phillips. Others have written in, including one man who said, "My son is 17 years-old with Down's syndrome. They are all different yet to me he is not a burden at all". And a mother who is quoted in the book *Far from the Tree* said, "I wouldn't exchange these experiences for anything. They have made us who we are and who we are is so much better than we would have been otherwise". Yet another speaks about how brilliantly they respond to opportunities and at the fringe meeting yesterday that some of you were present at, we heard about a Down's syndrome boy who "loves much, forgives quickly and laughs a lot". Sally Phillips, at the fringe meeting yesterday, commented on the motion that is before you now. She said how carefully crafted it was and how it is clear that it sets out to gain maximum consensus and coalition with others. "Please don't do anything", she said, "that might imperil its passage or create bias against people who have had a termination".

I mention this with some of the proposed amendments in mind, all of which are very well intentioned but not all of which, as we shall hear I hope, are entirely helpful.

Let me close by quoting the final paragraph of GS 2088, which sums up the essence of this motion: "People with Down's syndrome are complete human beings, made in the image of God, deserving full inclusion in both Church and

society. It is imperative that every step is taken to ensure that they are welcomed, celebrated and treated with dignity and respect". As Sally Phillips remarked yesterday, "People with Down's have a special place at the great banquet".

I am very glad to be able to move this motion in my name.

The Chair. Item 16 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Dr Mark Bratton (Coventry): I wholeheartedly support the Bishop of Carlisle's extremely well-worded motion. Whether the fear of a world without Down's syndrome is well founded or not, I think we are right to be concerned about the eugenic undertones and hurtful impact of some aspects of the debate. An important paper by Vardit Ravitsky in a *Hastings Center Report*, which is an American bioethics journal, has helped me to clarify some of my thoughts in this area. Ravitsky argues that the ethics of prenatal screening are characterised by a tension between two competing rationales for screening, which are difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile. The first ethical rationale for screening is that it promotes a woman or couple's so-called reproductive autonomy; the right of a woman or a couple to make capable, informed and uncoerced choices about whether to accept the offer of testing or to terminate a pregnancy when a serious disability or condition is diagnosed. On this ground, the point of offering access to prenatal testing is to support and promote women's or couple's informed choices.

However, according to Ravitsky, this principle of reproductive autonomy is being undermined by another rationale, what he calls the public health rationale. The public health rationale for screening, he says, is and always was to reduce the incidence of foetal abnormalities and thus the burden of disease in the population. This has created a clinical situation in which otherwise autonomous women and couples feel pressured into accepting testing and selecting termination. These women and couples fear the stigma, and even punishment for the social consequences of their refusal. Understandably, Ravitsky regards the public health rationale for prenatal testing objectionable on moral grounds.

I find this distinction a helpful way of identifying the principal concern underpinning this motion. It would be very easy to turn this into a debate about the ethics of abortion, which of course is integrally linked to the issue of reproductive autonomy. That is another debate to be had at another time. By affirming the value of people with Down's syndrome, we have the opportunity this afternoon to identify, expose and expunge the severe public ethic that insidiously suggests that we are only truly and fully human if we possess certain cognitive, physical and social capacities.

As Christians we have a richer and truer vision of what it means to be human; people with potential, however attenuated, which is best realised in an atmosphere of love, trust and community. Ironically, one of the best ways of beginning to combat this severe public ethic is to work to promote genuine reproductive autonomy as the other elements of the Bishop of Carlisle's motion imply. This is a project which I believe the Church of England can make a significant contribution to.

Mrs Isabel Adcock (Chelmsford): It has been said that it takes two to produce a child and a village to raise one. I am fortunate to live in a village where even today all children are watched over by the community. It can be challenging, as most of us here know, to bring up children. I have four and I am grateful for the support of my community.

We have two people in the village who have Down's. The first married their childhood sweetheart and was watched over by their mother until she died. Today, the whole community watches over them: the shop assistants, the doctors, the neighbours, friends, extended family and, yes, the churches. We all keep a watching brief and occasionally, unfortunately, it has been necessary to call in social workers. They manage their money and household as well as many others. The other person is a teenager who works when they have the opportunity. They volunteer very readily and, since the grandmother died last year, help with the family and the running of the house. Again, the community as a whole keeps a watching brief. Both are very valued members of society. But we know that they, and we, are lucky.

We live in a community that, yes, at times can be very claustrophobic but it is supportive. Most do not. Other villages around are dormitories and in towns people often do not even know their neighbours, let alone seem to care. The church communities may be supportive, but they generally draw their congregations from a fairly wide area and only see each other on Sundays.

I personally know the challenge. Some 30 years ago last month I underwent a test. My fourth child had been born with Patau syndrome, mentioned in the Report, and died at five days. I was informed that it was unusual for a live birth. I was also told that Down's had a very definite wide spectrum of severity. My fifth child when he was born, and I did not have to make a decision - I was very lucky - often complained he did not know his brother and many people in the village were affected by what happened.

When people go for these tests, particularly if they have had problems before, they need support. They need support from everybody. I passionately believe that all are made in God's image and are God's children, but these decisions for parents are incredibly difficult. Grief will be there. We need to build loving communities that are non-judgmental, that will support all who inhabit them and those outside them. People need to know that they will be looked after every day and every hour, not just on Sundays.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Madam Chair, Synod, I would like to thank the Bishop of Carlisle for the irenic and nuanced way in which he introduced this motion, ruling out arguments some people have been having. I am standing to speak in support of paragraph (c). I chaired the National Steering Committee for screening people with sickle-cell disease and thalassaemia; a 12-year work. Our approach was to give parents informed choice. In 10 years of research involving health professionals, community groups, carriers of sickle-cell and thalassaemia disease, we really worked hard and the programme which is now in place in the NHS and which has been seen by the World Health Organization as the best programme for screening people with sickle-cell and thalassaemia in the world. I am very grateful that the Government put in a lot of money to do the research. Every baby born in this country is immediately

screened. I think that is just fantastic. There is no way of discriminating against anybody. Our own daughter is a carrier and she was screened. The baby does not have sickle cell, but this particular programme, at its heart, was to ensure that patients are given informed choices. There will be carers, there will be informers and there will be people who actually help. It is one of the best programmes now in the National Health Service.

I want to suggest the same thing in (c) to “support the continued development of antenatal care including access to information that new, safe screening techniques provide”. If it has been done for sickle-cell and thalassaemia, and it ought to be happening for people with Down’s in the same way, and in a way that gives people wonderful, wonderful information. Again, in that particular programme, with the amount of money and the time that was taken by all those who are very good at this, this question of informed choice for both carriers, possible parents and other people. Again, it has taken away one of the greatest problems in the world: ignorance. When you do not know, you can be so frightened and so petrified and yet the Gospel of Jesus Christ tells us in the letter of John, “There is no fear in love because love casts out”. What this motion is about is to put love where love is not; to make sure that people are given informed choices so they can live their lives.

I am godfather to a Down’s syndrome child. The parents were missionaries out in Uganda. Trish, the mother, died at childbirth to the Down’s syndrome child. The father was so heartbroken that the mother had died, four years later he walked onto a train track and also died. He was a very great psychiatrist. We were left to care for this particular child. He has outlived his parents and he is delightful, but he requires a lot of love, a lot of care and a lot of compassion. That phrase, for the humanity of people born with Down’s syndrome, this is what this Synod is all about, and we want to found this and ensure that our work has at the heart of it tremendous love. When I meet my godson, it makes me feel that this is the place I want to be where everybody is so loved and so cared for. Preparing him for confirmation was not an easy matter, but we did get there and I am sure he is full of the Spirit, like you and me. I thank you, Synod, and the Bishop who brought this motion. Let us with confidence, in Christ, with His love, His grace, see everybody with tremendous dignity and what has been done for sickle-cell and thalassaemia, may it be the same programme, of the same standard, of the same quality, of the same care, and of the same compassion. God bless you.

The Chair: After Rachel Wilson has given her maiden speech we will then work our way through the amendments.

Revd Rachel Wilson (Rochester): I wish to speak in support of this motion which is in front of us. Indeed, on one level it seems extraordinary to me that as a Synod we would not want to be welcoming of people with Down’s. But this should not be just a commitment to be kind and benevolent, but a recognition that as churches we are called to provide places where disabled people can actively participate. It is not for me to dictate to any parents what choice they must make in the face of a diagnosis of Down’s, but I do think that we need to remove the link between perceived capacity and whether a life is really worth living.

What I know is that being born with a disability is not a disaster. I know myself to be wonderfully made in the image of God. It is important that Synod realises that

in coming to this realisation, that moment - which I can put a date and a time to - was transformative in what it was to be me, because I had no longer to constantly fall short on the world's terms. I realised that I am what God has made me to be, and, if it was good enough for God, it was okay with me.

But, make no mistake, my medical record is a catalogue of disaster. It is not untrue but it bears no relation to me. Had my parents been able to test for my condition, they would surely not have been blamed for reaching the conclusion that the life of their unborn child, with this catalogue of disaster in front of her, would be too difficult, and yet, with all due apology to any doctors who are in the room, I was blessed with parents who saw fit to completely ignore what the medical profession told them, and I am enormously grateful that they did that. I was also born within the termination limit. It was clear that I had been without oxygen for a very long time and yet it appears that God might have known what he was about. We do a dangerous and disingenuous thing if we look at disabled people and imagine for the worst what their lives must be like. The beginning of an individual story does not dictate its end.

I pray and believe that we, as a people who know ourselves to be children of God, will have the imagination not simply to welcome people as an opportunity for us to demonstrate how kind and generous we are, but to recognise the Gospel imperative to foster people as individuals that they might grow to be the people that God intends them to be.

ITEM 29

The Chair. Thank you, Rachel. Members, let us move on to working our way through the amendments. They are found on Order Paper V. When we debate the amendments, the speech limit will be two minutes. As we come to Item 29, I invite Revd Canon Martyn Taylor to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to five minutes, thank you.

Revd Martyn Taylor (Lincoln): I beg to move

In paragraph (a) leave out “born with Down’s syndrome and insert “with Down’s syndrome, before as well as after birth”.

I wish to amend clause (a) from, “affirm the dignity and full humanity of people born with Down’s syndrome” to, “affirm the dignity and full humanity of people with Down’s syndrome before as well as after birth”.

Yesterday lunchtime, I had the privilege of listening to Heidi, a wonderful 20 year-old self-advocate for those with Down’s syndrome, and I quote: “My name is Heidi. I am 20 years-old. I work in a hair salon. I have got Down’s syndrome and my life is just as important and just as joyful as anyone else’s is. When parents are told their baby has a disability, they do not always get the support and information they need and they are not told that their little one can thrive and blossom. They are not told the potential this new human life has and how much love and happiness they can have and bring to the lives of their family and society. The Government are considering introducing another test that could lead to fewer children with Down’s syndrome being born every year. This is because our society and the health services do not realise that children with disabilities are

part of the diversity and richness of life. Parents need to be shown the support and given help to have and to look after their babies instead of being faced with a hopeless choice. I am here because I believe we are all equally valuable and should be equally valued. Mums and dads should be given the help they need, so they do not see a disabled baby as a worry but the beginning of their happy adventure. Do not screen us out; work with us, so that we can make a society that treats everyone with the dignity and respect and compassion and love that we all deserve”.

I thank the Bishop of Carlisle for bringing this motion to Synod and want to wholeheartedly affirm our support and welcome for people with Down’s syndrome. I simply want to reflect in my amendment that the process of affirmation begins even before a child with an extra chromosome is born. As a Church, we need to reassure the parents, who know they are very likely to have a baby with Down’s syndrome because they have had a test, that both the Church of England and their local church are there for the whole family, that we already love and value their child and that we are going to journey with them in the decision that they have already made.

The specific wording proposed is the same as that used in the UN Declaration of the Rights of a Child 1959: “Whereas the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection before as well as after birth...” The premise of the UNDHR is that the child in the womb is vulnerable and needs safeguards, especially if that child has any disability.

UNESCO’s International Bioethics Committee states: “The widespread use of genetic screening and, in particular, of NIPT, may foster a culture of perfectionism or zero defect and even renew some eugenic trends with the consequence that it could become more and more difficult to accept imperfection and disability as a part of normal human life and a component of the diversity we are all called on to acknowledge and respect. The right of an individual to make autonomous choices is to be made consistent with the right not to be subjected to discrimination or stigmatisation based on genetic characteristics and the duty to respect every human being in her or his uniqueness”.

Sally Phillips, who also spoke at yesterday’s fringe meeting, spoke about a friend who was expecting a child with Down’s syndrome being phoned on nine separate occasions by the clinic to see if she had changed her mind about wanting to keep her child. For such people, it is so important that they hear us affirming the dignity and full humanity of the child that they are carrying before she or he is born as well as afterwards. To mishandle the news about Down’s syndrome, either before or after birth, can create stigma and discrimination not only for the individual but for the whole community of those living with that condition.

As Sally Phillips said, “Down’s syndrome is not a disease. It is a type of person. People who are Down’s syndrome may be different but they are worth no less than anyone else. We are all human beings. We all count”. As a Church, I believe we should be saying to all people, including those with chromosome 21: we affirm your full dignity and humanity both before and after you are born; we are so pleased that you exist; we welcome you. I move my amendment.

The Chair. Thank you. I invite the Bishop to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): We understand absolutely where this amendment is coming from. We have a lot of sympathy with it. It is very clear, I think, from our paper, that we are committed absolutely to people with Down's both before and after birth. I have already mentioned Sally Phillips' plea with us not to change the motion too much so that we can attract the widest possible support within and beyond the Church.

The difficulty, to my mind, with this amendment is that it touches, whether inadvertently or otherwise, on a much more complex and controversial matter, which is the status of the human embryo. Synod, there is a very major debate to be had about when the embryo becomes fully human - at conception as some believe, after 14 days, and so on, or at some undefined point after that. It is a very important debate to be had but not today.

We are trying to unite people within and beyond the Churches to affirm people with Down's syndrome in the face of the possible unintended consequences of the screening process. To make a real impact on public policy we need that wide coalition. My fear is that this amendment also brings unintended consequences because it implies a position on the status of the human embryo without actually stating that position clearly or rehearsing the arguments for it.

The Church of England's current position on that topic is clear, nuanced and actually quite conservative. If we want to revisit that position, that should be done in a debate for which there has been proper preparation and explanation of the ethical principles, not as an amendment, however well-intentioned, to a debate focused on people with Down's Syndrome. I do not object to the implications of the amendment at all, but I do not think this is the place or the proper process to open up those issues.

I should add that the Convention on the Rights of the Child does not define, "appropriate legal protection". Because we want to build a wide coalition behind the substantive motion, I urge Synod to reject this amendment.

The Chair. Thank you. Item 29 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes

Dr Nick Land (York): For more than 20 years, I have worked as a specialist psychiatrist for people with learning disabilities. Over the years, I have met dozens of people with Down's syndrome and their families. What can I tell you? They are people. They love and they are loved. Most people with Down's syndrome do not need to see a psychiatrist, so those I met were all facing additional challenges and, yet, virtually none of their families would have been without their enriching presence in their lives.

I can also tell you that for many people with Down's syndrome, society's preoccupation in finding more effective ways of removing them from society is a heavy burden to bear. I have had a number of conversations with people with Down's syndrome who have tearfully asked me why people want

them to be dead. Do we feel strongly enough about the injustice of a legal system which denies people with Down's syndrome and others with disability the protections it offers to the rest of its citizens? The fact that there is a 24-week limit for abortion, except for the disabled, entrenches discrimination against people with disability from before birth.

As Christians, we do not value people by their genetic profile or by their economic productivity, but as people created in the image of God who Jesus loved enough to die for. Let us affirm the dignity and full humanity of people with Down's syndrome before and after birth. Let us ask for prospective parents to be given comprehensive and positive information about people with Down's syndrome. This is an area where we should not be unbiased as a Church. Just as we should have a bias to the poor, so we should have a bias to life, a bias to the vulnerable and a bias to love.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I had not intended to speak but the motion that Martyn has helpfully brought forward has crystallised some thoughts. I have been reminded of my mother's life working in an abortion clinic and the stories that she has told and, so, I am very aware of the problems and the issues that are around that drive Martyn's concern. However, what we do sometimes when we want to raise an important principle is we focus on the principle and not on people. What I fear Martyn's amendment is doing is moving us away from the focus of this particular motion, which is on people with Down's syndrome, and towards a discussion on the principle of abortion. We can have that debate somewhere else. I will also be opposing Emma Forward's motion, therefore, but I think we need to keep this focused on the people this motion is meant to be discussing, not a principle.

The Chair: Yes, point of order, Anthony Archer.

Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans): A motion for closure of this item.

The Chair: Yes, that has my consent. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: We move to vote then on Item 29, this amendment from Martyn Taylor.

The motion

In paragraph (a) leave out "born with Down's Syndrome and insert "with Down's Syndrome, before as well as after birth".

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 30

The Chair: We now move to Item 30. I invite Emma Forward to come and speak to and move the amendment standing in her name. You have up to five minutes, thank you.

Miss Emma Forward (Exeter): I beg to move

After paragraph (b) insert–

“() advise that pregnancies should not be terminated on the basis of Down’s Syndrome;”.

And

In paragraph (d), at the end, insert– “without initiating discussion of termination”.

Just to start with a response to what I just heard from Simon Butler. I do not actually see the difference between the principle and the people. I think we are standing up for the principle and we are standing up for the people. That is my immediate response to that.

Just to move into a speech that I wrote this morning on this; my amendment gives the Church of England a chance to make an actual, tangible difference in the face of the very real threat to Down’s syndrome children before birth. I speak of the attitude not of expectant parents themselves but of a medical system whose practice is to present the expectation that a pregnancy ought to be terminated once a Down’s syndrome child is identified.

If I could ask you to look, first, at the second part of my amendment. I intend to strengthen clause (d) with the very words found in the guidance paper GS 2088 to say that the comprehensive information parents ought to be entitled to should not be accompanied by the presumption that termination of their pregnancy is normal or the natural course of action. Hence, I ask that we add, “without initiation of discussion of termination” to the final clause.

Then, to work backwards to the first part of my amendment, here we have the chance to make a very clear statement on the unquestionable value of Down’s syndrome people by, as a Church, advising that pregnancies should not be terminated on the basis of Down’s syndrome. I really want to be clear that, within this, I would like to qualify that any parent, regardless of their decision, past or future, is loved by God and welcome in our Church, and to acknowledge that some pregnancies are so fraught with complication and danger that it is not always simple.

Nevertheless, I feel that this Church - God’s Church - needs to make a strong and clear statement today which boldly asserts the value of Down’s syndrome people against the prevailing medical model which encourages termination unilaterally and which, I fear, will only be exacerbated by new screening techniques. Synod is so good at talking, affirming and welcoming that it neglects that it has the potential to be “doing”. Let us “do” something to prove that we mean it when we say that we value Down’s syndrome people. Please vote for my amendment.

The Chair: Thank you. I invite the Bishop to come and make his comments, please. You have up to two minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): I want to thank Emma very

much indeed for that deeply compassionately amendment. I understand exactly where she is coming from, have plenty of sympathy with that position and agree with just about everything she said.

The Church's position though on this is clear. We have been supporting, for instance, Lord Shinkwin's motion in the House of Lords. This though - and I am making the same point as I made a moment ago - is a motion that we want to be able to put to Her Majesty's Government and other professional bodies and this runs a serious risk of derailing it. We are speaking to others here, not just ourselves. Although that second comment does, indeed, come from the background paper, we do not need to include everything that is in the background paper in the actual motion itself. We will be bringing up this sort of point in our continuing conversations.

Anyway, as we have now discovered, and we had not realised this when the background paper was written - and for that I apologise - it could be construed as going against GMC guidelines; not least advising that pregnancies should not be terminated on the basis of Down's syndrome could be seen as putting pressure on women and even criticising them. I would ask Synod to resist this amendment, despite the enormous sympathy we have with it.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Bearing in mind the comments of the Bishop of Carlisle just now and the concern not to derail the motion, which I wholeheartedly support, I wonder if consideration could be given to taking this amendment in two parts so that we can vote on both parts separately.

The Chair: Thank you very much for that important point. I am minded to say no, because I am very conscious of the time and there are plenty of people who really wish to speak and have a burning desire to speak on the main motion.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): I would like to begin by saying I wholeheartedly support the whole motion but I also wholeheartedly support the amendment put forward by Emma Forward. This debate is not about abortion and it is not about condemning people for abortion, but it is impossible to ignore the subject of abortion. We live in a society where secular, politically correct liberalism is the dominant cultural force. We live in a society which claims to value and appreciate those people who are different and those who have any form of disability and, yet, what we say and what we do are two very different things.

It is easy to signal virtue when it comes to preaching the secular Gospel of diversity and inclusivity. However, the facts speak for themselves. In countries like Iceland, Down's syndrome has been virtually eliminated. According to the BBC, in the United Kingdom the termination rate for foetuses diagnosed with Down's syndrome is 90%. In Denmark, the figure is 98%.

To give you an idea of the current culture that we have, in 2015 a Dutch newspaper ran an article pointing out that it costs between 1 and 2 million euros to support the life of someone with Down's syndrome during their lifetime and how much easier would it be if they were not there.

What we have, my friends, is a very simple situation. The UK and Europe has begun to practise eugenics, by default and without intent. This is not because of

a state-led desire to remove those who are considered weak or sub-human. We do not live in 1930s Germany, thank God; but, while the reasons and the motivations are different, the outcome is the same. I refer to 1930s Germany with some caution because the Third Reich has a habit of being dragged into debates but, quite frankly, when it comes to this one, I am afraid, there are some stark comparisons.

Today, we face a different challenge. No one is advocating a state-led eugenics programme but that is what is happening. Now, either the Church says, “we value people with Down’s” and means it, or we do not. If we value people with Down’s, then we cannot agree that Down’s is a basis for abortion. It cannot be so. I understand the Bishop of Carlisle’s very good intentions for this, but if we weaken our message, then, we send a very clear message that ---

The Chair. Thank you, Andrew. Thank you for bearing with us. After Jamie Harrison has spoken, I will call Vivienne Goddard for a one minute speech limit and then I am looking for a motion of closure, please, on this item.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I want to pick up the point made by the Bishop in relation to the General Medical Council; and I have warned Emma, for whom I have the greatest respect, as she knows, but this is life, or deaths in this case, is it not? The concern really is very simple, that in the GMC’s “Good Medical Practice: Duties of a Doctor” - and I speak as a GP by training and background - it is very clear certain things are laid out that we are required to do. If you look at the “Duties of a Doctor”, paragraph 48, it is around respecting patients fairly and respectfully doing so.

Secondly, in paragraph 49 there is a requirement on doctors to share information needed to make decisions about their care. My concern is on the (e) on our screens, which is actually in addition to (d), you will see the context. The context is speaking not just to Government but to professional bodies such as the Royal Colleges, Obstetrics and GPs, but also the General Medical Council.

My fear with this is that, although I agree with the general direction of it, if it is seen just that we cannot bring this up, unless it is brought up by the patients, this could be seen as a sort of *carte blanche* for not being able to engage in a proper discussion with the patients. I know that all good practitioners would not do that but my fear is flagging up something, as we have heard, that could just be saying, “We are against abortion”, or this is a very strident statement.

I am afraid I am asking you to resist this amendment. If you want to add to (d), then you have got John Appleby’s option, which again further clarifies what might be the offering. I worry that this is a bit too stark, although I am quite with Emma’s direction of travel.

Mrs Vivienne Goddard (Blackburn): I too had not intended to speak, but I am in the difficult position that if we do not accept something like this I cannot vote for the entire motion. I accept the fact that the Bishop of Carlisle did not intend for it to sound like it was advocating abortion, but I am afraid it can be read in that way.

Therefore, I would beg Synod to put something in so that we can vote as a whole, so that the whole Synod can support this motion, otherwise some of us are going

to be in a very difficult position of having to vote - I should probably just go and catch a train actually, but otherwise what would I have to do - against valuing Down's syndrome people in our churches, which I could not possibly do.

The problem in the Church at the moment is that we have not got a Down's syndrome person. I think it is the only Church I have ever been in where we have not had one and they are so valued and so valuable from the beginning of their life. We really do need something in it just to take out this edge which gives the suggestion that could be understood that we are advocating abortion.

The Chair: A point of order. Thank you.

Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds): Chair, in order to avoid a divisive vote on this amendment, is it in order to move to Item 31 without voting on this?

The Chair: Thank you, everyone. Having sought advice, we cannot move to next business on an amendment. I am looking for a motion of closure. I see John Freeman is standing. Marvellous, thank you.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Madam Chair, a motion for closure on Item 30.

The Chair: Yes, I do. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: Thank you. Let us move to the vote without further ado.

The motion

After paragraph (b) insert–

“() advise that pregnancies should not be terminated on the basis of Down's Syndrome;”.

And

In paragraph (d), at the end, insert– “without initiating discussion of termination”.

was put and lost on a show of hands.

ITEM 31

The Chair: Let us move swiftly on to the next amendment, Item 31. I call Dr John Appleby to speak to and then move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to five minutes. Anything less would be great, please.

Dr John Appleby (Newcastle): I beg to move

In paragraph (d), at the end, insert– “and be provided with full information about the support available and the future prospects of those with this

condition, with no implied preference for any outcome”.

Just for clarity, I should also say I am a member of MPA Council which provided some of the background to this paper. All I seek to do in this amendment is to add some clarity to something which is clear in the Report that I fear might be unclear to those reading the conclusions. “Comprehensive, unbiased information” should mean just that, “comprehensive”. We have heard more than one story about people for whom the medically provided information may have been comprehensive medically but was not comprehensive about the prospects for a person with Down’s syndrome and the support available.

The sole point of my amendment is to make that clear to any reader. I am proposing that the full information includes information about support available and future prospects and adds, which I believe would also cover some of the concerns in the previous amendment, “with no implied preference for any outcome”. That is simply to emphasise “comprehensive and unbiased” and what we mean by it. That is all I wish to say, thank you.

The Chair: I invite the Bishop to comment, please. You have up to two minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): We are very grateful to John for that clarification. We see entirely where this is going and what he is desiring to do and we have no problem at all with his amendment and we would be quite happy for people to accept it.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 31 is now open for debate. At the moment, there is a two minute speech limit.

The Chair imposed a two minute speech limit.

Revd Eleanor Robertshaw (Sheffield): I wish to support this amendment, but also with the caveat that I need to make you aware that I do not have a lot of experience or knowledge of working with people with Down’s syndrome.

That was until 2013, when I came into my first incumbency parish and met Simon. Simon is a few months older than me. His parents attend one of my churches. He now lives in supported accommodation 20 miles away, but whenever he is home he is in church. I always know when Simon is home because the atmosphere of the church is lifted by his presence.

In his childhood, Simon was instrumental in getting the peace introduced to our Sunday morning service. He embraced both the concept of the peace and members of the congregation quite literally! To this day, whenever Simon is there the congregation goes from being hand-shakers to huggers. Simon just brings out the best in us all. He is also someone who chunters about being bossed about by assertive church ladies. No one else dare do this.

But what his parents want me to bring to you is the struggle that they faced as Simon was growing up. They did not always get the support that they required, and it was an exhausting fight to get where they needed to be and the support that Simon required. I ask you to support this amendment so that people not only get information but get realistic information about what they face in the future.

Simon is a great joy - I absolutely love him to bits, as do his parents - but it is hard, and comprehensive information should always be provided.

The Chair: After the next lady has spoken I am hoping for a motion of closure on this item, please - Item 31.

Mrs Susan Adeney (Worcester): I want to tell you my story to support John's suggestion. It was a late Friday afternoon when my GP rang with my routine blood test results 10 weeks into my pregnancy. There was an unusual and abnormally high risk of Down's syndrome. I had been loving my pregnancy and we were excited for the future, but this news tore our world apart. We clung to each other that weekend in fear. My husband is a GP - he knew the routine - but even he felt a loss of control as we were soon in front of a consultant pointing us to the invasive and risky amniocentesis. Fortunately, we recalled our discussions before pregnancy and were able to say that we did not want to go ahead. The consultant was dumbfounded. It was as if he was programmed for that route only. His counsel had no options. I regained my pleasure and excitement as we took back control on our terms, but it would have been so easy to get caught up in this process in our fragile emotional state. That was 25 years ago and our daughter was born without Down's syndrome. It could have been very different had we gone down that route. I hesitate to say that we were lucky, but you can see where I am coming from. I have no hesitation in supporting this amendment.

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

The Chair: Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: Thank you. So we now move to vote on this amendment: Item 31.

The motion

In paragraph (d), at the end, insert– “and be provided with full information about the support available and the future prospects of those with this condition, with no implied preference for any outcome”.

was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That is clearly carried. Thank you very much. That will now be incorporated into the main motion. So we now move to our last amendment: Item 32. I call Miss Prudence Dailey to speak to and move the amendment standing in her name. You have up to five minutes. Obviously, as you know, anything less would be great. Thank you.

ITEM 32

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I beg to move

“() and encourage the partner churches of the Porvoo Communion, and especially the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark to affirm the dignity and full humanity of

people born with Down's Syndrome in their own countries, and to oppose any policy of making society Down's Syndrome free."

In Iceland over the past five years almost 100% of babies who were diagnosed prenatally with Down's syndrome have been aborted. Out of about 4,000 babies born in Iceland last year, only a couple have Down's syndrome. Denmark is not far behind - there, 98% of babies diagnosed prenatally with Down's are aborted. Denmark expects to be Down syndrome-free by 2030. Not far behind that is the UK at 90%, so we have nothing to boast about. Both Iceland and Denmark insist that mothers are not coerced into aborting babies with Down's syndrome, but the figures tell a story of a society in which attitudes are nudging women towards abortion when their unborn baby is diagnosed as having Down's.

On American *CBS Reports*, which can be seen on YouTube, a social worker at the National University Hospital of Iceland who counsels pregnant women is interviewed, and she says: "The cute little one! They act so cute, but an 18-year-old boy with Down's syndrome, plus other problems, is not maybe a good thing". In an interview for *Vice News*, which you can also find online, a professor of obstetrics and gynaecology at the University of Copenhagen says: "I think that Danish women are less sentimental about aborting malformed fetuses, partly because that view is supported by professional medical staff". Just let that sink in.

There really is only one word for this: eugenics. It is an offence against God and against humanity. As bad as things are for babies diagnosed prenatally with Down's syndrome in the UK, they are even worse in Iceland and Denmark especially. I know we all agree that our care for the vulnerable does not end at our borders.

This amendment asks us to encourage our partner churches in the Porvoo Communion to uphold the value of people with Down's syndrome and to oppose these developments - because encouragement is the language of friendship. Synod, please ask our partner churches to stand with us on this. Please support this amendment.

The Chair: I now invite the Bishop to comment. You have up to two minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): I am very grateful to Prudence, but at the risk of repeating myself - why change the habit of a lifetime - we do need a very clear motion that we can put in front of the Government and professional bodies and others. Matters to do with inter-church relations are really important, but they will be utterly inexplicable to the audience we are trying to address here. If the motion is passed without this amendment, we are nonetheless committed to opening discussions on these matters - and I hope that will come as a reassurance to Prudence - and not only with our Porvoo partners in Denmark and Iceland. I should emphasise that those countries were only cited as examples. They are not the only places where there are concerns. But we will do so through the proper ecumenical channels and also through the other networks, both formal and informal, which we enjoy for discussions with those churches. Synod, please do resist this amendment so that we can make a very clear representation to the bodies that are concerned with policy in these fields.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 32 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister): I have huge sympathy with what Prudence is asking and I weep at the thought of what is happening in the countries mentioned - and others - and our own. However, this is not how we work with our partner churches. I speak as Chair of the Council for Christian Unity, overseeing those relations. We talk quietly and in a gentle way and one-to-one with our partner churches. We do not address them through motions at Synod; it is not the best or most helpful way. Of course, these things need to be said - and can be said - but our partner churches read our Synod material. They see the motions that we put forward. They will be well aware of this. In our conversations through the Porvoo Agreement, and in other ways, our partner churches will be made fully aware of what we are saying, but this is not the way to speak to them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): I agree with what Bishop Donald has just said. If it helps the Synod in making up its mind on this amendment - although I agree with the sentiments and very much see the point of it - I undertake that when I next have a meeting with Porvoo Primates that I will discuss this with them.

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

The Chair: Thank you very much. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: So let us move to voting. Will all those in favour of Item 32 - Prudence Dailey's amendment - please show?

The motion

"() and encourage the partner churches of the Porvoo Communion, and especially the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark to affirm the dignity and full humanity of people born with Down's Syndrome in their own countries, and to oppose any policy of making society Down's Syndrome free."

was put and lost on a show of hands.

The Chair: We can now get back to debating the main motion, which now incorporates John Appleby's amendment, Item 31.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): As the Anglican Bishop accompanying L'Arche communities in the UK and around the world, communities where people with and without learning disabilities work and share life together, I am privileged to have the ongoing opportunity to learn from, and engage with, many people with Down's syndrome. At the most recent international meeting of

L'Arche, the budget, rather spontaneously, was presented through dance and song. I commend this practice to the Archbishops' Council on which I sit.

Jean Vanier, who co-founded the first L'Arche community with two men with learning difficulties, spoke of how his life among differently able people has taught him how to be human. He believes that by welcoming the poorest and the weakest among us we can be transformed, and we recognise that we are never truly human when we are autonomous and powerful. People who rely on others for their survival and flourishing and who rely on their interdependence with others are the people who are most alive. Our identity is a gift of God in creation and we need to learn from the virtues of the given life - the life that God has given and chosen for us - to learn steadfastness, patience, hope and, above all, love. All those who relate to people with Down's syndrome and those with other learning difficulties know that, as they say in the North East, you cast your bread on the waters and it comes back as a full high tea.

As related forms of healthcare and social attitudes have improved, many people with Down's syndrome now live long and fulfilling lives, many enjoying mainstream education, employment, and, fundamentally, the opportunity to achieve their potential as full and flourishing members of our society. This is possible not least because people with Down's syndrome are prevalent and visible, and it is that visibility and continuity of their life that is allowing for improved social acceptance, leading to a more inclusive and positive understanding of diversity in our society. I believe passionately that disabled people have much to teach us about living in the truth and working for inclusion and genuine diversity. So many contemporary ideologies seek a tidy but coercive uniformity, when any rich contact with those whom society usually despises or excludes shows us that real joy is found when we rejoice in diversity and difference - including diversity and difference in physical and intellectual ability.

Morris West, the Australian novelist who wrote many fictional novels about the Papacy, wrote one novel about the imminent return of our Lord Jesus Christ. The pledge of the love of the returning Christ was the gift of a young child with Down's syndrome. We must take care not to deny ourselves God's invitation to learn from those who present us with an opportunity to know that pledge of Christ's love.

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

The Chair: I would like to hear another couple or so speeches, please, and then I might be minded to do that.

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): We are discussing today the implications of a particular medical testing development that pertains to people with Down's syndrome, but I want to talk a little from the perspective of a parent of a child with a different special need. Our daughter Abigail was born with autism. She was diagnosed at the age of three. Autism and Down's syndrome are not the same, of course, but there are sometimes similarities. Despite the excellent support that she gets at our local school, she is years behind her peers in terms of reading, writing, social skills and self care, but she has a strong and child-like faith and has been known to correct her teachers on their understanding of Christian

eschatology, and for some reason Jesus often enjoys a picnic with his disciples on her head.

Here is the thing. She is a wonderful child, who is, if I am honest, a bit of a handful sometimes, who needs a family life which is structured, predictable and calm, so what on earth was God doing when he gave her to us to look after? I completely understand why expectant parents who discover they are having a child with a disability wonder whether they will be able to cope and so often decide that abortion is their only option. The truth is that none of us is prepared or equipped to be the sorts of parents that we need to be, but that is no reason not to bring children made in the image of God into the world and love them and care for them the best that we can with the help of God.

As a Church, we need to ensure such parents of our support and advocacy, in particular for the erosion of support for disabled people in our schools and in independent living as adults. Let us pass this motion overwhelmingly so that as a Church we can be seen to say that children with Down's syndrome and all those with disabilities deserve life as much as anyone else.

The Chair: After the lady in the purple has spoken I would be interested in a motion for closure on this debate.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): I welcome this motion wholeheartedly and hope that Synod will vote overwhelmingly for it, but I would have loved to have heard directly the voices of people with Down's syndrome in this Chamber as part of the debate. I know those at a fringe meeting yesterday were able to hear directly from Heidi. It would have been wonderful if we could have heard either directly or perhaps through a video. Inclusion of those voices in the Synod Chamber would send a really powerful message and show that we mean what we say when we talk about welcoming people in clause (b).

I would urge Synod to go back to the parishes and think not just about welcome but how that welcome can lead to inclusion - the inclusion that is mentioned at the end of GS 2088. Not only are people with Down's syndrome complete human beings, made in the image of God, but those who have faith in Christ are our brothers and sisters. They are part of the body of Christ. Like all members of that body, they have been given gifts to bring for the benefit of all. So if there are people with Down's syndrome in your churches - and we heard of Simon earlier - please think about what their gifts are. Do not just welcome them, but think about what they bring to the congregation and how they can use those gifts to serve others.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): I wish to share with Synod how reading this motion impacted on me, as someone who lives daily with a hereditary congenital bone condition. Reading the motion brought back to the surface questions of personal worth and value. What does it mean that we are all made in the image and likeness of God?

I wondered whether there was a blood test for multiple exostoses. Knowing that it is only a matter of time before there is, what would be the story that would be shared when a diagnosis of multiple exostoses was being given to a pregnant mother? It could be my story, as someone who was in and out of hospital as a

child and teenager, having invasive orthopaedic surgery, periods of considerable pain that still impacts on my quality of life, who lives with an increased risk of cancer, potential diminished life expectancy and physical disability. That story might then be followed by the option of termination.

But that story is not one I fully recognise, because my story also includes the opportunities which multiple exostoses has afforded me. Unable to do contact sports I was encouraged to embrace my gift in music. The gift of music has brought me huge joy, being the base of lasting and deep friendships and an extraordinary insight into the building and holding of community. Without my run-in with cancer and paralysis I doubt I would have put myself forward for ordination.

I daily give thanks to God for the fact that I have to live an interdependent life, one that overflows with the giving and receiving of extravagant love, the very means through which we all reflect God's image, and yet, Synod, all too often it is the negative narrative that is most often reflected back onto me. Synod, as a Church we need to listen to and learn from the lived experience of those with Down's syndrome and all those who live with disabilities. I also agree with the former speaker that Synod has missed a trick today by not inviting someone living with Down's syndrome to share their lived experience with us here in the Chamber, centre stage, rather than on the fringe.

I welcome any new blood test that can diagnose without putting the unborn baby at risk, but I do call for greater training for those who share the diagnosis with parents so that a full and honest picture of the true life experience of those living with Down's syndrome, and all disabled people, is shared and valued.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on Item 16.

The Chair: That has my consent. Members of Synod, would all those in favour of moving to voting and closing this motion please show?

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

The Chair: I will ask the Bishop of Carlisle to respond to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): I would like to express my huge gratitude to everybody who has contributed in such a very sensitive way to this very, very important debate. Several people have spoken from their own personal experience, and that has been deeply moving. We are hugely grateful to you all. Thank you. There is not time now to thank all individuals who have spoken by name, nor to raise all the issues that have been discussed, but some of the key themes that have emerged from what people have said for me have included, first of all, the meaning of full humanity and what we have to learn, the lessons we have to learn not only from people with Down's syndrome but also from other conditions as well.

Another important theme has been the importance of parents who are told that they may have a Down's child having really informed choice, the need for all of us to rejoice in diversity, including intellectual diversity, and the necessity of talking

not about the risk of having a Down's baby but about the chance of having a Down's baby. Language matters. Several people have referred to the importance of being positive about this rather than negative.

There is currently no support pathway that I know of for parents with Down's children, and that is one of the things that, if this motion is passed, we will commit ourselves to pursuing in every way that we can. It is an ongoing journey. It is not the first time the Church has been dealing with this particular question and it will not be the last time.

But at the heart of it all are issues about identity and value, not just the identity of those with Down's syndrome, or indeed other conditions, but about the identity of every one of us here as somebody made in God's image. The consequence, the outcome, the result of this motion, will have wider implications as we send a message from the Church to the whole of our society.

Two people have mentioned the fact that we seem to have missed a trick by not having somebody with Down's saying something to us. Those who were at the fringe meeting yesterday heard Heidi, and there have been several references to Heidi, who is absolutely fantastic. I want to close now and give the last word to some people with Down's syndrome who have been following rather closely what we are doing here this afternoon.

(A video entitled Dear Church of England... was played to the Synod.)

The Chair: We move to vote on Item 16 as amended to include Item 31. Due to the fact that this item calls on Her Majesty's Government to take action, as well as bearing in mind the public interest, I order a count of the whole Synod.

The vote on Item 16: Those in favour 284, against none, with no recorded abstentions.

The motion

'That this Synod, valuing all human life equally and celebrating the advances in medical technology which help alleviate human suffering:

- a) affirm the dignity and full humanity of people born with Down's Syndrome;
- b) request dioceses, parishes and the NCIs to work to review their activities and the provisions they make for people with Down's Syndrome and their families, to ensure a real welcome for all;
- c) support the continued development of ante-natal care including access to information that new, safe screening techniques provide; and
- d) call on Her Majesty's Government and relevant professional bodies to ensure that parents who have been told that their unborn child has Down's Syndrome will be given comprehensive, unbiased information with regard to this condition and be provided with full

information about the support available and the future prospects of those with this condition, with no implied preference for any outcome.'

The Chair: Thank you very much for the way that everyone has responded to this debate. That concludes this item of business.

PROROGATION

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Justin Welby): Before proroguing, may I just thank the whole Synod, first of all, and particularly those for whom it has been inconvenient to be here today, for staying until the end. It has been hugely worthwhile. Secondly, to say what good debates we have had and to thank you for that, it has been really excellent. Thirdly, to thank especially the NCI staff and the sound and security people, everyone who has been making the Synod work, for being here on a Saturday. We do appreciate it. This is not something said so often, but we appreciate very much too the journalists and the people in the press who have also given up their Saturday.

Now we move back into good legislative mode! In accordance with Standing Order 45 I prorogue this group of sessions.

The Archbishop of Canterbury prorogued the Synod.

INDEX

- abortion 87, 240–41, 243, 249–53, 255–7, 259–60
- Absolution, Ministry of 49
- abuse:
- child sexual abuse inquiry 196–215
 - historic 60, 65–8, 70–3, *see also* Bishop Bell case
 - and power 43–4, 198, 199, 202
 - spiritual 210
 - survivors 196–7, 198–203, 205–7, 210–15
 - and terminology 63–4
- adults, vulnerable 209, 212
- Advisory Council for Religious 217, 218, 222, 225, 227
- affirmation of baptismal faith 57–9
- Al-Qaeda 93
- Amending Canon No. 36 132
- Amending Canon No. 37 132, 133, 153
- Anglican Communion:
- and appointment of archbishops 23, 29
 - appointment of bishops in 19, 29
 - and Companion Links 38–9, 91–2, 95–109
 - and environmental issues 88, 93–5
 - guests of Synod 1–2, 90–5
 - and human sexuality 91, 105, 108–9
 - relationships with 3, 129
 - and religious communities 226
- Anglican Consultative Council 106
- Anglican–Methodist Covenant 3, 172
- Affirmations 171
- and mission and ministry 174–95
- anomaly, bearable 175–8, 181, 183, 192
- apostolic succession 189, 192, 193
- appointments:
- senior 41–3, 89
 - and unconscious bias 24
- Appointments Committee, appointment of Chair 109–11
- Appointments Secretaries 20, 23, 42
- apportionment 81
- Archbishops:
- appointment 14, 16, 23–4
 - and Crown Nominations Commission 13
 - websites 231–2, 237
- Archbishops’ Council:
- and Church Commissioners 142–3, 145–6
 - questions to 33–8
- Archbishop’s Task Group on Responsible Credit and Saving 84
- archdeacons, articles of enquiry 202
- Armenianism, in Methodism 184–5
- autonomy, reproductive 243
- BAME Anglicans:
- absence on Crown Nominations Committee 20, 28–9
 - increase in vocations 24
- banking, in rural areas 84
- benefices, multi-parish 73
- best-before dates 124
- bias, unconscious 24, 64
- Big Lottery Fund 77–8
- Bishop Ball case 199, 201, 205
- Bishop Bell case 60, 66–8, 70–3, 206
- bishop visitors 210–11
- bishops:
- funding for 32
 - in House of Lords 24, 84, 86
 - oversight role 19, 39
 - and permissive delegation 146–7
 - and safeguarding 61
 - as sign of unity 179–80
 - women 22, 39–40, 88–9
 - see also* Crown Nominations Commission
- Bishops’ Advisory Panels 51, 81–2
- Bishops’ Mission Orders (BMOs) 136, 139, 220, 238
- Brexit, impact 96
- British Sign Language 236
- bullying, homophobic 75–6
- Business Committee:
- report 2–11, 151
 - and safeguarding debate 212–13
- Cahill Report 201

- Canons:
 - B 5 47
 - B 11(1) 61
 - B 22 152
 - B 43 134
 - C 4 44
 - on the religious life 215–28
- Canterbury, appointments to see 19, 23–4, 29
- capability procedures 83–4
- Carlile Report 9, 60, 63–4, 66–73, 205, 207, 212
- cathedrals:
 - Church Commissioners support for 31–2
 - and safeguarding 208, 209–10
- Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division 149
- catholic tradition, and senior appointments 41–2
- Chancery Court of York 144–5
- change 126–30, 136
- chaplains, hospital 154
- Chemin Neuf community 219
- Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 129
- Chichester diocese, and safeguarding failures 197–9, 205
- children:
 - church attendance 35–6
 - and digital evangelism 232, 235–6
 - institutional sexual abuse 196–215
 - UN Convention on Rights of the Child 247, 248
- Children Act 2004 62
- Christians, persecution 1, 92–3, 98–9
- Church Army 217, 219–20
- church attendance:
 - children 35–6
 - decline in 50
- church bells 148–9
- Church Buildings Commission 73–4, 148
- Church Buildings Council 73–4
 - questions to 76–80
- Church Buildings Review 74
- Church Buildings (Uses and Disposals) Committee 73
- Church Commissioners:
 - Annual Report 143
 - and Archbishops' Council 142–3, 145–6
 - Bishoprics and Cathedrals Committee 32
 - funding for ordination training 81
 - General Fund 142
 - and mission funding 142–3
 - Mission and Pastoral Committee 73
 - question to 31–2
 - Strategic Development Funding 31–2
- Church of England:
 - and change 128–9
 - and national affairs *see* Church and State; House of Lords; Parliament
 - website 231–2, 236–7
- Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 3, 142–66
- Church House, staff 23, 73–4
- Church House Publishing 229, 231, 233
- Church Representation Rules 134, 135, 136
- church schools:
 - and religious diversity 5
 - and religious head coverings 74–6
 - and safeguarding training 213
 - and transgender issues 48
- Church of Scotland, and church attendance 50
- Church of South India 176
- Church and State 143, 149–50, *see also* House of Lords; Parliament
- A Church Near You* 230, 232, 237–8, 239
- ChurchCare website 78–9
- churches:
 - festival 73
 - rural 84, 86–7
 - and welcome to Down's syndrome people 241, 242–3, 245, 247, 259
 - and welcome to transgender people 47–8, 54–9
- civil partnerships 53–4
- clergy:
 - and abuse 65

- capability procedures 83–4
- deployment 82
- diversity among 24, 29
- extra-parochial 143, 151–2, 154
- leaving ordained ministry 82–3
- retirement 81
- and safeguarding 201–2
- in same-sex relationships 52
- self-supporting 41
- spouses 210–11
- wellbeing 82–3
- Clergy Discipline Measure, and safeguarding 62–3
- climate change 1, 32–3, 78–9, 88, 93–5
- Code of Conduct (Synod) 6, 8, 10
- common good 128, 132
- communications, digital 228–39
- communications officers 200, 208–9
- Communion and Disagreement* (Faith and Order Commission) 49
- Communities, Recognised and Acknowledged 216, 222, 228
- Community Fridge projects 114
- Community of St Anselm 4, 90, 219, 221, 227
- Companion Links 38–9, 91–2, 95–109
 - and mission agencies 95, 98–9, 101–2
- confirmation:
 - presbyteral 186
 - and Statistics for Mission 35
- connexionalism, in Methodist Church 171–2, 179, 183
- conversion therapy 7, 49–50
- Core Groups 67–8, 69, 70–1, 73
- Council for Christian Unity 135
 - question to 80
- Court of Arches 144–5
- courts, ecclesiastical 144–5
- Covenant *see* Anglican–Methodist Covenant
- Crown Nominations Commission 3, 179, 183
 - appointments to 13–15, 16
 - lack of diversity in 20, 24, 27
 - and laity 25, 29
 - questions to 88–9
 - and secrecy 21, 23, 24, 29
 - theological review 11–30
- culture change 201–3, 205, 207, 214–15
- Deaf Anglicans Together 4
- deaf people, and digital evangelism 236
- Declaration of Assent 128
- Declaration and Settlement 26, 30, 176
- delegation 146–7
- dementia awareness 85
- Denmark, Evangelical Lutheran Church 255–7
- diaconate 181, 185
- Digital Communications Team 229–36
- digital evangelism:
 - and children 232, 235–6
 - and deaf people 236
 - and Fresh Expressions 232
 - and men 236, 237
 - in parishes 233, 234, 235, 237–8
- Diocesan Enablers for Dementia Awareness 85
- Diocesan Environment Officers 78–9
- Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors 62, 204
- Diocesan Synod Motions:
 - on food wastage 111–26
 - on welcoming transgender people 47–8, 54–5
- diocesan synods, and Vacancy in See Committees 14
- dioceses:
 - dementia-friendly 85
 - linked 88, 95–109, 223
 - and peer review 82
 - and safeguarding 198, 200, 204
- Dioceses Commission 167–9
- disability:
 - and accessibility 77–8, 237
 - and dementia awareness 85
 - and discrimination 249
 - and diversity 242, 247, 258–61
 - and welcome in churches 245, 260
- Discerning in Obedience:*
 - debate on 17–30
 - presentation 11–17
- discernment, and Crown Nominations

- Commission 11–17, 17–30
- discipleship:
 - intentional 99
 - and international links 97–109
 - and teaching resources 33–4
- Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) 61–2, 203
- discrimination:
 - and disability 249
 - and sexuality 75–6
- diversity:
 - in clergy 25, 29
 - in Crown Nominations
 - Commission 20, 24, 27
 - and disability 242, 247, 258–61
 - in House of Bishops 18, 20, 24, 27–8, 42
 - in leadership 25
 - in ordinands 24
- divorce, and re-marriage in church 53–4
- doctrine, and Anglican–Methodist Covenant 184–7, 192
- Dover, see 19, 24
- Down’s Syndrome 196, 240–62
 - and abortion 240–41, 243, 249–53, 255–7, 259–60
 - and education 241, 258
 - welcome in churches 241, 242–3, 245, 247, 261
- Draft Amending Canon No. 38 133–5, 141–2
- Draft Ecumenical Relations Measure 133–7
 - revision stage 137–41
- Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) (Amendment) Regulations 2107 83
- ecumenism:
 - and digital media use 237–8
 - and local schemes 134–5, 139
 - and ministry 170–71, 174–95
 - and mission 170–73, 175, 177, 179–80
 - and religious communities 228
 - see also Anglican–Methodist Covenant
- education:
 - and food waste 115–16, 125
 - theological see ordination training
- Elliott Review 66, 197, 208, 212
- End Hunger UK campaign 115
- English Churches and Cathedrals Sustainability Review 76
- entrepreneurship 85–6
- Environment Working Group 79, 84, 88, 124
- episcopacy:
 - and Anglican identity 129, 131, 176–9, 186, 193
 - and Methodist Church 170–72, 174–6, 181–4, 187–90, 195
- Episcopal Teaching Document Group 47–8, 50–51
- equality, intergenerational 113
- Equality Act 2010 77–8
- Ethical Investment Advisory Group 33
- ethics, medical 240–43, 248
- eucharist, presidency 185, 186, 188–90, 195
- eugenics 243, 247, 251–2, 256
- evangelical tradition, and senior appointments 41–2
- evangelism, digital 228–39
- Evangelism and Discipleship department 35, 37
- Evangelism and Discipleship Team 230, 239
- Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 77
- faculty process 44, 144–5
- FairShare waste food scheme 120
- Faith and Order Commission 46, 128
 - and Anglican–Methodist Covenant 174–5, 177–8, 185, 187–90
 - Communion and Disagreement* 49
 - and lay ministry 33
- families, and faith 35–7
- Finance Committee, question to 80–81
- Five Guiding Principles 21, 26, 30, 40, 41–2, 46, 88–9, 177–8
- food banks 111, 114, 117–18, 123, 124, 125
- Food Share 114
- food wastage, Diocesan Synod Motion 111–26
- Freemasonry, and Christianity 46–7
- Fresh Expressions of Church 128, 177
 - and digital media 232

- and religious communities 225, 228
- funerals:
 - and lay ministry 145, 147, 153–5
 - and non-parochial ministers 143, 151–2, 154
- GAFCON 38
- gambling, fixed-odds betting 50, 87–8, 118
- gender:
 - and ministry 88–9, 177
 - reassignment 47
 - gender identity 47, 52–3
 - gender dysphoria 47, 52–3
 - gender transition, and liturgy 7, 48, 54–60
- General Medical Council 251, 252
- General Synod:
 - Agenda 2–11
 - cancellation of meetings 144, 156–7, 158–62
 - Code of Conduct 6, 8, 10
 - Constitution 60, 144, 157–8
 - continuous praying presence 4, 90
 - elections to 6
 - Environment Working Group 79, 84, 88
 - guests 1, 2
 - members' expenses allowance 74
 - new members 1–2
 - presentations 7, 11–14, 170–73, 196–215, 229–34
 - requests to speak 3–4
 - and safeguarding 60–61
 - and self-supporting clergy 41
 - Shared Conversations 6
 - staff 4
 - young adult observers 237
 - see also* Business Committee
- Gibb Report 199, 201, 205
- Gloucester diocese, and safeguarding failures 199–201
- #GodWithUs* campaign 229–30, 233, 237
- Handbook on the Religious Life 217, 225
- homophobia, and bullying 75–6
- hospitality 93–4, 95, 104, 106, 109
- and dialogue 91–2
- House of Bishops:
 - Declaration and Settlement 26, 30, 176
 - Delegation Committee 45, 49, 55–6, 57
 - and diversity 18, 20, 24, 27–8, 42
 - and human sexuality 47–9, 50–51, 57–8
 - questions to 36, 38–73
 - report 6
 - and safeguarding 61–72, 204, 214, 215
 - Sanding Committee 41, 49
 - Summary of Decisions 55
 - and welcoming transgender people 54–8
 - and women diocesans 14, 15
- House of Laity 160
- House of Lords, bishops in 24, 84, 86
- Iceland, Evangelical Lutheran Church 255–7
- identity, Anglican 129, 131, 176–9, 186, 193
- image of God, and Down's syndrome 241, 242, 244, 245–6, 249, 259, 261
- improvisation, faithful 127–32, 154, 166, 218
- inclusion, radical Christian 52, 59
- indaba* 91–2
- Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) 196–215
- innovation, traditioned 127–32, 154, 166, 225
- Inter Diocesan Finance Forum 81, 82
- inter-diocesan links 105, 108–9
- interfaith advisers 86
- investment, and climate change 32–3
- Isle of Man 138–40
- Issues in Human Sexuality* 51
- Jerusalem, status 86
- JIC *see* Joint Implementation Commission (JIC)
- Joint Implementation Commission (JIC) 182, 185, 188, 194
- Kirkstall, *See* 166–79

L

laity:

- and Crown Nominations Commission 25, 29
- lay ministry 33–4, 61, 145, 147, 153–5
- in Methodism 183
- lay presidency 185, 186, 188–90, 195
- and same-sex relationships 52, 53–4

Lambeth Conferences:

- 1897 218
- 2008 91, 106, 226
- 2020 88, 91–2, 95–6, 109

Lambeth Quadrilateral 174

L'Arche communities 257–8

leadership:

- clergy, and diversity of views 25
- and safeguarding 201–2

Leeds diocese, and See of Richmond 166–79

Legal Office 9

legislative business 3

- Amending Canon No. 36 132
- Amending Canon No. 37 132, 133, 153
- Draft Amending Canon No. 38 133–5, 141–2
- Draft Ecumenical Relations Measure 133–41
- Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 3, 142–66

LGBT members of the Church:

- and conversion therapy 49–50, 52
- and international links 105, 108–9
- and radical Christian inclusion 52, 59

- and safeguarding 52–3

Life Events ministry 151–2

Listed Places of Worship Grant Scheme 76–7

Liturgical Commission 57–8, 60

liturgy, and gender transition 7, 48, 54–60

#LiveLent - Let your light shine 233

Living Ministry project 83

Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) 200, 206

loneliness 124–5

Manorstead Nursing Home 32

marriage:

- re-marriage in church after divorce 53–4
- same-sex 53–4

Mawer Report 19, 42–3, 45–6

media, and mission 228–39

Melanesian Brotherhood 223, 227

Memorandum of Understanding on Conversion Therapy 49–50

men, and digital evangelism 236, 237

Messy Church 191–2, 193

Methodist Church:

- address by invited speakers 170–73
- Conference 171–3, 181
- and episcopacy 170–72, 174–6, 181–4, 187–90, 195
- Faith and Order Committee 174
- and interchangeability of ministries 82, 155, 175–6, 184, 186

ministry:

- and gender 88–9, 177
- interchangeability 170–72, 175–6, 184, 186, 190–91
- lay 33–4, 61, 145, 147, 153–5, 183
- Pioneer 128
- reimagining 128, 131
- rural 154

Ministry Council, questions to 81–2

Ministry Statistics 82–3

Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 3, 142–66

mission:

- and church buildings 79–80
- and confirmation 35
- and ecumenism 170–73, 175, 177, 179–80, 186
- five marks 78
- funding 142–3
- and local identity 166–79
- and occasional offices *see* Life Events ministry
- and religious communities 217, 223, 225
- and safeguarding 200–201, 204,

- 205, 215
- mission agencies, and Companion Links 95, 98–9, 101–3, 109
- Mission and Ministry in Covenant - Report from the Faith and Order Bodies of the Church of England and the Methodist Church* 174–95
- Mission and Pastoral Committee 73
- Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 144
- Mission and Public Affairs Council: and End Hunger UK campaign 115
- questions to 84–8
- and welcoming those with Down’s syndrome 241
- Mission Theology Advisory Group 73–4
- monasticism, revival 217–18
- Morning and Evening Prayer, and Ecumenical Relations Measure 134
- National Institutions, and clergy deployment 82
- National Investing Bodies, and climate change 33
- National Safeguarding Framework 204
- National Safeguarding Panel 213
- National Safeguarding Steering Group 5, 63, 64, 67, 72–3
- National Safeguarding Team 62–3, 64–7, 69–72, 197, 201, 204, 209–212, 215
- National Society Council, questions to 74–6
- Neutral Notification 62
- occasional offices *see* Life Events ministry
- ordinands:
- gender balance 24, 88–9
- and House of Bishops’ Declaration 26
- and human sexuality 51–2
- increase in numbers 81
- ordination training: funding 81
- and overseas church 99–100, 106
- and safeguarding 202
- Orthodox churches 80
- Oxford, appointment to *see* 19
- Paris Agreement 93–4
- parish church councils (PCCs), and safeguarding report 202
- parishes:
- and digital media use 233, 234, 235, 237–8
- and international links 98–103, 107
- and Morning and Evening Prayer 134
- and safeguarding 207, 208–210, 214
- websites 239
- Parliament:
- and ban on conversion therapy 49–50
- and fixed-odds betting 87–8, 118
- and General Synod 149
- Pastoral Advisory Group 51–3
- Pastoral Care Group 52
- Pastoral Mission Measure 2007 147
- The Patronising Disposition of Unaccountable Power* 43, 212
- peer review 83
- Pensions Board, questions to 32–3
- Perry report (*Working with the Spirit*; 2001) 25
- persecution, of Christians 1, 92–3, 98–9
- pews, removal 79–80
- Pioneer Ministry 128
- plastic, reduction in use 84–5
- plastic bag use 115
- Porvoo Communion 176, 255–7
- poverty, food poverty 111–26
- power, and abuse 43–4, 198, 199, 202
- Presence and Engagement, report from Mission and Public Affairs Council 86
- presentations 7, 11–14, 170–73, 196–215, 229–34
- President of Methodist Conference 171–2, 180
- Presidential Address 126–32
- Private Members’ Motions, conversion

- therapy 49–50
- Promoting a Safer Church* 204
- Questions 4–5, 31–89
- Quinquennial Goals 128
- Rates and Expenses Policy 74
- Reader ministry, and funerals 153, 154
- reconciliation, and Anglican–
Methodist Covenant 175–6,
187–90
- REfUSE 123
- Released for Mission* 86–7
- religious communities 216–28
 - bishop visitors 218, 224
 - charisms 217–20, 218, 219, 226
 - community 217, 222
 - enclosed 222, 227
 - rule 217, 218
- Religious Communities Development
Trust 227
- Remuneration and Conditions of
Service Committee, questions to
82–4
- Renewal and Reform 128
 - and digital media 230
 - and mission 96–7
- reproductive autonomy 243
- Research and Statistics Unit 59
- Resourcing the Future 82
- Richmond, See, change of name 166–
79
- Rural Affairs Group 84, 86–7
- Safe Spaces Project 204
- safeguarding 7, 10, 43–4, 60–73, 131
 - agreements 206
 - audits 200, 201, 204, 208–9
 - funding 198, 207
 - and independent inquiry into
institutional child sexual
abuse 196–215
 - and LGBT members of the Church
52–3, 60
 - and religious communities 217,
224
 - and role of General Synod 60–61
 - training 68, 198–9, 200, 201–2,
208–215
 - and vesture 61–2
- St Anselm Community 4, 90, 219,
221, 227
- Salvation Army 134–5, 136
- Sanctorale, revision 60
- Scottish Episcopal Church:
 - and church attendance 50
 - and human sexuality 50–51
- screening, for Down’s syndrome 240,
241, 243–4, 246, 248, 250, 258–
61
- Scripture, and human sexuality 75–6
- secrecy, and Crown Nominations
Commission 21, 23, 24, 29
- Secretary General, questions to 73–4
- Setting God’s People Free* 85–6, 87,
96, 183
 - implementation plan 33–4, 46
- sexuality:
 - and Anglican Communion 91,
105, 108–9
 - and counselling and therapy 49–
50
 - and discrimination 75–6
 - and House of Bishops’ teaching
document 47–8, 50–51, 57–
8
 - and ministry to same-sex couples
52
 - see also* marriage, same-sex;
Pastoral Advisory Group
- Shared Conversations 6
- Sheffield, appointment to see 19, 26,
44, 46
- Shrinking the Footprint campaign 78–
9, 113
- Simplification 136
- Simplification Task Group 133
- Sodor and Man diocese 138–40
- Some Issues in Human Sexuality* 47
- Soul Food (Birmingham) 230, 235
- Standing Orders 60, 144
 - SO 4(3) 9
 - SO 19 208
 - SO 26 189
 - SO 45 262
 - SO 57(6) 135, 144
 - SO 58(4) 137, 148
 - SO 59 137, 148
 - SO 60(1) 148
 - SO 68 132

- SO 120 170
- SO 126 110
- Statistics for Mission 34–5, 36
- Strategic Development Funding 37, 82
 - evaluation 31–2
- Strategic Leadership Development Programme 15, 16, 42
- Strategy and Development Unit 82
- subsidiarity principle 146
- suffering 242
- suffragan bishops, and Crown Nominations Commission 16–17, 22–3
- suicide, and burial 153
- supermarkets, and food waste 116–17
- survivors of abuse 196–7, 198–203, 205–7, 210–215
- Survivors' Voices* 196–7
- Sustainable Food Cities Network 117
- Synodical Government Measure 1969 3, 158

- Talent and Calling* (Pilling Report) 27
- testing for Down's syndrome 240, 241, 243–4, 246, 248, 250, 258–61
- theological educational institutions, and safeguarding 209
- theology:
 - and Anglican–Methodist Covenant 184–7, 192
 - and digital evangelism 236, 237
 - and suffering 242
- Thirty-Nine Articles 184, 186
- Thy Kingdom Come* 193, 233
- Tractarian movement 186
- tradition, and change 127–31
- transgender people:
 - and conversion therapy 7
 - and liturgy 7, 48, 54–60
 - welcome in churches (Diocesan Synod Motion) 47–8, 54–5
- Trussell Trust 118, 124
- trust, and Crown Nominations Commission 18, 20, 24

- Vacancy in See Committees 13, 14, 15–16, 20–21
- Valuing All God's Children* 48, 75–6
- vesture, and lay leaders 61–2

- A Vicar's Life* 234–5
- vocations:
 - and change 131
 - and diversity 24
 - increase in 81
 - to episcopate 18
 - to religious life 216–17, 219, 221, 223
- voting, CNC:
 - secret ballot 21
 - single transferable 16
- voting, General Synod:
 - by Houses 194
 - by whole Synod 261
- vulnerability 206–7, 215
 - vulnerable adults 209, 212

- website, Church of England 231–2, 236–7
- welcoming Transgender People* 47–8, 54–9
- wellbeing *see* clergy, wellbeing; common good
- West Yorkshire and the Dales diocese 166–79
- women, in religious communities 216, 221–3, 227
- Women Bishops Measure 22, 39–40
- Working with the Spirit* (Perry Report; 2001) 25
- World Mission and Anglican Communion Panel 38
- World War I, centenary of ending 234
- worship, led by laity 61–2
- worshipping communities 34–5

- young adult observers 237
- young people:
 - and digital evangelism 232, 235–6, 237
 - and ecumenism and mission 177
- Your Christmas Journey* 229–30
- Youth Council 99–100

Index created by Meg Davies