

# **Report of Proceedings 2018**

**General Synod  
July Group of Sessions**

**Volume 49, No. 2**

## Officers of the General Synod

### Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

### Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

#### *Canterbury*

The Revd Canon Simon Butler

#### *York*

The Ven. Cherry Vann

### The House of Laity

#### *Chair*

Canon Dr James Harrison

#### *Vice-Chair*

Canon Elizabeth Paver

### Secretary General

Mr William Nye LVO

### Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

### Chief Legal Adviser & 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*

Ms Polly Dunn

### 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
ADDRESSES FROM INVITED SPEAKERS OF MEMBER CHURCHES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION .....	2
WELCOME TO ECUMENICAL GUESTS .....	6
REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2091) .....	8
DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046Z) .....	20
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047Z) .....	20
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2064B) .....	22
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103) .....	23
QUESTIONS .....	31
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS .....	90
SAFEGUARDING (GS 2092) .....	100
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SATURDAY AFTERNOON SEMINARS (GS MISC 1188) ....	133
CLIMATE CHANGE AND INVESTMENT (GS 2093 and GS MISC 1196) .....	141
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMMES (GS 2094A and GS 2094B) .....	174
THE ETHICS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (GS 2095) .....	192
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2096) .....	214
THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL'S BUDGET AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT FOR 2019 (GS 2097) .....	224
DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046B) .....	243
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 30 (GS 2047B) .....	243
DRAFT CHURCH PROPERTY MEASURE (GS 2083A) .....	252
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND PENSIONS MEASURE (GS 2084A) .....	252
DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE (GS 2046AA) .....	256
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO.39 (GS 2047AA) .....	256
ADDRESS FROM THE MOST REVD MOON HING .....	259
DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE (GS 2046AA)	
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO.39 (GS 2047AA) (continued) .....	263
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) (NO. 2) MEASURE (GS 2104) .....	306
LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE (GS 2089A and GS 2089B) .....	315
PRESENTATION FROM THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS .....	333
REAPPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE PENSIONS BOARD (GS 2099) .....	340
REAPPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE (GS 2100) .....	342
REPORT OF THE CATHEDRALS WORKING GROUP .....	346



## **Full Synod: First Day Friday 6 July 2018**

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

### **WORSHIP**

*The Chair.* Good afternoon, members of Synod, and an extremely warm welcome to the July sessions; that is what we always arrange in York. As we gather together over the next few days under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is right that we start with a period of worship. We are indebted to the continuous praying presence who will be holding our meeting in prayer throughout our time together. I invite the Synod Chaplain Michael Gisbourne to lead us in our worship.

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

### **ITEM 1 INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES**

*The Chair.* In a moment I am going to read the names of the new members of Synod. Please would they stand in their places when I mention their names and remain standing so that we can greet them all with applause at the end?

The new members are: the Rt Revd Viv Faull, Bishop of Bristol, replacing the Rt Revd Mike Hill; the Rt Revd Dame Sarah Mullally, Bishop of London, replacing the Rt Revd Dr Richard Chartres; the Revd Mark Murthen (London), replacing the Revd Bertrand Olivier; Revd John Henry Curran, (Southwell & Nottingham) replacing the Revd Chris Hodder; the Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester) replacing the Revd Mike McGurk; the Revd Martyn Gough (Armed Forces Synod) replacing the Ven. Ian Wheatley; Mr Simon Friend (Exeter) replacing Dr Sam Robinson; and Dr Eve Poole, Third Church Estates Commissioner (ex officio) replacing Mr Andrew Mackie. May we please greet them all?

I would like to welcome two guests from member Churches of the Anglican Communion who are attending Synod as invited speakers. They are as follows: the Most Revd Humphrey Peters, Bishop of Peshawar & Moderator and Primate of the Church of Pakistan; the Most Reverend Albert Chama, Archbishop of Central Africa and Bishop of Northern Zambia. We will also be joined tomorrow by the Most Revd Moon Hing, Archbishop and Primate of the Church of the Province of South East Asia and Bishop of West Malaysia. Archbishop Winston Halapua, Bishop of Polynesia and Archbishop and Primate of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia was invited to speak to us today, but, unfortunately, he needed to turn back. He travelled as far as

Auckland but had to go back because of very serious ill-health. We pray for him, for a speedy recovery, and we trust that the Lord will continue healing him. Please join me in welcoming our Anglican Communion guests. That concludes this item of business.

## **ITEM 2 ADDRESSES FROM INVITED SPEAKERS OF MEMBER CHURCHES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 2 where we have a chance to hear from our Anglican Communion guests. Will you please both come to the platform?

I now invite the Most Revd Humphrey Peters, Bishop of Peshawar & Moderator of the Church of Pakistan, to address us, to be followed by the Most Revd Archbishop Albert Chama of the Church of the Province of Central Africa.

*The Bishop of Peshawar & Moderator of the Church of Pakistan (Most Revd Humphrey Peters):* Your Grace Archbishop John Sentamu, Your Grace Archbishop Justin Welby, worthy members of the Synod, it is such a joy and blessing to be with you once again. Last Synod I was here and it is an encouragement that we have been invited again. Greetings from the Church of Pakistan. For those who do not know much about it, the Church of Pakistan is a union of Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists and the Scottish Presbyterians, so we celebrate this unity, and we are very happy that Pakistan is the only country in the world where the Lutherans could join, and we really cherish this friendship with them.

Pakistan was created in 1947. At that time there were about 60 million Pakistanis between two parts, West Pakistan and East Pakistan (which is now Bangladesh). There was a population of 60 million with 15% Christians. Now we have just one part because the other part has become East Bangladesh and we have 200 million people in Pakistan right now. The Christians have gone down to only 3%, which is not a good sign and an alarming situation. There is a constant struggle by the Church for its existence, its survival and its identity.

The most dangerous thing is this: Al-Qaeda was established in 1980 in Peshawar, in my own city, and Osama was there. Malala Yousafzai also comes from that area. Malala's father is very well-known to our local priest and he is known to me personally. The most disturbing thing is that ISIS and Daesh have made their headquarters in Afghanistan very close to Pakistan - one of our parishes is just seven miles from Afghanistan - and they have started their activities. This Easter I was not allowed to go for the sunrise procession. The security people told me, "Bishop, if you go out, we are going to pick you up and bring you back because there is a problem of target killing", and what happens? On Easter Monday, Daesh killed four Christians and they were target killings. Within two weeks two more were killed. The situation is not very good and it is disturbing as well. This real hatred started in Pakistan with the influx of Afghan refugees in 1979, because

the Afghan refugees brought in extremism, fundamentalism and so many other things. They were heavily supported by our friends and dear ones from the West. The situation really improved and with the passage of time the Pakistanis got this idea of extremism, fundamentalism, terrorism, whatever you call it, and it is there.

If you look at the total environment for the religious minorities in Pakistan, if you look at the legislation, the politics, education, the socioeconomic side, everything is not very supportive. There is biased material in education. The most disturbing factor is at our elections on 25 July the minorities cannot elect our own people. They are selected by the winning majority political parties. It is a very complicated system. We do not have a direct voice that could really influence the legislation and rules that are made, and, this year, except for one political party - and there are so many - nobody has given priority to the Christians, which is again alarming for us. Target killing, no political say, a problem with biased education are all things that are there, and it is creating a lot of problems for the Church, for its existence and for its survival.

The reason for my coming over here and accepting this invitation was this: look at Iraq, look at Syria, look at Palestine, the Church has fast diminished in those areas in the Islamic context. Now the waves are coming towards Pakistan as well, but still there is time and there is a little bit of hope. Before we discuss hope, I would like to show you a short video and then we will proceed to see how we can do things better. Can we have video number one, please?

*(Video played)*

This is the condition, this is the situation in which the Church is trying to survive, the Church is trying exist and the Church is trying to maintains its identity. In this situation we have thought about what to do and how to do it. We have very good institutions from the old Raj time, but it is really difficult to maintain those educational and health institutions because there is hardly any support for us. Even from the local government, which fund the minorities, it is very difficult to acquire the funds for their development. Our existence and survival is a real challenge.

Despite that, in our very humble capacity, we thought that we should do something for reconciliation with the majority Muslim community. Some of them responded to it very nicely. This is a little ray of hope in a very small way. We started interfaith activities to reduce the intolerance and also to promote peaceful co-existence and harmony. We tried it out in a very small way, but it worked very well. I would like you to see our humble efforts in that regard. Can we have video number two, please?

*(Video played)*

These are our humble efforts to maintain the existence and the survival and the identity of the Church in the Islamic context. We have been a little successful at it and we celebrate that success. We really want the global Church, one Body of Christ - 1



Corinthians 12 to end leading on to 1 Corinthians 13 - and we should be looking very carefully at how the weaker parts of the body are struggling for their survival. Do we want to see Pakistan becoming another Iraq, another Syria, another Palestine, or do we want to see that Pakistan should grow and become a source of blessing and a source of joy not only for Christians but for the Muslim community as well? They also need us. It is a humble struggle.

One of the biggest achievements I am going to share with you involves the chief of the Islamic Party, Jamaat-e-Islami. We started Faith Friends in 2004 and after a long, long struggle, just see what he says about the minorities. This is how we manage to make inroads. In the video, you saw people sitting with their round white caps. These are all students from the religious schools. Some of them are turned into Taliban later on but the Government is trying to control it. We have managed to make inroads and we have achieved a little. I am just going to show you the biggest achievement, after a long, long struggle of so many years, which involves the chief of the Islamic party. They have influence right from Karachi, from the seas, to the mountains, to my area, which is more than 1,000 miles. Can we have video number three, please?

*(Video played)*

These are some of our humble efforts to maintain the existence, survival and identity of the Church in a hostile environment. We need your support. May God bless you all. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* I think it is right and proper, before the Archbishop Albert Chama speaks for us, to stand in a moment of solidarity and spend a moment of stillness praying for the people of Pakistan. Thank you.

*The Archbishop of the Church of the Province of Central Africa (Most Revd Albert Chama):* Your Grace Archbishop John Sentamu, your Grace Archbishop Justin Welby and all members of this Synod, I bring greetings to you from the Church of the Province of Central Africa. To some of you who might not know the Province of Central Africa, politically, on the African continent we are not really situated in the centre of Africa. We are mostly in the southern part of Africa but in the Anglican geography we are in the Province of Central Africa.

Our Province is a composition of four countries: Zambia, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Botswana. We are transnational and, of course, I work there as a diocesan Bishop in Zambia in the Diocese of Northern Zambia and also I do work in the other countries as Archbishop.

In our case, we engage in various ways in terms of ministry and missions. From ACC-16, where the issue of intentional discipleship was resolved, we took that on board seriously, and, of course, it was taken to our provincial synod as well as individual diocesan synods, and we are taking intentional discipleship as a serious ministry in our

different jurisdictions where we exist as Anglicans. We also do a lot of community work working with people who are deprived or underprivileged in various ways. We also now have taken seriously the issues of engaging our Governments on matters affecting our citizenry in various ways on various issues which at times are very, very critical, where we need to work and live together in harmony within our nation states.

Of course, Zimbabwe is our concern. You might have seen in the media that there was an attempted assassination on the President, his Vice-President and other government officials when they were campaigning in Bulawayo. Since they are going to go to the polls very soon, our concern as a Province is that the polls be peaceful, fair and free.

Secondly, we are very hopeful that with a change of leadership in Zimbabwe, things will change and the country will be rebuilt in terms of the economy, which has been shut for many years. We ask that you join us to pray for Zimbabwe as they plan to go to the polls. It is a very, very serious matter. I am constantly in touch with the bishops in Zimbabwe.

Also, we have taken on board seriously the financial sustainability of the Church within our Province. We are encouraging one another as bishops and as faithful Christians that we take things on board to see how best we can sustain our churches financially which would enable us to continue with the mission and ministries where we are. Of course, this has been taken on board by us as Central Africa, but other Provinces on the continent have also taken it on board and we are sharing and comparing notes that as we go in the next 10 years, we pray that things will change.

That is not all that we do. I wear two hats being chairperson of CAPA as well. Some of you might not know what it is. It is a council of Anglican Provinces on the continent of Africa together with one diocese in Egypt. It is where we meet with a common mind to see how best we can tackle common problems which affect our people on the continent of Africa. We are so much engaged with reconciliation, missions and ministry, of course in collaboration with Lambeth Palace, to see to it that the problems of South Sudan are resolved by accompanying them on their journey, their quest for peace, through the Province of the Episcopal Church of South Sudan as well as the Council of Churches in South Sudan in the spirit of ecumenism. We have taken that on board seriously and we are supporting our friends.

On the whole, we ask this Synod, as you also continue to deliberate mainly on issues which might be peculiar to your situation, or to your Province, you also remember us in your prayers as we continue to see how best we can continue to work in the propagation of the Gospel as the Province of Central Africa, as well as the continent of Africa, where there are so many problems, especially economic and political problems. We ask you that you remember us in all that you do. Do not only concentrate within house but think of us who are outside your house that we should also be involved in what you are doing, especially through prayer and counsel where necessary.

With these few words, I wish you all God's blessings in your deliberations on various issues. God bless you.

*The Chair:* Again, it will not be just the clapping but the commitment to pray for the province of South Africa, so we stand too, to show our solidarity. I would like to thank the Primates again for their messages to us and this concludes this item of business.

### **ITEM 3 WELCOME TO ECUMENICAL GUESTS**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 3. In addition to our nine representatives of other Churches who are with us at each group of sessions, we always have some additional Anglican and Ecumenical guests at the July group of sessions and, like the nine representatives, they usually attend on one occasion and do not have speaking rights. I am going to ask them to stand and invite you to greet each one of them in turn when I introduce them.

On this occasion, first of all, we want to welcome Bishop Ralph Meister. He is the Landesbischof of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Hanover, which is one of the largest Landeskirche of the Evangelical Church in Germany. Previously, he served as General Superintendent, or original Bishop of Berlin. He has also worked in the Department of Practical Theology at the University of Hamburg and has been a longstanding contributor to religious broadcasting on German radio. He is the co-Chair of the Meissen Mission, which is responsible for developing the commitment between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church of Germany under the Meissen Agreement. May we please greet him? I always love his title, he is Bishop of the Land, which means every part, wherever there is land.

Revd Tauno Teder has been advisor for the international and the ecumenical relations of the Church Council of Estonia and Evangelical-Lutheran churches, 2015. Following ordination he served as a parish priest before becoming General Secretary of the National Council of Churches between 2004 and 2011, after which he turned to parish ministry. He has been a lecturer in systematic theology. He is a former member of the Liturgical Commission and Theological Commission of the Church and is now in the Commission of Legislation and member of the General Synod. He has been a member of the Porvoo Contact Group since 2009. May we please greet him? Thank you very much.

And the Venerable Paul Mackness. The Venerable Paul Mackness is Archdeacon of St David's and domestic chaplain and clerical secretary of the Bishop of St David's. He has served in all of his ministry in the Diocese of St David's in the Church in Wales, he is a trustee of the representative body of the Church in Wales and has also served on the governing body of the Church in Wales, serving as a member of the implementation panel that looked at the review of the Church in Wales, carried out by Lord Harris. He serves as the governing body worship co-ordinator and the ecumenical secretary to the Diocesan

Conference, Nomination Board and DBF HR committee. Some of you who were at the dinner last heard him speak. May we please greet him?

I now invite Bishop Ralph Meister to come to the platform to greet the Synod on behalf of the ecumenical guests.

*Landesbischof Ralf Meister (Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland):* Chairman, members of the Synod of the Church of England, dear brothers and sisters in Christ, it is a great honour for me to attend the General Synod of the Church of England and to convey to you today the cordial greetings in the name of the ecumenical and other guests and of the Evangelical Church of Germany. I bring to you the greetings of the Council of the EKD; of the Chairman of the Council Bishop Professor Heinrich Bedford-Strohm; the greetings of the Presidium of the Synod and personally from the Chair of the Presidium Mrs Schwaetzer. It is a great pleasure for me to visit you again. I want to express as the co-Chair the relevant and fruitful relationship in our Meissen Commitment, and in the name of the EKD I say we are and will be strong partners of the Church of England.

We live in unpredictable times in national life in Europe and worldwide. It is easy to list crises that affect the world: migration crisis, climate crisis, Brexit crisis. We are in a time of uncertainty. A few years ago, if you had asked a politician for a vision of the future they would probably have spoken of a future of unity, particularly within Europe. However, the language of unity has to some extent been replaced by populism and nationalism, by separation rather than reunion, but we as Christians have to oppose these tendencies. We do not count our lives in calendars of separation. We are not only living in the third year after the Brexit referendum, we are living to bridge the gap between our Churches. We are not only living in years of uncertainty and unpredictability, we are “saved by hope”, as we read in St Paul in the letter to the Romans: “Hope that is seen is not hope; for who hopes for what he already sees? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience”. We do hope! Constantly, deeply and with patience. “The messenger of the covenant in whom you delight, behold, he is coming”, so we read in the prophet Malachi.

We have to manage these days. But we have another vision, since we have another promise. We are empowered by God and liberated by His grace. Albert Einstein said: “There are only two ways to live your life. One is as though nothing is a miracle. The other is as though everything is a miracle”. As Christians we approach life in the second way. Our attitudes are not bound by the limits of the world but set free by the wonder and presence of God.

T.S. Eliot, one of the 20th century’s major poets wrote: “Where is the Life we have lost in living? Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information? The cycles of Heaven in twenty centuries bring us farther from God and nearer to dust.” Giving up is not an option. Resignation is no Christian option. My generation started 40 years ago in a Church which was strong, established and a broadly accepted religious institution. These days are gone in Europe. Society is now

more plural and fragmented. But the Church is about more than statistics. Our mission follows that of one man, Jesus Christ. On Easter Day he walked and talked with just two disciples on the way to Emmaus. We walk that journey with him and we follow his command to go and make disciples of all nations.

The Church of England and the Protestant Churches in the EKD and all these Churches represented by the ecumenical guests, we are side by side on the path to Emmaus, with burning hearts, while he, our Lord, talks with us on the way.

Martin Luther once wrote: "It is not up to us to maintain the Church. And it was neither the role of our ancestors nor the work of our successors. But it was Him, our Lord, and he will maintain the church, when he says 'I am with you always, even unto the end of the world'." God bless your Synod and your work for the Kingdom of God. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I would like to thank Landesbischof Ralph Meister for his address, and that concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 3.27 pm.

*The Chair:* Good afternoon. Synod. Excuse me, I have not got my jacket on but neither have you - mostly.

#### **ITEM 4 REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2091)**

*The Chair:* We move to Item 4 on the agenda, the report by the Business Committee for which you will need GS 2091. I invite the mover of the motion, Canon Sue Booy, the Chair of the Business Committee, to present her Report. Sue, you have up to 10 minutes to do so.

*Rev. Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you. Friends, it is good to be back in York for the longest Synod of the quinquennium so far and possibly the hottest. This is one of the widest ranging agendas this Synod has considered in recent years, covering everything from the ethics of nuclear weapons, the state of the environment and the NHS, the future of our cathedrals and a presentation and debate on safeguarding, including a welcome opportunity to hear from survivors.

I want to begin by addressing what was undoubtedly the Committee's most difficult decision and one which I am aware is controversial, namely the decision not to schedule for debate Mr Archer's and Mr Shaw's motions nor the Hereford diocesan motion. We were fortunate to have the opportunity at our residential meeting to take unhurried time for an initial consideration of all these issues before our final agenda-setting meeting in May. We heard from Dr Eeva John, the enabling officer for the evolving document on

marriage, and the Pastoral Advisory Group about the work of the different groups of people involved in this process. The document is very much a work in progress with an emphasis on teaching and learning together. Members of the Committee had been in touch or had conversations with a number of people at or prior to the February group of sessions and others of you had written and spoken to us between that Synod and our meeting.

Nevertheless, the Committee was persuaded that Dr John's approach, the timescale and the commitment to engage regularly with this Synod offered the best way forward and the best use of the Synod's time. We would like the Synod to know that this decision was unanimous.

Following the successful presentations on Saturday afternoon last July, we were committed to the idea of including within our time together a similar conference-style pause in our formal work. During this time, you will have opportunities to engage directly with those working on the teaching document, with the Pastoral Advisory Group and in some of our national initiatives. Our expectation is that having participated to the full you will share the Business Committee's belief that this approach presents an opportunity not only to hear about but to influence these aspects of the Church's work, outside our normal, sometimes adversarial context. I look forward to introducing this work at lunchtime tomorrow.

A first for this agenda is the work that the Business Committee has done to bring together three Diocesan Synod Motions and a motion from the national investment bodies into two debates. We are grateful to all those concerned for their willingness to work with us on this and to Joyce Jones and Clive Scowen from the Business Committee for their leadership of this work.

Now for some practical matters. I need to apologise for the slight slippage of timing in the emails sent to members to alert them to the publication of the questions and answers paper. Although the papers were online at the right time, the notice arrived with you a little late. My profound apologies.

This is the second year that York Synod days are structured in the same way as those in London, concluding with worship at seven and leaving the evenings free for food, fellowship and football. Please note that within the Agenda the timings on Friday afternoon and Monday morning have inadvertently reverted to the old schedule. For the avoidance of doubt, we end at seven on Friday and break for lunch at one on Monday. Given that the afternoons are quite long, I understand that the Chairs will be adjourning Synod for a brief comfort break during afternoons. A bell will be rung one minute before the end of those breaks and I urge you to make every possible effort to return promptly.

We hope that in this broad Agenda, everyone who wishes will be able to find something to enthuse them. If you have not made your maiden speech, or have not spoken often before, please seek this opportunity. I know that the Chairs would welcome this. Please

help them in their conduct of debates by standing clearly in your place and by putting in requests to speak early. Speaking of speaking, may I ask you to refresh your understanding of the Business Committee's Code of Conduct and, in particular, the section on declaration of interests. You are requested to declare any interest of your own or a close family member which could result in a conflict of loyalty or which could affect another member's ability to form a balanced judgment of your arguments. Relevant interests, financial or non-financial, should be declared at the beginning of any speech or intervention. I would also like, as usual, to draw your attention to the Notice Paper that details security arrangements and, as ever, urge your vigilance.

Our staff continue to look at improvements to the accessibility of Synod meetings for members, guests, staff and visitors. In the February group of sessions a consultant will help carry out an accessibility audit. In the meantime, please approach the staff at the information desk with both requests and feedback. We will be introducing a feedback survey following this group of sessions seeking your views on a wide range of issues. A link to the survey will be circulated and I would encourage you to complete and return it so you can help us to improve Synod for you. Another item for completion is – guess what – the GDPR form. This will help us to have a complete list of members for all kinds of circulations. You may place your completed form in the box at the information desk.

Now to the national game. Following this item of business, a Notice Paper will be available which has revised timings for tomorrow afternoon. We have enabled those who wish to watch the match to miss only the second seminar slot and no seminars are cancelled; not everybody wants to watch the football I understand. We have taken this action specifically to enable as many people as possible to attend the seminars and to watch the football. To further enable this, I am delighted to tell you that the football will be screened here, and to thank the staff and the university who have arranged this.

More good news. After such a busy Synod I am sure you will be relieved to learn that the presidents have agreed that the November contingency dates will not be used. There will be a formal confirmation of this when the group of session ends. I want to offer particular thanks, as always, to our talented and dedicated staff who have been here in advance of us and will leave after us, working extremely hard to enable our work together.

When we next meet in 2019 it will be the centenary year of the legislation which established the Church Assembly, the predecessor body to the General Synod. As Synod gets into its 100<sup>th</sup> year I commit us all to the work of God's kingdom and pray with you for the guidance of God's spirit. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you. This motion is now open for debate. Can I just remind you before you stand up that your speeches need to be about the Agenda and not the speech you would have made had the Agenda been different. If you start on that I will have to stop you, in a very nice way, but we need to be clear about that. I will be calling two people at a time and there will be a three-minute speech limit from the beginning.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Charles Read (Norwich):* I just want to offer a brief comment on section 46 of the Report which refers to the timings and the comment on including Saturday in our meeting in February. Over the time that I have been a member of this Synod I have always tried to invite guests to come and observe what we do, usually colleagues and students from TEIs where I have been teaching, but occasionally other people from my diocese. In February, I had the greatest number of guests come and visit us ever, which was four students from the Eastern Region Ministry Course where I teach at half-time. Other TEIs are apparently available but they were all from ERMIC. My four students found the sessions they observed by turns intriguing, puzzling, fascinating, impressive, informative and even inspiring and, whether you are encouraged by that response from four ordinands or not, the point is that they were able to come because we were meeting on a Friday afternoon and a Saturday.

By means of inviting guests we can connect the work we do here and with our constituencies and those who we might describe as stakeholders in what we do and with the wider Church and community. This is a good way of connecting the work that we do here with other places and with other people and meeting on a Saturday makes it easier to do this by inviting guests. When the Saturday meeting was first mooted I confess that I was at best rather ambivalent about it and I am now a convert to it. I am not an incumbent now, if I were still an incumbent I might be still ambivalent, but I would like to commend the Business Committee for thinking about this and encourage them to think about making the Saturday meeting a more constant part of what we do, not least because it enables us to invite guests to be part of what we are doing here. Thank you.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* Chair, I urge Synod to join me in voting against this Report, given its decision, as set out in paragraph 27, that the various PMMs and DSMs relating to matters intended to be addressed by the teaching document will not be scheduled for debate until 2020. In the inaugural debate of this quinquennium I voiced a concern that I feared Synod was being managed. At the time I said what I still believe, that we have to trust that God is working in and through us here, and I urged us to speak openly about our differences so we could discern a path forward here together. I now realise my fears were right. We have heard continuing calls from various members inside this chamber for debates relating to the matter of sexuality so that they are on the record in public and for us all to hear. The sad truth, as I articulated in February last year, is that there has been and still is a severe breakdown in trust.

Following the highly costly, both financially and personally, Shared Conversations process, we were told, as we are being told now, that the House of Bishops would listen and come back to us with a report. Sadly, our trust was broken and little has been done to mend it, indeed quite the opposite. There have been letters to America, groups appointed with poor representation of openly gay people despite loud protestations in this chamber to the contrary and the teaching document's Chair is the one Bishop who did not vote to condemn conversion therapy. All this leads many of us to question whether



radical Christian inclusion is just a trendy new catchphrase, hollow words with no substance.

Synod, while we procrastinate and delay people's lives are being ruined. These are not just theological differences we are playing with here but people's futures, people's health and people's long-term happiness. Real people, flesh and blood people, people who Christ told us to care about and serve, and what do we do? We delay, we silence and we appear to ignore those cries that are just too inconvenient. Had we had the opportunity to debate things I would believe that this could be a safe place for LGBTI Christians, but, sadly, I do not believe it is at the moment. I really urge Synod to consider joining me in voting against this Report and send a strong signal to the Business Committee of their concern with their damaging decision. Thank you.

*Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich):* I want to start by saying I just want to thank the Business Committee for all the hard work they must have put in to compiling the Agenda, it is not a job I would particularly envy them, and particularly thanking them for the consideration they have clearly put in to the issue referred to by the previous speaker about the scheduling of the various Diocesan Synod and Private Member's Motions on the issue of human sexuality. We know this is a huge issue for this Synod and I would just like to put on record that I think they have made a wise decision here. We have commissioned people to go and work hard for two or three years to produce resources which will hopefully help us all to think about it, to engage with it and then, if there are debates on the floor of Synod, we will be able to do that in the best possible way with resources drawing on the Bible, on theology, on history, on the social sciences. We have got the opportunity to engage with those on Saturday afternoon and I am really pleased that we have that opportunity as well.

I think I am just sorry that I cannot actually go to all the seminars. My first reaction when I saw the papers was, "Well, I want to hear about it all". I do not know if there is going to be any possibility for any sort of reports or whether if I want to hear about the ones I do not go to that is just a question of talking to friends and trying to share ourselves out among them. Yes, the football as well, how can I choose between watching England and hearing about human sexuality?

*Dr Simon Clift (Winchester):* I recognise that I am somewhat of a novice in terms of the procedures of this Synod, but I want to make a comment about the Agenda and an omission, as I see it, on the Agenda.

Between 17 and 22 June, 1,950 Anglicans from 50 countries around the Communion gathered in Jerusalem for the third Global Anglican Future Conference, including 16 Primates, 38 Archbishops and 316 Bishops, the largest gathering of Anglicans for over 50 years. At the end of this gathering, they released an official communication, *Letters to the Churches*

I was not in Jerusalem and I am not a member of GAFCON, but a number of my friends did take part, whose opinions I value. As a mission partner in the 1990s within the Province of Tanzania, we served under the authority of our diocesan bishop and worked side-by-side with such friends as Partners in the Gospel and, subsequently, through local parish and diocesan links I have had the privilege of spending time in the company of other leaders present in Jerusalem from the Provinces of Uganda and Myanmar, and I recognise how much I have to learn from them.

One senior Church leader said to me in a personal communication regarding GAFCON, "I must say, the movement is growing and the time spent at the Conference was much rewarding. It is simply high time not to ignore the movement; its impact is positively huge". These are voices of GAFCON, I believe, straightforward godly men and women within the mainstream of the Church who continue to look to the Bible as God's Word and historical teaching of the Church for matters of faith and conduct.

So, two weeks on, when I look at the Agenda for this sitting, I was surprised and disappointed to see no time set aside for the presentation or an emergency debate on GAFCON, nor to hear plans for Synod to consider their *Letters to the Churches*.

When I get home on Tuesday, my friends will be asking me, "What did they say at Synod? What response did they give to the *Letters to the Churches*?" My question, fellow Synod members, is: what shall I tell them? Surely, the voices of our GAFCON Anglican brothers and sisters deserve to be listened to, so please can we find a way of giving attention to what they are saying? I am happy to leave it to others more knowledgeable about procedural matters to work out suitable mechanisms for this, but, at the very least, I would encourage all of us to read the letter so that we can reach our own conclusions as to its substance. Thank you.

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells):* I would just like to draw us for a moment into relatively non-controversial waters, if that is all right, by referring to paragraph 36 of the Business Committee Report about the early morning Communion Service. Those of you who know me well will know that I am not the greatest pray-er in the world nor am I sometimes interested in anything other than Synod nerdiness, but on this matter I am slightly bothered. It has been agreed that we will move the early morning Communion forward to 7 o'clock, which gives people more time to get to breakfast and fringe meetings and all that stuff.

I have been on this Synod now for 13 July sessions and it took me until about the sixth year before I realised that going to early morning worship was a really good thing to do. The reason I started going regularly and getting myself out of bed and turning up and going to Berrick Saul, which is very well provided for and is very nice, was we were in the middle of ongoing aggro about women in the episcopate and it was all getting very difficult. It came to me that I would do better in this process of the Synod if I turned up to pray with people a bit more often, particularly with people I did not agree with, so I made a resolution that I would turn up to the early morning Eucharist.

I just want to encourage those of you who like staying in bed or who, like me, like staying up late in the Vanburgh bar, that you would do well to think about coming to that early morning worship. You may hear a really nice homily from the person leading the service. You may not but you may, so give it a go.

More to the point, you will have given yourself a bit of discipline in sitting next to and receiving the sacraments and hearing the words with people you do not necessarily agree with on the big topics that are annoying the Synod, on which we have already heard some speeches in this particular item.

I do want to encourage you to go, as I will try and go, even though it is at 7 o'clock. Just have a think about that and think, "Can I do this? Yes, I can".

The second thing is to ask the Business Committee specifically: is there some plan to review whether or not this works? What would be really sad would be, despite my encouragement, if the numbers attending the service fell off simply because it is at 7 o'clock. I am hoping the Business Committee and the Chaplain have a process at the end of these sessions for saying, "Did the numbers fall off? If so, did we do the right thing by starting even earlier?" Thank you.

*Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans):* I enjoyed Mr Lynas's important little speech but I am going to take Synod back, I am afraid.

Chairman, this is the second group of sessions in succession with no Private Member's Motion scheduled for debate, albeit that we have a PMM listed as contingency business, but with the shape and detail in the Agenda I would be surprised if we get to it. I declare an interest, as the Chair of the Business Committee has pointed out, as having a PMM on the lists.

Leaving aside the subject matters covered by PMMs, I think this is starting to create an unfortunate precedent in terms of democracy and Synod governance. Synod members support PMMs in the reasonable expectation they will get debated, and those with the most support should get debated.

There has been much said already in social and other media about this Agenda and the fact that same-sex marriage and its myriad of related issues have been kicked into the long grass by the Business Committee and I think the House of Bishops may stand similarly accused.

Chairman, no subject is of greater missional importance to the Church today. I get the fact that the teaching document process with its snappy new long title, which I like but it is so long I cannot remember it, is the declared method of moving the process forward, but there is no expectation it will be met with any proposals until 2020. I know there is an opportunity to engage with the issues in the groups tomorrow either side of the football.

We need to continue to debate elements of the subject on the floor of this Synod. Synod members were elected to do that in 2015 and expect to do that, not to sit on their hands until the end of the quinquennium.

Kicking it into the long grass is the wrong idiom. You kick something into the long grass when you expect it will become forgotten and the effluxion of time will somehow lead to something more important. Nothing is more important. What the Business Committee and the House of Bishops have done is not to kick this into the long grass but to kick the can down the road. When you kick a can down the road, it is noisy, it is clanky and it gains publicity, often unwanted.

I urge the Business Committee to reflect further on its strategy. It would be churlish to vote against this Report but I shall vote to abstain and urge members to consider doing likewise.

*Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester):* I have signed several PMMs and I am eager to see them debated, but I believe the Business Committee has made a wise and entirely appropriate decision about PMMs and Diocesan Synod Motions about sexuality.

It is for the Bishops to uphold and, where necessary, redefine the teaching of the Church of England. The Bishops have set up a very wide-ranging process to re-examine and then reaffirm (or change) the teaching of the Church of England on human sexuality. It also cannot be right for us to bring in new liturgical practices unless or until the teaching of the Church of England has been changed. There are many other pressing issues as well that need to be discussed, not least the re-evangelization of this country and of other European countries more generally.

I commend the Business Committee's thoughtful and unanimous decisions not only about human sexuality but about the beautiful game.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* I have got two points. The first one is on paragraph 39. I have a great interest here in disclosure and openness for elections. I would like to think that the online election process that is being piloted will include hustings, either in person or electronically. I would be very sad to see those disappear. I can see that it is difficult but I think it absolutely must be done.

The second thing I would like to say on the sexuality issue is this. We have spent a very great deal of time in this Synod and in our dioceses talking about this matter. What worries me a little is that in 2020 we will have a completely new Synod which will not have gone through that process. It seems to me that, having spent all this investment of time on it, we should make the best of that and at least have plenty of time to talk from the experience that we have had over the last few years. Thank you.

*Revd Sarah Schofield (Lichfield):* I would just like to ask the Business Committee, when you say 2020, for a point of clarification do you mean the last two sittings of the current Synod or the first sitting of the next Synod?

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Mr Chairman, members of Synod, I would like you to consider and ask the Business Committee to revisit the decision not to hold a Synod on the contingency dates in November. Tomorrow morning, we are going to be debating issues of safeguarding, but we are going to be doing that without the benefit of any recommendations that come from the IICSA inquiry, which held a three-week session, as you know, in February into the Diocese of Chichester and will be holding another week's session at the end of this month in relation to Bishop Peter Ball. Further, I think in September there is to be a seminar on the issue of mandatory reporting.

At the end of the March session of IICSA, the Chairman announced that it was intended to publish a report on both the March session and the Peter Ball session in the autumn. One other matter, which has not yet reached a conclusion, is the investigation into the "fresh information" about the late Bishop George Bell.

Really, the debate that we are going to be able to have tomorrow morning, without being informed by the recommendations from IICSA, by whatever emerges from the fresh investigation - and we have not yet been able to debate the Carlile Report - means, in my respectful submission, that we ought to be looking to use those available November dates.

Might I just remind Synod of a couple of contributions that were made in this equivalent debate in London in February in relation to this very issue? Canon David Banting said: "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. Please, Business Committee, and those with influence, may we have time?"

My colleague from Suffolk, Jonathan Alderton-Ford: "I am worried that as Synod gets shorter and shorter we have less time together as fellow Christians. We listen to each other less. Synod, I call on you to urge for longer debates, to spend more time listening rather than speaking".

It is also the case that we have had limited time to consider such material as has been circulated for the debate tomorrow on safeguarding, in particular, of course, GS 2092 only two weeks ago and the Singleton Report – we now have that although it was only due to be released on 12 July.

Business Committee, I urge you to reconsider the question of whether we have a session in November where we could have at least a full day on the safeguarding issues. Thank you.

*Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford):* I came back from Jerusalem, a spectacular time, to an article in the Church press, which began, “Many General Synod members will be asking themselves whether there is any point in the annual trip to York this year”. It was critical both of the Agenda and of the Business Committee. I want to jump to their defence.

I do have some comments to make and I do not want to be misunderstood, like the MP who jumped up for the umpteenth time in his long parliamentary career to say, “I object”. He was greatly misunderstood. All he wanted, as he had always wanted, was for the issues to be debated and to be debated properly on the floor of the House.

I realise the Business Committee cannot initiate business; that is for the House of Bishops or the Archbishops’ Council or the MPA or other such bodies, but it is to be fiercely independent. I remember the occasion when the General Synod refused to appoint a bishop to chair the Business Committee because it wanted to be independent of the Bishops. I have a good memory. I also want to have a good projectory. I am beginning to notice that there is a rise in presentations, a rise in motions that cannot be separated or amended. There is shorter and shorter time for questions, even when presentations are made. There is the absence of debates about, “Well, is the General Synod beyond its sell-by date?” We have been tinkering with the system and answering questions but there is no serious debate about what is happening here.

The GAFCON meetings began with an hour’s Bible study and prayer and praise at the beginning of every day. There is much more attention to theology and Bible that should be built into this Synod to inform and to envision us, yes, but to set parameters for our debates and thinking. Where is the life of the Ecclesiastical Committee in Parliament represented? It seems to be a powerless body waving through stuff without understanding it. I would love to know where we have got to between the state of this House and the Houses of Parliament, for example. When will be discussing Carlile? When will we hear back from the Working Party\*\* after the independent reviewer report on the situation in Sheffield? I realise that, looking back, the lack was only a year ago of proper space, responsible space and time for the science and medical side of our debate which left us with a very short debate and very flaky debate and decision in my opinion.

I want to encourage the Business Committee to maintain their proper independence. I thank them for their work. May they be bold in moving us forward and, yes, using November for the time.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: after the next speaker, can I tempt you with a motion for closure?

*The Chair:* I am very easily tempted. Thank you.

*Dr John Appleby (Newcastle):* I have to confess that I have come to this Synod less well prepared than ever before because I have been going through what I call the “long dark night of the kitchen refit” for the last three weeks and life has been a little stressful.

I would be delighted to be corrected that I have overlooked something, but, as it stands, I think there is something missing. In February, we debated Mission and Ministry in Covenant GS 2086 and passed a motion that said: “(b) Call on the Faith and Order Commission to report back to Synod at the next group of sessions on progress with the Methodist Church”. I also note that the Methodist Conference has been debating this issue in the last few days. I am not aware this issue appears anywhere on the Agenda. I hope somebody might have got it into the questions; I was too busy to submit one. If I am wrong I am delighted; if I am right then would somebody please give a brief report on this issue.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Motion for closure on Item 4.

*The Chair:* That has my permission. Could I put the motion for closure?

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried, so I therefore call on Canon Sue Booy to respond to the debate. Sue, you have up to five minutes.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you. I will do my best. Charles Read, thank you very much. It is always really good to hear from a convert. I would just like to tell Synod that we do give some time to thinking through items that it would be good for you to invite guests to hear, hence the environment debates appearing on Sunday afternoon.

I want to try to answer Jayne Ozanne, Caroline Herbert and part of Anthony Archer all together, although I think I did give an answer in my main speech. I do want to be clear that our decision was neither careless nor forced. I do agree, Jayne, and pray that God is working in and through us, although we do not all agree about how we are working.

Mr Archer, I am not good at kicking anything: footballs, cans, and even aiming into long grass. We are simply considering prayerfully what the agenda should be and trying to do our best for you, Synod, and for the Church as a whole.

Dr Clift, thank you. We had some correspondence about this before Synod and I think we have heard what you have said. Certainly, if somebody proposes something to the Business Committee we will consider how it might be scheduled.

A few years ago, we were all agreeing with Pete. I now want to agree with my friend Stephen. Early morning Communion is a good thing and we will be very sure to put in our feedback survey something about the revised time to see how that is going.

I can only agree with Anthony Archer about the scheduling of Private Member's Motions and assure him that because there is a Private Member's Motion scheduled for contingency business that, even if it is not taken now, it will be taken in February, and to promise that when we meet again as Business Committee in September and December about the February group of sessions, we will look very carefully at ourselves and at the PMMs to see which ones should be scheduled and to make sure that we do better.

April Alexander, thank you for your thoughtful contribution about disclosure and openness for elections. There is no legal requirement for hustings but I do know that the current guidance for returning officers suggests various ways in which they can be sure that important points are heard by the electorate.

Sarah Schofield, I believe we mean July 2020.

Mr Lamming, this November Synod business is really difficult. We have not habitually held meetings of Synod in November. Although I understand what you were saying, we do not know at what date there will be anything clear from IICSA. In the autumn is really a bit difficult. In fact, we would be planning a November Synod in September, so it would be foolish of us, in fact, to schedule something for November that we would have to plan in a vacuum in September. That does not mean that we will not, as we have done in this group of sessions, think seriously about the proper way to schedule debates about this very serious business of safeguarding, but November would not be in the best interests of all of you.

Mr Banting, thank you for your commendation at the beginning of your speech. We try very hard, as I pointed out right at the beginning of this, to keep our proper, thoughtful, prayerful independence, but it is inevitable that not everybody will agree that that is what we have done. We give you of our best and you may vote, as I have said before, as you wish. This is our best effort.

Dr Appleby, thank you for asking about the Methodist Conference. I understand that the House of Bishops are to discuss this at their next meeting and, of course, if we are asked, indeed I am sure the Business Committee would welcome the opportunity to schedule a debate in February about this important issue.

I am on orange and I have finished. Thank you all very much indeed.

*The Chair:* Item 4 is therefore before us, Synod, "That the Synod do take note of this Report".

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

*The Chair:* Thank you. That concludes this item of business and we move on to the next item.



THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 4.11 pm.

## **ITEM 500**

### **DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046Z) DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047Z)**

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, we now come to Item 500 on Special Agenda 1. This is the Final Drafting stages of the draft Ecumenical Relations Measure and the draft Amending Canon No. 38. Members will need the draft Measure GS 2046B, the draft Amending Canon GS 2047B and the Report of the Steering Committee, GS 2046Z and 2047Z. Members should note that this is Article 7 business.

I now call upon the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 500: "That the Synod do take note of this Report". Archdeacon, you have up to 10 minutes.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* Thank you, Chair. I promise not to take them. The Steering Committee has identified the need for three drafting amendments, as members will have seen; two to the draft Measure and one to the draft Amending Canon. They are shown in bold type in GS 2046B and 2047B. Our Report, which you also have before you, identifies and describes the effects of these amendments.

Clause 2 of the draft Measure will now make a further consequential amendment to the Ecumenical Relations Measure 1988. That amendment ensures that the formal mechanism for entering into local ecumenical co-operative schemes fully takes account of the new power for bishops to designate partner churches at diocesan level. It does so by extending the definition of "appropriate authority", which basically means a partner church's governing body to cover partner churches that are designated at diocesan level.

The amendment to the draft Amending Canon carries that extended definition through into the new Canon B 43.

The amendment to clause 3 of the Measure clarifies the relationship between the new Canon and the Code of Practice to be issued by the House of Bishops under the Measure. These drafting amendments will ensure that the legislation works in an internally coherent way. They are all of a technical nature to enable the legislation to do what we intend it to do and none of them raises any questions of policy. The Committee is not proposing any special amendments. Thank you. Chair, do you want me to move now or in a moment? I have moved the motion standing in my name, whatever I have done.

*The Chair:* Item 500 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Mr Philip French (Rochester):* Let me declare if not an interest then a context. I have the privilege to participate in the Local Ecumenical Partnership of the Church of England and the United Reformed Church. Despite all the practical obstacles, we are richly blessed and challenged in our faith by the traditions and insights of both denominations. Naturally, I support the intention to make ecumenical co-operation less onerous and bureaucratic, more flexible and dynamic. What concerns me slightly is the wording and the impression that it may convey. The days of the local ecumenical projects may be over, by common consent among denominations, but there is surely still an honoured place for a Local Ecumenical Partnership. That concept is richer than a project, implying covenantal interdependence and a local constitution conformable to and supported by each of its denominations, going well beyond the language of this draft Measure and Canon of co-operative schemes.

Looser, slighter associations may often best suit local needs and the promptings of the Holy Spirit. Or what about those churches which have already chosen to enter into a deeper union at the local level or may wish to: that unity for which our Lord prayed? There seems little to encourage them here. We have been told that Churches Together in England is content with both the mechanisms and the terminology, but the governing bodies of other Churches may have had little opportunity to reach a common mind on these matters and, all too often, from the perspective of free church members in a local ecumenical project, our established Church comes across as arrogant and overbearing. Let us try to avoid that mistake.

So, while I would certainly support the motion before us and the vote for Final Approval on Monday, I would ask the House of Bishops and the Council for Christian Unity to take great care in taking this forward, to engage carefully and respectfully with other denominations, particularly the free churches, in how this very significant change regarding the present Canons B 43 and B 44 is communicated, and over their own policymaking and governance needs; secondly, to consult widely on the Code of Practice before it is issued, including consulting with existing Local Ecumenical Partnerships, and with ecumenical partners in those and perhaps specifically in that Code of Practice to consider whether the partnership option could still be described and encouraged as part of the broad spectrum of arrangements which this legislation would permit.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so I now invite the Archdeacon to respond to the debate.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* Thank you very much for that speech. There are two things that I would like to say very, very clearly. The first is that this terminology is for our internal legislative purposes only. We are not imposing anything on any partner church or on anybody else, even if we were able to. The second thing is that the language of Local Ecumenical Partnership - let me make sure I am saying what I am supposed to be saying - is language which has been agreed with our ecumenical partners. We are not changing anything that Churches Together in England already uses or is agreed on. We are bringing forward a generic legal term for our own internal purposes. That is the technical stuff.

On a more personal, I suppose, or interpersonal level, there is nothing in this legislation to prevent the depth of relationship which was described in this speech and, on the contrary, we would encourage relationships between Christians to be of the nature of relationships expressed by the word “covenant”.

Finally, thank you so much for the suggestion of consultation at the stage of the Code of Practice. That is not something that I in any way can influence, but I think Synod would not be minded to disagree with you that consultation would be a good thing.

*The Chair:* I now put Item 500 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried. The draft Ecumenical Relations Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 38, being Article 7 business, now stand committed to the House of Bishops. That concludes this item of business. We now move to the next item.

## **ITEM 504 DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2064B)**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 504 on Special Agenda I. This item, too, is Article 7 business. We now take the final drafting stage of the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. Members will need draft Measure, GS 2064B, and the Report of the Steering Committee GS 2064Z. It is my pleasure to invite Ms Josile Munro to move Item 504: “That the Synod do take note of this Report”. Josile, you have up to 10 minutes.

*Ms Josile Munro (London):* I just want to bring to your attention that the Steering Committee has agreed a number of draft amendments to this Measure. They are identified and described in the Report of the Steering Committee and have been made to clarify any remaining uncertainties of meaning and to improve the drafting. The Steering Committee is not proposing any special amendments for this. I do so move.

*The Chair:* Item 504 is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I now, by a show of hands, put Item 504 to the vote.

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

*The Chair:* Item 504 is clearly carried. The draft Measure, being Article 7 business, now stands committed to the House of Bishops. This now concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR The Bishop of Stockport (*Rt Revd Libby Lane*) took the Chair at 4.22 pm.

## **ITEM 510**

### **DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103)**

*The Chair.* Synod, we now come to Item 510, draft Amending Canon No. 40, which is before Synod for First Consideration. For this, members will need the draft Amending Canon GS 2103 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 2013X. I call on the Chair of the Steering Committee, the Bishop of Manchester, to move Item 510: "That the Canon entitled Amending Canon No. 40 be considered for revision in Committee". Bishop, you have up to 10 minutes.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Synod, thank you for agreeing overwhelmingly at our February group of sessions that there should be a Canon specifically focused on our religious communities. Just to prove that the Church of England can sometimes act quickly, I am delighted to be able to present to you only five months later a draft version of such a Canon for First Consideration. Having had that previous debate so recently and with such strong support, I presume that you do not need me to go over the grounds of why such a Canon is needed in any great depth. At its most succinct, it is about our owning our religious communities within the Church of England, making our expectations and support for them clearer, better facilitating the ordination and licensing of ministers to serve in them and providing the right framework for the discharging of their safeguarding responsibilities.

I was called as a witness by the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse in March. The inquiry officers and the panel were very keen to hear what we as a Church were doing to ensure that religious communities fell within our safeguarding procedures. The news that Synod had asked for a Canon to be put forward was very well received, so here we are with our initial draft.

One of the most important things about this Canon is how it proposes to shape the work that we do with our religious communities. Creating or revising a Canon is not a quick and simple process, hence its direct scope is restricted to those things that require it to be on its face, underneath which it sets out the places where more detailed and changeable work will happen. The vast majority of support and oversight of the communities from the national Church will be held where it has been for the last 80 years or so by the Advisory Council on Relations between Bishops and Religious Communities, which I chair. Back in December, in anticipation of our work, the Council was reconstituted as a formal committee of the House of Bishops, hence the various references to the House of Bishops in the text before us. The House delegates its oversight of religious communities to the Council but, of course, it can always, as in the past, overrule its subsidiary body should it be minded so to do. That changes nothing. The text of the Canon sets out the very broadest definition of a religious community and leaves the precise determination for whether particular communities should be recognised or acknowledged to the House of Bishops. It is vitally important that we do not over-specify on the face of the Canon itself.

Over the centuries the religious life has taken many and varied forms. In this present generation God is once again calling groups of men and women to fresh ways of living life shaped by it. Proper discernment of whether a community represents an authentic expression or development of the religious tradition cannot be totally captured by legal texts. Rather, it needs to be worked through between the community itself and the institutions of the Church, particularly the Advisory Council, where a wealth of supplementary material and guidance already lies and where more can easily be developed as circumstances evolve. Hence, at the heart of the Canon lies the power and responsibility of the House of Bishops to acknowledge or recognise a community and - the necessary other side of the coin - to remove such acknowledgement or recognition for an appropriately grave cause.

The draft Canon then goes on to set out the two main types of accountability which it puts in place: regulation and guidance. These are terms which Synod members will be familiar with from many pieces of legislation in recent years but also from a well-accepted concept in wider British law. Put bluntly, regulation tells me what I have to do and guidance tells me what I have to have a very convincing case for not doing.

Because regulation is such a strong concept, the Canon sets out the sorts of areas where it would be proper for the House of Bishops, via the Advisory Council, to regulate. These are things such as finance, governance, safeguarding and vows. It is not a list that I imagine conveys any surprises. Moreover, the Canon sets out that any such regulatory material must be laid before us here in Synod for our approval, mandatory requirements are too serious to be delegated to a lower level. If the Canon is supported by you today, I would expect to set up a Working Group from the Advisory Council which will work through the autumn in parallel and in close contact with the Revision Committee for this Canon so that the initial regulatory work is ready to lay before you as soon as possible.

Guidance comes with a lower degree of requirement. Much of what is contained in the *Handbook of the Religious Life*, which has been in existence since the 1940s, constitutes guidance. It is here that detailed work, taking account of the different types of community and the appropriate shape of such communities, is held. The Canon does not change any of that. It merely notes that it has the status of formal guidance in the Church of England.

All of what I have spoken about so far, Chair, comes in the first main section of the draft Canon. The remaining clauses deal with the ordination and licensing of persons to serve Holy Orders in a religious community. Depending on your overall view of the Episcopate, my colleagues and I have in the past either been creatively imaginative or disingenuous in the ways we have had to find to ordain, license or give authority to minister to clergy working from a base in such communities. That can leave both such priests themselves and the wider Church unsure of where their accountability lies and from where they can expect to receive training, support or development review. It can also deny them their rights to participate properly in our synodical processes, including here.

The Advisory Council looked at a number of options as to how to help regularise the situation but felt that clear canonical provision was by far the best and simplest step, especially as the Church was looking to create a Canon anyway.

That final couple of clauses in the Canon will also require some minor work via the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure No. 2, which is also starting its journey with us over this current group of sessions. Those of you who have already read your papers for the latter parts of Synod will have spotted where that will come. It does no more than is necessary to complement the Canon. Synod, thank you once again for asking for this Canon to be brought forward. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair.* The motion is now open for debate. I would remind members that under Standing Order 51, speeches must be directed to the general purport of the Canon rather than to points of detail.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I welcome this draft Canon. Quite apart from the safeguarding concerns, which obviously have made this a matter of urgency, I think it is right that we should give religious communities a place in our Canon law, but I have some questions.

First, it is not wholly clear from the papers whether this draft Canon is intended to apply to the small missional communities which are increasingly growing up, particularly in urban areas, some operating under Bishops' Mission Orders but not necessarily. The definition of a community in the Canon would appear to include them, but it is not entirely clear whether that is intended. If it is intended, I suggest that, as it stands, the Canon is insufficiently flexible for these rather more fluid, rapidly developing small communities. I would like to suggest that for missional communities at least, it would make much more sense if the House of Bishops were to delegate the approval or designation of these communities to individual dioceses. I do wonder whether a community operating under a Bishop's Mission Order really needs to be covered by the Canon at all. Either way, we need clarity on that point.

I would also question the proposal to prescribe a minimum size for a religious community. Again, I think this could pose particular problems for missional communities where the membership might be rather more fluid than in a more traditional monastic community. I would, in any event, wonder whether a minimum number is appropriate. Clearly, a community needs to be more than one person, but when our Lord promises that when two or three gather in his name, He is with them, who are we to impose a greater number? Even traditional monastic houses are now sometimes very small. Think of the Community of St Margaret at Walsingham, which I believe is now just three strong. Are these faithful nuns who have sustained the Church by their prayers for decades to be told that they no longer qualify as an Anglican religious community?

Chair, I will support First Consideration because I think the principle of this Canon is good, but I hope that the points that I have made will be given serious consideration by the Revision Committee.

*Ven. Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester):* I also very much support the proposing of this Canon. We need to become a more creative Church in our mission, and this allows us the possibility to recognise creative missional endeavour and creative forms of Christian life. We must seize the opportunity to do it. To be a truly creative church requires that first step of adventure and the ability to recognise it. To continue to be a creative church also requires the ability to recognise when something has run its course. To start well, one must also be able to end well, and do so consistently. One might say if we had more of that facility about us we would not need to have quite such an extensive programme of Renewal and Reform because we would be doing it anyway.

I very much hope that the regulations that accompany this Canon will have guidance about ending well so that we can also begin well. Whether it is possible to affirm that as a positive part of being a creative Christian community in the text of the Canon I do not know, but I think it is worth considering.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent):* I too welcome the direction this is taking. I think we have to be clear that the more we do things by regulation and Code of Practice, the more difficult and obscure it is to make those things work. I think Clive Scowen's words earlier were things we ought to heed.

The parallel with Bishops' Mission Orders. We are operating under a Code of Practice. If you have read through all the papers for this Synod you will have seen that the BMO Code of Practice has been amended and simplified. It is still pretty long and pretty turgid and many of my episcopal colleagues find it quite hard to find their way through it in order to make it work. It would be foolish if we devised a similar kind of framework for religious communities. If we devise secondary legislation that is impenetrable, you cannot make it work.

I would urge simplicity and clarity in the drafting, I think in two particular ways. The first is to make sure you are clear what you are trying to achieve via these designations. We have had terrible problems in the past with religious orders where we do not know who is ultimately accountable and the visitor has not been able to be found and, therefore, we cannot get things done when there are issues of governance or issues of finance. We need some clarity about that. We also need some clarity about how - and Mr Scowen touched upon it - this thing differentiates itself from an ordinary Bishop's Mission Order, and whether you can run things under the two regimes. It is quite possible that something could be both a BMO and a religious community and it is a question of which bit of the guidance covers which bit. There is some very careful drafting that needs to be done. I hope we can give this a good wind, but we will not get lots of regulations which are impossible to understand and therefore to implement.

*Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough):* Again, I welcome all the work that has been done so far, recognising that it is often quite difficult to describe what exactly a religious community is because the charisms of the various founders of the religious communities that we know vary so widely. In the world Church there are many thousands perhaps of religious orders all subtly different from each other. It is going to be quite a difficult task to produce regulations that address all circumstances, but I have just a few questions at this stage which I hope I might register.

First of all, the process of giving recognition to a religious community: will this process be by the consent or the invitation of the religious community in question or will the Church of England take a direct approach towards religious communities and say, "We want to regulate you"? That is the first question.

The second question is a definition question: what kind of community are we talking about life as? Are we talking about those who have taken a vow of celibacy as part of belonging to that community or will this include the much wider societies that exist in the Church of England that have been around for a very long time, such as the Society of the Holy Cross?

Thirdly, in section 3 there is a reference to financial affairs, and I would like to ask if the regulations will in any way duplicate the responsibilities of the Charity Commissioners. I think it is a good idea to avoid duplication if at all possible.

*Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* As Stephen Trott has just mentioned, one of the concerns I have is that this does not ever ask in the Canon we have before us for consent from the community itself. It may well be the House of Bishops will have that in their own processes for recognition, but I feel it would be best written into the Canon to avoid any confusion later on, especially as this is not just for established traditional communities but is framed quite widely.

*Mr Ian Yemm (Bristol):* I was not expecting to speak so thank you for calling me. It is a maiden speech. Hurrah! I was for five years of my life a member of a Roman Catholic religious order, the Canons Regular of Prémontré. Try saying that when you have had a few! That means that I have lived under Canons, rules, constitutions, statutes and various chapters. It can be very complex. I was curious to see, therefore, how this Canon would come together.

One of the things that was a great blessing in religious life was to have a superior. I was interested to see whether or not that role of a major superior, who in my case would have been also an ordinary of the Church and have had responsibilities of dialogue between bishops and religious communities, which preserves the autonomy of those religious communities, would be preserved in this Canon in some way. I am really interested to understand whether or not the group looking at this looks to Roman Catholic provision to understand a little better what was available there in a long and respected history of the religious life, but also whether there was some way in the Canon of preserving that



autonomy that exists in those religious communities under major superiors who are ordinaries in their own right and sometimes have dialogue roles of communication with the House of Bishops.

This particular Canon puts a lot of responsibility on the House of Bishops and I am concerned about the autonomy and growth of these communities as they go forward.

*Revd. Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* The Bishop of Lambeth told me a joke the other week about three things the Pope does not know. One is what a Jesuit is thinking, another is how much money the Salesians have got and the third is how many female religious orders there are in the Roman Catholic Church. The point that Mr Scowen made about what constitutes a religious community is actually quite important.

I take very seriously the point made by the Bishop of Willesden about overregulating, but one area where it may be that some consideration needs to be given in revision is the whole area of where discipline applies as well around, obviously, clergy who are licensed in religious orders who are going to be covered by the Clergy Discipline Measure or, hopefully, its successor in due course.

The nature of discipline in a religious community, especially in perhaps newer forms of religious community, might be quite unclear and there could be a situation where some members of that community are subject to certain sorts of discipline and others would not be and that could lead to tensions within the community. I think some guidance or, indeed, possibly even some regulation around that area might be helpful. I just offer that to the Revision Committee for future consideration.

*Revd Frog Orr-Ewing (Oxford):* It is my maiden speech as well, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking. I just want to say I am very, very warmly supportive of the general direction of where this is going. I want to warmly commend my colleagues and other members of this House to vote in favour of this. That having been said, there are a couple of points of clarification that have been brought up as well.

The simplicity issues: absolutely crucial to make sure that it is actually usable and doable and not so impenetrable that, even though it is right on paper, nobody else knows what it means. It has got to be actually usable.

A second area of clarification. The language used where the bishops come in is very loose. It does not say whether it is an area bishop, a suffragan bishop, a diocesan bishop or a visiting bishop, a bishop visitor to the order as well. There is some unnecessary ambiguity there which I think could clarify this quite well, particularly because - and this affects BMOs as well - if things go beyond an area.

One of the great advantages of the monastic communities and the religious communities is that they have a fluidity about them, particularly geographically or for the amount of

time somebody might be in one place or other. I think that is just something that ought to be represented in the legislation.

The last is really to chime on what one of my colleagues has already said as well, which is to protect the autonomy. It is very easy for the House of Bishops or advisory groups or even General Synod to dole out codes of conduct without having properly asked whether those codes of conduct have not just been consulted but actually approved by key religious communities. So not just consulting them but actually saying we would like to know as General Synod that key religious communities, including newly approved ones and registered ones, such as the 24-7 Prayer Group that has just come through as well, are actually warmly enthusiastic of them. It would be good for us to know when we are voting that they are on board rather than just it meets the requirements of legislation.

*The Chair.* I see no one else standing and so I call on the Bishop of Manchester to reply. You have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Thank you for the overwhelming support for this that I have heard from Synod. If I may address some of the particular points made. Does it apply to small missional communities such as exist under BMOs? No, by and large we are not expecting to have kind of double regulation there, that small missional communities will continue where they are. If such a community gets to the point where it wants to become a formal religious community of the Church of England, of course it will approach us in the normal way.

I think that leads on to the point that there is no compulsion here. No group of Christians who associate together is going to be compelled to come forward to register or be acknowledged. If they want to be officially part of the Church of England structures, if they want to be able to elect members to this General Synod, if they want to be under the oversight of the Church of England, to be owned by the Church of England, then they will choose to come forward to become part of our official family.

Minimum size. That has always existed. We have always said that half a dozen is the size at which we should begin to recognise or acknowledge a community. Much smaller than that and the communities tend to be so fragile that they have not reached the level of stability that you can have that kind of protracted conversation. When a community becomes small, yes, it is up to it when it winds up and some communities do only have two or three members still living and part of them. They choose when they want to wind up if they feel they have got too small. There is no threshold going down. It is simply when a community is being recognised the first time, which again leads us to how communities end well.

Much of what has been said in this debate is stuff that exists in the *Handbook of the Religious Life*. We are proposing very little that is new. Really, what we will be doing will be extracting from the existing handbook over the next few months those things that are of such paramount importance that they require to be expressed in the regulations. You

will see a draft version of those regulations, I hope, before we ask you for agreement on the Canon itself; though, of course, we cannot formally put regulations in place until after the Canon which allows such regulations to be written.

We are not going to make things complicated. It is what already exists and is working well with religious communities, acknowledged and recognised in the Church of England.

I am grateful for Stephen Trott welcoming the work we have done so far. Will it be by consent? Yes, it will always be consent. Communities have to approach us. We do not "approach a community and say, "We think you should be recognised or be acknowledged". They approach us. Any community that wishes to be derecognised or cease to be acknowledged, of course, at any time it can do that if it wishes.

Vows. Yes, there are a great variety of vows that take place. I am a Third Order Franciscan. I am under very different vows than that of a Benedictine living in an abbey somewhere. There needs to be that variety and that is why an awful lot of the work is under the bonnet; it is in the guidance. Well, most of it in the guidance, a little bit in the regulations.

Will it duplicate the Charity Commissioners? No, we are very clear that we are not going to attempt to duplicate the work that the Charity Commissioners do.

A major superior who is not accountable to the ordinand, the usual ordinary. The policy of the Church of England is that the diocesan bishop has responsibility for all ordained ministry in particular that operates in her or his territory. The diocesan can always delegate to a suffragan under the rules that apply or to one of the assistant bishops, such as the Bishop of Maidstone, or the Bishop of Beverley in my own patch, but there will not be independent superiors. There never have been. Communities all have a visitor. That is a requirement that a visitor is in Anglican episcopal orders. That will continue, but that visitor does not have jurisdiction that can take something out of the oversight of the local diocese. That is not a change. That is how it always has been in the Church of England.

Simon Butler asked where discipline lies. Obviously, for clergy it lies within the Clergy Discipline Measure. For those who are not in ordained ministry, then the *Handbook of the Religious Life* contains clear guidance as to how discipline is expected to be carried out within communities, usually with an ultimate appeal to the visitor of the community. In very, very grave matters, for example, where somebody is being expelled from a community for having abandoned its life or committed some grievous sin, normally under one of the Henry VIII Acts that lies with the Archbishop of Canterbury as the successor to the papal legate from those pre-Reformation days. He usually consults with me before exercising that power and does so only very rarely.

Frog Orr-Ewing, thank you for your maiden speech. Yes, we are keeping it simple. We are basically continuing with the handbook that has existed for the last 70 years or so. Who licenses? Yes, the diocesan bishop. Geographical fluidity. Yes, we accept that

members of religious communities move around. As I say, I am a Franciscan and Franciscans tend to move around quite a lot, but the rights of any diocesan bishop as to the conduct of ordained ministry within his or her diocese are not something that we are going to be undermining through this proposal. Thank you for your comments.

*The Chair.* Thank you, David. We now put Item 510 to the vote.

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

*The Chair.* That is carried. The draft Amending Canon is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the Agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk of the Synod to reach her no later than Friday 10 August.

As indicated earlier in our session, in order to enable good order of business, I will now adjourn the sitting for 10 minutes to allow members to take a short break. The next item will resume promptly in ten minutes and a bell will be rung one minute before the business will resume. You are asked to be back in your seat by that time.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 5.06 pm.

## **ITEM 5 QUESTIONS**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, everyone. We come to Item 5 on our Agenda, Questions, which I know for some people is one of the highlights of our group of sessions. Members have been sent the full question Notice Paper by email and then there are the hard copies available on the seating around you.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind fellow members of Synod that when it comes to asking a supplementary question, there are a couple of things. One is that members should give their name, diocese and Synod number before asking their question and then a simple single question, which can be answered in a straightforward way rather than a speech, must be asked. I am emphasising that, everyone. No composite questions, please, otherwise I would have to call it out of order, which I would rather not do.

The same goes for questions which contain arguments, imputation, ask for expressions of opinion, including on legal questions, or which ask for a solution to a hypothetical problem. Also, on a practical note, if you intend to ask a supplementary question, then please make your way to one of the microphones as quickly as possible. This will help us to get through more questions.

Let us make a start. The first batch of questions is for the Mission and Public Affairs Council.

## MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

1. *Mr Clive Scowen (London) asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* In view of recent reports that HM Treasury have agreed with the betting industry that the reduction of the maximum stake for Fixed Odds Betting Terminals to £2 which the Secretary of State announced last month (following Synod's unanimous request in February 2017) will not be implemented until April 2020, what action has the Mission and Public Affairs Division taken, or will it now take, to press the Government to fulfil the Secretary of State's pledge to "take a stand" and do "everything we can to protect vulnerable people" without further delay?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* As soon as the Reports to which this Question refers appeared, the Bishop of St Albans and others wrote to the press asking for swift implementation. The Mission and Public Affairs Division, with ecumenical colleagues, have written to relevant Ministers including the Treasury and will seek a meeting. The Bishop of St Albans and MPA staff are working through parliamentary channels to explore the factors involved and to press for implementation as soon as possible and certainly by April 2019.

*Mr Clive Scowen:* What would the Chair of MPA recommend that members of this Synod, and indeed faithful Anglicans up and down the country, should do to support the efforts of the Bishop of St Albans and the MPA staff in demanding that the Government live up to its promise to take a stand, as the Secretary of State put it, and to reduce the maximum stake for Fixed Odds Betting Terminals to £2 before the end of this year?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* Thank you very much for that, Mr Scowen. I would urge them to do everything possible. I think this Synod, very rightly and passionately, voted in favour of reducing Fixed Odds Betting Terminals. We cannot leave it there. We must rejoice at being heard but we must not allow this, in any way, to be delayed in implementation. I would urge people to write to their MPs, write to Ministers, maybe even follow Mr Scowen's example of writing to *The Times*, along with others. Do all possible. If anybody has any further suggestions about how we can keep the pressure on to eradicate or minimise the evil of Fixed Odds Betting Terminals and get the Government to hold up to its commitment, then we would welcome them and we will do all we can to support them and to encourage other people to do so.

2. *Canon Linda Ali (York) asked the Chair of the Mission & Public Affairs Council:* In view of the UK Government's intention to leave the European Union in response to the 2016 Referendum, what steps has the Church of England taken to protect clergy from EU countries (and their families) currently working in the United Kingdom?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* All UK residents who are EU citizens will be subject to the arrangements announced by the Home Secretary on 21 June, for a process of application for 'settled status' which he

described as 'straightforward'. When the details become clear, dioceses and other relevant bodies will do everything possible to support and reassure those affected, and their families, and to intervene if the treatment of any of them should appear unfair.

*Revd Charles Read (Norwich):* Is the MPA aware that some of the clergy who are EU citizens are finding the process so far anything but straightforward?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* We are hearing that life is, in so many areas, not as straightforward as often we are led to believe. I must confess to being slightly surprised to find this particular item on the Mission and Public Affairs agenda. It felt to me that it could well sit well within Min Div. I believe the Chair of the Min Div Council has a vested family interest in this particular matter and I am sure he would welcome any further discussion in the Vanbrugh bar at a later stage.

3. *Ms Jay Greene (Winchester) asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* Does the Church of England plan to submit a contribution to any consultation arising from the Government's recent proposal for further research into the operation of civil partnerships? cf <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-future-operation-of-civil-partnership-gathering-further-information>

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* We continue to monitor developments in government, on this and related issues. Only a few days ago, the Supreme Court ruled that civil partnerships could not be retained solely for same sex couples, so we wait to hear how the government plans to incorporate that ruling into law. If and when there is a consultative exercise, we will certainly make a submission, and this will, for obvious reasons, involve the Coordinating Group for the Living in Love and Faith project as well as the MPA Council.

*Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester):* Will the Church of England's response affirm and confirm the Church of England's teaching that marriage is between one man and one woman and that sexual relations are intended for the expression, "Only in marriage, as so defined"?

*The Chair:* Excuse me, that is outside the remit of the original question. Thank you.

*Ms Josile Munro (London) asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* What steps is the MPA Council taking to ensure that people of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller heritage are fully welcomed within our churches?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:* MPA/CMEAC host the Churches Network for Gypsy, Traveller and Roma (CNGTR) – an ecumenical group aiming to increase awareness and understanding of issues that affect these communities. We are working with the network in developing a paper on welcoming Gypsy, Traveller and Roma people in the life of the Church and will seek the permission of the Business Committee for a General Synod debate next year.

*The Chair:* We move on to the next section which come under the Business Committee.

## **BUSINESS COMMITTEE**

5. *Revd Timothy Goode (Southwark) asked the Chair of the Business Committee:* Given the Archbishop of Canterbury's call for a radical new inclusion and his observation of loving and monogamous gay relationships of "stunning quality" plus the guidance given by the Bishops of the Lichfield diocese welcoming LGBT people to the Church, which acknowledges the "great contribution" that LGBT Christians are making to our churches, how does the Business Committee's decision not to allow a debate on the Hereford Diocesan Synod motion until after the teaching document has been presented, avoid contradicting the above statements by implying that the teaching document could conclude that LGBTI Christians are not welcomed and valued by the Church?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Business Committee:* In deciding not to schedule any PMMs or DSMs on the subject of human sexuality, the General Synod Business Committee is not making any assumption about the future shape of the resources which are now entitled "Living in Love and Faith, Christian Teaching and Learning about Human Identity, Sexuality and Marriage". The creation of these resources constitutes a major piece of work, involving a wide range of individuals from a whole range of perspectives, including members of General Synod. We were not convinced that scheduling DSMs and PMMs which approached these issues from a particular viewpoint would help the Church of England to proceed productively and coherently on this matter. I would encourage all Synod members to attend the seminars and workshops on Saturday afternoon.

*Revd Tim Goode:* I note that in your answer you stress that the new teaching document will not necessarily be simply a report with recommendations but that it will include the creation of a range of resources. Would you agree that for the Archbishop of Canterbury's call for a radical new inclusion to have any currency in Anglican ecclesiology, these resources need to include liturgical resources and that, without liturgical resources, the call for a radical new inclusion would simply become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy:* I think that you are asking me for an opinion which I am not able to give.

*The Chair:* Yes, I concur, Sue. Thank you.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Is the Chair of the Business Committee aware of the widespread relief felt by many members of Synod and, indeed, of the Church of England that Synod is to be spared further divisive and premature debate on this issue until we have all received the benefit of the learning and wisdom of the Living in Love and Faith Report?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy*: Mr Scowen, I and the rest of Synod have heard your comment. Thank you.

6. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Will the Business Committee take steps to ensure the avoidance of food waste at fringe meetings in London, for example, by ensuring that organisers cater only for the number of people who have signed up for food in advance?

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford)* replied as Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee is very aware of the need to minimise food waste at Synod meetings both in London and in York, especially since the Synod passed a motion on the subject in February of this year. In York, we have reduced food waste by ceasing to provide food for fringe meetings and abandoning the provision of packed lunches after July 2016 when 120 unclaimed packed lunches had to be disposed of. It is the responsibility of those General Synod members who organise fringe meetings in London to minimise food waste by ensuring that they give accurate numbers of those requiring meals. We have also passed members' concerns onto the Church House Conference Centre, who oversee the catering during London groups of sessions.

*The Chair*: Let us move on to the section under the Crown Nominations Commission which covers Questions 7 and 8.

## **CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION**

7. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: Because there are people on the CNC with theological convictions which oblige them to oppose the consecration of women, every appointment, male and female, will necessarily be made "with reference to gender" despite the reference in the first of the Guiding Principles set out in the House of Bishops' Declaration on the Ministry of Bishops and Priests to "all orders of ministry being open equally to all without [any such] reference". The resulting higher bar for women compared to men was not covered specifically in Discerning in Obedience (GS 2080). What plans are there to reduce the bar for women and, correspondingly, to raise it for men?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* replied as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: The Crown Nominations Commission have nominated women to 40% of diocesan sees considered since November 2014. The CNC is committed to working within the Five Guiding Principles, and members of the Commission must confirm that they are committed to the mutual flourishing of all the traditions of the Church of England and thus to the Five Guiding Principles.

*Mrs April Alexander*: What wonderful candidates must the 40% have been with the numbers so stacked against them. Would the Archbishop not agree that other very high calibre women would have been appointed had all considerations been without reference to gender and, if not, is there a good reason why 60% of the appointees were male?



*The Chair:* Excuse me, it is an expression of opinion and so we can leave that one.

8. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough) asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:* Given that the Church of England is committed to the mutual flourishing of all its members, including those evangelicals holding a traditional, biblical, complementarian view of gender equality in ministry (a group which represents a sizeable minority of the church), what plans are there to give them a voice in the House of Bishops by appointing diocesan bishops holding this traditional, time-honoured theological position?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission:* I would like to draw attention to my answer to Mrs Durlacher at Question 33. Although there is currently no diocesan bishop who holds a complementarian view of gender, the Bishop of Maidstone is a suffragan bishop who attends and speaks at meetings of the House of Bishops thereby representing churches with this theological position. The Central Members of the CNC are aware of the importance of mutual flourishing and are committed to the Five Guiding Principles. They will need to continue to reflect on what this means in practice and how it is considered in nominations. The Development & Appointments Group have asked the Chair of the Implementation and Dialogue Group to include senior appointments in its work as it considers examples of good practice and designs resources.

*Revd Mark Lucas:* Whilst noting the answer I received to my question, I would like to remind you that the Bishop of Maidstone has no vote in the House of Bishops. In response to the final sentence of the answer, "The Development & Appointments Group have asked the Chair of the Implementation and Dialogue Group to include senior appointments in its work as it considers examples of good practice and design resources", is it time to include matters of churchmanship in unconscious bias training and perhaps even to introduce quotas in order to ensure mutual flourishing?

*The Archbishop of York:* The Crown Nominations Commission has gone through unconscious bias training and that, actually, covers every bit of bias that you may think of.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford):* Could the Archbishop confirm that the CNC will specifically give dedicated time to its reflections on the practical implications for it of mutual flourishing rather than doing so if time allows during a particular appointment process?

*The Chair:* Excuse me, that is not to do with the original question and so we will leave it there as well. Thank you. Now we move on to Questions under Church Commissioners, Questions 9 to 11.

## CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

9. *Mr William Seddon (St Albans) asked the Church Commissioners:* Given the statement by Sibanye-Stillwater that its takeover of Marikana Mine owner, Lonmin was “like starting on a clean slate” and that it “can’t take on the liabilities of Marikana”, what steps have the Church Commissioners taken, as Lonmin shareholders, to see that the Lonmin commitment made in the aftermath of the 2012 ‘Marikana Massacre’, to build housing for the Marikana workers, is fulfilled?

*Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner:* The Commissioners have a clear policy on the extractive industries, adopted in 2017 following an extensive policy review by the EIAG. This includes clear expectations about the treatment of workers and communities. We have engaged with Lonmin consistently and firmly since Marikana with a particular focus on the need to improve housing. We have written to the Sibanye-Stillwater Chief Executive seeking assurances about Lonmin honouring its commitments if the proposed take-over of the company completes.

10. *Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool) asked the Church Commissioners:* To assist in presenting an integrated and transparent picture of the finances of the National Church Institutions will the Church Commissioners publish their budget or financial projection for 2018 and 2019 and commit to making such publication a regular practice in future?

*Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner:* Following each triennial actuarial review, the Commissioners prepare a three-year spending plan which is shared with beneficiaries such as dioceses, bishops and cathedrals. The current plan for 2017-19 was communicated in mid-2016. However, each year, in the light of updated advice from the independent actuaries, we review whether it remains appropriate to make the planned sums available for distribution and communicate any adjustments to beneficiaries accordingly. Our main general communication tool is the Annual Report which looks forward as well as back. I look forward to presenting this to Synod and taking questions on Monday afternoon.

*Mr Keith Cawdron:* Will the First Estates Commissioner ensure that there is discussion in the Board of the Commissioners of the proposition that in declining to put into the public domain financial forward planning information that is clearly available, the Commissioners are falling short of the expectations of transparency and openness that we have of ourselves and of others, including those in whom we invest?

*Loretta Minghella:* Thank you very much for the question. We do, obviously, want to be transparent and accountable. We publish well in advance to those people who receive funding from us what we expect them to receive in the coming triennium. The current plan for expenditure was shared in 2016, as I said in my written answer, and we are before you on Monday reporting on the year gone by when you can ask us any questions at all about how we have spent our money. I hear the sense of passion in the question and I will, indeed, reflect on it with my colleagues. Thank you.

11. *Ms Jay Greene (Winchester) asked the Church Commissioners:* What are the Commissioners doing to minimise the risk of loss of confidence, both within the Church and in wider society, incurred when the sale of glebe land happens without local consultation?

*Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner:* Dioceses must have regard to guidance issued by the Commissioners on how they should communicate about glebe sales, and respond to comments about such sales from the parish. Dioceses are required to notify the local incumbent and PCC about proposed sales of glebe land, although in future there will no longer be a right to make representations to the Commissioners about it (this was removed by section 11 of the Mission and Pastoral etc. (Amendment) Measure 2018 which took effect on 1 July 2018). We have also previously advised dioceses that diocesan solicitors should expect to see a copy of the notice before completing any contract for a sale of glebe.

*Ms Jay Greene:* Thank you for your answer, but can you tell us how the Church Commissioners monitor when dioceses do not comply, because we are concerned in our diocese and in our deanery about the significant bad publicity?

*Dr Eve Poole:* Thank you very much, Jay, for your question and for giving me this opportunity to talk about glebe because this will be the first and last opportunity I shall be able to do so, as the legislation is changing, so future glebe cases will not come to us with representations. Just to say that we have, as I said in my reply to you, issued guidance to dioceses that we do expect them to have regard to. There will not be, in the future, any possibility of appeal if local people feel they have not been consulted, but there is an opportunity under section 20(3) of the Endowments and Glebe Measure, I think it is, where there is a section that allows the Commissioners to suspend the operation of a diocese's glebe management scheme if there are procedural problems. If you do feel there is anything material of that nature happening then do consult about that particular measure.

*The Chair:* The next section is for the Pensions Board. Question 12.

## **PENSIONS BOARD**

12. *Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells) asked the Chair of the Pensions Board:* It is now some five years since the Board outsourced the provision and maintenance of their clergy pensioners' rented housing stock to Sanctuary Housing. What monitoring of the standard of service provided by Sanctuary to the Board is in place, and how does the Board monitor the tenants' satisfaction (or otherwise) with the timeliness and quality of work done on houses (a) as ingoing works before occupation and (b) when incidental maintenance and repairs are necessary?

*Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Pensions Board:* The standard of service for our rented housing is monitored through monthly reports on performance against a range of indicators set out in the contract with Sanctuary. It is managed through regular meetings at both Director and operational levels. Ingoing works are inspected by a surveyor on completion, and the Board receives a post-work sign-off form and photographs. The Board seeks feedback from customers once they have been living in their new home for a month. For day-to-day repairs and maintenance, Sanctuary's customer services staff telephone a sample of our customers to get feedback on the work that has been completed in their home. The results form part of the monthly performance Report to the Board. All complaints, compliments and other feedback – whether received directly or via Sanctuary – is regularly reviewed, and feeds into a process of continuously improving the service we provide.

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas:* I will undeclare an interest as I have my own house and will not be requiring Pensions Board housing but "on behalf of a friend", as people say, and many members of the House of Clergy, I suspect. Thank you for your answer. The concern that has been expressed to me is that the service given by Sanctuary is not effectively monitored by the Pensions Board. The case is not relevant here, but nine visits to fix a shower and no loft insulation in a house that, according to your answer, has been inspected. Will the Board consider more direct consultation with tenants rather than just one month after they have moved in, but after some experience of having Sanctuary supposedly looking after them?

*Dr Jonathan Spencer:* I will have to consider that proposal and, with my colleagues, see what can be done that is both practical and helps us to monitor the Sanctuary performance better than we do at present, though we do have a range of survey data available to us which on the whole is very favourable.

*The Chair:* Moving on then to the Central Readers Council. There is one Question for them.

## **CENTRAL READERS COUNCIL**

13. *Mr Clive Scowen (London) asked the Chair of the Central Readers Council:* Is there any Canonical or other legal obstacle to Readers/Licensed Lay Ministers continuing to be licensed (rather than receiving permission to officiate) once they have reached the age of 70? If not, on what is the practice of not licensing Readers/ Licensed Lay Ministers beyond the age of 70 based?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Central Readers Council:* It is House of Bishops policy as expressed in the Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry that Readers over the age of 70 should be authorised to exercise their office by way of written permission and on a temporary basis. Under the Canons, a Reader may be licensed by the Bishop or may be authorised to exercise ministry temporarily by way of written permission and these Canons do not refer

to the age of the Reader. It is therefore on the Bishops' Regulations that the practice of not licensing Readers beyond the age of 70 is based. Exceptionally a small number of Readers hold office under common tenure and the age limit provisions applicable to such office holders apply to them.

*Mr Clive Scowen:* Will the House of Bishops now amend the regulations regarding Reader ministry to bring them into line with the retirement provisions for clergy on common tenure and so enable Readers to continue to be licensed beyond the age of 70 if they, their incumbent and their PCC wish it and the bishop considers it appropriate?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I am standing in for the Bishop of Leicester and I will take that question to the Bishop of Leicester who is the Chair of the Central Readers Council.

*The Chair:* Now we move on to Questions 14 to 28, the Archbishops' Council.

## **ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL**

14. *Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Following Bishop Philip North's article in the Church Times (1 June 2018) about the disparity of assets between the northern and southern provinces, how does the Council intend to address this issue?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents:* The disparity of assets is not purely a north/south issue. For example, Birmingham and Canterbury have relatively low levels of assets. In respect of Strategic Development Funding, it is worth noting that all bar one of the northern dioceses have received a grant or have an application in train. The guidelines for the funding make clear that, in general, the greater a diocese's resources, the larger the financial commitment it will be expected to make to its project, although there is no formula about what amount each diocese should contribute. The apportionment formula which determines the sums asked from dioceses towards its budget does consider the differences in historic assets held by dioceses and parishes. When considering its 2019 budget, the Council questioned whether this approach took sufficient account of assets and decided to review this aspect before the 2020 budget is presented to Synod next year.

*Revd Canon Kate Wharton:* Would the Archbishops' Council consider looking at the total resources available for mission across different dioceses and drawing attention to any inequalities which might exist and to researching a mechanism which would allow transfer of assets between dioceses in the spirit of mutuality and sharing all things in common in a way which satisfies charity law?

*Canon Dr John Spence:* There are two elements to this. Will we look at the total investable assets of each diocese? Yes, we will. We will be taking them into account as we deal with the various requests of us as we enter into the 2020-2022 triennium. It would

be quite wrong of me to make any approach for additional funding from the Church Commissioners if we had not equally understood that every part of the Church, every diocese, where it can afford to do so, plays its part in that. The question of taking steps for the transfer of assets between dioceses would be one that would require significant legislation and could only occur not with the will of the Archbishops' Council but with the will of Synod.

15. *Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Will the Archbishops' Council reconsider for future years the decision not to include in its Annual Report for 2017 details of the grants it has given to individual dioceses for Lowest Income Communities Funding, transitional funding and restructuring funding, totalling as they do expenditure of almost £45m?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* A list of Lowest Income Communities Funding grants made to dioceses in 2017 has been provided in response to Father Benfield's question. I consider the most appropriate place to publish details of these grants in future is as an appendix to the Annual Report of the Strategic Investment Board (SIB – the 2017 Report is GS Misc 1198). I will ensure this is done in the 2018 Report.

*Mr Keith Cawdron:* I thank Canon Spence for the information that he has provided, and in noting that he has not provided all that I actually referred to. Will he ask the Finance Committee to consider whether it is right that seeking basic information about financial planning decisions should sometimes feel like pulling teeth?

*Canon Dr John Spence:* The last thing I would wish Keith to feel is that his teeth are being pulled. I would observe if I tried to pull teeth I would probably end up in the armpit. Keith, you made a very good point and I gave you an answer and it has been the subject of further conversation since. I am going to be having a conversation with Mary Chapman, the Chair of the Audit Committee, as to how best we can give you the information you require. I suggested I might do that through the Strategy Investment Board Report. We will debate whether it would be better as an adjunct to the Report and Accounts of the Archbishops' Council. Taking into account that you cannot be selective as to which grants you are going to publish, if you need to do it you really ought to do it for them all and that will mean quite a lot work and quite a lot of potential cost. We will look at it, Keith, and I will want your mouth to feel much more comfortable in future.

16. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Which dioceses receive Lowest Income Communities Funding from the Council and what is the amount of such funding that each diocese receives?

*Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Lowest Income Communities (LInC) grants paid to dioceses in 2017, which were calculated in accordance with the agreed formula are listed below:

Diocese	2017 LInC Funding
Birmingham	£1,600,845
Blackburn	£1,205,636
Bristol	£354,892
Canterbury	£679,939
Carlisle	£388,205
Chelmsford	£689,908
Coventry	£402,855
Derby	£800,474
Durham	£1,415,457
Exeter	£895,507
Hereford	£266,910
Leicester	£806,642
Lichfield	£1,529,826
Lincoln	£946,613
Liverpool	£1,461,444
Manchester	£1,813,761
Newcastle	£815,870
Norwich	£762,698
Portsmouth	£428,134
Sheffield	£1,334,898
Southwell & Nottingham	£1,025,261
Truro	£767,593
Worcester	£689,130
York	£1,101,465
Leeds	£1,664,426
Europe	£151,610
<b>Total</b>	<b>£24,000,000</b>

The Council has agreed the planned grant levels for 2018 and 2019. Funding for 2020-2022 will be considered as part of the wider planning for distributions from the Church Commissioners' funds in the next triennium.

17. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* What monitoring is done of the 25 dioceses that receive Lowest Income Communities Funding from the Council to ensure that the funding aids only the lowest income communities and parishes and is not used for the benefit of all communities and parishes in those dioceses?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Dioceses are asked to report annually on their use of the funding. The first

survey took place at the beginning of this year. Dioceses were asked to describe their current approach to distributing the funding in order to support and develop the Church's mission and growth in the lowest income communities. They were also asked to list which parishes received support. An analysis of their responses will be considered by the Strategic Investment Board which is responsible for the distribution of this funding on behalf of the Archbishops' Council. The use of the funding will continue to be closely monitored. This funding is committed for 2017-19 and its effective use will be reviewed during preparations for the 2020-22 budgeting period.

*Revd Paul Benfield:* Is consideration being given to withholding funding from dioceses which do not show that they are distributing the funds to the lowest income communities?

*Canon Dr John Spence:* Thank you, Fr Benfield, and I would sincerely hope that that is not the case. As I have indicated in my response, we are collating all the reports that have come in from the dioceses at this stage and I have no reason to believe that they are using them in any other way than that which it was intended. We are firmly committed to continuing funding for lower income communities. We will, in any case, need to review the methodology of that at the end of the 2017-2019 triennium and ahead of the 2020-2022 triennium in order that we can ensure that they are being most efficacious from the viewpoint of the dioceses and the needs of those communities.

With the leave of the Chair, I would be grateful if I could clarify some points, as members have identified that there are some differences in numbers in various reports. The number of dioceses receiving link community funding is 25. There is an element in the Report and Accounts to the Archbishops' Council which refers to 26. That is because under that one heading they included the one grant to the Diocese of Europe. That was for convenience but it is not, of course, link funding. In the Church Commissioners' Report, you will hear reference to 27. That is because, on top of those 26, there is reference to the one diocese that receives transition funding but not link funding. Thank you very much.

18. *Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* How much funding has been provided by the Council by way of Strategic Development Funding towards the establishment of Resource Churches?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Out of £44m of Strategic Development Funding awarded in 2017, £15.3m has been awarded to programmes to revitalise mission and ministry in cities and large towns which are centred on the establishment of Resource Churches. In some cases, the figures also include funding towards a wider programme of church planting and renewal.

19. *Ven. Cherry Vann (Manchester) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Has the Council established a committee for the purposes of exercising the functions conferred upon the Council by the Legislative Reform Measure 2018 and, if it has, who are the members of that committee?



*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* At its meeting in May 2018 the Council established a committee ('the Legislative Reform Committee') to exercise its functions under ss.1 to 7 of the Legislative Reform Measure 2018. Its members are the Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) (Chair), Canon Adrian Greenwood (Southwark), Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford), the Revd Graeme Buttery (Durham) and the Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter).

20. *Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Pursuant to the Legislative Reform Measure, passed by Synod in July 2017 (GS 2027B):

- 1 What orders are the Archbishops' Council currently considering in order to remove or reduce burdens from ecclesiastical legislation; and
- 2 When are any such orders likely to be laid before the General Synod?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Following the Royal Assent being given to the Measure on 10 May this year, the committee established by the Council to exercise its functions under the Measure will be meeting during of this group of sessions to begin the process of agreeing a programme of work to be taken forward by Legislative Reform Orders in the coming few years, in the light of the Council's Quinquennial Goals. Once that has been developed, consultation on the terms of one or more draft Orders will take place in accordance with the Measure, with a view to laying them before the Synod in early 2019. Steps are also being taken to constitute the Scrutiny Committee, the role of which is to consider and report to the Synod on draft Legislative Reform Orders.

*Mr David Lamming (Salisbury):* If necessary, I declare an interest, first of all, as a member of the Revision Committee, for this particular Measure referred to in the question. At the end of the answer, you say that steps are being taken to constitute the Scrutiny Committee. Bearing in mind that the Standing Orders, which were distributed to us today, provide that the Scrutiny Committee is to include three members of Synod elected by the Synod and three members appointed by the Appointments Committee, and that the first election of members must take place as soon as reasonably practicable after this Standing Order comes into operation, can you give Synod any guidance as to what the timetable is for establishing the Committee?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler:* Mr Lamming, as you will see, the Measure only received Royal Assent in May, so the actual committee has only just been formed. I imagine, although I cannot quite get the answer quite so clearly as you might hope, that the election process will take place in the normal way and I imagine that will happen in the next few months. Certainly, although the Committee has not met yet, it is our intention that we should lay an order before this Synod early next year with a view to taking the process forward from there. I hope very much that we will have a Scrutiny Committee in place in order to take the whole process forward.

21. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The unsung heroes of the Church of England are the huge numbers of Christians whose voluntary work in their communities provides a living witness day by day to "love your neighbour as yourself". Why does the Church not embrace these activities more visibly, so that those who currently see no relevance for the Christian faith in their lives might be inspired and seek to discover more by joining in these good works?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* The voluntary work of Christians is crucial, both inherently, and as witness – that's why serving churches tend to be growing churches. The Church embraces these activities enthusiastically, both in theology and practice, and I could list numerous MPA-led programmes under the Archbishops' Council's Objective 4 – 'Pursuing the Common Good' – all of which are exceeded by local parish and diocesan work. But we do need to enhance visibility. That's why we are now building a new section of the Church's website highlighting the Church's role in community action, and 'A Church Near You' already enables parishes to highlight the substantial work being done locally. We are determined to identify the Church much better in future with the unconditional Christ-like love being provided by so many of its members to those in need and urge all dioceses to make the visibility of that commitment a central part of their mission.

*Mr Gavin Oldham:* I hope all members will have seen your call for dioceses to make visibility of community action a central part of their mission. Is the Archbishops' Council aware of the strong correlation between the decline in the Church's membership and the handing over of welfare responsibility to the state over the past 70 years as resolved by the Lambeth Conference in 1948? The text of that resolution is shown in question 36.

*Mr Mark Sheard:* Yes, indeed.

*The Chair:* Actually, this is outside the scope of the original question.

22. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What actions have those working to implement *Setting God's People Free* taken so far to encourage the 'man or woman in the pew' to get involved with any of the many long-standing professional organisations of Christian lay people, as appropriate - such as the Association of Christian Teachers, the Christian Medical Fellowship and the wider Transform Work UK network; and what plans are there for such encouragement in the future?

*Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* The implementation of *Setting God's People Free* has focussed on work across dioceses to prioritise the calling of all God's people to seek to serve God in the workplace as well as in local communities, at school and college, through leisure and recreation activities. This includes the promotion of resources to support Christians in the workplace alongside work to enable a more supportive culture towards faith in the workplace in worshipping communities. The importance of prioritising this cultural shift, and the Church

of England's resources to support this, has been promoted by Transform Work UK. Given the rapidly changing nature of the workplace it is vital to engage with longstanding and newer groupings that help to stimulate a Kingdom understanding of work. The SGPF team interacts with a variety of such networks and encourages awareness and connection to such groupings through sharing of stories and experience in local contexts.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* Will the *Setting God's People Free* team ensure it encourages awareness and connection to groups which promote the role of lay leadership for all Anglicans which, independent of their sexuality, are not those groups which say that we have to be disciplined and not allowed to be part of a lay leadership team?

*Mr Mark Sheard:* I think *Setting God's People Free* is, indeed, for all people.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* Thank you.

*Mr Mark Sheard:* End of.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* So, you will only promote those groups which do all?

*The Chair:* Jayne, thank you.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* Thank you.

*Mr Mark Sheard:* I do not think that is quite what I said, Jayne, is it?

23. *Revd Canon Barney de Berry (Canterbury) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* Evangelism and the work of the Archbishops' Evangelism Task Group should be things that the whole Church of England can unite around. With two of the most gifted Evangelists in the Church feeling that they could no longer be part of the Group and resigning from it, what steps will the Council's Evangelism and Discipleship Team be taking to make sure that the implementation of the Group's recommendations is something around which we can all unite?

*Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* We are passionately committed to helping communicate the good news of Jesus Christ relevantly to the nation and supporting our dioceses and parishes in this vital work. The newly formed Evangelism and Discipleship Team is committed to ensuring its work is something around which the whole church can unite and work together on. The team members themselves represent a wide cross-section of the church. Whatever we are developing and resourcing is always done with the widest consultation possible with differing parts of the Church.

24. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* The concept of Jesus Christ as Lord and Judge is not explained on either the Church of England's website or Alexa. Did those who write and approve the theological content of

these consider providing a link from the Church of England website to the gospel outline known as “Two ways to live” ([www.matthiasmedia.com.au/2wtl/](http://www.matthiasmedia.com.au/2wtl/))?

*The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:* The content for both the Church of England website’s ‘Our Faith’ section and the Amazon Alexa skill is based on the Church’s Pilgrim discipleship resource, commissioned by the House of Bishops and written by Steven Croft, Stephen Cottrell, Paula Gooder and Robert Atwell. Both the ‘Our Faith’ section and the Amazon skill highlight the Apostles’ Creed – one of four core texts at the heart of Pilgrim – which, of course, sets out that Jesus “will come to judge the living and the dead”. We would be wary of linking to a non-Church of England resource as we wouldn’t be able to maintain editorial control if the content of the third-party website suddenly changed.

*Miss Debbie Buggs:* Will the people who work on the website consider communicating with Matthias Media to see whether their material can be hosted on the Church of England website as well?

*The Bishop of Ely:* I think that the answer to the question is that I will take this up and see what we may do, but I cannot give you an immediate answer.

25. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:* From the most recent data, how many dioceses have seen growth in the number of regular services held within their churches?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:* Since 2013 the annual Statistics for Mission return requested from every church each year has asked about the number of services during October. The most recent data relate to 2016. Over the period 2013-16, the proportion of churches declaring a number of services has increased as churches have become more familiar with the question. The proportion of churches declaring zero services has also reduced over the period but it is likely this is also an improvement in data quality rather than a true decrease.

*Mr Robin Lunn:* Thank you for your answer. Do we know if the growth in services has led to a growth in attendances at these services?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I do not have that information but I will find out.

26. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:* From the most recent data, how many parishes hold more than two services per Sunday? Is this greater than ten years ago?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council:* Since 2013 the annual Statistics for Mission

(SfM) return requested from every church each year has asked about the number of services during October. The most recent data relate to 2016. Therefore, it is not possible to provide a comparison with ten years previously as these data were not collected in 2006. Considering data for 2016, 2,300 church SfM returns declared more than two services per week on average during October. This represents 17% of all SfM returns that gave numbers of services. Some church SfM returns include figures for one or more other churches in the parish, and therefore the reported number of services given above may have taken place across two or more churches.

*Mr Robin Lunn:* Are we seeing a growth in services on other days of the week apart from Sundays?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I will have to repeat my previous answer.

27. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* This May, the Church Times reported numerical research by the Revd Dr Robert Barlow suggesting (unsurprisingly) that most people did not like to travel to other villages and that "Rotating services in rural areas is 'a failure'". The editor of *Rural Theology*, Canon Leslie Francis, said the wider Church of England needed to invest more in such research and in listening to and respecting the views of people in rural situations. Are there plans to do what Canon Francis suggests?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* In recent years the Archbishops' Council and the Renewal and Reform Programme have published research on the rural church including *Released for Mission: Growing the Rural Church* (2015), *Going Deeper: Church Attendance Statistics and Clergy Deployment* (2016) and *Strategies for Mission and Growth in Rural Multi-Church Groups* (2017). Good quality research, like that conducted by Revd Dr Barlow, is an important basis for strategic decision-making in parishes, benefices and dioceses alike. Additionally, Germinate: Arthur Rank Centre, for example, has a range of tools and resources to assist rural congregations, PCCs and clergy to listen to their communities and learn from their views and experiences. Research has been encouraged as part of the SDF process for the benefit of the wider church. This includes specific rural mission programmes in two dioceses. The Archbishops' Council would encourage further research in this area, including where appropriate through the SDF process.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond:* Thank you for the very full answer. In view of saying that it was good quality research, does the wider Church give guidance then about rotating services in rural situations amongst various churches?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I declare an interest being a Bishop in a rural diocese and I would love to see some sort of guidance around this, or at least the guidance which reflects the fact that no one rural area is like any other rural area. I will take this away with an interest in trying to see what we can do in terms of just sharing

good information and good experience and recognise that it is not replicable in every single place, but it is helpful to understand the response.

*Ms Caroline Herbert (Norwich):* As a member of the Rural Affairs Group, I wondered if the Bishop was aware of the fringe meeting on Monday lunchtime, which includes an opportunity to contribute ideas and experience to shape future research and resourcing to support rural churches?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I am now!

The Chair: Thank you, Caroline, for that reminder.

28. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford) asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:* How will the Council's World Mission and Anglican Communion Panel be taking steps to encourage dioceses and parishes to build relationships with the newly-constituted Anglican Church in Brazil?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as President of the Archbishops' Council:* There are no plans to encourage links with the newly formed Anglican Church of Brazil. Relationships between parishes and dioceses of the Church of England with Churches not in communion with the Church of England are governed by the usual rules of ecumenical relations.

*Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone:* Thank you for the answer. I am surprised to hear there are no plans given the excellent debate on these links in the February Synod. I wonder if the Archbishop can lead us by example by putting Brazil on your itinerary next time you are in the Americas as part of our desire to promote global Christian unity?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I think that is a question on my own activities and plans, which I think is out of order.

*The Chair:* Yes, that is fair enough. I agree with you, Archbishop Justin. The next section for the House of Bishops, we go from Questions 29 to 61. This is the largest section.

## **HOUSE OF BISHOPS**

29. *Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* What plans does the House of Bishops have to consider and respond to the "Letter to the Churches" issued by the GAFCON Conference in Jerusalem in June 2018?

30. *Mr Andrew Bell (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Given that GAFCON includes leaders of a large majority of Anglicans worldwide, how will the House of Bishops, on behalf of the Church of England, respond to the "Letter to the Churches" issued at their recent assembly in Jerusalem, and how will they relate to provinces not currently accepted as part of the Anglican Communion?

31. *Dr Simon Clift (Winchester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Recognising the significance for the Anglican Communion of the recent GAFCON Assembly in Jerusalem which included 38 Archbishops and 16 Primates representing an estimated 50 of the 70 million Anglicans in the world, what steps are being taken to build good relationships with GAFCON in order to respond to their “Letter to the Churches” and to assure them that there are many of us here in Synod, across all three houses, who would share their commitment to the scriptures and the historical teaching of the Church?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied:* With permission, I will answer Questions 29, 30 and 31 together. We place a very high value on maintaining good relationships with other churches. To this end, several conversations are taking place at episcopal level with different churches in order to ensure that our relationships with these churches continue to flourish. With regards to the letter issued by the recent GAFCON Conference, the House of Bishops has no specific plans at this stage to consider the GAFCON letter at a future meeting. However, we do believe that it is important to note and welcome events that happen around the world that aid the life and wellbeing of the Anglican Communion. It is always open for Churches around the world to approach the Anglican Communion if they want to become provinces recognised by the Anglican Communion.

*Mrs Susannah Leafe:* I think I have to declare an interest. I was one of the 1,950 delegates from over 50 countries who attended GAFCON in Jerusalem. If I may, I am glad to say that those of who you missed it can catch up, as they say, and join the hundreds of thousands who made use of the recorded livestream of the events. Naturally, I am disappointed by the initial answer that the House of Bishops have no plans to discuss the “Letter to the Churches”. My question is simple. Why, when they knew that GAFCON was taking place, have no plans been made to discuss the outcome?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I am grateful for the question. It does not really add much to, I think, the questions you had asked already and I think I would want to echo the answer that I made earlier. We welcome very warmly all groups across the Anglican Communion that seek the flourishing of the life of the Communion, but we do not always discuss the different propositions that are made by them.

*Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough):* I just wanted to ask on the answer on page 18 where reference is made to maintaining good relationships with other Churches. However, GAFCON is not another church. It is part of the Anglican Communion. It is the same Church that we are here representing and represents, indeed, far more of the Anglican Communion than we do. It does seem to make a lot of sense to make more comment on it here at this group so that we know what is going on, those who are not there.

*The Chair:* So, what is your question?

*Revd Mark Lucas:* The question is can we have an opportunity - I am aware it is going to be difficult here, but maybe at the next Synod meeting - for a presentation on what went on at GAFCON Jerusalem 2018? There are a number of us here that were there that would be very happy to do that.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* Thank you very much for the question. I rather suspect that is one for the Business Committee, not for me.

*Revd Mark Lucas:* Okay.

*The Chair:* Yes, absolutely. Thank you.

*Dr Andrew Bell:* Thank you for your reply. As you agree that it is important to note and welcome events, how did the House of Bishops note and welcome GAFCON as the largest Anglican gathering in 50 years or how will it so note and welcome?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* Thank you very much indeed for your supplementary. There has not been a meeting of the House of Bishops since the GAFCON meeting, so the answer to that is it has not yet had an opportunity to do so. How will it do so? I can only quote Groucho Marx, "I never make predictions, especially about the future".

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Is the Archbishop aware that there are larger Anglican meetings in the world in other parts of the world where 4,000 people turn up for celebration when people are ordained as new brothers?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* Thank you very much for the question. I am aware of a very wide range of meetings and celebrations, many of which I often go to.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I note that the Archbishop has commented that it is open to Churches around the world to approach the Anglican Communion if they want to become provinces recognised by the Communion. I would like to ask whether that has happened and, if so, what the response has been?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* I think, technically, that is a question about the Anglican Communion. I am not aware of it having happened - ever.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I am aware as a member of the Archbishops' Council that the Archbishop briefs the Council on Anglican Communion matters, does he brief the House on Anglican Communion matters?

*The Archbishop of Canterbury:* Thank you very much, Simon. I do, indeed.

32. *Mrs Vivienne Goddard (Blackburn) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Since the coming into force of the legislation on women in the episcopate and the making of the House of Bishops' Declaration embodying the 'Five Guiding Principles',



- i. how many (a) women, (b) traditionalist Catholics, (c) conservative evangelicals have been made bishops;
- ii. how many (a) women, (b) traditionalist Catholics, (c) conservative evangelicals have been made deans;
- iii. how many (a) women, (b) traditionalist Catholics, (c) conservative evangelicals have been made archdeacons?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Vice Chair of the House of Bishops:* The number of appointments between November 2014 and June 2018 is as follows: 14 women have been appointed as bishops, three as deans and 20 as archdeacons. In relation to traditionalist Catholics and conservative evangelicals, such labels can be imprecise. If Mrs Goddard means those who are unable for theological reasons to recognise the priestly or episcopal ministry of women, then no archdeacons or deans have been appointed. Since the legislation has come into force two bishops have been appointed who do not ordain women.

*Mrs Vivienne Goddard:* Given that, apart from Maidstone and Burnley, the two that the Archbishop mentions, there are only five other serving Bishops who do not ordain women, what does the House of Bishops intend to do about this apparent discrimination?

*The Archbishop of York:* I was making my way to the platform but I did not hear the question.

*Mrs Vivienne Goddard:* Given that, apart from Maidstone and Burnley, to which you refer, there are only five other serving Bishops who do not ordain women, what does the House of Bishops intend to do about this apparent discrimination?

*The Chair:* It is outside the question, really. Thank you.

33. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* With reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury's assurance, quoted in the forward to the 2018 FAOC resource for Study, 'The Five Guiding Principles' ("I say again that the Church of England is deeply committed to the flourishing of all those who are part of its life in the grace of God. It is not our intention that any particular group should wither on the vine."), what progress has been made or is planned so that the current solitary role the Bishop of Maidstone has in representing a significant percentage of conservative evangelical churches in the House of Bishops may be addressed in terms of appointing more such bishops and in according them voting rights in the House of Bishops, to give some balance to the growing numbers of women elected to the episcopacy, either as Diocesan or Suffragan Bishops?

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Vice-Chair of the House of Bishops:* I would like to draw attention to my answer to the Revd Mark Lucas at Question 8. Although there is currently no diocesan bishop who holds a complementarian view of gender, the Bishop of Maidstone plays an important role

attending and speaking at the House of Bishops thereby representing churches with this theological position. Only full members of the House have the right to vote and there are no current plans to change this. The Central Members of the CNC and Diocesan Bishops are aware of the importance of mutual flourishing and are committed to the Five Guiding Principles. They will need to continue to reflect on what this means in practice and how it is considered in nominations. The Development & Appointments Group have asked the Chair of the Implementation and Dialogue Group to include senior appointments in its work as it considers examples of good practice and designs resources.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* Sorry to make you come back, Archbishop. A bit like the persistent widow and that infuriating message on the tube, "Mind the Gap", the gap never seems to get closed and, when it comes to repairing the selection of people, of able people for high office, particularly for bishops and preferably diocesan bishops, it is woefully, is it not, inadequate? How are you proposing to change the criteria which was apparently so inimical to getting proper representation?

*The Archbishop of York:* The Crown Nominations Commission, Archbishops in their appointments, the deans in their appointments, the Orders actually adhere to the Five Guiding Principles where there is a hope for mutual flourishing and the work which was done by Oliver O'Donovan is playing a major part. The review by Sir Philip Mawer has got groups that are working on those particular recommendations. All I can say is that it is already invidious to think that people have got within their heads to be discriminatory. The processes, the way they work, may not produce the result that you want but, in terms of when either the Archbishop of Canterbury or myself are chairing the Crown Nominations Commission, the Five Guiding Principles are abided by the people that are coming and they are asked questions. How then the result turns out is a matter which you could not second guess, hence the work by Professor O'Donovan and also Sir Philip Mawer's Report and groups have now been set up to work at that particular work and we are hoping that, in the not distant future, change may appear.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher:* Thank you for your answer.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* Yes, Sue Booy for a point of order. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Chair, I very clearly heard you ask people to make their way to a microphone if they were planning to ask a supplementary. I am not sure that everybody else heard you and I wondered if you would like to say it again.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Sue. Your words will suffice, thank you very much. If everyone could remember that, please, that would be helpful for the smooth running.

34. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Sir Philip Mawer recommended at the end of his Report on the See of Sheffield "that the House of

Bishops commissions a group with balanced membership to review what has been done to inform and educate clergy and laity about the Settlement agreed in 2014” (Press Statement 15 September 2017). Is the House of Bishops able to assure us that, in going about its work, that group will proceed on the basis that the Five Guiding Principles all have to be read and applied in such a way as to give effect to the statement in the first Guiding Principle that “all orders of ministry [are] open equally to all, without reference to Gender”?

*The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Five Guiding Principles in the House of Bishops’ Declaration on the Ministry of Bishops and Priests were extensively debated in Synod in February 2014. When issued by the House in the light of that debate in June 2014, the House prefaced them by saying that ‘they need to be read one with the other and held together in tension’ (para 5 of GS Misc 1076). That remains the way the Principles should be read and applied by us all, including the Implementation and Dialogue Group which I chair (and which was set up in response to Sir Philip Mawer’s first recommendation). I commend to Synod the Faith & Order Commission’s publication – *The Five Guiding Principles: A Resource for Study* (2018), which includes a helpful commentary on the Five Guiding Principles.

35. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What impact has the “turning up the volume” initiative had on increasing the numbers of BAME clergy in senior roles?

*The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd James Langstaff) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The work of TUTV has made a strong contribution to highlighting the missional imperative of BAME inclusion and representation in our senior roles. Since TUTV began its work in 2012, working group members have participated in the College and House of Bishops, and we have facilitated discussions in a number of bishops’ staff meetings. Whilst not solely attributable to the work of TUTV, the number of BAME bishops has more than doubled and at least four BAME clergy have been appointed as Archdeacons since 2012. BAME clergy make up approximately 10% of the participants in the Strategic Leadership Development Programme, and we have also provided development opportunities to a number of BAME clergy.

*Ms Josile Munro:* Thank you for your reply. I wanted to ask, given these new appointments identified in your reply and for Synod to know what the progress of “turning up the volume” is, what is the current percentage of BAME clergy with senior roles in the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Rochester:* I do not have that precisely in my head, but what I can tell you is that the current percentage of BAME clergy in senior roles on the back of these appointments is pretty close to the percentage of clergy overall in the Church of England. That does not mean that we should not be going further. It is fairly closely representative now of the overall proportion within the Church of England as a whole of all ordained

persons, but I would not want us to be complacent about that because we need to keep working away at it.

*Ms Josile Munro:* Good, thank you.

36. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In 1948, the same year as the NHS was founded, the Lambeth Conference passed a resolution stating: "We believe that the State is under the moral law of God, and is intended by Him to be an instrument for human welfare. We therefore welcome the growing concern and care of the modern State for its citizens, and call upon Church members to accept their own political responsibility and to co-operate with the State and its officers in their work." Does this remain the Church's position and, if so, how does the Church reconcile its support for universal distribution when that welfare system has demonstrably reduced the quantum of resources available for targeting help on the poor and most disadvantaged, as we are taught by the Christian Gospel?

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* There is nothing in the 1948 Lambeth Conference resolution nor, indeed, in the work of Archbishop William Temple whose ideas it reflected, which reduces the concept of welfare to nothing more than supporting the poorest. On the contrary, in Temple's work there is a very strong theme that citizens' participation together in all social structures is essential to the welfare of everyone. Theological reflections on welfare policy were most recently explored in the paper *Thinking Afresh about Welfare: The Enemy Isolation*, drafted for the House of Bishops and circulated for discussion in 2016. It can be found on the website. There is no single Church of England position on welfare economics, although I hope we continue to hold that Christians can provisionally support a state which seeks to maximise the welfare of all its citizens and does not stigmatise the poor by marginalising structures which express solidarity with the disadvantaged.

*Mr Gavin Oldham:* If by marginalising structures which express solidarity with the disadvantaged, he is describing, for example, the child tax credits system which benefits one in six of the poorest families in the United Kingdom, is he aware that the Government has found it necessary, as the Institute of Financial Studies puts it, to significantly reduce the income of low income working age households, particularly those with children, so that the universal Health Service can enjoy a further £20 billion each year in contrast to higher taxpayers paying a mandatory individual insurance premium to cover the cost of their use of the Health Service?

*The Bishop of Durham:* The very specifics were not at the top of my head, Gavin, but please be assured that we are involved deeply, regularly in debates with Government and government departments about every aspect of child benefits and child welfare, believing that we have to improve the system for the nation as a whole.

37. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Can the House outline to Synod the nature of the disagreements that currently are holding

up the publication of the Report of the Working Group on the Seal of the Confessional, and what steps the Chair is taking to find a resolution?

*The Bishop at Lambeth (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Seal of the Confessional Working Group presented its Report to the House of Bishops in May. It should come as no surprise that there were differences of view about the retention or abolition of the Seal. The House decided that the subject matter lent itself to wider consultation with the College of Bishops (comprising all diocesan and suffragan bishops). This is due to take place in the context of bishops' regional groups over the autumn prior to a discussion about the pros and cons of retaining the Seal in December (by which time the Archbishops' Council – which commissioned this piece of work – will also have had an opportunity to consider the Report).

*Revd Canon Simon Butler.* Thank you for the answer, Bishop Tim. I wonder if you could give me some idea of what process you are going to take the College through so that they just do not repeat the inability to find a common mind that the House has clearly found so far?

*The Bishop at Lambeth:* As the answer says, I think the College is going to meet not altogether but through the regional processes, and a group is looking to how we can put together sort of advice but also people to give their opinions, if you like. So, from people who feel very strongly about this, we are going to try and give all the regions as many resources as we can so that they can discuss these in the regions with as many Bishops as possible so that when we come to the House in December the debate is as informed as it can be when we are going to have to make a decision.

38. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Was what is stated about the Seal of the Confessional in part 3 of the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy prepared with the advice of the Legal Office; and, if so, has the Legal Office subsequently changed its legal advice that “if a penitent makes a confession with the intention of receiving absolution the priest is forbidden (by the unrepealed Proviso to Canon 113 of the Code of 1603) to reveal or make known to any person what has been confessed” or that the Canon imposes a “requirement of absolute confidentiality”?

39. *Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Since publicity has been given to advice from the Diocese of Canterbury and the Deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey, which appears to put at risk the Seal of the Confessional in those places, what measures have been taken to publicly reassure penitents that no changes have been made to the Canon Law and guidelines which assure absolute confidentiality of sins divulged during confession?

*The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* With permission I shall answer the questions from Mr Hogg and Dr Newcombe together. I can confirm that the Legal Advice summarised in Section 3 of Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy (2015) remains the Church's official

position on the ministry of absolution. This is too long to include in full in this answer but a copy is available on the Notice Board in the concourse.

*The Ministry of Absolution - Extract from 'Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy' 2015*

**Reconciliation**

**3. They are to teach and to admonish, to feed and provide for his family, to search for his children in the wilderness of this world's temptations, and to guide them through its confusions, that they may be saved through Christ for ever. They are to call their hearers to repentance and to declare in Christ's name the absolution and forgiveness of their sins.**

*3.1 The ministry of reconciliation, as an extension of Jesus' own ministry, lies at the heart of this vocation. It is to be exercised gently, patiently and undergirded by mutual trust. It may include spiritual or godly counsel as appropriate and as requested by those concerned; it may include mediation between those who have found themselves at enmity with one another.*

*3.2 Where it is freely sought by a penitent, a priest may exercise the formal ministry of absolution as described in Canon B 29.*

*3.3 The ministry of absolution may only be exercised by the minister who has the cure of souls of the place in question or by another priest with that minister's permission, or by a priest who is authorized by law to exercise ministry in that place without being subject to the control of the minister who has the cure of souls (e.g. a priest who is licensed to exercise ministry under the Extra-Parochial Ministry Measure 1967).*

*This rule is subject to an exception that permits a priest to exercise the ministry of absolution anywhere in respect of a person who is in danger of death or if there is "some urgent or weighty cause" (See Canon B 29.4)*

*3.4 Before undertaking the ministry of absolution a priest should receive appropriate training and be familiar with any guidelines published by the House of Bishops that relate to the exercise of this ministry.*

*3.5 A clear distinction must be made between pastoral conversations and a confession that is made in the context of the ministry of absolution. Where such a confession is to be made both the priest and the penitent should be clear that that is the case. If a penitent makes a confession with the intention of receiving absolution the priest is forbidden (by the unrepealed Proviso to Canon 113 of the Code of 1603) to reveal or make known to any person what has been confessed.*

*This requirement of absolute confidentiality applies even after the death of the penitent.*

**3.6** *If, in the context of such a confession, the penitent discloses that he or she has committed a serious crime, such as the abuse of children or vulnerable adults, the priest must require the penitent to report his or her conduct to the police or other statutory authority. If the penitent refuses to do so the priest should withhold absolution.*

**3.7** *The canonical duty of absolute confidentiality does not apply to anything that is said outside the context of such a confession. In particular, if information about abuse that was disclosed when seeking the ministry of absolution is repeated by the penitent outside that context the priest must follow the established procedures for reporting abuse of children or vulnerable adults.*

**3.8** *However confidentiality extends far beyond the specific situation of the ministry of absolution. People have to be able to trust clergy with their stories, their fears, and especially their confidences. The duty of confidentiality relating to the ministry of absolution sets a standard for our ministry against which all other instances should be set and judged. Those to whom we minister must know that they can depend upon us not to disclose information which they have shared with us in confidence.*

**Note:** *The text of this section reflects the current legal position in relation to the ministry of absolution, arising from the unrepealed proviso to Canon 113 of the Code of 1603. In September 2014 the Archbishops' Council decided to commission further theological and legal work to enable it to review, in consultation with the House of Bishops, the purpose and effect of the proviso to the Canon of 1603, with a view to enabling the General Synod to decide whether it wished to legislate to amend it.*

*Mr Bradley Smith (Chichester):* Since the answer confirms that the legal advice contained in the Guidelines represents the Church's official position on the Seal of the Confessional, what will be done to ensure that conflicting advice, such as that recently offered by the Diocese of Canterbury, will be withdrawn and when?

*The Bishop of Ely:* All I can say is that my answer to this question is a public answer which will be in the public domain and makes clear the Church of England's position as things stand.

*Dr Lindsay Newcombe:* The written response to my question did not actually answer my question and I think you have partially answered that question now about whether measures have been taken to reassure penitents that the law has not changed. However, this morning *The Times* raised this issue in a negative way and the publicity around the Canterbury guidance has destabilised the certainty that people have in this ministry of the

Church which is so important and so freeing. Will steps be made now to make a more public statement on this?

*The Bishop of Ely:* As I have already said, my answer will be very public and is the clear view of the Church of England on the Seal of the Confessional in advance of any other conversations and debates, which will proceed as the Bishop of Lambeth has outlined. That is the guarantee that we can issue at this stage.

*Dr Lindsay Newcombe:* Can I ask a supplementary for the other question?

*The Chair:* No, Lindsay. Thank you. Thanks for understanding.

40. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Could the Chair of the House of Bishops confirm whether it remains the Church of England's official position that lay people in registered civil partnerships are able (i) to be admitted to baptism, confirmation and communion without any questions as to the nature of their relationship and (ii) whether their children are eligible for baptism as set out in Civil Partnerships – A Pastoral Statement from the House of Bishops of the Church of England (July 2005)?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* According to the 2005 Pastoral Statement, 'lay people who have registered civil partnerships ought not to be asked to give assurances about the nature of their relationship before being admitted to baptism, confirmation and communion.' As the Statement also explains, 'we believe an unconditional welcome should be given to children in our churches, regardless of the structure of the family in which they are being brought up,' a welcome that includes the offer of baptism 'provided there is a willingness, following a period of instruction', for parents and godparents to make the vows set out in the baptism service.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* Thank you for your answer, Bishop Christine. Given that there are many LGBTI Anglicans in civil partnerships who have been refused communion and who have been told that their children cannot be baptized in various Anglican churches around the country, what is the proper process by which they should register their hurt and anger with the welcome that they have received?

*Bishop of Newcastle:* The statements made in the Pastoral Statement from the House of Bishops 2005 state, in slightly softer language, the situation that actually is expressed very clearly in our Canons. If you look at the Canons, particularly B 15 and B 16 for Communion, B 22 for baptism, there is a very clear statement of what happens if someone is to be excluded from Communion, which can only happen with the authority of the diocesan bishop. There is also a very clear statement about admission of infants for baptism. In both cases, it is to the diocesan bishop that recourse should be made.



*Dr Angus Goudie (Durham):* As a method of assuring that this welcome will be made clear across the churches of the Church of England, will the House of Bishops commend the Lichfield Letter to Clergy as a model that could be used by other dioceses to encourage their churches to give a general welcome, as this is something that would not step beyond Church of England teaching or prejudge the areas of the teaching document?

*Bishop of Newcastle:* I cannot make promises on behalf of the House of Bishops, but we are certainly, and have, considered and commended to the House the Lichfield Letter in the Pastoral Advisory Group.

41. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Has the House considered whether the following paragraphs, from the Evangelical Alliance's *Affirmations (Biblical and Pastoral Responses to Homosexuality)*:

“9. We believe that habitual homoerotic sexual activity without repentance and public promotion of such activity are inconsistent with faithful church membership we believe that either of these behaviours warrants consideration for church discipline.

10. We encourage evangelical congregations to welcome and accept sexually active lesbians and gay men. However, they should do so in the expectation that they, like all of us who are living outside God's purposes, will come in due course to see the need to be transformed and live in accordance with biblical revelation and orthodox church teaching. We urge gentleness, patience and ongoing pastoral care during this process and after a person renounces same-sex sexual relations.”

which have been adopted by many Church of England evangelical churches, are consistent with the House of Bishops' current guidelines as set out in *Issues in Human Sexuality* (1991)?

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Members of the Church of England belong to a wide range of organizations that issue guidance on many different matters. The House of Bishops has not taken a view on the passage cited from the Evangelical Alliance.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne:* Bishop Christine, I am afraid I am confused. The House of Bishops has not taken a view but I thought they had taken a view in *Setting God's People Free* that LGBTI members should be able to take to a full role within their church rather than be disciplined and that they should not have to be transformed. We agreed in Synod last year that conversion therapy was wrong. Will the House of Bishops reaffirm their commitment to both the involvement of LGBTI lay members without discipline and the danger of conversion therapy, as the Government itself has recognised this very week?

*Bishop of Newcastle:* Jayne, your question relates to the Evangelical Alliance and, if I have understood it correctly - and I am sure I will be corrected very quickly if I have not - the sections you quote are part of the teaching resource of the Evangelical Alliance. They are not, if I have understood it correctly, the two, the basis of faith and the evangelical relationships commitment that have to be made for a person or a church to join and be accepted as a member of the Evangelical Alliance. The Evangelical Alliance is an ecumenical movement. There are many many groupings, both ecumenical, and, more specifically, Church of England, who have teaching resources that are not aligned with the guidelines from the House of Bishops. This is the Church of England where we have a lot of opinions and our opinions on sexual ethics are divided at the moment.

42. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Noting the “What We Believe” section of the Church of England website, what does the Church of England believe regarding sin and repentance?

*The Bishop of Coventry replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Church of England professes the faith revealed in the Holy Scriptures, to which its historic formularies bear witness. Regarding sin and repentance, that witness may be found in, for instance, Articles IX to XVIII of the XXXIX Articles.

Its teaching is expressed in its authorised liturgies, including those for Holy Baptism and the Prayers of Penitence that form an integral part of many services. All of these texts are available on the Church of England website. The “What We Believe” page forms part of the “Our Faith” section, intended to convey the Christian faith as the Church of England understands it in accessible language for inquirers with no church background. Various references to sin and repentance may be found in this section, including the “Commission” from the Confirmation service and answers to the questions “How do you become a Christian?”, “What is sin?” and “What is baptism?”

43. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* How will the insights and learning from the report due to be published later this year by the UK Government’s Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) concerning the culture of the Church of England in respect of gender and sexuality be incorporated into the teaching document on human sexuality promised for 2020?

*The Bishop of Coventry replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Co-Ordinating Group for *Living in Love and Faith* is expected to be attentive to developments in other areas of the Church of England’s national life that are relevant for its work. When the report from IICSA is published, it will consider whether there are specific points for it to reflect on, and how to go about this. It is also likely that the report will be relevant to the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group.

44. *Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Who was aware of William Nye's letter to TEC's Task Force on the Study of Marriage, and the contents of the letter, at the time the letter was sent?

45. *Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Had William Nye's letter to TEC's Task Force on the Study of Marriage not been made public by TEC, when was it intended that the House would be informed of its sending and content?

*The Bishop of Coventry* replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission, Chair, I will answer questions 44 and 45 together.

The Episcopal Church sought comments from all Anglican provinces ahead of their discussions on possible further changes to their provisions on same-sex marriage. The Secretary General's reply was prepared by a number of members of Church House staff. The Archbishops were consulted, as was I, as Chair of the Faith and Order Commission. It was intended to inform the House of Bishops of the reply ahead of the Episcopal Church's planned publication of all the responses. In the event, the Episcopal Church published the responses without the expected prior notification to the Church of England.

*Ms Christina Baron:* Mr Nye's letter to the Episcopal Church of the United States was sent in October 2017. Its existence became public knowledge in April 2018. Why the delay? Should not the House of Bishops have been informed more speedily?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* Thank you for the question. My understanding is that the letter was not planned to be published or we were waiting to hear when the letter would be published by the Episcopal Church. It was a letter to them and we were waiting for their decision to publish and at that point the House of Bishops would have been informed.

*The Chair:* Christina, you cannot ask another supplementary.

*Mr David Lammie (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Given that in your answer to the question, Bishop, you say that it was intended to inform the House of Bishops of the reply ahead of the Episcopal Church's planned publication of all the responses, why could the content of the letter not have been discussed by the House of Bishops before it was sent?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* It is difficult when these responses are requested because we have to work within the timeframe of the people who are asking the question. As I have indicated, I was not directly involved in the composition of the letter or the process, but my understanding is that the timeframe was pretty tight, and it was necessary to get a response back pretty quickly, and so the timeframe simply did not allow that which you are asking for, regrettably.

*The Chair:* Which question first, because we have had two for question 44 now?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I was going to ask a supplementary as you have taken them together.

*The Chair:* Fine, I will let you off.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler:* Bishop, what is the learning of the House from this experience?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* That is a good question. There is always something to learn. I think there might be a case for drawing more people into that consultation to which I refer so that there are more voices which are able to contribute to it. I would stress, though, that these timeframes are often pretty tight. What was being asked was pretty tight, and I think the consultation that was made was appropriate in those circumstances.

46. *Revd Canon Barney de Berry (Canterbury) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In the light of the Bishop of Maidstone's reply to the Bishop of Lichfield's *Ad Clerum*, do any House of Bishops' guidelines preclude clergy participation in enquirer-led discussions about the wisdom of their taking Holy Communion?

47. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Is there any canonical or other impediment to a priest providing pastoral advice about the meaning of the exhortations in the Book of Common Prayer Communion Service?

48. *Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* In the light of the Bishop of Maidstone's careful response to the recent Lichfield *Ad Clerum*, and its consonance with the BCP and Scripture (1 Corinthians), what advice will the House of Bishops give to clergy regarding parishioner-initiated discussion towards the wisdom of their taking Holy Communion?

*The Bishop of Coventry replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* With permission, I will answer these three questions together.

The Exhortations for the Communion Service in the BCP urge the importance of preparation, including repentance for sins, so that we may 'worthily receive' the sacrament and know what Article XXV calls its 'wholesome effect'. While stressing the responsibility here of each person, the Minister also addresses any 'who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein', saying 'let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word'. Canon B 15.2 states that 'The minister shall teach the people from time to time ... that they come to this holy sacrament with such preparation as is required by *The Book of Common Prayer*.'

The House of Bishops expects clergy to carry out their responsibilities in this matter with attention to relevant statements of the House of Bishops and with the pastoral wisdom that it is their duty to cultivate.

*Revd Peter Breckwoldt:* Bishop, thank you very much for your answer. You refer to statements in your final paragraph. What statements were you referring to? Would you also have thought of including the General Synod motion that was passed in November 1987?

*The Bishop of Coventry:* It does refer to “statements”. I think the statements that were particularly in mind were the Pastoral Guidance on Same-Sex Marriage and the 2005 Statement on Civil Partnerships by the House of Bishops. It does refer to “statements”.

49. *Revd John Dunnett (Chelmsford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Since the Bishop of Maidstone’s response to the May 2018 Lichfield *Ad Clerum* does not suggest that a priest should bar someone from Communion, will the House of Bishops publicly support his right to express his opinions as he did?

*The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Members of the House of Bishops are well aware of the differences of both emphasis and substance that exist among them and understand this to be part of the gift and challenge of working together as a House of Bishops in the Church of England. Furthermore, their freedom to express a diversity of views while bearing the common responsibilities of their calling is a means of engaging with one another in discerning God’s guidance in a changing world.

50. *Dr Christopher Angus (Carlisle) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Amending Canon No. 39 before this Synod aims to ensure that the observance of Canon B 11 can become a reality such that provision is made for Morning and Evening Prayer to be said in at least one church in every benefice each day. Whilst it is up to the minister who has the cure of souls to make such provision, would the House of Bishops be prepared to actively encourage that provision to include the participation of the laity in leading those offices on a regular basis?

*The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Canon B 11 in its amended form provides a workable basis for the regular celebration of Morning and Evening Prayer (or the alternatives provided in *Common Worship: Daily Prayer*). This change was made at the request of the Rural Affairs Group, on the basis that it was unrealistic to expect those services to be held on a daily basis in every parish in a multi-parish benefice.

A requirement that they be held in at least one church in each benefice should be achievable. I very much hope that bishops will actively encourage their clergy and laity to promote this ministry of daily public prayer and to share responsibility for it. Where appropriate this could include the bishop authorising lay people to officiate at these services a very helpful way of growing the corporate spiritual life of our parishes.

51. *Mrs Chris Fry (Winchester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* What progress has been made in providing a mechanism for validating safeguarding training from related

professions (for example social workers, probation officers, teachers and medical professionals) to be accredited by the Church of England?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Section 3.4 page 8 of the Training and Development Framework states the following: at “present no accreditation is given against the core safeguarding training modules for prior learning that has not been provided by the Church of England. This is due to the church core safeguarding training modules situating safeguarding practice within the unique context of the Church and providing participants with the opportunity to relate their learning to their faith”.

Where prior learning has been completed in relation to the specialist modules, the diocesan bishop, in consultation with the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisor, will be able to exercise discretion in giving accreditation for prior learning. For example, where a person requires training in safer recruitment but has completed an employment based safer recruitment training package within the last 12 months, this may be considered sufficient for them in fulfilling their Church related responsibilities and discretion may be used.

52. *Mrs Chris Fry (Winchester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* What plans are there to provide practical national child safeguarding policies that can be adopted by PCCs and provide straightforward guidance on the day to day issues of safeguarding across the range of churches, from a small church with no regular children to a large church with multiple children’s and youth activities?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The House of Bishops’ Parish Safeguarding Handbook has just been issued. The handbook summarises the safeguarding responsibilities for parishes outlined in the House of Bishops’ Safeguarding Policies and Guidance. It is primarily aimed at incumbents and parish safeguarding officers, with specific sections aimed at PCCs and leaders of activities for children, young people and/or adults who may be vulnerable. The handbook has been designed to be easily consulted and provide quick answers to support the day-to-day safeguarding work of a parish. The handbook will be accompanied by a parish safeguarding resource pack, a pocket safeguarding guide and a safeguarding contact card, coming soon. Plus, the A3 safeguarding policy poster that is currently available.

All House of Bishops’ Safeguarding policy, guidance and resources can be found on the safeguarding pages of the Church of England website.

53. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* At the July 2017 group of sessions, I asked about an awaited Parish Safeguarding Handbook. In subsequent correspondence the Bishop of Bath and Wells kindly informed me “The draft Parish Safeguarding Handbook is being presented to the National Safeguarding Steering Group tomorrow (24 January)” and, depending on further work, “it is envisaged that the handbook will be published in March of [sic] April of this year.” I have since found a ‘Draft Parish Safeguarding Handbook’ on some diocesan and

parish websites. What is now the situation and the timescale for official publication of the Handbook?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* To date, many dioceses have produced their own parish safeguarding materials and guidance for local use. The House of Bishops' Parish Safeguarding Handbook has just been issued. The handbook will be accompanied by a Parish Safeguarding Resource Pack, a pocket safeguarding guide and a safeguarding contact card, coming soon. Plus, the A3 safeguarding policy poster that is currently available. All House of Bishops' Safeguarding policy, guidance and resources can be found on the safeguarding pages of the Church of England website.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond:* Many thanks. I am delighted that this handbook is out. Were the survivors' groups consulted and have they approved this product?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* There has been consultation and there will be more. That is why it is probably important to emphasise that this is a prototype and the intention is that eventually it will go to publication, and we hope that will be a definitive guidance for parishes and be useful in that regard. That will be made available online, but the intention is also to put it into hard copy for every parish. There is further consultation to come, and I particularly, and I know others involved, would welcome contributions from anyone on Synod and also particularly those who either are themselves victims or survivors, or those who are represented by their groups.

54. *Mr James Lee (Guildford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Given the legal responsibility that PCC members have for safeguarding in churches, including for safe recruitment of those working directly with children and vulnerable adults, what consideration has been given to making it a requirement for all PCC members to be DBS-checked before they can sit on a PCC, rather than simply an optional requirement?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* There can be no requirement for all PCC members to have any form of enhanced DBS check. Under current UK legislation, enhanced checks can only be requested for those PCC members who work, or have substantial contact, with children and/or vulnerable adults or where the PCC qualifies as a children's or vulnerable adults' charity. PCC members will always qualify for basic DBS checks, but these only reveal unspent criminal conviction information. It is, therefore, left to local determination to decide when checks are appropriate for PCC members.

DBS checks are only one element of safer recruitment. A tiny percentage of individuals who abuse have prior convictions and in that respect therefore, DBS checks, whilst an essential component of safeguarding, are limited in terms of their value. Organisations must never rely solely on DBS checks when recruiting. For best practice advice, see the Safer Recruitment Practice Guidance on the Church of England website.

*Mr James Lee:* Thank you for your answer. I ask my question on behalf of my sister-in-law who is very concerned about this issue. What reassurance can you give her that there is not a loophole that would allow someone to serve as a member of a PCC with the safeguarding responsibilities that that brings when a DBS check might bring something to light that would show their unsuitability for the role? What reassurance could you give her?

*The Chair:* That is a comment on the law so we will leave it for the moment. Thank you.

55. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* What national guidance (i) was in place in 2007-2009, (ii) was in place subsequently and (iii) is being proposed (if any) for the conduct of reviews of alleged safeguarding failures?

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

(i) There was no formal guidance in respect of the conduct of reviews of alleged safeguarding failures during this period.

(ii) The first guidance issued on learning lessons from alleged safeguarding failures was incorporated into 'Managing serious safeguarding situations relating to church officers' (June 2015), which has now subsequently been revised and strengthened within 'Responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers', published in October 2017 (section 9). This can be found on the Church of England website.

(iii) A 'Lessons learned case review guidance' is currently in development and following a consultation exercise and agreement by the National Safeguarding Steering Group will be issued later in 2018.

56. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Given the discrepancies in numbers between the original ('around 3,300') and corrected ('around 2,600') answers to my question in February 2018 regarding the number of safeguarding cases and allegations of abuse, please could an explanation be given as to why the National Safeguarding Team finds such difficulty in stating the number of safeguarding concerns/allegations and the breakdown of the number relating to church officers?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Each diocese is asked to collate and complete an annual safeguarding self-assessment. Since February, an NST Associate has been commissioned to analyse the data from 2016 and 2015 and the format for its collation. The analysis of this will be presented to the NSSG on July 12th. The self-assessment for 2017 data is currently with dioceses and as a result of the Associate's work the guidance has been strengthened and clarified to minimise data quality issues. The return is due by the end of July. Following the report to the NSSG and in the light of evidence given to IICSA, the NST will consider other ways to strengthen both the accuracy and regularity of monitoring and reporting arrangements.



*Mrs Kat Alldread:* In order to keep Synod better informed, what plans are there to share information that is collated by the National Safeguarding Team about the number of safeguarding cases in dioceses and the number of allegations being made against church officers? When and how might that information be shared?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I am glad we have had questions and answers about this before, and, once again, my apologies that my answers have not been as accurate as I would have wished. We need to be very careful, when you talk about cases, to recognise that the numbers that are being registered involve concerns or reports about possible allegations. I want to be careful when you use the word “cases” in your question, we need to be clear that those are used in a specific way.

In answer to your question, I am delighted that the National Safeguarding Team now has additional budgetary resources to do this and an associate has been appointed. It has been a concern to me and to many others that we just do have not the data. The data has not been good enough and it has not been analysed enough. I would hope that not only will it be analysed and monitored properly, but I will be able to bring back to Synod some statistical reassurances that this is now being looked at.

57. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* At the February group of sessions I asked the supplementary question “After Carlile (ie the Report of Lord Carlile’s independent review of the Bishop George Bell case) shall we see better transparency of process from start to finish in respect of the new Bell allegations than we did with the first?”. I received the reassuringly unqualified answer “Yes”.

Five months later, why are the terms of the second Bell review still unavailable in the public sphere, and can you give us an estimated time for conclusion and an outline progress report on process, not substance?

58. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* With reference to the answer given by the Bishop of Bath and Wells to my supplementary questions at General Synod in February 2018 regarding the ‘fresh information’ about Bishop George Bell received by the National Safeguarding Team in December 2017 (Q58), and his answer that “the questions are being noted; I’ll make sure you get a reply”, and given (i) that the identity of the independent investigator (Ray Galloway) and the decision-maker (the Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden) have now been revealed in *The Spectator* magazine, and (ii) that the Bishop answered “yes” to Martin Sewell’s supplementary question, “After Carlile, shall we see better transparency of process from start to finish in respect of the new allegations than we did with the first?”; will you please now inform Synod of (a) the terms of reference for the new investigation and (without revealing any confidential information) what Timothy Briden is to be asked to decide, and (b) the timescale (if any) set for the investigation to be concluded and a report published?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Mr Galloway is performing a role analogous to an investigating officer, were this a secular criminal investigation. He will provide a report on the results of his investigation. Consistent with Lord Carlile's recommendations, the Core Group will not decide whether allegations are made out, i.e. whether they are assessed to have occurred on the balance of probabilities. The Bishop of Chichester has asked Tim Briden to come to an independent judgment. Mr Briden will hear representations from all those with a proper interest. As the body which instructs the investigator, members of the Core Group have a legitimate interest in questions about Mr Galloway's terms of reference. They will, as soon as practicable, be asked to consider their publication. Given previous criticisms, the Church has put in place a thorough process which allows for a fair and robust decision. I am therefore not able to give a fixed completion date.

*Mr David Lamming:* Thank you, Bishop, for your answer. Have terms of reference been set both in relation to Mr Galloway and to Tim Briden and, if so, when and by whom? On the question of timescale, the National Safeguarding Team's press release on 31 January of this year said that Sussex Police had been informed about the fresh information and that the National Safeguarding Team would be working collaboratively with them. Given that Sussex Police concluded what they called a "proportionate" investigation before the end of March, and given that George Bell's frail 94 year-old niece is waiting anxiously for the outcome of the investigation, what is the reason for the prolonged delay and will an early target date for the completion of the investigation now be set?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* David, as ever, I think I recognise three questions in your question, so forgive me if I do not answer them entirely. With regard to the last question, there is a real concern for all those who are particularly troubled and concerned by these matters, but it is an operational matter, it relates to a particular case, and I am not able to comment upon that.

You asked a more general question which was about process and I would reassure you that the terms of reference that have gone to Tim Briden are being considered by him, and it is both right and courteous that he should have time to consider those terms of reference before they are made public. I am confident, I trust, in saying that when they have been finalised that we will be able to make them public.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* In answer to David, you write: "Consistent with Lord Carlile's recommendations, the Core Group will not decide whether allegations are made out". Yet the Carlile Report actually says the complete opposite and I quote: "Recommendation 26: Complaints are not considered to be proved until findings of fact have been made by the Core Group"; and recommendation 31: "It is unavoidable [that] in the case of posthumous allegations, the Core Group will be required to make findings of fact".

I am sure the fault is all mine, but can you undertake to provide me with a written explanation reconciling the apparent contradiction between what Carlile is reported to say in the answer and what he actually wrote?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I have been asked just to pause for a moment before responding. I cannot quite read the handwriting on the note. You have asked for a written answer. To be fair, both to you and to Synod, I need to give you a written answer for that question. Thank you.

59. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* At the July 2017 General Synod group of sessions Martin Sewell asked (Q13), “Given the importance of transparency and accountability in raising public confidence in our safeguarding culture, will the House seek the co-operation of the Business Committee to ensure that members of Synod may extensively evaluate the Church’s responses to [the Gibb and Carlile] reports by no later than February 2018?” The Carlile Report had not then been published but, in his reply on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops, the Bishop of Bath and Wells said that both reports would be considered “at the next full meeting of the House.” The Carlile Report was published on 15 December 2017 and issued to General Synod members in January 2018 as paper GS Misc 1173. In February 2018, in answer to a question from the Ven. Julie Conalty (Q50), Bishop Hancock said that the National Safeguarding Steering Group were “working through its consideration of how to give effect to the recommendations of Lord Carlile’s Independent Review into the case of George Bell” and that “the NSSG will report to the House of Bishops as soon as this process is complete.” In February 2018, the NSSG’s “Response to the George Bell Independent Review Recommendations,” was published on the safeguarding pages of the Church of England website. However, there is no reference to that document in GS Misc 1192 (Summary of decisions by the House of Bishops and Delegated Committees, dated June 2018) and the only reference to the Carlile Report is at paragraph 27 recording that the House of Bishops Standing Committee (HBSC) “considered a number of Safeguarding matters, including the Independent Reviews from Dame Moira Gibb and Lord Carlile QC...” at its meeting on 14 March 2018. Further, there is no reference to the Carlile Report, or to the NSSG’s February 2018 paper in response to it, in paper GS 2092.

In the light of the above, what is the current status of the paper “National Safeguarding Steering Group Response to the George Bell Independent Review Recommendations”, when will the various ‘responses’ be implemented, and why is there no reference to those responses in paper GS 2092?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The response of the National Safeguarding Steering Group to Lord Carlile’s Independent Review was published in February 2018 [and has been approved by the House of Bishops in accordance with its procedures]. In order to ensure a consistent approach where allegations are made against a posthumous office holder, the NSSG’s response sets out the principles which the National Safeguarding Team currently applies to the investigation and management of such allegations whether or not there is a civil claim. The paper GS 2092 relates to the key themes and priorities identified by the NSSG as a result of

evidence given to IICSA to date and is not intended to have in view the matters considered by Lord Carlile.

*Mr David Lamming:* Have the principles referred to in your answer, Bishop, been applied in relation to what we're calling the Bell 2 investigation? If so, can you confirm that Desmond Browne QC, who has now been accepted as a representative of Bell's surviving niece, Barbara Whitley, has been given access to all the material, and I quote from the response in the NSSG responses, "All the material and evidence which should include information on which the complainant relies, along with information that adversely affects the complainant's case, so that the representative can give a properly informed view to the decision-making body", who we understand in this case to be Timothy Briden?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* Rather Like St Paul writing to the Ephesians, you managed to write and ask something which has neither comma nor punctuation, and it had so many subordinate clauses that I am afraid the thrust of your question eluded me, so I will do you the courtesy of giving you a written reply, which I am sure will be better able to satisfy your question.

*The Chair:* Thank you for understanding. Simon Butler for a point of order.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Given that these matters are of public concern, would the Bishop intend to publish those questions so that all members of Synod can have the answers?

*The Chair:* I am sure they will be posted in the foyer downstairs.

60. *Mrs Isabel Adcock (Chelmsford) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Given the recent correspondence circulated to members of the Synod by a complainant concerning her dissatisfaction with the Church's response to her, what steps have been taken by the House of Bishops and the National Safeguarding Team to secure the publication of the Gladwin Report regarding Jersey and the Diocese of Winchester and the implementation of its recommendations?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The Bishop of Winchester has sent the relevant recommendations of the review to the National Safeguarding Steering Group for consideration as to what actions are necessary to implement learning at a national level.

*Mrs Isabel Adcock:* Now that the whole of Synod has been made aware of this matter, ought not all formal recommendations concerning the issue and the proposals for an associate for their implementation be made available to members as the new draft Guidance on Safeguarding makes a requirement, and when will this be?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I have not yet read the Gladwin Report personally and I have not yet seen the recommendations. I believe they are on the agenda for the

Safeguarding Group next week, 12 July, and they will see those for the first time. At that point, my role is to make sure that we act upon any learning that comes through from those recommendations. That is the process and the timescale for that.

61. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester) asked the Chair of the House of Bishops:* The completed report of Sir Roger Singleton on the Past Cases Review was only released shortly before Synod although it was evidently available some weeks beforehand. This joins GS 2092, the Elliott Report, the Carlile Report and the terms of the Bell 2 Inquiry as subjects which Synod has not been given adequate time or opportunity to address at an appropriate time. Are these unfortunate timings entirely accidental, or are the early views of the Houses of Clergy and Laity not wanted by the House of Bishops?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops:* Following evidence given to IICSA in March by Sir Roger Singleton, a draft independent report into the adequacy of the Past Cases Review conducted by the Church of England in 2008-09 was presented to the National Safeguarding Steering Group in April 2018. At this point there were two outstanding dioceses upon which the Independent Scrutiny Team (IST) had yet to finalise their views. The findings of the report were agreed by the Archbishops' Council and House of Bishops in May 2018. The judgment of the IST in respect of the two outstanding dioceses was confirmed to the NST in mid-June and the report published at the earliest possible opportunity on 22 June. The NSSG, supported by the NST, is now working to implement the recommendations of the report and will consider an action plan at its next meeting on 12 July.

*Mr Martin Sewell:* We are told that the release of the Singleton Report was delayed because two dioceses had yet to report to the IST. Can you tell us whether the views of the IST were received and included in the Report in the hours between 8.45 on 22 July, when the journalist Donna Birrell asked Sir Roger Singleton about it, and 11.20 when the Report went up online, or was the Report released in the form we have it now without it having been updated by anything from the IST? In other words, is this Report updated or not is the thrust of it?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells:* I am glad you asked me that question. I would like to say, and I hope Synod will be pleased to hear me say this, that it was very much the hope of Sir Roger Singleton and others that the Report would have come out at about Easter, but because there was work still to be done, and because it was only at a draft stage, which is what was emphasised in my answer at that stage, there was more work to be done. It is a recognition that these are quite long, complicated and important processes that mean that those particular timescales need to be considered before I more publicly answer your question.

*The Chair:* I am sure further conversation will take place. Okay. There is one question for the House of Clergy.

## HOUSE OF CLERGY

62. *Revd Julian Hollywell (Derby) asked the Chair of the House of Clergy:* Can the Chair update the Synod on the Working Group on Clergy Wellbeing's progress in the past year?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler replied as Chair of the House of Clergy:* The Group first met last November and has met on five occasions. Considerable progress has been made, working on the wide range of topics that relate to clergy care and wellbeing, all from within the framework of the Ordinal and mirroring the Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy. It hopes to have a document containing a draft Covenant and supporting material to put out for wider consultation in the autumn.

Following a planned engagement with the House of Clergy in February 2019, it is hoped to bring this piece of work to the General Synod next July.

*Revd Julian Hollywell:* Thank you for your answer, Simon. You indicate in it that the Ordinal and the Guidelines on Professional Conduct are giving the framework to the discussion of the Working Group. Can you give some assurance that not only those on a bishop's licence but clergy families (and their wellbeing) in the widest possible sense are also party to your research?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler:* The conversation with clergy has definitely included clergy families so far. We are using the guidelines and the Ordinal to try to match up our work with existing work, so that there can be some joined-up thinking around both professional standards and, at the same time, obligations to the clergy that they have to themselves, and that parishes and diocesan bishops have as well, so yes.

*Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter):* I welcome the possibility of more consultation, but I wonder if the Working Group would consider widening the planned engagement that you intend with the House of Clergy to include the Synod as a whole. I am sure that we are all concerned with the wellbeing of clergy, but there are laity in particular who participate in ministerial development reviews which are also based on the framework of the Ordinal.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler:* I am very happy to take that back to the group. I think we want to take it to the House of Clergy next February because the work originated in the House. Having said that, we are proposing to try to do a fairly broad and wide consultation using some technology that might be available to us. I do not want to say too much about that because there are other parties involved with that. It may be if it is of help for me to go back to the group and see if we can have a conversation with the House of Laity next February, if there were a meeting of the House. I would absolutely be very pleased to do that.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Questions 63 to 67 are for the Secretary General.

## SECRETARY GENERAL

63. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds) asked the Secretary General:* Further to question 62 at the February 2018 group of sessions of General Synod, what progress has been made on the revision of members' expenses, and can the Secretary General assure members that revised rates will be in place before the next London group of sessions?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* I confirm that work is in hand to ensure that a new policy for members' and staff expenses will be in place before the next London group of sessions. In the meantime, the existing rates remain in place.

A benchmarking exercise has commenced to facilitate relevant sector comparisons of policy and rates for expenses such as travel and accommodation. This will enable a new policy to be drafted and appropriate rates to be put in place.

We are also exploring the possibility of using a travel management arrangement to help us get the best value-for-money in certain circumstances.

64. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs) asked the Secretary General:* The re-launched website of the Church of England in 2017 removed from public access previously available Synodical documents prior to 2011. With the principles of transparency and good governance in mind, may Synod know what consultation process was undertaken, and with whom, before removing public documents of the Church of England's national legislative and deliberative assembly from on-line access and therefore making them less accessible?

65. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London) asked the Secretary General:* When will General Synod papers from 2010 and prior years be available on the Church of England website?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* With permission, Chair, I would like to take questions 64 and 65 together.

The new Church of England website was built from scratch over the summer of 2017 and launched in November 2017. Given levels of resource in the General Synod Office and the results of a website analytics audit, a decision was made to prioritise uploading the most recent papers first. More functionality has been added to the website enabling prior General Synod papers to be better categorised and it is the hope of the Synod Office that we will begin work on uploading 2011-2001 papers over this summer.

In the meantime, a process has been put in place by the Synod Office to enable members to access previous papers: 2010 to 2005 to email [synod@churchofengland.org](mailto:synod@churchofengland.org). 2005 and older, to contact the Church of England Records Centre.

*Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby:* Thank you very much for your answer. I am glad to hear that these documents are going to be restored to online answers not only for members of this body but for the wider Church. I do not think you answered my question about what

sort of consultation process was undertaken before removing the working papers of this body from online access.

*Mr William Nye:* I apologise if we did not undertake as much consultation as we could have done. It was very important to update the Church of England website, which was very old and rickety. I hope members of Synod on the whole would agree that the new website is a great improvement. What we found was there was no automatic upload system available for large amounts of documents, so, temporarily, we have had to focus and prioritise. We have put the emphasis, first of all, I have to say, on making the website suitable for ordinary Church members, enquirers, and for it to be a missional tool. For those who are researchers, and who need to look further back, we will be focusing on putting up 2001 to 2011 and then, in time, things that go earlier on.

66. *Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells) asked the Secretary General:* During the February 2017 group of sessions, I asked whether any plans were afoot to mark the centenary of Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act (usually known as the Enabling Act) 1919. Under God, we are for most practical purposes a self-governing Church, and at this time the consultative, legislative and deliberative roles of this Synod, not to mention other Synods and PCCs are critical in some very difficult debates and decisions. Now that some 17 months have passed since I last asked, what proposals are under discussion to mark this significant anniversary?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* I welcome the reminder of the forthcoming centenary of the Church Assembly, of which the General Synod is the successor body. I will request the General Synod Business Committee to give consideration at their next meeting to whether or how this anniversary might be marked at the July 2019 group of sessions.

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas:* Thank you very much for your answer, but I must confess myself a little disappointed in that the answer you have given focuses entirely on this Synod and on what the Business Committee might do. It seems to me that the invention of PCCs after World War I was a huge change in freeing up the Church of England to be what it could be. We are not the NHS. We cannot have a 70th anniversary bash in Westminster Abbey. We are slightly more important than the Incorporated Church Building Society, which managed its 200th anniversary in St Paul's last week. Will those in control, and you are only one of them I appreciate, look at what wider ways there may be to encourage particularly PCCs, which is what the Enabling Act is really all about, to be able to note their position and to celebrate the centenary which has made such a difference to the established Church?

*Mr William Nye:* Thank you, Stephen. I am sure we could find ways of communicating perhaps through the website that I was just been asked about to PCCs.

*Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas:* I was hoping you might write a book.



*Mr William Nye:* I am saving that for later. To communicate to PCCs the important information that they have been going for 100 years and, in some cases, they really feel like they have been going for 100 years! We will try to find ways of doing that.

*The Chair:* Thank you.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* Is the Secretary General aware that the author of the question delightfully put the Church of England through the millennial celebrations and therefore might be an adequate resource to help?

67. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield) asked the Secretary General:* What costs were incurred in connection with the recent hearing in relation to the appeal against the result of the House of Laity election to the CNC (the judgment in which was delivered on 6 April 2018) and can a breakdown of those costs be provided?

*Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General:* The only costs incurred in connection with the appeal related to the copying of documentation and its delivery to the members of the appeal panel (£199) and a sandwich lunch for the members and staff on the day of the hearing (£59).

*Mr Chris Gill:* Thank you for your reply. I think we would do well to remember that cost is not always financial, and, reading through the papers that came out after the judgment, it seems that there would have been, to my mind anyway, a considerable amount of stress involved in all of this, which is a significant cost. Also, again from the paperwork, there is a significant amount of contribution of staff time which you had not included in your figures. In other places we would have calculated an approximate amount of that cost. Of course, there will have been costs outside the Synod by the people involved. I wonder whether it might be possible for you to review the process and whether we ought to be allowing such appeals to take place at such regularity?

*Mr William Nye:* There are one or two things there. I had interpreted the question as being about financial cost. I do not think we could reasonably have sought to answer what other personal costs or stresses might have been involved, although I can well imagine there may have been. As regards reviewing the process, I will talk to the Legal Office to see if there are any learnings to be had from the process of this particular appeal.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* Could I ask the Secretary General to confirm that this is the first time that there has been an appeal of this sort and that we were all learning as we went through it?

*Mr William Nye:* You can ask, but I am afraid I do not know the answer to that question. I will look to a learned friend who may be able to give you the answer to later on.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The next section focuses on questions for the National Society Council.

## **NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL**

68. *Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) asked The Chair of the National Society Council:* In July 2017 this Synod called on the Secretary of State to amend the Schools Admission Code to require admission authorities to allocate places to children of clergy and other workers required to live in tied accommodation, and on admissions authorities to accept letters of appointment as proof of residence ahead of children moving into the area. What steps have been taken to communicate this to the relevant bodies, and could a pro forma letter be produced by the Church of England Education Office to this end for use in school applications?

*The Bishop of Ely replied as Chair of the National Society Council:* Following the debate and subsequent letter to the Secretary of State, the Department for Education has made clear that it is sympathetic to the issues raised and will give them full consideration when the Admissions Code is revised. In doing so it will consider the implications of any possible changes, including the impact on local children, and as part of the process will liaise with the Education Office and other faith representatives to better understand the issue and explore possible solutions. Any changes to the Code are subject to a full statutory process, including consultation, and the Education Office will ensure Synod's view is widely understood as part of that process.

*Revd Tiffer Robinson:* Thank you very much for your answer to my question. As part of calling on admission authorities to accept letters of appointment as proof of residence ahead of children moving into the area, could a pro forma letter be written which can be used by clergy and others moving into tied accommodation to support their application to that end?

*The Bishop of Ely:* Thank you for your supplementary. It sounds like an interesting idea. I think that the DfE is sympathetic that clergy and other workers are seen to be given priority in school entry, and this has been communicated to DDEs. I think that approaches with pro forma letters would be approached at a diocesan level where there are the appropriate links with the local education authority.

*Mrs Rhian Parsons (Leicester):* Have any considerations been made as to when such actions mentioned in your answer might be carried out and, if not, why not?

*The Bishop of Ely:* You mean which actions in relation to the Admissions Code itself or in relation to proceedings locally? I think that is for individual dioceses where there are established relationships with LEAs to establish protocols and to use the basis of that relationship to move forward. I do not think a national letter is going to make much difference, I am afraid.

*The Chair:* We have had two supplementaries for that question, so moving on to question 69.

69. *Mr William Belcher (Gloucester) asked the Chair of the National Society Council:* Given the current financial constraints, what is the national Church's attitude and policy towards the future of small Church schools?

*The Bishop of Ely replied as Chair of the National Society Council:* In March this year, we published a report, *Embracing Change*, which focuses on rural and small schools. The report not only draws together data to help us understand the challenge, but gives a range of pointers to schools and dioceses to support the provision of the quality education in rural areas which children in these communities deserve, whilst ensuring sustainability in the long term.

The report recognises the challenges and constraints of limited resources, sometimes poor infrastructure such as a lack of public transport or limited internet connectivity. Our recommendations include: the need for a focus on developing leadership for rural and small schools; for schools to work together in structural partnerships; and for the different stakeholders to work together to re-envisage a vision for rural communities.

*Canon Peter Bruinvels (Guildford):* I was going to mention the military families and how indeed they had the same predicament and they are allowed to go under the Admissions Code.

*The Chair:* Please let us stick to the question.

*Canon Peter Bruinvels:* As far as Church schools are concerned, and rural Church schools, Guildford thrives on Church schools. Is the Bishop aware that a number of these Church schools are forming into major clusters, with one head, sharing services, and this could be the basis of having a mother school under the academies, like a secondary school, with a number of these churches keeping the flag flying in their local areas?

*The Bishop of Ely:* Thank you for your question. I think that some of you will have seen *Countryfile* with the Bishop of Huddersfield last Sunday. We are raising the profile, of course, in every way we can, with such clusters, to make rural schools resilient. We are making as much headway as we can with that and we are planning a national symposium about the place of rural schools in the rural environment, and more we will come to the Synod about that in the future.

70. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester) asked the Chair of the National Society Council:* What consideration was given to inviting the Association of Christian Teachers or any other Christian organisation to be involved in producing the Church's guidance on responding to transgenderism in schools, as set out in *Valuing All God's Children*?

*The Bishop of Ely replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Valuing All God's Children* was published last year as a resource to help schools eradicate homophobic and transphobic bullying. It is not the Church's guidance on responding to questions about human sexuality or to people identifying as transgender. In producing the report we drew on many different resources and a wide range of those teachers and other professionals delivering the best practice in Church of England schools. The whole approach is underpinned by the Church of England vision for education, which is deeply Christian.

71. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) asked the Chair of the National Society Council:* What guidance has been given to Church Schools on how to formulate both a policy and an appropriate response to those children under the age of 11 who are identifying as transgender, and has any consideration been given to advising parishes and dioceses on how they should respond to the decisions taken by their local Church schools?

*The Bishop of Ely replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Valuing All God's Children* was published last year as a resource to help schools eradicate homophobic and transphobic bullying. It did not offer guidance on formulating policies for children identifying as transgender but did make clear the need for all pupils identifying as LGBT to feel supported and be offered appropriate care. It suggested some resources whilst making clear that the choice of resources is a decision to be made by the school as it knows its unique context best.

A vital aspect of any Church of England school is the link between school and church. That relationship is expressed through collaboration and partnership and most clearly through the prayerful pastoral care provided by the Church. It is also formalised at governance level. Given these essential links it would be extraordinary for any such decisions to be taken in isolation.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford:* I realise this is a very sensitive area and what I say now is not meant to be in any way adversarial. If I understand your answer to the question, there are no national guidelines, and I understand there cannot be, but can I urge you to please produce some because, as your answer says, given its essential links, it would be extraordinary for such decisions to be taken in isolation? Therefore national guidelines are needed because we need to avoid any sort of postcode lottery over how children and their families are treated from school to school.

*The Bishop of Ely:* I quite understand the force of your observation. The whole point about the report we have issued is that this is about guidance around protection against bullying and reminding Church schools of their obligations, not least under the Equalities Act. The point is that issuing national guidance which would suggest any relation to doctrine or the practice of the Church of England, there may be some guidance and I cannot predict there will be some in the end, but that certainly could not be happen until after the completion of the process which gives us the teaching document.

*The Chair:* Thank you. There are two questions for the Church Buildings Council.

## **CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL**

72. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough) asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* To what extent is the expectation that churches of high architectural significance should produce a Conservation Management Plan – with 10,000 to 30,000 words excluding appendices ‘and copiously illustrated’ (according to existing Church Buildings Council guidance) before it can apply for a faculty consistent with the Church of England’s intention to simplify processes to free up its churches for involvement in mission?

*Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* There is no legal requirement for any church to compile a conservation management plan before submitting a faculty. The requirement is for the compilation of a statement of significance and statement of needs, which should be commensurate with the significance of the church and the scale of the project. The Church Buildings Council does advise that Major Churches, that is exceptionally significant churches which meet certain criteria, should consider compiling such a plan, because this will help them to fully understand their built assets and get the best out of them for mission and engagement with the community. Also, funders like the Heritage Lottery Fund often require these documents, especially for large grants. The Council offers support to those Major Churches which decide to compile a plan. Almost all cathedrals and half of Major Churches already have one, and benefit from that.

73. *Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich) asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* What progress has been made in retaining the Listed Places of Worship Scheme or in creating an equivalent for after 2020?

*Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford) replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council:* The Government has, thanks to the sterling efforts of the Second Church Estates Commissioner, made a full commitment to continuing LPOW until 2020. After that time the Government cannot yet make such commitments, as a new spending round will have to be gone through. Myself, Dame Caroline, Bishop John Inge and many other supporters in parliament are already working on an approach to government, when the time is right, to ensure that churches do not end up disadvantaged by the VAT regime.

*The Chair:* We move on to the questions for Ministry Council. Question 74.

## **MINISTRY COUNCIL**

74. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* How many ordinands will begin training in September 2018? Please provide a numerical breakdown for the four age bands (under 29, 30-39, 40-55 and over 55) with each age band divided into numbers of men and women.

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The current estimated number of entrants in September 2018 is 582, compared with 547 in 2017 and 476 in 2016. Further detail on the breakdown requested is available on the Members' noticeboard. These estimates are based on the number of candidates attending Bishops' Advisory Panels between September 2017 and July 2018 and who will form the bulk of those entering training this September.

2018 Starters in 2019 Training Budget							
Age Range	Band	Estimated starters in 2018/19	Men	Women	Total	% of total	% women in each band
<32	Band 1	175	110	65	175	30%	37%
32-39	Band 2	96	50	46	96	17%	48%
40-54	Band 3	216	76	140	216	37%	65%
55+	Band 4	95	30	65	95	16%	68%
		582	266	316			

2017 Actual Starters							
Age Range	Band	2017 Actual Starters	Men	Women	Total	% of total	% women in each band
<32	Band 1	152	98	54	152	28%	36%
32-39	Band 2	91	56	35	91	17%	38%
40-54	Band 3	213	80	133	213	39%	62%
55+	Band 4	91	37	54	91	17%	59%
		547	271	276			

*Mr Graham Caskie:* I am sure everyone will welcome the expected number of ordinands due to start this year, an increase of over 100 from 2016. In light of this, what specific

plans do the Ministry Council have in place to ensure this upward and encouraging trend of those offering and being accepted for ordained Christian ministry continues in 2019 and beyond?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* The whole process, the whole priority of a 50% increase is a major focus of the staff and the Council Ministry Division with quite a substantial amount of staff dedication and processes across dioceses successfully gleaning various good practices that have enabled this growth to happen, which is both in terms of staffing and resourcing in dioceses but also practices in terms of vocation days, vocation programmes and so forth. That will continue and needs to continue with at least the same force that we are engaging at the moment in order to sustain the growth to reach that 50% target. I think we had a huge uplift last year and we have got a good uplift this year and so we need to work hard to sustain that. Thank you for asking.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham):* Yes, it is a very welcome increase. I wonder what the normal process of review is when a TEI, perhaps one that in the past was the largest training institution in the Church of England, suddenly ceases to train either ordained or lay candidates for licensed ministry without any obvious explanation?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Can you explain to me how that relates to this question?

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* It is about the provision of training places.

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Have I got the right question about the number?

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* 74, yes.

*The Chair:* Yes, question 74.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* Because of the expansion of training, obviously it is going to be put a demand on TEI provision.

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Alright.

*Revd Dr Ian Paul:* Is there a process review?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* You are asking a specific question about specific exclusion?

*The Chair:* It is a bit vaguely linked.

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* The whole process of engaging with the capacity of the TEI sector is one that there are a number of elements to. I hope we are

not looking at a reduction in the number of places. If you look at the way in which places are being used across the sector, both in terms of part-time provision and full-time provision, there remains capacity in that sector. There is a specific issue that you are raising which I think I am not going to walk into.

75. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* How are the Advisors for Bishops' Advisory Panels selected and trained? Do I understand correctly that someone who cannot receive the ministry of women priests can be an advisor on a panel considering the suitability of a woman put forward by her diocese for ordination training?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* Advisors are appointed by their diocesan bishop to serve for a period of five years. Guidance is issued to help bishops appoint suitable candidates and indicate to potential advisors the commitments involved. All new advisors attend residential training before their first panel, are de-briefed after that panel and attend a further training event within two years of their appointment. They are trained to assess evidence about the candidates objectively and with self-awareness about their personal views. In this evidence-based process, it is possible for an advisor who cannot receive the ministry of a woman priest to be an advisor on a panel in the case of women candidates who are being put forward. This policy is followed in the light of the Five Guiding Principles and the value arising from a diversity of advisors representing the diversity of the Church.

*Canon Jenny Humphries:* Thank you for the answer. Has consideration been given to the effect this has on women candidates and is there a policy to inform and prepare them for this eventuality?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I am trying to work out what the eventuality is. Could you just explain?

*Canon Jenny Humphries:* That when they go forward to a Bishop's Advisory Panel, one of their advisors may be someone who does not believe that they should be on it?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* What will be explained to them is that all of those who are selectors, whatever their disposition, have gone through training which includes unconscious bias training. They will also have been clear through that training that they are looking at objectively, or as objectively as one can in these processes, to fulfil the criteria laid out for selection. That assurance is given and candidates have explained to them that this possibility may arise.

*Canon Jenny Humphries:* Thank you.

76. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* With respect to the requirement for ordination candidates to read *Issues in Human Sexuality* and agree to live within its guidelines, can the Council/House confirm that the text of *Issues* made



available for DDOs and candidates on the Church of England website comprises only the preface and chapter 5: 'The Homophile in the Life and Fellowship of the Church'?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* I am grateful for this question which alerted us to the fact that only part of the *Issues in Human Sexuality* document was loaded on Ministry pages of the Church of England website which are concerned with selection. This was an inadvertent omission as a result of a technical problem. I confirm that it is expected that candidates will have read and discussed with their DDO the full document as part of the process of discernment. Ministry Division staff will ensure that the full document is made available through the website.

*Mrs Kat Alldread:* Thank you for the answer to the question. Given that the technical problem with the website still has not been corrected as of just earlier today, what is being done to rectify this and to correct the clear inference that the primary reason that *Issues in Human Sexuality* is being referenced is to emphasise a celibacy requirement for gay and lesbian candidates and ordinands in particular?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I will try and give as straightforward an answer as I can. First of all, as I understand it, because I anticipated what you were going to ask and tried to work out the answer, there is at the moment a copyright question, apparently. This has not been up online on the previous website. There is a conversation going on with Church House Publishing, who own the copyright for this document, to enable it to be put up fully online. It has not been fully online on the Church House website. The important thing is that we have been, for donkey's years, using the paper document. So DDOs used the paper document, the book which you can buy from Church House Publishing, to give to all ordinands to read so that they can affirm that they will live by those guidelines.

*Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester):* Given the fact that possibly no one outside or the Church of England and certainly no one under the age of 50 will have any idea what the term "homophile" means, would it be possible to have a definition of that term on the website?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* I am sure it could be. Let us see if we can get the document up. If we cannot get it up, we need to take it all down.

77. *Mr Nick Harding (Southwell & Nottingham) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* In the light of the Education Office paper *Education and Mission: Schools, Churches and Families*, which was distributed to all bishops and dioceses in January of this year, what measures are being taken in the selection of ordinands to ensure that they have a good understanding and range of skills relating to children and young people?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* I am pleased to affirm that the House of Bishops is committed to

ensuring that those who are selected for ordination training understand the vital importance of work with children, young people and families and can lead in enabling churches in this work. This is a central priority and not an optional extra. The selection criteria ask for evidence about a candidate's commitment to the mission of the Church in the local community including schools, and that they can relate well with a diverse range of people, including children and young people. In terms of leadership and collaboration, while the criteria recognise that not that all clergy must be exceptionally skilled or expert at ministry with children, young people and families, it is clear that they all need the leadership capacity to represent the church effectively and take responsibility for facilitating the mission of the Church to all ages.

78. *Mr Nick Harding (Southwell & Nottingham) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* In the light of the Education Office paper Education and Mission: Schools, Churches and Families, what changes are being made in the compulsory elements of IME 1-3 to ensure that ordinands have appropriate training for working with children, young people and families?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The House of Bishops is committed to ensure ordination training pathways reflect the priority of this area and equip clergy to enable work with schools and families. The formation criteria agreed by the House in 2014 for assessment of ordinands already include, for example, understanding how children learn, nurturing faith and understanding the Church of England's role in schools. The criteria extend to end of curacy assessment which requires commitment to Christian education in schools as part of the mission of the Church. I want to pay tribute to the work of many theological institutions (TEIs) where this area of learning is addressed well. The House will want to be convinced that all ordinands receive the same level of provision in all TEIs, particularly about partnership with schools and families. The House's process of regular review and quality assurance for TEIs run by Ministry Division will help in monitoring this.

79. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* For each of the last five years, 2014-2018, how many ordinands have applied for grants from the Research Degrees Panel and how many have been successful? In that period, what was the RDP annual expenditure on research degrees and the financial range of awards?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The information requested may be found on the Members' noticeboard.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Applications</b>	<b>Approved</b>	<b>Total RDP spend £</b>	<b>Range of award £</b>
<b>2014</b>	19	17	83,559	1759 to 24,000
<b>2015</b>	9	9	64,040	2000 to 15,665
<b>2016</b>	12	12	73,660	760 to 31,000
<b>2017</b>	19	18	82,801	1500 to 15,000
<b>2018</b>	24	23	97,848	3000 to 18,000

**Note:** Some of these applications are from ordinands in receipt of sufficient funding from other sources and who therefore do not require funding for their research through RDP. All ordinands receive, in addition to any RDP grant, the usual funding for cost of accommodation and maintenance.

*Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone:* What is the Ministry Council's strategy for keeping track of ordinands identified as potential theological educators to make sure that they are suitably trained and equipped for that role?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* Those who receive funding as potential theological educators are, obviously, pursued through their training. They are followed through their training through the Ministry Division's staff engagement. The question then is what happens. From my point, I am reflecting on this as somebody who ran an institution where we had a lot of people in that category. The question then is what happens. There are various groups, including the Young Theologians Group, which is one mechanism by which that process is pursued. I think there is probably a bit more that one could do. There is a question about our accountability in terms of this. It is a really important investment that we make in supporting people through that to ensure that that investment is then well used is an important question for us to pursue.

80. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* Which of the recommendations in the Report, *Serving Together: The Report of the Lay Ministries Working Group 2015/6* has the Ministry Council accepted, and what progress has been made against them in the year following publication of the Report?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The Ministry Council accepted all of the 18 recommendations of *Serving Together*, except for two. On legal advice the Council did not accept the recommendation for a Lay Ministries Discipline Measure. For lack of resources the Council did not appoint a full-time national officer for lay ministries. Progress against the other 16 recommendations has been reported to the Council at every meeting since *Serving Together* was accepted. In particular, progress has been made on two major areas identified by the Report, the theological deficit around lay ministries and the authorisation of lay ministers. Since *Serving Together* was published the degree of diversity between dioceses and the widening range of lay ministries, including lay pioneers and the lay roles entailed by Strategic Development Funding bids, has become even more apparent. The Council is therefore working to encourage greater common understanding between dioceses in order to progress the *Serving Together* agenda.

*Mr Nigel Bacon:* I declare an interest. I am a licensed Reader. Bishop Martin, thank you very much for your answer. In your answer you note the diversity between dioceses on lay ministry that exists today and also the widening range of those ministries. In the work of Ministry Council, will you be drawing out of this some view as to what best practices are, recommendations for the future evolution of lay ministry in its various forms and also

will you be considering the extent, if any, to which there should be consistency between dioceses on matters such as licensing of lay ministry?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* If I can answer the last part first. There have been two consultations on authorisation and the framework for authorisation is being developed, which should be published for wider consideration in the autumn of this year, so presently. One of the things that the Ministry Council is engaging with at the moment is trying to work out what the breadth of its remit is because, as you indicate, our understanding of ministries has expanded and expanded and expanded. The position I want us to get to is precisely the one you are describing where we are, as it were, an enabler and encourager of a variety of forms of ministry and particularly being able to enable dioceses to cross-fertilise, to learn from one another and to share good practice. That is the position I want us to get to. It may take us a little while but, hopefully, not too long.

81. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln) asked the Chair of the Ministry Council:* When will this Synod be given the opportunity to discuss the Report, *Serving Together: The Report of the Lay Ministries Working Group 2015/6* and the response of the Ministry Council to its recommendations?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:* The Ministry Council has provided a Report to this Synod on progress in dioceses in the number and variety of authorised ministries in GS Misc 1190, as requested in the February 2016 motion on Resourcing Ministerial Education. If the Business Committee decides that a discussion in the Synod of the development of lay ministries should take place at future sessions, the Ministry Council is ready to respond to that request and to help resource the discussion.

*Mr Nigel Bacon:* As far as I know, still a licensed Reader. Bishop Martin, will you join me in urging the Business Committee to make time at a group of sessions sometime next year for Synod to have a discussion on the development of licensed authorised and accredited lay ministry?

*The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich:* We will happily join you.

*Mr Nigel Bacon:* Thank you.

*The Chair:* We come to the back page, the last section. There are two questions for the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee.

## **REMUNERATION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE**

82. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark) asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:* What reassurance can the Committee give to clergy who are concerned about the inclusion of their personal contact details in the proposed

National Clergy Register described in paragraphs 56 to 58 of GS 2092 Report of the National Safeguarding Steering Group?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:* As paragraph 58 states, the intention is that the national register will include details of all clergy with an authorised, and, therefore, public ministry and make them publicly available free of charge. However, the register will not include addresses, contact details and biographies, although these will continue to be available in *Crockford*. In exceptional circumstances, clergy may, on request, have their contact details withheld from publication in *Crockford*.

Paragraphs 10 and 11 of GS 2104X, the Explanatory Memorandum to the Church of England Miscellaneous Provisions (No 2) Measure, explain that clause 2 of that Measure is intended to provide a statutory framework for the national register. If that Measure is approved, detailed provisions for what is to be published in the national register will be contained in subsequent regulations that will, in turn, require the approval of the Synod.

83. *Revd Canon Professor Mark Chapman (Oxford) asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:* The Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee has asked the dioceses for the numbers of clergy holding House for Duty posts and the policy in place which drives such appointments. What were the results of this enquiry? Have there been any attempts to monitor the numbers of hours worked by clergy appointed on this basis?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee:* As recorded in the paper for the House of Clergy debate on the Clergy Remuneration package, RACSC asked dioceses how many House for Duty appointments they had made. Responses were received from ten dioceses, making up a total of 29 appointments. Some indicated that they did not have this information available. This suggests there is limited capacity at diocesan level to provide further information. Monitoring hours worked is difficult, as clergy office holders do not have set hours.

*Revd Paul Hutchinson (York):* It may be difficult to quantify how many hours an officeholder works, but most House for Duty posts specify in their advertisement, and I presume probably in some of their particulars too, the number of days on which the postholder is expected to work. Has any information been collated about that?

*The Bishop of Portsmouth:* Thank you for the question. Yes, the conditions under which House for Duty appointments are made, of course, vary quite widely; sometimes, two days plus a Sunday, sometimes three, and in other circumstances. Each of those references to “days” clearly that might mean a particular number of hours or fewer or more and we have no information about that. As you can see from the original answer, obtaining information from dioceses in this area has not been straightforward.

*The Chair:* Well, wow! I hope everyone is pleased that we have got through all the Questions today. Thank you everyone for your contributions. That concludes our business for today. However, I would like to encourage you to stay for worship which will be led this evening by the Ven. Michael Everitt. Thank you and have a good evening, everyone. Thank you.

*Ven. Michael Everitt* led the Synod in an act of worship.

## **Full Synod: Second Day Saturday 7 July 2018**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 9.00 am.

### **MORNING WORSHIP**

*Revd Dr Rowan Williams* led the Synod in an act of worship

### **ITEM 6 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS**

*The Chair.* We now begin Item 6 on our Agenda. I invite the Archbishop of York to make the Presidential Address.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Seven weeks ago, on 19 May, at the wedding between Prince Harry and Meghan Markle, a bishop stood up to preach on Love. On the face of it, there was nothing unusual or unexpected in that. What was it then that sparked the reaction of amused amazement, the rush of tweets, the media excitement? The topic of his address was hardly controversial.

Was it that the Bishop was an African American? That he smiled? That he looked around to make eye contact? That he spoke with energy? Bishop Michael preached on love and people were surprised. Many said that they felt connected because of his style and yet Bishop Michael is an Anglican, from the Episcopal Church in America, and the content of his sermon was unremarkable to the ears of regular churchgoers!

In the face of this reaction, I asked myself what people had been expecting that they found his sermon so unusual. What is the perception of the Anglican Church, and in particular, the Church of England, that this event should have seemed so remarkable to so many?

Thirty-seven years ago, in this Hall, the Synod heard from a range of voices what the perception of the Church of England was in 1981, and what needed to be done to aid us in our mission of making Jesus Christ visible in all our parishes and chaplaincies.

The Synod had invited Partners in Mission to examine our structures and look at how our national bodies work for God's mission. The Partners in Mission were representatives from churches across the Anglican Communion, from other denominations in the UK, from voluntary bodies and, indeed, from our own dioceses.

Following the consultation, they came to discuss their Report with the General Synod and to give an account of their impressions of the Church of England's approach to the work

of mission. The Report was called *To a Rebellious House?* The title of the Report, as you will recognise, is drawn from the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.

Ezekiel's task was to call the people of Israel to use their exile fruitfully in repentance and return to the Lord, so that they might be ready to return to their land and the city which God would restore to them.

The life situation of the people of Israel who heard Ezekiel's message was one of slavery, poverty and political oppression; they had lost their sense of identity and had no real hope of returning to their past glory and security. And in their misery and rebellion, they had forgotten how to listen to the God (Yaweh) of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

But who was "the rebellious house" which was being addressed in 1981? Was it the people of the United Kingdom, who were turning from God and pursuing lives of selfishness and greed? Or was it the Church whose people were failing to follow God's commands to love one another and to take the good news to all parts of the world? I think it was both.

What was the situation of the people in this country back in 1981? We were suffering like the people of Israel in exile. Many people were.

There was political upheaval, with some members of the Labour Party splitting off to form the Social Democratic Party (SDP).

- Troubles in Northern Ireland, with bombings, shootings and unrest in the Maze Prison.
- Recession, poverty, pit closures and record unemployment of 2.5 million and rising, creating fear in the working population.
- Racist violence from the National Front and oppression of minority ethnic groups, causing fear and anger in those communities.
- Widespread riots across the country - from Brixton to Bristol, Southall to Toxteth - setting young black people and the police at odds with each other. The SUS Law (stopping and searching people on reasonable grounds to suspect the commission of a crime) was being used disproportionately and unintelligently against young black men.

People did not see much hope for the future, and many had embraced the "God is dead" theory of the 1960s.

What prophetic voice could the Church of England bring to God's mission to the people of God in this country? Were we equipped to achieve this? Did we have eyes but did not see the needs of the people, and ears to hear but did not hear their cries of despair?

At that Special Conference during the group of sessions in July 1981, one particularly telling contribution from the Partners in Mission consultation came from a young woman from the Roman Catholic Church, Jenny Bond. She challenged us in particular - as the



Church claiming to be the Church of all the people of England - about how little we reflected the people we ministered to in our parishes. Her perception of the Church of England was that our desire for respectability had shackled us. The lack of women, young people, minority ethnic people and working-class people in our congregations and in positions of leadership, were obvious areas of deficiency in our service and our calling to minister to all in our parishes.

At that time, the Church of England was perceived as the “Tory Party at Prayer”, self-satisfied, unadventurous, stuck in our ways. Could we hear the challenge? Could we change?

Of course, the Church of England can and does change - but it has been described as being like a large oil tanker, difficult to turn around. Change takes time.

But changes did happen after that Synod in 1981. We listened and we acted. In the next 10 years, the *Faith in the City* Report was published encouraging all churches to address the deprived and left behind in our inner cities - the Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns pursued a programme of racism awareness, cultural diversity and involvement for CMEAC members of our congregations; the Church Urban Fund was set up to provide funding for projects in cash-poor parishes; the Church of England Youth Council was set up to empower and develop the ministry of young people.

Women’s Ordination to the Diaconate and Priesthood was embraced. And other initiatives have followed - supremely the Ordination of Women to the Episcopate and the Renewal and Reform agenda. Last year, this Synod gladly received the recommendations of the *Setting God’s People Free* Report, setting out a new way of developing the mission and ministry of lay people - seven days a week.

But are we still regarded as complacent because we are “by law established”? From the reaction to that wedding sermon last month, it seems that general expectations of life, excitement and witness from the Church of England are still very low.

So, what is our country’s life situation today? Have our projects and programmes made a lasting difference?

Again, there is political upheaval, government uncertainty and conflict over Brexit and over public spending. There is a resurgence of racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, violence in our cities, with disaffected young people turning to gangs and lives of meaningless destruction. There is the constant threat of terror attacks - threatened by bombs, knives, guns and vehicles used as weapons. Sexual aggression and abuse seem to be on the increase. Hate crime is on the rise. And there is bitterness and anger from hard-pressed families on poverty wages, who have suffered the worst of the budget cuts.

As in 1981, large sections of our people feel unheard and abandoned. Again, they do not see much to hope for. What can encourage us to bring hope to the people we live amongst?

Let me read you a list of factors which have been suggested as impediments to our own desire “to proclaim that the Kingdom of God is at hand”.

- Contemporary apathy;
- Inability to express the Gospel with clarity;
- English reserve;
- Divisions of race, class and churchmanship;
- Lack of knowledge of the Scripture and inability to share it;
- Clergy who are more pastorally than evangelistically orientated;
- Failure to see ministry as the work of the whole people of God;
- The shallowness of much spiritual life and liturgical expression;
- Resistance to the priority of evangelism;
- Parish profiles summarised thus: “We are ready to accept change so long as it doesn’t make any difference”.

When do you think this list, friends, was drawn up? Yesterday? Last year? No, it was part of the Report I referred to - *To a Rebellious House?* - presented 37 years ago.

Archbishop Stuart Blanch, preaching at the Synod Eucharist in York Minster in 1981 said: “This Partners-in-Mission consultation could mean much more than simply the reordering of our institutions. It could mean a revival of spiritual life within the Church and it could produce a new dynamic in the life of the nation. It isn’t just the Church that is calling to our partners, ‘Come and help us’. It is the nation as a whole, so anxious, so conscious of its needs, so lacking in expectations, so fitful in achievement. I look for a revived Church of England in a revived England - nothing less”.

And Archbishop Blanch quoted an unnamed cleric who said: “I was ordained, so I believe, to be a fisher of men. My people want me to be the keeper of an aquarium”.

How can we overcome these impediments in order to share the Good News of Jesus Christ with our neighbours?

What kind of message can we take to people struggling in the social and political uncertainties of this age? What kind of hope can we share with people whose expectations are low, and whose faith is dying or dead, who have lost the sense of God?

The Word of God never leaves us long without an answer. God is forever nudging us to hope. That is what we all need.

We know most of us are finding hope difficult to sustain. The world is changing almost faster than we can bear, life is harder for our children than it was for us and, potentially, for our grandchildren harder still.

Yet the basis of hope is love - God's love for us even when we fail to return that love: God always nudging us to hope.

Ezekiel's own message was that even in exile, even in Babylon, with no Temple, there was still hope. God was still with His people. It is that hope that enabled the exiled Jews to build synagogues. And the same hope that three years ago helped young Ethiopian Coptic Christians build a makeshift church in the migrant "jungle" outside Calais.

So, even though this Church of England may feel that its message goes unheard, there are words that can open even the most closed heart. Namely, that God believes in us more than we believe in Him. That there is objective hope even when there is subjective despair. As Jim Wallis of the Sojourners told this Synod in a sermon in York Minster, "Hope is believing in spite of the evidence, and watching the evidence change".

His example was Archbishop Desmond Tutu, under house arrest in St George's Cathedral in Cape Town in 1989, dancing and joyfully imploring the security forces, three feet deep inside the Cathedral, "You are powerful", he said, "You are very powerful, but you are not gods and I serve a God who cannot be mocked. So, since you've already lost, since you've already lost, I invite you to come and join the winning side". That was 1989.

The second example of "Hope - believing in spite of the evidence and watching the evidence change" is also from the South African Cape. Vasco da Gama, a Portuguese navigator, who first rounded the Cape of Storms - a Cape that had defeated and killed many sailors in their desire to get to India. Da Gama sailed to India, to the astonishment of many, in 1497, and in doing so turned the Cape of Storms into the Cape of Good Hope. Very much like our Lord turning the grave into a bed of hope by His resurrection.

God believes in us more than we believe in ourselves. There is objective hope even when there is subjective despair.

That hope is that we - being made in the image and likeness of God - have more than self - we have a soul. And in the soul of everyone is a yearning for the good, the right, the compassionate and the just.

That is why God is always nudging us to hope.

The Prophet Isaiah - like Ezekiel - brought a message to the exiled Jewish people. Martin Luther King Jr quoted this passage, from Isaiah 40, in his "I have a dream" speech. It is a message to all who feel exiled, lost, abandoned.

“Comfort, comfort my people”,  
for there will be  
“A voice one calling:  
In the wilderness prepare  
the way for the Lord”.

Isaiah brings hope of rescue and a future; a hope of a servant who will come to take their pain. This is the great message of hope we hear each Christmas - and particularly up in Yorkshire, when the Messiah is sung in our churches:

“Every valley shall be raised up,  
every mountain and hill made low;  
the rough ground shall become level,  
the rugged places a plain.  
And the glory of the Lord will be revealed”.

And he goes on:

“He gives strength to the weary  
and increases the power of the weak.  
Even youths grow tired and weary,  
and young men stumble and fall;  
but those who hope in the Lord  
will renew their strength.  
They will soar on wings like eagles;  
they will run and not grow weary,  
they will walk and not be faint”.

This is God nudging the exiles to hope then and nudging us to hope now; the hope that we all need and indeed must share with everyone.

It is a message of hope that our fellow citizens throughout this country need to hear and know is for them. We are no longer in the thrall of the powers of the world. Even if we are damaged like a broken reed, says Isaiah in 42:3, still God will save us. Even if our flame is flickering very low, God will not blow it out. There is still comfort and still hope.

Comfort and hope for those who fear for their safety. Comfort and hope for those who are struggling to make ends meet. There is a positive attitude to the past, reconciled in Christ, which allows me to look forward. There is a positive attitude to the future, opened by Christ, which allows me to concentrate on the immediate practical tasks while keeping the horizon in view.

In adopting these two attitudes I am involved both in reflective thinking and in decisive action.

Let us give hope and comfort to those whose hearts are dismayed by the uncertainty and turmoil of world events, and by the erratic actions of political leaders. Comfort and hope to those who fear for the future, whose experience of life is like Meatloaf's song:

"It's like a storm that's never ending  
It's like a shadow on the land and the sea.  
There's nothing so sad as  
A tomorrow gone bad  
The future ain't what it used to be".

But what is our vision of the future? What kind of hope can the Church of England articulate to answer this kind of despair? What does hope look like for our children?

Answer: The security of a home and a family who will love and protect them. As I said in the preface to the Cahill Inquiry Report,

"As forgiven sinners, and members of the Body of Christ, who are all in constant need of forgiveness, let us take to heart our Lord's words about children and our responsibilities towards them. This means an institutional culture free of any systemic failure in relation to safeguarding children". Jesus welcomed children as members of the Kingdom of God, and said:

"Anyone who trips up one of these little ones, who believe in me, it's better for that person to have a donkey's millstone hung around their neck and be drowned in the open sea".

The Church has zero tolerance to all forms of abuse of children and vulnerable adults - in fact to everyone! Where there is a whiff of the smallest allegation of abuse, the Church - we - must act to give assurance and hope.

What does hope look like for survivors and victims of abuse?

Answer: We are with you! Total solidarity. A willingness to stand in their shoes - which will be very, very uncomfortable.

Justice also demands that alleged abusers are presumed innocent until proven guilty. But they must tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth because abuse is a heinous crime.

What does hope look like for our teenagers?

Answer: It is the possibility of a job or an affordable cost of study; the freedom from bullying and threat via social media; the ability to grow and be valued as individuals with new gifts, fresh generosity. Our teenagers' lives must not become a zero-sum game in which they strive to see who can stay the longest on top of the pile, and, at the same time,

are filled with a nauseating feeling that there will be no good outcome from their attempt to stay at the top.

What does hope look like for our young adults?

Answer: Excitement and discovery of what they are capable of; work in which they can flourish; love and the possibility of generous and creative relationships; a place to live.

What does hope look like for gay, heterosexual, lesbian and transgender people?

Answer: Freedom from bigotry and hatred; an environment in which we all can flourish.

For it is “In Jesus Christ - and in Him alone - we know both God and human nature as they truly are”: and so in Him alone we know ourselves as we truly are. There can be no description of human reality, in general or in particular, outside the reality of Christ. ... at the deepest ontological level, therefore, there are human beings, male and female, called to redeemed humanity in Christ, endowed with a complex variety of emotional potentialities and threatened by a complex variety of forms of alienation”. Human beings made and redeemed in Christ.

This means, therefore, that in the Church of England, there must be a continuing of serious conversations to find a “radical new Christian inclusion, founded on Scripture, reason, tradition, theology and faith as the Church of England has received it”. The task has to be done.

May I urge us all to be part of the wider participation and consultation on the House of Bishops teaching document *Living in Love and Faith: Christian Teaching and Learning about Human Identity, Sexuality and Marriage*.

What does hope look like for our middle aged?

Answer: Surely a safe home with the love and support of others; a job which is secure and rewarding; and which leaves time and space for relaxation.

And what does hope look like for our older people?

Answer: Time to discover new gifts; good health, financial security, care when they are vulnerable.

Hope is also an end to all forms of “isms”. For the Church of England must embody in all aspects of its life that it is an Embassy; a foretaste of Heaven, where God’s will is perfectly done.

In all these depictions of what hope means for different people across the generations, there is one constant - the need for secure love, which gives hope for the future. We

have that message of hope founded on God in Christ's love unconditionally which makes all this, and more, available to anyone who comes on board. The mission of God is to assure people of love, reconciliation, forgiveness and a secure future in Him, sustained by His generous friendliness - not just now but for eternity.

So, what is our response to the invitation of God which nudges us into hope? How do we go about bringing this message of comfort to people?

It is through loving all people unconditionally ourselves and showing them that we do so. By inviting them to share our joy and our hope in Jesus Christ. By knowing the pain and their suffering and exclusion and abandonment, and compassionately reaching out to them with the good news that rescue and hope are at hand. It is by becoming that new creation - we in Christ and Christ in us. Being of one mind with Christ. Our mission being indistinguishable from his.

As David Bosch said in his book *Witness to the World: The Christian Mission in Theological Perspective*, "If the church is in Christ, she is involved in mission. Her whole existence then has a missionary character".

And, as Dr Rowan Williams put it: "It is not the Church of God that has a mission; it is the God of mission that has a church".

What is needed is for each people of our mission units to recognise to call to take on the very life of Christ, whose whole purpose was to spread the good news to all he met.

Amidst all the various schemes for the putting right of human ills, there is often a whole dimension missing, the dimension of sin and forgiveness. It is this dimension of sin and forgiveness which the Body of Christ, the Church, must keep alive by living as an international community of forgiven sinners and of the forgiving Lord Jesus.

The Church follows Christ in the outgoing service of humanity, the poor, the hungry, the sick, the disinherited - with no motive but the compassion drawn from Christ himself and with the humility which banishes patronage or possessiveness.

The Church needs to be challenging the world's assumptions and showing that the world's greatest need is to be brought in humility and repentance into the love and obedience of God. Amidst its deep involvement in the service of the community, the Church must keep alive for its own members and, and strive to keep alive for others, three unchanging Gospel realities.

The first is the reality of divine forgiveness as providing the keystone of Christian ethics. That is to say, it holds our aspirations in place, gives them a stable relation to the ground on which they stand. The Christian community is the forgiven community; that is the ground of its relationship to God and the basis of the humility of the service of men, women and children.

The second reality is the Kingdom of God. God's promised future gives meaning to our existence now; defines the infinite worth of every man, woman and child; and provides the perspective in which life's problems are to be seen.

The third reality is worship. It is worship that is not apart from the life of the world but set right in the heart of that life, a practice of adoration and contemplation in the midst of the world's busyness.

Committees can be good and useful things, but what God's mission requires is for every member of the Body of Christ in this country to become that message, to be the Word of God. We are made in God's likeness. That means our purpose is his. His image is not a suit of clothes we put on each Sunday, or even each morning, it is our whole essence, so that that is what people see and hear.

Let me end by recalling what Bishop John Habgood, then Bishop of Durham, said in 1982, in his response to the debate on the Report *To a Rebellious House?* Bishop Habgood made a particular plea to the General Synod as they contemplated moving out in mission in a new way. He said this:

"I think we should understand very much better what the task in front of us is if we used perfectly ordinary, simple English words like purpose, task, aim, objective, growth, teaching, conversion. Whenever we find ourselves slipping into a piece of woolly indigestible jargon and great glowing thoughts about 'mission', let us check ourselves and ask, 'What am I actually saying?'"

Remembering his words, I believe there is no need to overcomplicate Christ's Gospel. So, I end with a plea that as we go out with a message of hope to the people we live amongst, we first search our hearts to know truly from where our own hope comes, and that, as we deliver our message, we model ourselves on Him from whom that hope comes. As the Apostle Peter told the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia:

"... do not be intimidated, but in your hearts sanctify Christ as Lord. Always be ready to make your defence to anyone who demands from you an accounting of the hope that is in you; yet do it with gentleness and reverence. Members of Synod, God is nudging us to hope.

*The Chair:* Thank you Archbishop. The Archbishop has asked me to say that copies of his address are available at the information desk. And that concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 9.51 am.



## **ITEM 7 SAFEGUARDING (GS 2092)**

*The Chair:* Members of Synod we now come to Item 7 which is a presentation on safeguarding. May I just remind you this morning that we do have people who have been victims and survivors of abuse, not only within Synod itself, amongst the staff and in the public gallery; people who have been able to tell their story and people who have not yet been able to tell their story. So, in the questions and in the debate that follows please would you bear all of that in mind. Can I also draw attention to the Twelfth Notice Paper which has on it details of a phone line that has been especially set up for today and a number of other organisations that you can contact if during or after the presentation and debate you feel that you would like to talk to someone, the opportunity is there. And, of course, our chaplain is available through the information desk as always.

So, it is my great pleasure to be able to welcome this morning Dr Sheila Fish, Senior Research Analyst at the Social Care Institute for Excellence, otherwise known as SCIE, and Mrs Jo Kind, a committee member of MACSAS, the Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors group. I am going to ask if Dr Fish would speak first of all, for 15 minutes. Thank you.

*Dr Sheila Fish:* Thank you and thank you for the introduction. We hope it is alright to do a bit more of a double act between us, thank you. And, to go even more off script, before we start properly we wanted to just take a minute to address our survivor colleagues and friends and supporter and facilitators from the event last night. I am not going to goggle at you but you know I am talking to you. Jo and I were very aware that we set ourselves a very ambitious goal in the two-hour session that we had last night. We wanted to give Synod members the chance to hear directly from the very courageous survivors who joined the session, we wanted to give the chance for dialogue between the Synod members who came and the survivors who came, and we wanted to have that dialogue really focus on what does a good church response look like to victims and survivors of abuse and what is it really important to avoid. The third thing is we wanted to get feedback, particularly from the survivors, on the proposals that are in the paper that Synod members are going to debate this morning.

Jo and I are very aware that we feel we did better on one and two and really not so well on getting systematic feedback on the proposals. So, we apologise to our friends and colleagues, who I will not goggle at, for that. We hope that Jo is going to mention some of the actions and survivor views on them. The implications of some of what I will say speak to the actions, so we hope that you feel nonetheless that there is a connection between what was in the room yesterday, including views about the actions in the paper even if we have not got a systematic, rigorous account of what survivors' views were about the 13 different actions. So, thank you for that. To start properly I will hand over to Jo.

*Mrs Jo Kind:* I am at that awkward age of looking at you over my glasses so I do apologise for that. My name, as you can see, is Jo Kind. I have volunteered with MACSAS for about six or seven years, and I do some email support to the people who write to us and I am sitting on a few committees. I was abused as a young adult whilst I was working in the Church of England and came to MACSAS for help and I am still here.

So, MACSAS stands for Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors. Thank you for inviting me, I am really pleased to be here. This is the first time that the General Synod has allowed a survivor of abuse perpetrated in the Church of England to address its members. Five years ago, I sat in the public gallery, in the cheap seats, and listened whilst words written by survivors and their advocates were read by a Bishop. He read them carefully and with great sensitivity and the Synod received them in the same way. But they were our words, our words to speak, and could have been delivered by us. Being invited to speak today represents a step in a better direction and towards, we hope, a realisation that you need the experience and expertise which victims and survivors are more than willing to share.

I have deep gratitude and a keen sense of responsibility to my colleagues and friends, some who are here connected MACSAS and others are not. All are victims and survivors of abuse perpetrated in the Church of England. We need to note the courage that it takes to report harm done to us and the immense strength it takes to come here to the representative body of the church in which we have been harmed. Some, quite naturally, are not able to do that this weekend. Each of us would be able to tell you about the harm caused and of the harm which continues to be caused when the response of the Church is ineffective and devoid of recognisable tenderness or compassion. Each of us would be able to tell you, and did so with such integrity at last night's fringe event, about the huge impact of that on our relationships, on our wellbeing, on finances, reputation, identity, safety, faith, meaning and purpose.

MACSAS exists because there is a need, most often an urgent need for immediate support for the people who contact us, people who have suffered abuse in a church or in a church setting. In the two decades since MACSAS was founded by Dr Margaret Kennedy this need has not changed and the number of people contacting us for help has not diminished. Most often, supporters needed to survive the processes and the response of the Church and the bewilderment, pain and sense of acute isolation which so often comes with that. Many feel, or are made to feel, that they are the problem and that nobody in the Church truly cares. This is a terrible truth. It is a truth, I think, which has added to the growing sense of urgency that there is a need for cultural change in the Church of England around safeguarding.

We have a joint understanding with you that we want our churches to be safe places, that perpetrators must be brought to justice, that we want it to be safe for people to report concerns or tell of harm caused to them and that we want the Church to respond well to victims and survivors of abuse. We know, and fully acknowledge, that much work has been done to improve safeguarding policies and training and that we are actually in a

different place from five years ago. I think that cultural change requires a radical reorientation of how we understand and respond to what we see and experience. Reorientation being the action of changing the focus of direction of something.

Firstly, focus. Where is the focus now? Is it wrong and simply needs to change? Are you sure that the Church, when it responds, is fully focusing on the needs of people broken by abuse and on the needs of the Church communities where the abuse happened? Or does it have half an eye, and sometimes more, on limiting damage to the institution and on protecting the reputations of Church officers? Please, shift your focus to people. Please be person-centred, it is in the Gospels. So many people say to us, "Where is the teaching and person of Jesus in the church's treatment of me?" They say, "How can this be the response of a Christian church?" Please keep a focus on people's needs, provide money for crisis intervention and counselling now, properly fund and accelerate the start of the Safe Spaces Project. It has been five years since this project was conceived, much money has been spent and yet we still wait for the first pound of it to be spent on a survivor. Until Safe Spaces is up and running, and to use Archbishop John's analogy, please throw out the lifeboats from your oil tanker.

Please lead the way on a properly funded reconciliation scheme and redress fund for those who have been abused in institutions. There are already models for this in Ireland, and some being developed in Australia and in Islington. As well as a change of focus, the reorientation needed for culture change is about changing direction. Instead of walking away from victims and survivors turn towards us, walk among those who have suffered. We had a glimpse of this yesterday evening and the power and potential for change which comes with real engagement and dialogue at the place of pain. To use my friend and colleague Jilo's phrase, please borrow some of our courage if you need it.

Use it to acknowledge the abject failure of the Past Cases Review, use it to turn words into actions, use it to own up to failings and to make amends. Use our courage and humility to meet with survivors, even when advisors say that you should not. Borrow courage and humility to take responsibility for your actions or your inactions. Borrow our courage to work out what CDMs are for in the 21st century and how best, whatever they are for, they can be achieved and please think seriously about starting with a blank piece of paper rather than tweaking the CDM to try to make it more suitable for cases involving sexual abuse. Invite us to work with you on this, many of us are experts. And please, as a starter, endorse the proposal of an independent ombudsman.

Please borrow as much of our courage as you like to take the moral high ground and publicly state the Church of England's support for mandatory reporting. It is a sobering thought and a stark reality that much of the abuse in churches, Church institutions and cathedrals in dioceses right across the country could have been prevented if it had been mandatory to report the sexual abuse of children. Borrow some of our courage to put an end to horse trading and civil settlement cases, to consult with survivors more, courage to involve us in training in person and not confined to a video. And borrow or find the courage to create independence in the safeguarding structure that you have. At the very

least, for our sake and probably for theirs, bring in independent oversight of the National Safeguarding Team and whilst leaving diocesan safeguarding advisors in their diocese, employ them and manage them centrally.

So, here you are about to debate GS 2092, a Report with an underlying sense of urgency, caused by the issues arising from the independent inquiry into child sexual abuse and by growing publicity, social media and academic writing and comment. Please debate it with wisdom, with the received wisdom from us here and that recorded in the initial findings of the SCIE survey, which Sheila will share. And please, please remember, endorse timely action and not just talk. Thank you.

Thank you so much. I receive that applause for all of my colleagues and for all the people who are not here and actually for all the people who have not survived this experience, so thank you so much. Thank you.

Sorry. The great thing about having Sheila is that she has a brain for what things could look like in reality. I think I speak from the heart and from frustration and what we have learnt from our own journeys in the last little while. We have been running a survey just for the last month which will continue for survivors of Church abuse and of any abuse where they report to Church just to find out what they think a good response would look like and to find out really where it might have gone wrong and where they think it could be better, so Sheila has that wisdom here and also some thoughts about process which we are really grateful for, so that is where we are going for now.

*Dr Sheila Fish:* Thank you. I feel like no more needs to be said after Jo, so I hope you take what I say as very much repeating and bolstering what Jo has so powerfully said and that captures a lot of the views of the victims and survivors that she knows personally, that MACSAS knows and that took part in the event last night.

I was going to pick up on bringing just a slightly wider perspective, three contextual points and five emerging themes from the survey that Jo mentioned. One, context-wise, is that fortuitously, by chance, by coincidence, this is the end of Co-production Week in the world outside the Church, where institutions throughout the country have been celebrating their efforts to bring people with lived experience, whatever that is in the different sectors, their efforts to bring people with lived experience into equal partnership in designing services, in training people, in diagnosing problems, in fixing them. There is a wealth of experience, of expertise out there. It is not rocket science but it proves incredibly difficult and challenging in a range of institutions and set-ups. I say reach out.

Secondly, context-wise, the same for learning from mistakes. There is a wealth of knowledge and expertise, very clever people who have spent a lot of years in aviation, in industry, thinking about how you learn from mistakes, what does a just culture look like where accountability is not about blame but it is about demonstrating that you genuinely are learning and changing and improving things and that is what a just culture looks like. Again, draw on it.

And that it is a journey. The Church, like any other institution, is on a journey to develop more effective safeguarding. I have to credit my colleague Edi Carmi, this notion of similar stages that a lot of institutions go through is created by Edi and comes from her wealth of experience. It starts from recognition, it goes into setting up the basic structure, systems, policies and procedures, training people, it goes on to realising that oops, implementation is not quite as straightforward, working out what some of the problems are, going back to revise the policies and training and then, if you are lucky to not get stuck in that cycle, to move on to really identify some of the more difficult, complex, systemic issues that organisationally and culturally are getting in the way.

If you recognise them it is a different step to really start trying to address them and in our work, the work that SCIE has done with the Church over the last three years we do think that you are in some regards at that really difficult stage, an urgent stage, to really try to address some of these underlying cultural issues that are really difficult, that require questioning, some very basic assumptions about power and hierarchy and deference, some very basic fundamentals about how the Church is structured that are fundamental that will hopefully get you on, like all institutions, to the nirvana of being an open learning culture where things are continually under review, you are continually using feedback from survivors to check and challenge the robustness, the reliability of your systems and processes and actual practice and how people are doing things. So, it is a bit of a positive but it is a journey that all institutions go on and our SCIE perspective from the work we have done is that there is progress.

So very briefly, on five really important themes that are emerging from the survey. It has been a very humbling experience, receiving and reading and responding to the 40-odd people now we have had take part and the sensitivity, the generousness and the nuance with which people have responded is striking. One thing that has come out is that there is no simple “us” and “them”. We have had a lot of responses from clergy. We have had a lot of responses and heard last night in the fringe event from people who would have been clergy if it was not for the abuse that they suffered on the part of other clergy. We have heard of abuse, bullying from clergy to clergy. We have heard of bullying of people in training to go into ministry. We have heard stories of clergy who were themselves abused before they took up the ministry and are learning to deal with it as they support others in the congregation who are dealing with being victims and survivors of abuse. There is no simple “us” and “them” and polarisation just does not help.

The second point was that when survivors come forward, and Jo said this, and disclose abuse and share concerns, they are providing a really, really valuable service often generously and at great personal cost. There is a question about is how we are treating them reflecting that service that they are providing, are we rewarding people for helping the Church be a safe space, to be a safe Church? Some people, a handful, have really been at the vanguard of helping the Church look at, recognise, see the harm that has been caused in the past. What is the recognition for those people? Are they celebrated? Are they rewarded? Are honorariums enough? Should we be talking about pensions?

What does celebrating some of this valuable service, generous contribution, look like? Sorry if that is an inappropriate graphic but you get the idea.

Linked to that is the long-term impact. Again, Jo said that we heard last night really harrowing accounts of the long-term impact on people who have been victims and now survivors of abuse within the Church, by clergy, by Church officers, by volunteers. We heard very strongly in the meeting we had in the afternoon people saying no-one of them has chosen to be a survivor, they have alternative lives lost to grieve, they have marriages failed, children not had, children removed, self-harm, suicide, the children they have have got greater statistics of themselves suffering from mental health problems, of suicidal tendencies. The long-term impact - sorry, it moves me - is shocking.

How do we demonstrate, how does the Church demonstrate real ownership of the long-term impact of abuse that has taken place within the Church by clergy and clergy-related officers? What does resourcing that look like? What does it really mean?

Fourth and fifth, providing compassionate justice. I think Jo said justice is critical. There are core questions that often need to be answered. If someone's abuse was known for ten years, how was it not called out earlier? These very fundamental basic questions need answering. What survivors say is that there is no possibility of moving on before those questions are answered. What does it take to actually demonstrate that the Church view is that cover-up is not the best form of reputational management? What does it actually look like to really make that tangible?

Those four are all about responding to survivors. There is one last one that is coming out very strongly through the survey which is about the other side of the coin. Survivors are saying, "Please talk more about the abusers. Please talk more about their abusive behaviour. Talk more about how they were groomed, how they groomed individuals, how they groomed the community". One very powerful quote in the survey was saying, survivors have no choice but to remember the good and the bad of the people who abused them and they need to see the Church doing that as well. That is what prevention looks like, knowing what abuse looks like and knowing that it could happen here, and that is as important as responding well with compassion and care to the survivors that we are dealing with.

I am very nearly there. I was responding to every response to the survey as quickly as I could. It has taken a lot of courage for people to do very detailed responses and one person responded saying, "If I were to speak at Synod this is what I would say", and I think she is far more eloquent than I am so I would like to just share that with you.

"As long as abused people experience minimising, discounting and lack of compassion while the Church focuses on protecting against litigation there can be no common ground because the church is using the wrong currency. After five years of trying to be heard all that I see is that when the Church talks about safeguarding it means safeguarding itself from innocent people and safeguarding its own complacency. It means safeguarding the

bishops, the archbishops, the clergy from me and others like me, innocent people who struggle for years to be heard and to be taken seriously. We are assured of prayers and then nothing changes. We ask again, and we are told to move on. It is not possible to move on while injustice remains, it cannot be done.

“My own diocese speaks of living God’s love while ignoring what happened to me. Just a few months ago they told me that perhaps I felt hurt or rejected and perhaps a little more compassion could have been shown, but it was a long time ago, they do not intend to take any further action. It would seem that my diocese has a five-year statute of limitations on compassion. What the Church fails to see is that if it is not safe for me it is not safe for anyone, not for adults and not for children. But, instead of listening to me, the Church pretends that I am the problem and ignores every word I say. I have no idea who you all think you are safeguarding but it certainly is not me”.

It is sobering, it is really sobering, and important to own, and yet we did want to leave you with something a little more constructive.

*Mrs Jo Kind:* Last evening people were kind enough to fill out feedback forms from our session and here are a couple of things that people said and this is what we would like to leave you with.

What worked well. “Deep, frank and honest sharing from survivors and good listening from everyone, perhaps this was just a first step to genuine dialogue”. And “I really want to feel that I am part of improving the church on safeguarding. There is so much to do, please can we keep up the impetus.” That second comment was from a survivor who was present. So, can I urge you again, please remember, endorse timely action and not just talk. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, we have an opportunity to ask Dr Fish and Ms Kind some questions, so the way I am proposing to do it is if you would like to ask a question, please stand, I will call you in groups of three and then ask them to respond. If they do not feel able to respond then the National Safeguarding Team might be in a better place to respond and they have undertaken to provide you with a written answer at a later stage. Who would like ask a question? Please stand.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Thank you very much for your presentations and thank you, Chair, for calling me. I was contacted yesterday by a survivor of abuse in the Church who had some anxieties about the way that the survey process had been run by SCIE and she came to York especially because she wanted that disquiet to be known. She spoke to me with great grace yesterday and she had two concerns really.

One was that she received an email inviting her to participate, completely out of the blue, without any warning, and although there were suggestions in the document about where she might find support, she was really taken aback by the lack of pastoral engagement in

this incredibly difficult area because the feeling was that completing the questionnaire brought up some very complex ---

*The Chair:* And your question is?

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* I am just coming to them. Secondly, when she contacted the other survivors she knows, none of them was aware of the survey or had heard anything about the research. She has asked me to ask you two things.

The first is how such a sensitive issue could be approached with something which felt to her like sad insensitivity, although with good intentions. Secondly, what decisions were made about who should be approached for the survey and how can we be sure that it has produced meaningful results if the process of seeking responsibilities has been apparently quite limited? Thank you.

*The Chair:* Just a reminder, a question, please, not a speech.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* Yes, of course, although it has to be contextualised.

*The Chair:* We will have a very short context, please.

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* Survivor questions. I have had phone calls and the same question came to me as well which Giles has just given. I have a couple of others about how it is going to be interpreted. It covers a range of abuses: domestic abuse, spiritual abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse. Are we going to have the results broken down so that we can see whether our responses are better in one area than another? That survivor was worried that if you presented the average it might confuse how badly we are doing in certain areas. I would like you to address that question.

The other one, following on from what Giles said, is about whether IICSA will accept this particular piece of work if we want to present it, because that problem about support may not have passed through an ethics committee and some people would be very wary about accepting a survey that had that difficulty within it. I wonder if Sheila would address those two issues, please.

*Mrs Joan Beck (Southwell & Nottingham):* I guess I need to declare an interest. I am a registered social worker and I chair a safeguarding adults board. Thank you for the presentation and thank you to the victims and survivors of Church-based abuse. I absolutely agree with Jo Kind's exhortations to us. Obviously, a lot of work has been done and there is a huge amount still to do. I guess not many people stood to speak because to disagree seems like disagreeing with motherhood and apple pie.

*The Chair:* Do you have a question?



*Mrs Joan Beck (Southwell & Nottingham):* I think the paper begs more questions than it answers. I have about 30 questions but two important questions. The first is: will we be able to have a debate? This is not a debate; this is an opportunity to ask questions. Will we be able to have something more like the Shared Conversations in relation to safeguarding? It opens itself up not as “them and us” and information. Also, where is the action plan? Where is the three-year plan? We have been told what is going to happen in the next 12 months but what is going to happen after that? What next?

*The Chair:* Would you like to answer those questions where you can, please?

*Dr Sheila Fish:* Can we do it in reverse order? I think number three is one that probably will get a written response rather than being something that Jo or I can answer.

In relation to the survey and ethics, sorry, I am aware of the person who has felt the delivery of it to be insensitive. It is important to say that the survey that we are doing of survivors is not a stand-alone piece of research; it is part of the quality improvement work that SCIE has been commissioned to do that included the first ever independent audits of all 42 diocesan safeguarding arrangements and this piece of work to get the views and experiences of survivors.

It is part of quality improvement work, which, as such, does not technically need to go through a research ethics committee. That is, of course, not to say that we have not spent a lot of hard time and discussion going through SCIE’s normal processes in collaboration with MACSAS and with other survivors, to think very carefully about the ethics and the care and the way that we can try to do least harm to anyone who might be made aware of the survey and who might decide to take part in it.

We have done that in the balance of also wanting to give people the chance to take part and to share their experiences and views and not be too risk-averse to close the chance that people can actually take part in the survey. We have done a Freedom of Information response to the same questions, which we are happy to share. That was one question.

How is it going to be interpreted? You are right, we have set the survey up to cover a very broad range of safeguarding scenarios of types of abuse and we will analyse to distinguish where feedback is similar across the board and where there are differences. That is part of the goal. It is important to clarify also that the survey was not designed as an evaluation of how well the Church is currently doing. It was designed to be future oriented, if you like, to focus on how victims and survivors think the Church should be responding at different stages to try to inform good practice rather than be only a backward-looking evaluation. The analysis will also be framed in that way.

*The Chair:* Any more questions? Just a reminder, please keep your questions brief and it is on the presentation that we have heard.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* I am speaking to you as someone who has been disclosed to in the classroom. Thank you for being here. Do you have any particular role or advice in safeguarding for children and, if so, how has that been imparted to the National Safeguarding Team? That is the first question.

Is there anything that has been successful in the practice of diocesan safeguarding officers or national safeguarding officers that you would like to recommend to us?

Thirdly, have you been consulted at all about the *Parish Safeguarding Handbook* which has just been published?

*Revd Mrs Sonya Doragh (Liverpool):* Thank you so much both of you. I am a survivor of abuse myself but it was perpetrated outside of Church structures. However, as a clergyperson and a member of Church, the Church also had a role in responding to that - or not.

My two questions, Pete, you will be glad to know, are these. First of all, will you help us understand why it is different when the abuse is perpetrated by a representative of the institution and a representative of our spiritual wellbeing and leaders, because it is different, I recognise that? Will you help us, please, to also respond to those who are abused by non-clergy and ministers of the Church because we need that learning to be spread wider too? Thank you.

*Dr Yvonne Warren (Coventry):* Just to declare an interest: I am a therapist who over the years has seen many people who have been sexually abused. My question is to Dr Fish. You said "talk more about abusers' behaviour and how they groom others". I wonder if you could expand on that, please, and say exactly what you mean in terms of the Church's response.

*Mrs Jo Kind:* I am really sorry, I did not catch the name from question number two. My apologies. There is a certain level of pain that comes from being abused by somebody who is a representative of God. There are a few things. One is that for people who go to church, generally it is their safe place. It is somewhere where they can be in community, be in family and when, if something goes wrong in their everyday life, they are safe to take it there and feel supported.

When that goes wrong and when somebody from that place takes advantage of them and uses their power to abuse, it not only causes that hurt but also it excludes them from their community. That is the deepest pain and that is what people tell us over and over again, "I've lost my safe place", so there is that.

I think what follows on from that is that our communities, through no fault of their own actually, find it very difficult, as Sheila was saying, to hold the good and the bad about people. It is so much easier, as a human, to look at the good that somebody has done and to cast aside the bad. We have to find some way to be able to hold those two together

in order for there to be some kind of restoration for us. We are expected to hold that and for communities to do that as well I think is something key that you need to think about. That has gone off the question and I apologise for that.

There is much more I could say and if anybody wants to write to MACSAS about this issue of what is different, I would be much more coherent on paper than I am here.

On the other question about non-clergy abuse, I think part of what I have just said about helping communities to understand and to hold the realities of abuse within its context would also help them to be able to support people who have been abused from without and want to have some help from the Church. I think it is just a human condition that we do not want to talk about horrible things and what we need to do is to walk with people through their pain. That means not just to kind of go, "Gosh, that's terrible", but to look out for them and actually to do that in the long term. We need humans. We need one another. When people have been abused that relationship has been absolutely shattered. It is a job as Church, as us as humans, to rebuild that.

*Dr Sheila Fish:* Responding to the third person about talking more about abusers and abusers' behaviour, I think there are two aspects to this. One is that it is notoriously difficult in institutions to keep vigilant about the potential of abuse happening in your patch, because in any one location it is a rare occurrence, so it is notoriously difficult cognitively to keep vigilant. One of the ways of being able to keep, in a way, on the table that it could always happen here is to not have what a Jewish colleague friend of ours called the "holy hush" where we do not talk about the known abuse that has been identified and the convictions that have happened.

In a way linked, we need to skill people up about the very clever tactics that tend to be used by people who are grooming. If we never talk about those tactics and the fact that abusers often are people who are very effective, loved and good in all sorts of other regards that both are true, how do we expect people to be able to disclose, to feel that they will be heard and believed if there is this holy hush about talking about any abuse that has been identified and dealt with appropriately.

On question one, the expertise on safeguarding children, SCIE does have expertise on safeguarding children, as well as safeguarding adults, and that has underpinned the independent audits that we have conducted. We have not had an explicit role in sharing that more widely. We will be publishing very soon the final overview report from all 42 dioceses and that will draw out some good practice points. There are possibilities of making those more accessible in subsequent work. SCIE has not been consulted on the Parish Handbook.

*Mrs Jo Kind:* The Parish Handbook was presented to the National Safeguarding Panel as a draft and there are three survivor representatives on that. We did have a chance to comment a few months ago before it went to print.

*The Chair:* We are overrunning slightly but I will just take one more.

*Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs):* Thank you very much for your presentation. Thank you for the session organised last night. I found it profound in the deepest sense, if you can forgive that. I am not a survivor of child sexual abuse myself. I have tried to become much better educated about this over the last 10 years or so. My question really is it seems to me that as a Church - and I am not pointing fingers, I think it is all our responsibility - we are still in a reputational bubble. We have moved from the cover-up as a way of dealing with our reputation to realising that the cover-up ends up hurting our reputation more. We have not yet really approached that person-centred starting point of all of this that you talked about in your presentation. That is how it feels to me not as a survivor. Is that how it feels to you?

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester):* My question is how, when clergy or representatives of the Church are approached and shared with by survivors, can we help produce justice for them when the shape of the justice that they are asking for appears to be impossible?

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Thank you for that very moving presentation. I wanted to press a bit more on the issue that was raised about understanding the behaviours of perpetrators. As you were speaking, it occurred to me that in the diocese where I serve, painfully and tragically in the last couple of years we have had a couple of cases which have ended with two clergy abusers being removed from office, prohibited from ministry and, in one case, going to prison.

The question that has emerged for me listening to you this morning is I do not know how to tell that story. It is a terrible story, but in some ways it is a story of, "We have dealt with these people. We have removed them from the Church", but I do not really know how to say it in an appropriate way, which I think would give some confidence that we are trying to address these things; not to mention, of course, the story in the parishes themselves where the long-term damage is so vast. In a strange kind of way, I find myself almost covering up the fact that we have actually got rid of somebody. I do not know how to tell that story. I would love some help

*Mrs Jo Kind:* I was so busy listening that I forgot to write down the questions, so this is from memory - just about. The first question I think is about the fact that the lady said we are in somewhat of a reputational bubble and whether we think that and how that makes us feel. Rather than answering the question, I think what I would like to say is openness actually brings with it respect of people. The people I know who report do not report to damage reputation; they report to get things better for other people, that is usually the first desire, and then quite often as a secondary to get some justice. If there can be an openness about that I think reputation will improve. People are clever and they will see if things are hiding under the surface.

I think you only have to look at other institutions which have had to come clean and show what they are doing and say, "This is what has happened". Everybody still watches the BBC and listens to the radio. I think it will improve reputation. I hope that answers that.

The second was: how can you help to provide justice which seems impossible where we might be asking for something that is unattainable. That is a really big and profound question. I think you have to start from the beginning and that is to make sure, as I said before, that people are supported and accompanied. It is a journey to justice. You cannot just flick it and it works. To start with, everybody here, and I think I can do this with confidence, would say that they felt isolated after they reported. They needed somebody who was there, who was theirs, who could maybe advocate on their behalf or with them, and that would lead to getting the kind of justice that they want. I think it is about relationship. Again, feel free to write to me because I write better.

Understanding and Bishop Stephen. Good luck! I can think of a few people who have had immense courage to report what has been done to them in very recent times who have found that because the people in the senior part of their diocese have not been able to be open with the community that they have been ostracised from the whole community and not just from the Church. That is a terrible thing to do to somebody. It was not because of not having done the right thing, because the right thing was done as far as justice was concerned; it was about how that was handled with a community. This person has had a triple abuse really: abuse from the perpetrator, that from a response which took a long time, and then being completely ostracised from her very own community.

I urge you to think on that really. The way that archdeacons and bishops go into communities and talk after a case has been resolved needs some really careful thought. I do not think I am qualified to say what to do, except there has to be some openness and truth. Of course, that has to come within the lines of the legal structure but truth, I think, is the main key there.

*Dr Sheila Fish:* On the last question about, "I don't know how to tell that story", I do not think anybody does. Personally, I would think that is a very useful thing to do some work on. Part of it is not only telling the story of having dealt with it but also showing how having dealt with it has made you more likely and much better to deal with it better, quicker, faster, more efficiently if anything similar were to occur on your patch again.

*The Chair:* That is all we have time for. May I once again, on your behalf, thank Dr Fish and Mrs Kind for their profound and insightful, humbling contributions that they have made to us this morning.

May I suggest, Synod, that just before we go into debate on the motion, Item 8, that we just keep silence for a minute or so. Perhaps I invite you in this silence to ask where God has been for you in that presentation and question and answer session.

## **ITEM 8 SAFEGUARDING**

*The Chair:* Let us move on to Item 8, debate on a motion on safeguarding. For this, you will need GS 2092. I am going to invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to introduce the debate and he has up to 10 minutes.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* Good morning, Synod. I would like to echo the Chair's warm welcome and the greetings that he has given to those who are watching this debate; those from the public gallery and those we know will be watching us online. I am also aware that among us, within Synod, there are a number who are themselves victims and survivors of abuse. Synod will also know that there are a number of people who have come to York specially to hear this debate. I am very grateful to them and I and other members of Synod had the opportunity to meet with several of you last evening at the safeguarding event and to hear some of your personal experiences. It is very important that you are with us here for this Synod, but I am also aware that, for them, being here is not easy.

From Sheila Fish and Jo Kind we have just heard a very clear, very powerful presentation. I speak for Synod when I say that we are very grateful to them for their directness and their honesty and also please note, Synod, the challenge that they have brought to us. Their words have at times not been easy to hear but we thank them and especially we are grateful to them for engaging so frankly with us.

Speaking to Synod, I hope that I am absolutely correct in saying that together as Synod we feel and believe that they have made a significant contribution to the commitment that we are being asked to do this morning in part to address our past failings and to build a safer Church for the present and for the future.

I am also grateful as Lead Bishop for Safeguarding for the trust which a number of survivors have placed in me. The conversations I have had with them have often been very harrowing and they have made me acutely aware of the need for the Church to actively engage with and respond to survivors in a much better way than we have in the past.

Over the years, the Church and its leaders have singularly failed to see what was before our eyes. We did not give safeguarding the prominence it deserved. We failed to put preventative measures in place. We failed to listen to those who came forward with powerful accounts. We failed to fund safeguarding sufficiently at national or diocesan level. We failed to put in place proper accountability for safeguarding at the senior level of the Church.

Yet the signs that we needed to change were there. They were there in the work of other churches and in the secular world around us. They were there in the voices of survivors, calling on us to address our failings.

It took the 2013 Report of the Chichester Commissaries to galvanise the Church into action at least 10 years after we should have done so. We know from the recently published Report into the Past Cases Review that whilst the Church did undertake a well-motivated review of some 40,000 clergy files in 2008-09, this was failed to be delivered consistently. Whilst there is much to do to improve safeguarding in the Church, I hope that Synod will nonetheless acknowledge the steps that we have taken in recent years to improve our safeguarding practices. At a national level our spending on safeguarding has increased from £37,000, which when we look back on that is a really derisory amount, to £1.6 million in 2018. Each diocese has also massively increased their resources for and with safeguarding. Indeed, in 2018 overall the Church will spend some £2 million on safeguarding.

Of course, change is never instant and in our meeting with survivors and their groups last night, the Archbishop of Canterbury acknowledged that. Money alone will never be enough. Real change requires a fundamental shift in attitude, behaviour and culture, especially where issues of deference or resistance to good safeguarding practices are identified. I am however confident that the resources and training that we are putting in place are now moving the whole Church forward.

As the legislative body of the Church, Synod has an important part to play in this. Not only are we responsible for passing legislation on safeguarding but also we must promote robust safeguarding practices in every aspect of church life.

At the February Synod, I committed to bringing a motion for debate on safeguarding. The motion you have before you today invites you to commend the priorities for action set out in paper GS 2092. This paper comes to us from the National Safeguarding Steering Group, and it does so in response to some of the emerging themes from the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA). The NSSG is a committee of the House of Bishops, which has delegated powers to agree safeguarding practice guidance on behalf of the House. The group includes seven bishops and members from the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners and the soon-to-be-appointed independent Chair of the National Safeguarding Panel will be part of the NSSG. It is the group which in our name is tasked with strategic oversight of work for safeguarding at a national level.

The paper before us this morning is not a comprehensive action plan describing all the work on safeguarding which is happening at national or diocesan level. There are safeguarding business plans which do that. Instead, the paper before us sets out some of the issues arising from the IICSA process so far and identifies those actions which are already in hand and those which require further work and further thinking and further action.

Synod needs to note that an interim Report from IICSA will be published in the autumn of this year. Its final Report on the Anglican Church may not be available until 2020. Therefore, we may not know for another two years what its final recommendations may be. However, we should not wait for these Reports as we continue to improve our work on safeguarding. When we see steps that we should take, and improvements that we should make, we must act. Knowing that some of these changes will take time, we must act as quickly as we possibly can.

The paper before you sets out safeguarding in the context of leadership, vision and culture, and I quote from the Report.

“Our vision for a safer Church is based on our belief that this is what God intended the Church to be: a place of safety, refuge and healing, and a place where people, including those who are suffering, will find people who love them and care for them and do the right thing for them. Our vision must go beyond where we are now as a Church to where we want to be: a church that society trusts to be a voice for the marginalised, a Church that is not afraid of hearing or speaking the truth and a Church that always stands up for truth and justice”.

The paper identifies three thematic priorities which Synod is being asked to endorse this morning. All three priorities have a dual focus. They seek first of all to improve the Church’s engagement with and response to survivors whilst also focusing on prevention. We must not lose sight of the need to prevent or minimise the risk of abuse occurring. This must also involve engaging children and young people and vulnerable groups in helping to build a safer Church.

The three priorities are: first, strengthening support for and engagement with victims and survivors of abuse; secondly, implementing the robust processes for clergy selection, suitability and discipline; and, thirdly, strengthening independence, oversight and scrutiny under each of these strategic priorities, specific tasks and actions which are detailed in the paper. These include, for example, the formation of survivor panels to support the work of the NSSG and the NST, and an exploration of our approach to redress.

Some of you have been aware that there have been calls for the Church’s safeguarding processes to be made entirely independent and, whilst there may be changes about how safeguarding is structured and operates, I am clear that the Church must take responsibility for its own safeguarding. Safeguarding, I argue, is integral to our mission and our missionary. Our Christian faith requires us to value all creation; fundamentally the Church must ensure that everyone is kept safe and can flourish.

I notice the light has turned to red. I am grateful to the Business Committee for scheduling this debate. I shall be listening very closely to what Synod members want to say. Safeguarding is at the very heart of the Church’s mission. I am therefore urging you to vote for this motion which stands before you in my name.



*The Chair:* The matter is now open for debate. If you would like to speak, please stand. I call on Kashmir Garton for her maiden speech.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Ms Kashmir Garton (Worcester):* I fully support the motion and the thematic priorities identified in the Report. They provide the multi-approach that is necessary to ensure that our Church's safeguarding procedures mirror those in place in other public organisations involved in safeguarding vulnerable adults and children.

I declare an interest in this area as I work with offenders in the National Probation Service and lead on public protection and safeguarding within my area and nationally on work between probation and prison chaplains.

The independent inquiry has been, and continues to be, a painful experience for everyone involved. Survivors will feel the impact of their abuse for years to come and their trust in our Church has been broken. We therefore need to take action and that action has to be robust and implemented consistently across our churches and be fit for purpose to restore the trust of survivors. I am encouraged by the range of actions proposed that will ensure the voices of victims will be heard and responded to: that there will be more robust arrangements for the selection and oversight of clergy and that there will be a process to validate and continuously improve these changes through independent scrutiny and the audit of such procedures.

However, Synod, I believe we can go further and strengthen our safeguarding priorities by including how the Church will respond to those who have perpetrated such crimes and have been punished and wish to maintain their faith in the community. As Christians we believe that every human being is made in the image of God and is loved and cherished by God. In the Probation Service, we believe in people's capacity to change their behaviour with the right interventions and support.

Currently, the Probation Service is working with prison chaplains to strengthen how we work together and, significantly, recognise the role of faith in an offender's rehabilitative journey. By continuing such collaborative work into the community, the Church's safeguarding framework can provide assurance to survivors about how the Church is safely managing the risk posed from known offenders who worship in our churches.

Synod, I urge you to support the motion so that our churches can restore the trust and confidence of survivors and create a safe environment in which all can worship.

*Mr David Kemp (Canterbury):* I am the joint Chair of the Canterbury Diocesan Safeguarding Management Group. The meeting with survivors last night was sobering, harrowing and moving, and I hope that Synod's response today will be worthy of their contributions.

There are a number of elephants in the room when the Church talks about safeguarding and one of them is the archaic structure of the Church of England. Forty-odd dioceses - and I mean "odd" because no one would invent them as they are now - are all fiercely independent and unaccountable.

Paragraph 70 of GS 2092 talks about the accountability of the bishops for safeguarding in their dioceses. My question is: accountable to whom? If a diocesan bishop does not fulfil his or her responsibilities, what happens to them? The answer is probably nothing. If a diocesan bishop "gets" safeguarding, there is a good chance it will work in the diocese. If they do not get it, the work of their safeguarding team is seriously hampered. I know the Church of England well enough to know that it is too difficult and will take too long to change the structure, but we do need to find some other ways of increasing the actual accountability of diocesan bishops quickly. We need to give very serious thought to passing all allegations of abuse by clergy and church officers to a transparently independent body and to doing it soon.

Finally, let us take IICSA seriously. The Church must be seen to acknowledge and respond speedily to its Report in the autumn. Let us leave the provisional Synod dates in our diaries for November and, if the Report comes out more than a week before then, let us meet for one day, respond from the heart and show we mean business. There will be time enough later to respond with calm logic but let us for once move swiftly and effectively. Let us stop being like that oil tanker, changing course with the speed of the continental drift, and let us stop making excuses about preparation and process and show the world that we are doing our best to get safeguarding right. Please support the motion, but it is only one step on a lifelong journey.

*Canon Phillip Blinkhorn (Manchester):* I want to support the creation of a centralised safeguarding service. It has already been said that we have made big strides in the last few years. In my own diocese, we have gone from 0.3 of a person (one person shared with two other dioceses) to two full-time employees, but I know that in the future we will be required to take more. I think what we need to support their activities is a national framework of processes; a service which will give procedures that can provide consistent and timely decision-making and appropriate levels of resource in each diocese, so that decisions about safeguarding and how it is staffed in particular are not left to budget decisions in one diocese and very unfortunate choices that have to be made.

I think it is crucial in developing our safeguarding personnel so that they have professional training, development and, crucially, mentoring and support for their work, from professionals who understand the whole range of issues in which they are involved. It still needs to be firmly rooted in the diocese but should be a professional function that is subject to funding and organises its decisions from the centre, not from the diocese. This is not removing accountability; it is about providing a good service, consistent practice and, as Chair of the DBF, one of the things that concerns me most is that consistent practice. We have one safeguarding advisor and one person for training. If the safeguarding advisor leaves, what do we do? Yes, we have procedures in place that will

deal with issues that come up but the consistency of practice of handing over is just not possible, and I think that is something that a national service could give us.

The other thing that came out of the Report to me was the point about an ombudsman. I find myself, as has my father in God, increasingly called upon to make judgments in cases about procedures, because querying the procedure and the framework within the diocese is really the last call for people who have big complaints about the way we deal with safeguarding, and I feel extremely uncomfortable in dealing with that. It is not that I am trying to make a hospital pass to an ombudsman, but I think having somewhere else to refer those issues to will help us. It will certainly help with pastoral concerns in my diocese so that I do not get the blame as being somebody to do with safeguarding. I am quite happy to take the blame for all the financial matters, but I really think there are some pastoral issues for chairs and diocesan secretaries and other people who are dealing with these matters, and that we need somewhere else that we can refer to. Please, please vote for a centralised safeguarding service.

*The Chair:* After the Bishop of Durham, I am going to reduce the speech limit to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler):* I was previously the Bishop for Safeguarding. IICSA is showing us that we are a nation that is having to come to terms with a deeply disgraceful national history of abuse in all kinds of institutions and in all kinds of ways. It is heavily focused on child abuse. In recent years we have also had to face up to the fact that as a nation we have not treated our vulnerable adults, and, particularly, our vulnerable elderly well. We as the Church of England are caught up in this whole national debate and have had to recognise that as a nation we have not been the people that we always thought we were: nice British people. We have to hold our hands up and accept that the national Church has failed the nation in the way that we have allowed ourselves to be caught up entirely in it and sometimes perhaps even led the way. We need to set that context.

Prevention remains utterly critical, but prevention and recognition of the past and learning from it are not two separate matters. I think Jo Kind helped us very deeply with that in her references this morning. Handling what has happened in the past helps us be a better preventative organisation today.

I would like to make some specific comments first on independence. We must have independent scrutiny and audit. It is already helping us. It needs to go deeper. We absolutely need independent advice, but any move towards independence that means we stop taking responsibility for what we are responsible for must be resisted. It is not an easy balance. I believe that the move to an ombudsman is vital, particularly for those of us who are Bishops. There must be a way for people to respond differently from the CDM if they feel hurt or failed by the way we have conducted ourselves. The CDM is not the way to do it; an ombudsman may well be. We need to find a way of accompanying people from the moment they make a disclosure and need support. Accompaniers/advocates

must become part of how we respond. We need to deal with the issue of redress much more rapidly than we have been. Insurance is important, and it will remain a critical part of that, but changing the insurance laws will take a very long time. I have personally committed myself to entering into that battle if it needs to happen, but it will have to go through Parliament and it will take ages. As a Church we must find a way of redress that is independently handled: we put the money in and we must have a system of understanding redress that helps people have adequate counselling for an ongoing time, helps them with retraining, offers the potential for start-up of a person's own business, but not a redress system which creates an ongoing dependence. We have to help survivors stand on their own feet in the way that they want to once again. We must develop this as a matter of urgency.

My final comment is simply to friends, or those who may regard me not as a friend, and as someone who remains absolutely passionate that we have to change as a Church. It is a long, long slow journey. I am sorry where I have not pushed us faster and harder but I remain committed to doing so.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr David Ison):* I am afraid I have to disagree a bit with the Bishop of Durham. Picking up the point Sheila Fish made about the basic assumptions that we might need to question, I think this Report needs to go further or we need to go beyond this in terms of looking at the assumptions we are addressing on this. There is a distinction indeed between safeguarding as prevention, and the structures we put in place for that, and safeguarding as following up on complaints and dealing with victims, survivors, the accused and perpetrators, and the congregations and societies who suffer as a result. I believe that the complaints process is the one that needs to be delegated. We can retain responsibility for that but we can delegate that to an independent body doing the judgments and making the arrangements on your behalf.

Why do we need to do this? When I was Dean of Bradford, I was Chair of the local authority standards commission and I learned about prejudicial interest and the way that disqualifies us from taking part in judicial processes. It is not only having a prejudicial interest, it is also being perceived as having a prejudicial interest so that justice is not seen to be done. I speak here to those sitting on the benches in front of me. Brothers and sisters, we are inevitably compromised in dealing with complaints because of conflicts between law, insurance, care for church personnel and ministry, defending the Church's reputation and trying to care at the same time for victims and survivors. Stop trying to do everything. You cannot. Do it by delegating to independent complaints authorities which can do it on your behalf and which are not seen to have any interest in the outcome and not seen to be compromised.

The other thing I wanted to question is what Jo Kind pointed out in terms of the focus on people. This is something for Synod to think about. Brothers and sisters, we have authorised the expenditure of millions of pounds of Church money on Renewal and

Reform so that we will have a future as a Church of England. We should be making millions of pounds available, to be generous in the support of victims and survivors and our processes in safeguarding; those who have been hurt, who have been marginalised at our hands. We are to love those on the margins and we should be doing it in practice. If we do so, if we make such resources available, we will do more, I think, to win converts and draw people to the Christian Gospel by being compassionate and person-centred than Renewal and Reform may do into the future. Please will you put this into the budget, those of you who have the authority to do so, and enable Synod to show its concern and compassion for those who are survivors by voting through such compensation and funding.

*Mrs Margaret Sheather (Gloucester):* I welcome both the motion and the Report and I find myself pursuing something of a theme that has emerged from other speakers, which is looking at that duality between what Singleton calls the legacy which needs to be dealt with open and transparently and how we then move into and continue to develop good practice so that it is consistently embedded in our life and culture.

We have that dual task to carry out and it is crucial that we keep those two aspects in balance and we have heard different suggestions about the way that that might happen. I think the point about where we move from being in the reputational bubble that was made during the questions into something that is more grounded in the personal and current response is a part of that.

We must, of course, continue working openly and sensitively in dealing with the legacy that we have and learning from it and from survivors and particularly powerful messages such as those coming from today's presentation. I hope though that we can do that in ways that do not really undermine our confidence in our capacity to change and to establish and develop strong systems and responses now, so that we do continue on the journey on which we have started.

I want to advocate strongly that the safeguarding responsibility should not be transferred to an external body. Other organisations of our size and complexity have had to face the same shaming issues that we have had to face and have found ways to move forward that enable them to continue to own and to respond positively to those challenges and to work in a better way. All the considerations in paragraph 68 of the Report about this issue of independence are highly relevant but, to my mind, the most important is the risk of what is referred to as "distancing from responsibilities".

If we are to consistently embed good practice and become the place of safety, refuge and healing we aspire to, then those responsibilities need to rest with all of us at every level, each fulfilling our appropriate role and that will build on the important work that is already underway.

*The Chair:* After David Coulston, Stephen Hofmeyr, also for a maiden speech.

*Mr David Coulston (Europe):* This is indeed my maiden speech. I am also colour blind and so you may have to shout at me if the colours change, Chair. I declare an interest that I am a member of the Diocese in Europe Safety Advisory Committee. I have been a JP and so I have seen the impact of abuse, shall we say, at the wrong end. Like a previous speaker, I have also spent some time with the National Probation Service, assisting them, not being assisted by them.

I speak in very strong support of the motion, Chair. I am very grateful for the progress that is being made. Yes, it is slow and a long road that we are following; perhaps not quite like tectonic plates but we are moving slowly forwards. It is important that we move forwards and get it right. We have seen a very succinct policy presented by the Church which is, from my point of view, extremely welcomed. It is very easy to understand.

In Europe, we are grateful for the caveat that acknowledges the fact that, working in over 40 different countries, not only do we have to work with the idea that we have got 40 different dioceses but we have got 40 different national, legal and cultural requirements to deal with. In some places, for example, domestic abuse is perfectly acceptable. In some places, the age of consent, if there is one, is less than the UK. It might come as a surprise to you that my own home country, Spain, has only recently moved from 14 to 16 years of age. It presents particular challenges.

I also welcome the *Practical Guide to Parishes* which has been recently published. I just want to add a cautionary note, if I may, Chair and Synod, which has come from this paper that we are discussing today and also from that practical guidance. The concept of nomadic predatory abusers is well-known to us. It has been an issue in the charity sector. We see it in Europe. It is important - no, it is essential that we look as closely as we can at the history of all people.

The matter which concerns me very simply is that there is a strong bias on mentioning just DBS as a checking medium. In Europe, many of our priests and many of our parishioners have never lived in the UK and DBS has no meaning. We have to look at safeguarding against the criminal records of the countries in which they are currently living and have lived. I suspect this actually rings a large bell here as well. Many of our communities in the UK are multinational. They have not just lived in the UK; they will have lived elsewhere.

*The Chair:* Mr Coulston, your light has changed to red.

*Mr David Coulston (Europe):* Oh, thank you. I was not able to see that, Chair. I do apologise. I would simply urge that we include more than just DBS in our checking, as we do.

*The Chair:* After Stephen Hofmeyr for a maiden speech, I am going to ask Simon Taylor to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name.

*Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford):* I had hoped to use my maiden speech to bring humour and colour to a debate, with great wisdom and tact and a lightness of touch to make an uncontentious point and to leave you smiling. This morning, however, we are dealing with matters of the very highest moment; no more so than to those who, whether as children or adults, have survived abuse or, even worse, have not survived abuse.

At the outset, I must declare an interest. For more than a decade as a lawyer I have had peripheral, indirect involvement in matters concerning safeguarding. I also sit as a judge in child abuse cases. Hearing earlier speeches, I must declare that I am a lawyer and an insurance lawyer.

Having done the ground clearing in supporting this motion, may I plant three seeds. First - and please excuse the inconsistency in my use of metaphor - no stone must be left unturned in the quest to establish the truth of what has happened in the past. I am a South African and I know the importance of truth and reconciliation. Let us leave no stone unturned - the past.

Second, the present. We must recognise and applaud good new growth where it exists. I am currently serving on a core safeguarding group. From my first-hand experience, I can speak to the expertise and professionalism being shown by those involved and being followed and it is a truly encouraging witness. For the present, let us applaud progress.

Third, whilst we must draw on the knowledge, understanding and expertise of professionals outside of the Church, it is essential that we retain ultimate authority and responsibility. Only if we retain authority, will we take responsibility. I urge you to support the motion.

## **ITEM 32**

*The Chair:* Simon, you have up to three minutes.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby):* I beg to move

'After paragraph (a) insert:

“( ) Endorse as an additional priority the support of safeguarding at parish level to create a safer church for all.”

Synod, I hope this will be taken as a friendly amendment. I am the safeguarding lead for Derby Cathedral. I have written policies and implemented them for three parishes and for a Fresh Expression of Church. My interest in this whole debate is mostly about how it lands in parishes and at the local level. The National Safeguarding Team have an unenviable job and I want to record my gratitude for all that they do.

Much of the debate inside and outside of this chamber has been directed at bishops and at a very high level. This is appropriate and important but it is not enough. I am troubled

that all of the three priorities identified in GS 2092 are top-down priorities. They are all important, they are all necessary, but they are not quite enough.

One of the key challenges for safeguarding in the Church of England, which we have heard about this morning, is about changing the culture of the Church. We need to change the culture so that everything is safe and that good practice is shared across the whole Church.

If we want to do that, safeguarding needs to be bottom-up as well as top-down. It needs to land well at the local level. It needs to be implemented at a local level. It needs to work well at a local level. It needs to become embedded in the Church at a local level. I hope that we will add an additional priority to support safeguarding at parish level so that we can create a safer Church for all.

By adding this priority, I hope that we as Synod can exercise our role properly and give directions so that the work of the team has a rightful impact at local level across the whole of the Church. Policy that is set at national level does filter through to the parishes and so it is important that it lands well, or else we will have wonderful policies never translated into practice.

It is important that national policy is proportionate to the size of the operation of work with children and young people and adults in parishes. It is important that work that does happen at a local level is owned as a priority by the National Team so that they can support that work and tailor what they do so that it really does enable best practice in all churches across the country. I ask you to support the amendment.

*The Chair:* Will the Bishop of Bath & Wells respond, please?

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* I am grateful to Simon for bringing this amendment. It makes something which was implicit explicit and it is good that it does that. If I had not run out of time in my speech, I was going to say a lot more about safeguarding at the frontline in parishes. I am glad that this amendment has been raised.

Can I also take the opportunity to draw Synod's attention to these prototype publications that I am sure you have already found in your pigeonholes? One is a *Pocket Guide to Safeguarding*. One is a credit card sized handy reminder. These are available for you and they are intended to be used at parish level and so I am grateful to Simon for bringing this additional clause.

*The Chair:* Point of order, Mr Freeman.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: motion for closure on Item 32.

*The Chair:* I think 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 are now going to put that amendment to the Synod.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (a) insert:*

*“( ) Endorse as an additional priority the support of safeguarding at parish level to create a safer church for all.”*

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

### **ITEM 33**

*The Chair.* Now I am going to ask Simon Butler if he would speak to and move the amendment in his name.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Butler (Southwark):* I beg to move

*‘After paragraph (b) insert:*

*“( ) call on the House of Bishops to introduce, as a matter of urgency, ways to improve relations between the Church and those survivors currently in dispute with the National Church Institutions including, where appropriate, by the use of mediation processes”.’*

I declare an interest as a member of the Archbishops’ Council but not speaking for the Archbishops’ Council. Like many of you, I stood on the steps of Church House in silent prayer with survivors in February and, having spent some time with survivors since then and listening to their varied experiences, their bafflement, their anger and frustration about aspects of their treatment by safeguarding staff of the NCIs. They deserve enormous weight to their concerns.

At the same time, Synod should recall that those who work in safeguarding for the NCIs, who would be the first to acknowledge past failures, are, nevertheless, the people we have employed to get us out of the mess that we have made, not them. We would do well to remember, Synod, that you and I and survivors can say all that we want, and rightly so, but professional staff cannot.

They are people. They are not heartless functionaries. If survivors have names, so do our staff. I am sometimes ashamed of the way in which some members of Synod claiming to speak on behalf of survivors speak about our staff. Many of them are not practising Christians. When we talk about how the world sees the Church, we should remember that.

We find ourselves in something of a stand-off between dissatisfied survivors and the NCIs. The anger and frustration are palpable, chiefly on social media, with every remark of the NCIs pored over and frequently rebutted. This is a deteriorating and concerning

state of affairs. I am also concerned about the perceived conflict in the way it is affecting the health and wellbeing of the survivors involved.

It is also having another effect, members of Synod. I have been contacted by a number of survivors - two, at least, members of this Synod - who feel inhibited about sharing their stories publicly because of the public tone of the conversation. I wrote about this in a blog a couple of weeks ago. One called Joanne, I will call her, said, "You may recall that I tried to say something on social media and got shot down by one or two people, one a survivor, which left me feeling that I really didn't have the strength to engage in the context of Synod anymore, and if I don't also I feel that I'm colluding with my own silence".

We have to find a different way of having a conversation about this with those in current dispute because the silencing will cause further damage. My amendment is simply to ask a little more of the House of Bishops through the NSSG to take some steps to try to heal the breach between what I understand is a modest group of, maybe rightly, angry survivors. I note the proposals for an ombudsman which I welcome but that will take time.

Right now, we need to find an urgent way, a better way, possibly independent mediation, to reduce the temperature, to dial down the public accusation and mistrust and to free us all to talk as we want, as fellow Christians and safeguarding professionals, in a better way that generates partnership and peace. I move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* The Bishop to reply, please.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* I am grateful for the second Simon for his amendment, which I am pleased to support. I think in the light of the discussions, the conversations, the distress and also the hope, all of which was meshed together in the very powerful conversations that took place last night, this is one way in which Synod can help to keep momentum and movement with regard to the concerns that were being raised very forcibly last night and then were again represented to us by Jo and Sheila this morning. It is for those reasons, particularly, that I am pleased to support this amendment.

*The Chair:* Mr Freeman.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: motion for closure on Item 33.

*The Chair:* That would have my consent. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

*The Chair:* I now put that amendment to the vote.

*The motion*

*'After paragraph (b) insert:*

*“( ) call on the House of Bishops to introduce, as a matter of urgency, ways to improve relations between the Church and those survivors currently in dispute with the National Church Institutions including, where appropriate, by the use of mediation processes”.*

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

*The Chair.* Now the debate on the amended motion continues. The speech limit is still three minutes.

*The Bishop of London (Rt Revd Dame Sarah Mullally):* I am a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group and I received the Elliott Review. Through you, Chair, I would like to extend my thanks to both Jo and Sheila but also to those survivors who attended the event last night and are here today in the gallery. I know that it has cost them dearly.

I also think that today has been a very clear demonstration around why we should involve survivors in what we do. I think, to date, we have not involved them effectively. Also, our understanding of what a good service looks like and how we provide care to them can only be defined well if they walk with us and we walk among them. I am also conscious that it costs them highly. Therefore, I am grateful for the additional amendment that looked at how we could provide support for those survivors who continue to find this a very complex situation.

Jo Kind commented on the fact that we had come far and I believe that I have seen change within our area of safeguarding. However, we have far to go. The earlier suggestion that we need to separate out safeguarding is a very wise one. How we provide a safe environment for today I think should be distinguished from how we respond to complaints in the past.

Therefore, for me, there is something about independence. There is something about independent scrutiny. There is also something for me about independent disclosure, particularly for those who have experienced abuse at the hands of a member of clergy. Also, for me, there is something about independent redress and independent ombudsmen. However, the responsibility, I am clear, is mine to provide a safe environment and a place in which individuals can disclose. Therefore, we should not lose our responsibility and hand over safeguarding completely independently.

Also, one of the areas I think we have not addressed clearly enough is that of power. Each of us in this House should reflect on our power, the power whether we perceive or not. At the heart of power and the heart of secrecy is when trust is abused. One of my greatest sorrows is the fact that those who have made a commitment to care for Christ's flock have abused that power.

I really just want to commend this motion to you and the action that is in front of you. I know that it may not be the vision that we absolutely want but, actually, it is a part of this

journey. Not to approve it today, I believe, will slow this down. There is a sense to which we should join in with the tenacity that the survivors show, to be tenacious to ensure that we do get to the vision of a safe Church that is open and enables reconciliation for all.

*The Chair:* Thank you. That was a maiden speech.

*Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Earlier this week, a friend sent this tweet, “Church, we have got to stop introducing safeguarding training with comments like, ‘Sorry, I’m afraid we have to go through the boring safeguarding stuff, it’s the rules’.” This is part of the problem. Friends, for as long as we see safeguarding as a chore and some kind of necessary evil - if you will pardon the choice of words - we will continue to allow darkness to grow in the home of light and the hope we are called to offer to a lost world will wither and die.

Safeguarding is not something to be seen as a hoop through which to jump but, instead, an opportunity for fulfilling the mission of God. We quite rightly get excited about #NewRebs, Fresh Expressions, Messy Church as proof of new life and growth, but do not talk of safeguarding in the same terms. There is good reason for this as, thus far, our safeguarding track record is nothing about which to boast. This must change.

We need to see how safeguarding is at the heart of mission, for it is only when sheep feel safe that they will give birth to lambs. Only when the Church is a safe place to grow will the flock increase, regardless of any other efforts or programmes. We have failed the good shepherd again and again and we stand accused in the same terms as the faithless, self-serving shepherds of Ezekiel 34.

Our Church is supposed to be like a mother nursing her children but, too often, we have been seen and have been a predator lurking in the dark waiting to strike. We have much still to do. The motion before us goes a long way to achieve that. Some would say it is not yet perfect but, to be resilient, we must never again think we have done all that needs to be done.

Heaven forbid that we will ever think, like the rich fool building ever bigger barns, that we can fold our hands and become proud instead of humble, self-serving instead of serving and a place of death instead of the home of life eternal.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: after the next speaker can I tempt you to a motion for closure on Item 8.

*The Chair:* No, thank you very much. A few more speeches.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* When I put in to speak, I put in to oppose the motion. Since I have seen these amendments, I now feel my way clear to support it. However, the point I want to make is this.

Having run one of the most rigorous safeguarding programmes in my parish, long before we got our act together, I was amazed and surprised that when a perpetrator was unmasked in our midst how people who I counted as friends, friends I looked upon as being sometimes saintly, would not believe what was being told to them. It led to a split in my church. Healing has not yet come.

It is very hard to run a church when a large number of your congregation is no longer there because they do not believe in what they have been told. There is a real price to do with strong leadership which has been called for in other reports. Unless dioceses get behind their frontline clergy and support them through the crisis that comes when you are dealing with this, it has a knock-on effect in that we do not get into this safeguarding stuff at all and we look upon the survivors when they come to us with grave suspicion because there is a cost if we start dealing with this as we should. There is a lot more to do.

However, I do want to say that we have done a huge amount and the people who have done it need our full and complete support. We need to go on doing this until we make a Church that is safe and, finally, worthy of the name, "Church".

*The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby):* I want to, first of all, echo what Bishop Sarah said a few moments ago about the tribute to survivors and to say that that will include those who are undeclared, undisclosed survivors here, of which there will be a very significant number, not only those who are survivors of Church abuse who are undisclosed but others for whom all discussion of abuse opens ancient scars and is infinitely painful.

We need to care for them very deeply and to pay a tribute to those survivors who have disclosed clergy abuse, who have come to this place and who will pay for that in sleepless nights and deep psychological pain for some time to come as a result. We are very, very grateful to them. We cannot say often enough how appalled and how sorry we are.

That takes us to some of the points that they have raised and I want particularly to touch on three very briefly. One is resourcing. There has been much talk of resourcing, and rightly, but resourcing means paying. If we are going to have budgets that resource redress and more effective work, including all forms of mediation and help in psychological help and counselling and that will lead to an improvement in what we do, someone has to pay.

The kind of debate we are having here today must happen at diocesan synods and deanery synods and PCCs so that people, when they see the bills, know why they are paying it and why it is essential that it is paid, otherwise it will be seen as coming from on high rather than being something that should be supported. Andrew Dotchin in his very notable speech a few moments ago was right about the positive attitude that needs to prevail about safeguarding not as simply obeying rules or ticking boxes, but as something that we are deeply and emotionally committed to and that will enable us to find the resources.

Thirdly, independence. I have been listening to these arguments for some time. I, again, agree with Bishop Sarah. I see the power of the argument for more independence, provided always we remain no less committed to our own responsibility. We have to hold those two things together. I will be interested to hear what Bishop Peter says in his summing-up when we speak of independence because I think it is something that will give confidence to what we do.

Finally, all this depends on culture. I am particularly struck by what Jonathan said a few moments ago, that the only way of ensuring that when people make disclosures or when something happens in a parish or any other church group, that it is not the victim and survivor who is blamed, is to have a culture similar, someone said last night, memorably, to the one that we have on drink-driving which has changed so much over the last 40 or 50 years - it was a survivor who said this last night - that nowadays it is condemned not sympathised with. Thank you.

*The Chair.* Nigel Bacon followed by Jayne Ozanne and then I would welcome a motion for closure, please.

*The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.*

*Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln):* I fully support the Report and the motion before us. It seems to me that it is the least that we can do and there may well be other things which we must attend to once we hear the interim and final Reports from IICSA. As a reader though, I recognise that safeguarding risks can arise from many directions within the life of the Church.

I would argue that readers and all other lay ministers who hold a bishop's licence should be held to the same high standards of safeguarding as the clergy. Whether a minister is ordained or lay, the consequences of abuse that they may perpetrate are the same. Action is underway to establish a national database for clergy. Readers and other licensed lay workers, like clergy, do move between dioceses and reader wardens do try to conduct background checks and obtain assurances to verify that people are in good standing.

If we could extend the national database proposed for clergy to include those who hold the bishop's licence or permission to officiate I think it would help prevent issues occurring in the future, help us put our house in good order and to keep it there.

*Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford):* I fully welcome this Report and the urgency with which many of us have pressed for it to be debated and to be taken forward. Last night, I, with various members of this Synod, had the privilege of hearing the harrowing stories of many abuse survivors and it has prompted me to ask the question: how do we say sorry?

One of those survivors came for the first time to meet other survivors and for the very first time shared his story with us. With his permission, I am just going to share a little bit of what he told us. He is happy for me to name him as Mark and he is in the gallery right now. He talks about how he was abused by a bishop 37 years ago.

He says: "He destroyed my innocence. He destroyed my self-respect. He destroyed my self-confidence. He destroyed my faith in humanity. He destroyed my future. He destroyed my faith in the Church of England and he destroyed my faith in Jesus Christ. His actions committed me to 37 years of despair, fear, anxiety and sadness. His actions caused me to have a nervous breakdown and attempt suicide three times. His actions have caused me employment problems, family problems and spiritual heartache beyond belief".

Synod, how do we say sorry? How do we individually and collectively say sorry? Who says sorry? Words can be said, prayers of repentance can be offered and action plans can be endorsed, but it is only until each one of us takes responsibility for the change of culture that is needed that will take this Church from being a point of fear for so many to a place where I hope we can all be safe. That responsibility lies with each of one us in this chamber and each one of our parishioners back home. I do believe we have to learn to say sorry with our hearts.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: motion for closure on Item 8.

*The Chair:* Mr Freeman, thank you very much. That has my consent. Does that have the consent of Synod?

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

*The Chair:* I am going to ask the Bishop of Bath and Wells to respond to the debate.

*The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock):* Thank you for the debate and for all that has been said. I need to clarify, just before I make some concluding remarks, that I made a mistake. I was speaking about numbers and said that in 2013 the Church spent £37,000. I believe I then said that in 2018 the overall Church spend was £2 million. I should have said that it was £7 million. I apologise to Synod.

I would like to say that, almost without exception, everything that has been said by all those who have contributed are things that I have welcomed and agree with almost everything that has been said. I am grateful to Kashmir Garton for saying encouraging things about the proposals in the paper but encouraging us and saying we must go further.

To David Kemp, reminding us of the accountability of bishops to be balanced with their leadership, a requirement for an independent body and the call for us to move more swiftly with our processes and procedures. To Phillip Blinkhorn, speaking about a national framework and the need to look at this as a national Church, the need for development in

supporting and resourcing safeguarding personnel at parish and diocesan level and the need to provide consistent practice, good service and resilience. A call again for an ombudsman, a call that I personally support and for a centralised safeguarding service.

I am grateful to Paul Butler for reminding us that prevention is utterly critical. The need for independence in scrutiny, audit and advice, but the need to go further and saying that an ombudsman style service is vital, introducing for us a concept that was very importantly brought to us last night in the meeting about the place of accompaniers and advocates.

David Ison encouraging us to go further and to go beyond what we already had, to extend our vision, our resources, our commitment and outlining practical ways in which we could do that. From Margaret Sheather, from David Coulston, from Stephen Hofmeyr, a helpful analysis of our Report but also some cautionary notes. We listen to those cautionary notes and voices very carefully, and a reminder that within Synod that there are some very experienced people who bring this to our debate and to our future work and we are grateful for that experience within the life of Synod.

Sarah Mullally brought us back to survivors and used the word “tenacity”. That, again, was a word that was brought to us at our meeting last night. She said there was far to go. She emphasised the need for independence with disclosures, redress and in other areas. She spoke about something which is shameful to all of us, which is the abuse of power and the secrecy that sometimes results.

Andrew Dotchin, I am grateful to you. You located safeguarding in the mission of the Church. That is where it begins, that is where it must stay and that is very important. Jonathan Alderton-Ford, you emphasised the need for safeguarding, for responding to be done well and to be done at a parish level. You helped us think about what Sheila Fish was bringing to us, which is the question: what would safeguarding look like, what is good safeguarding for the Church?

I am grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for being very clear in what he said and then, very charitably and very clearly, knocking a very fast serve into my court, if I might take a Wimbledon analogy. The answer, very briefly, I have not much time, you asked what we are going to do about independence. It has been a theme that has run through the debate and all that is said.

I think the first things we need to learn from other organisations, particularly those that are perhaps regulated and have statutory requirements which they work within, there are models out there we can look at, although I think - and this is not special pleading - as a Church we need to make sure that what we have is fit for purpose and, therefore, bespoke. Somebody spoke earlier about stripping back and not trying to bring in something that may be inadequate.

The Bishop of Durham told us that it was vital and urgent that we do this. I hear that. I have used the phrase “ombudsman type” because I think if we just fix our minds on one



model and try to import it into the Church, we may get it very wrong. That is one model that I think will be very helpful in clarifying what we need. I am grateful for Nigel Bacon, reminding us we have spoken sometimes in the past too often about clergy and bishops. There is the role not only of lay ministers but all of us who carry responsibilities within the life of our parish churches.

Jayne Ozanne brought us back to the voices of the survivors. I would like to end, if I might, with the words that Jo Kind brought to us this morning. She said to us, as members of Synod, we need to reorientate our thinking to focus on people who have been broken by abuse.

She said to us, very clearly, shift your focus to people. The Gospel is people focused. She reminded us that what was needed was changing direction, walking towards survivors, walking among us, she asked, walking in our shoes, borrowing some of our courage and borrowing some of our humility. I am grateful for every contribution we have heard this morning. Thank you.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* Point of order: as this is an immensely emotional subject and of high public interest, may I request that we have a recorded vote of the entire Synod.

*The Chair:* In order to do that, we have to have 25 members of Synod standing in their places. Are there 25 people? Yes, there clearly are and so this will be a counted vote.

The vote on Item 8: In favour 368, none against, with 2 abstentions. The motion  
*That this Synod, recognising that safeguarding is at the heart of Christian mission and the urgent need for the Church of England to continue to become a safer place for all and a refuge for those who suffer abuse in any context:*

- a) *endorse the priorities for action outlined in the report (GS 2092);*
- b) *endorse as an additional priority the support of safeguarding at parish level to create a safer church for all;*
- c) *call on the House of Bishops and the Archbishops' Council to ensure that the plan of action is implemented as a matter of priority; and*
- d) *call on the House of Bishops to introduce, as a matter of urgency, ways to improve relations between the Church and those survivors currently in dispute with the National Church Institutions including, where appropriate, by the use of mediation processes.'*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* Therefore, that item has been carried. Thank you very much everybody for your contributions to the debate. Please stay in the chamber for the next item telling you what is going to be happening this afternoon.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 12.06 pm.

## **ITEM 9**

### **AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SATURDAY AFTERNOON SEMINARS (GS MISC 1188)**

*The Chair.* Synod, we now move on to our final item of business this morning, which is basically an explanation of the offer for this afternoon. For this you will need GS Misc 1188. We are going to hear, first, from the Chair of the Business Committee and then, between the Bishop of Coventry and the Bishop of Newcastle, we will have Eeva John. The whole process should take us roughly half an hour. We are going to use the timings because I do not trust fellow Bishops how long they are going to speak for. No questions are allowed during this session. Chair of the Business Committee, please. Three minutes.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Friends, yesterday I outlined the Business Committee's commitment to providing a forum to learn about and contribute to various work streams important to our life and work together. Today, I am privileged to be introducing this conference style afternoon of seminars and workshops that have been prepared by key groups to help us work together and contribute to significant aspects of the Church's mission.

Last year, we received a good deal of positive feedback for the series of interactive sessions on major national workstreams and an encouragement from you to repeat this experience or something similar. In April this year, the Business Committee had the opportunity to meet with Dr Eeva John and to hear her outline of the work she has been appointed to oversee, at that stage called "The House of Bishops Teaching Document".

As part of our discussion, we considered Dr John's proposal for a series of seminars and workshops in which the different themes of the teaching document could be shared with Synod members and our contributions heard. You will have the opportunity to hear from Eeva shortly. I hope that her presentation will help to give the whole Synod an overview of the story so far, what is planned and, most importantly, the thinking underpinning this process.

Conscious that there are other important areas of work in which members are interested, we took the decision to extend the seminar proposal and invite four other groups to offer key seminars that will enable our continued understanding of and contribution to mission amongst children and young people, the environment, evangelism and digital evangelism.

On behalf of the Business Committee, I want to commend this afternoon to you and encourage you to participate in it as fully as you are able. We are convinced that this has the potential to be an effective way for the Synod to work together now and in the future.

*The Chair:* Thank you. We now move on to the Bishop of Coventry who has up to five minutes to speak on the *Living in Love and Faith: Christian teaching and learning resources*.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* Good afternoon. Sue, and the Business Committee, I am really grateful for the opportunity, as you have just said, to bring you up to date with this important project and to engage you in it.

There are a whole lot of people involved in this work and many of us felt the need for a less cumbersome working title for the project than we had, so we are glad that the Archbishops, following the advice of the Co-ordinating Group, have agreed on this as a working title for the project: *Living in Love and Faith: Christian teaching and learning about human identity, sexuality and marriage*. I hope that the reasons for this choice will become clearer as the presentation and the afternoon engagement goes on.

I said there are a whole lot of people involved and I would like to pay tribute to the over 40 people who are giving of their time, experience and expertise serving on the Co-ordinating Group and the thematic Working Groups and to those who are supporting those people. They have already produced some really great work. There is a file about *that* thick of some fascinating background papers that members of the Working Groups are producing to help us to shape our thinking and shape the sort of product that we will be producing for the Church.

Really, I do not want to take my five minutes because I think my main job today is to hand over to Dr Eeva John, the Enabling Officer of the teaching document process and the Pastoral Advisory Group. In little more than six months, Eeva has moved this work on with great, skill, energy and imagination.

The presentation that Eeva will give and the seminars and workshops she has helped us to design are part of our commitment to share our work as it progresses and to offer members of General Synod an opportunity to engage with us. Please make use of them, despite the football. May I say that I know when we discuss these matters anxiety levels can rise but there is plenty of time for anxiety later. I do not actually think this is the time for anxiety. This is the time to think, to learn, to work together, to reflect together.

People have been very kind to me in my role as Chair of the Co-ordinating Group and said, "This must be a really hard and horrible job for you". Actually, it has not been hard and horrible thus far. It probably will become hard and horrible, but at the moment I am really enjoying it because I am working with some great people and we are doing some good thinking together. A tough moment came when the England penalty went in and I

thought, “Well, that’s going to make life a little bit difficult this afternoon”, but so far it has been a good process. I do encourage you to engage with it and to enjoy it. Thank you. Now, Eeva, if I may pass on to you.

*The Chair:* Just before you do, can I tell Synod we have now been joined by Archbishop Moon Hing, Primate of the Church of the Province of South East Asia. Archbishop, it is an honour for us to have you in our presence. Eeva, I am told you are allotted 13 minutes.

*Dr Eeva John:* Thank you so much for this opportunity to share with you what has happened since this project came into being this time last year. The work can be conceived of as involving four aspects, each of which I will take in turn. I will be looking at visioning, learning, involving and planning.

I do not need to tell you, of all people, that this project is complex and ambitious. It is vital, therefore, for all those involved in implementing the project to establish a vision that gives us the inspiration, imagination, direction and determination that we need to make this project succeed.

In developing the vision, we began by asking ourselves the question, “What would success beyond our wildest dreams look like?” Here are some highlights that emerged from asking ourselves that question. It will be a landmark piece of work. It will gain respect in and beyond the Church because it will dig deep into Scripture, acknowledging its authority in the community, tradition and pastoral practice of the Church. It will neither dodge the diversity of the views in our Church today nor the ever-growing number of questions with which our society is faced in relation to human identity, sexuality and relating.

It will address the culture which we inhabit and within which we are called to be salt and light, and in that sense have a mission focus that brings Good News. It will comprise a variety of teaching and learning resources that are accessible and attractive, and therefore widely used by the whole people of God.

The impact of producing the resources and the way that people are invited to engage with them will be a unifying one. It will enable us to live together fruitfully and with ecclesial and personal integrity. Finally, it will embody vulnerability with humility and a mutual desire to discern God’s voice among us as we commit to deepening relationships with one another, both in the way that the project is carried out and in the teaching and learning that it will invite its audience to engage with. Those are just some elements of the vision that we dream about as we embark on this project.

We have also clarified something to do with the purpose of the project. It is first, of course, to provide resources for the Bishops to exercise their teaching both in the sense of teaching the faith and in helping the whole people of God to engage in deep and transformative learning.

An image that continues to inspire and identify and clarify the shape of the project is that of a tree. The roots reflect the deep scholarly study that is currently going on in a range of disciplines. This work will be brought together into a substantial core document, which may well be a book represented by the trunk. From the trunk spring the branches and leaves which represent a variety of forms that the material is likely to take in order to be responsive, accessible and attractive to the whole people of God.

The life of a tree is, of course, dependent on the flow of the sap that goes up and down from the leaves to the roots and vice versa. This represents the work of the Holy Spirit in the lived experience of both individuals and churches, about which I will say more a little bit later on. So, you are invited to learn more about the vision and to contribute your own reflections and comments at the vision workshop in the Spring Lane building.

The second aspect that I would like to share with you is about learning. Teaching and learning go hand-in-hand. This means that even as the four thematic Working Groups have been meeting together, exploring how their particular disciplines intersect with the questions of human identity, sexuality, marriage, relationships, anthropology and ecclesiology, they themselves have been learning from one another and are committed to contributing to do so. It has been a process of feeling together where and what are the key questions that need to be asked and addressed.

As you know, the members of the Groups represent diverse views, and so the Groups have also begun to learn to be honest with one another and to bring diverging perspectives to the table. This kind of openness to learning will require our work to integrate scholarship with experience and practice, to be imaginative in our approach, ensuring that the learning enables people to make personal connections. This means that we will need to maintain a relational dynamic but, above all, to pray for the transforming power of the Holy Spirit to be at work. A willingness and desire to learn asks of us to cultivate qualities of attentiveness, of openness, of compassion towards those with whom we differ. It requires of us vulnerability, courage and a spirit of adventure to be open to new insights.

Our work has often been described by the Archbishops, I believe, as a mapping exercise that sets out areas of agreement and disagreement. I guess that I would say that our emerging vision suggests it is more than a mapping exercise, but that we hope in the mapping process to discover brand new territory. We anticipate discovering new insights that may challenge and inspire each of us in different ways, bringing fresh understanding to what God is doing in and through His Church today.

The work that the Groups have done so far could be described as the ingredients of a cake. The work that you will be able to sample in the seminars does not yet look or taste like the case but represents a selection of ingredients that we have gathered together so far. You are invited to join these learning communities this afternoon, to meet the members of the Groups and to sample some of the work that they are doing and to discuss it with them.

The third component of our work, which is evolving, is about including others in the process of creating the document. A substantial piece of work that we are embarking on is engaging with Church communities and individuals. We want to hear about good practice in the ministry and mission of Church communities in a range of contexts embodying different theological convictions. We want to hear their stories of welcome, whether they are small rural churches, busy city churches, estate churches or Fresh Expressions. There are, I am sure, examples of not so good practice that we could report. However, others have done this and continue to do so. We have chosen to take the approach of appreciative inquiry, searching out the good from which we can all learn.

We also want to listen to individual's voices right across a variety of axes of difference. We want to hear the voices of those who are certain that they disagree or agree with the current teaching of the Church. We want to listen to the voices of those who are confused and unsure, the young, the old and the in-between. We need their help to ensure we are addressing the questions that the people of God are asking and to find out what format of teaching and learning resources would best be useful for them to be attractive and helpful. We will, of course, invite these individuals to tell us their stories.

All of this is in order to ensure that the scholarly work that we do, the roots of the tree, makes connections with experience, and vice versa. However, this is not a theologically passive listening to experience or a piece of sociological research, as valuable as these might be. We look to create a robust conversation between experience and theology as a means of listening to the Holy Spirit.

In a similar vein, we recognise that the Church of England is not isolated. What it does and decides as an established Church will affect other Churches and faith communities in England. Similarly, as a member of the Anglican Communion, we recognise that what we do and decide affects our sister Churches across the world. So, in a spirit of learning, we want to hear about the experiences, stories and perspectives of sister Churches in the Communion.

Last but not least, while this project is a project commissioned by and implemented with the House of Bishops, we are committed to offering you, as members of the General Synod, regular opportunities to hear and comment on our work. You are invited to come to our Questions Workshop to tell us what your questions are and what kind of resources you would like to see us produce.

Finally, and briefly, moving on to planning. This year, our work is focused on the thematic Working Groups and the participatory process that I have just described. In 2019, we begin to bring this together by reconfiguring the thematic Working Groups into interdisciplinary Groups which will weave the scholarly work together with the findings of the wider participation process that I have just described engaging with individuals and Churches.

In 2019, we will also be road testing the material that is being produced so that by 2020 we will be in a position to agree and publish the core document and the resources springing from it. We will do this, hopefully, just in time for Lambeth 2020. You are invited to come and find out more about the project and how we are currently planning to go about it; find out about its aims, its purpose and plans and contribute your own reflections.

I would like to finish by sharing two images with you. The first is that of a tangled knot of multiple threads of many different colours. We can choose to try to pull on the threads, maybe each one of us pulling on a thread of our favourite colour, making the knot tighter and tighter and eventually causing the threads to break. Or we can pause and patiently unravel the threads one-by-one until the knot has disentangled and the liberated threads can be woven together into something new and beautiful. This is how I envisage this project.

The second image is that of a gathering around a table at which we feast on a rich fare of scholarship, exploring many different questions while listening deeply to the stories of lived experience. As we do so, we discover that Christ himself, the scriptural Christ who was shaped by Scripture and shaped us through Scripture, is not only among us but is our host in this work. It is He who has invited us to listen out for what the Spirit is saying to the Church today. What new teaching and learning is He calling all of us to? What transformational work is He doing among us?

Please do visit the prayer space we have prepared to take time out to reflect on and pray for this work. Thank you so much.

*The Chair:* The Bishop of Newcastle is now going to speak about the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group for up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman):* The Pastoral Advisory Group is a fascinating concept and task. We are quite clear that we work within the current boundaries of our current teaching and doctrine as the Church of England has received it. That is the framework within which we are held.

To some, of course, this means that they view our work with deep frustration because there is a real desire for many to see change in our doctrine and our practice in the Church of England. We believe that we can do better in the way we relate in the incredibly important issue of our deepest vulnerability; our sexuality. Others, of course, will be fearful that in doing this, this is the thin end of the wedge and we are going to undermine the doctrine and teaching that we have in the Church of England at the moment. I am very relaxed about the fact that we will not please anybody, and if we do not we are probably doing really well.

The notion of pastoral care is a difficult one. In that powerful safeguarding presentation we had one slide which showed “us” and “them”. The one thing we really have to avoid is a sense that we in the Church of England are developing a system of pastoral care for

“us” to show to “them”. Nothing could be further from our task that we are faced with. Each and every single one of us is vulnerable at a very deep level in our sexuality. This is about the way that each and every one of us, as brothers and sisters in Christ, relate to one another with the greatest tenderness, compassion and respect in all our vulnerabilities.

In the Ordination Service in our diocese on Sunday, there is that wonderful line: “Remember always that the treasure with which you are entrusted is Christ’s own flock”. Brothers and sisters, we are entrusted with one another in our most vulnerable parts.

In the Group that we are working on, we are taking that very seriously. How do we live out that trust? How can we do so much better at living in a way where we are so open with one another, compassionate with one another, respectful of one another, that we offer a deep level of pastoral care to one another in our practices in the Church?

In the Group, we are attempting to live the change we want to see. It is the most extraordinary group I have ever been involved in. I cannot tell you the level of respect I have for each and every single member of the Pastoral Advisory Group. We are working in a way which is showing we entrust ourselves to one another in a level of trust. We are seeking to see not working out of just our intellect, although we are using our intellect, but we are working out of our deepest feelings.

So, where do we go from there? Well, a month or so ago we had our first residential. What we did in that residential to begin with was take the current teaching and guidance on prayer for LGBTI people, people in same-sex relationships, the current guidance issued by the House of Bishops and Church of England, and we allowed ourselves to react to that in an extraordinary session. We set ourselves a whole context of working. We asked what qualities would we like our conversations to embody? Respect in the context of difference, honesty, compassion, participation on behalf of others, integrity, obedience, warmth. We agreed ground rules which are about presence and focus, confidentiality, and we acknowledge that we are going to get it wrong. We said, “What happens when we break our ground rules?” We have allowed ourselves compassion. Any of us can call for time-out on the conversations as they happen, when they happen. We are careful with one another. We care for one another.

If you want to see what our gut response was to that guidance, and I will stop now, come along this afternoon, because you will see in our seminars a very wonderful vivid display of how the current guidance impacts on us, that varied group of people that we are. You are warmly invited. Come along, talk to us, and we would love to listen to you too. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Back to the Chair of the Business Committee to wrap this session up for us. Three minutes.



*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* So, I have a brief opportunity to introduce the remaining seminars, which are explained in greater detail in GS Misc 1188 (copies at the information desk).

The Digital Evangelism Workshop will focus on the ways the national, digital and Church House publishing teams are supporting local churches. There will be a progress report on recent campaigns and initiatives, including the Amazon Alexa launch and research showing the impact of this year's Live Lent reflections. There will be a discussion on the ways national teams can help encourage people into local worshipping communities and a briefing on what is coming up for the rest of the year.

The Evangelism Task Group – it is a very typical brief – invites us to an energising and participative seminar in which we are invited to reflect on culture change and to share learning and strategising for evangelism and witness. Mary Hawes and Nigel Genders will host a conversation focusing on the changes we need to make and the steps we need to take to encourage and enable churches, schools and families to collaborate in the crucial work of mission and ministry amongst children and young people.

Taking as its starting point Archbishop Justin's words, "Reducing the causes of climate change is essential to the life of faith. It is our way to love our neighbour and to steward the gift of creation", the Environment Seminar reflects on the opportunities and challenges for the Church's environmental work.

As a bit of a Business Committee addendum to that statement, I would like to tell you that the estimate for the circulation of papers this Synod is at least 25 trees. If you do not use one of these, perhaps you might think about it.

You need to know that Evening Worship will take place in seminar rooms and the Berrick Saul Building. Please collect a worship booklet as you leave this lunchtime. The staff will be on hand with maps and water at the information desk. I want to make you aware that ITV have asked – I really do not believe this – to film Synod members watching football and will join those of you watching here briefly this afternoon. I felt you might want to know. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Sue. I trust that the Chaplains will be on duty here for anybody who is adversely affected by anything they see on the big screen during the course of this afternoon.

Can I remind members of the Standing Committee of Canterbury Convocation and the York Assessors, your meeting in Spring Lane, 005/006, will now start at 1.20 pm. You need to grab your lunch fairly quickly. Push to the front of the queues if you need to do so. The rest of us be good Anglicans and queue as long as it takes to get some dinner. See you later.

## **Full Synod: Third Day Sunday 8 July 2019**

THE CHAIR *Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, Synod. Just so that you know how to look after your needs, the comfort break is going to come after Item 12.

### **ITEM 10**

#### **CLIMATE CHANGE AND INVESTMENT: A PRESENTATION FROM THE NATIONAL INVESTING BODIES AND THE DIOCESE OF OXFORD (GS 2093 AND GS MISC 1196)**

*The Chair:* Synod, we move to Item 10 on the Agenda: Climate Change and Investment: A presentation from the National Investing Bodies and the Diocese of Oxford, for which you need GS 2093 and GS Misc 1196.

We are going to begin under Standing Order 107 with a presentation. This is going to be given by the First Church Estates Commissioner, Loretta Minghella, Dr Jonathan Spencer, the Chair of the Pensions Board, and the Bishop of Oxford. They are each going to have five minutes to speak and Loretta is going to sum up. We will go from one speech to another. Afterwards there will be some time for questions so if you can think of your questions, please. I call on the First Church Estates Commissioner to begin the presentation. We are starting with a video.

*(Video played)*

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* Good afternoon, Synod. I am Loretta Minghella, First Church Estates Commissioner and Chair of the Assets Committee, the committee which makes the strategic decisions about investment and disinvestment of the Church's endowment plan. I will be joined in this presentation by Jonathan Spencer, Chair of the Pensions Board and together, we will be reporting back on behalf of all three National Investing Bodies on what we have been doing since 2015 - when we committed to concerted action as investors in the fight against climate change and to report back to you in 2018, and here we are.

After we have made our remarks, the Bishop of Oxford will give his presentation on the background to the amendment that he will move in the debate that follows this presentation. With your leave, I will then wrap up.

Back in early 2015, I was the Chief Executive of Christian Aid and a new member of the Church's Ethical Investment Advisory Group, the EIAG. I joined the group fresh from a trip to the Philippines where I had visited the exceptional recovery work Christian Aid had

been doing in response to the massive typhoon, Typhoon Haiyan, which struck there at the end of 2013. Over 6,000 people died and millions more were displaced.

In Tacloban, one of the areas hardest hit, I sat with a group of survivors and listened as the tales of bereavement and trauma poured out. In this coastal community, the typhoon had whipped up a huge body of water six metres high which had swept in, wrecking homes and carrying people upwards and inland, and claiming many victims on the way. One woman told me that for her, it had been a case of swimming for hours in this body of water, with her four children calling out, “Mum, Mum, how long do we have to keep on swimming?” And she replied, “Just a bit longer, just a bit longer”. “How much longer?” “Just a bit longer”. “How long Mum?” “Just a bit longer”. “How?” And she said to me, “I still don’t know how I kept on swimming”. And then came her challenging question to me: “So what are you doing about climate change?” Her question is seared on my memory.

As the EIAG advised us back in 2015, “humankind has a divinely mandated responsibility for the physical world, for its creatures and for one another, especially the weakest ... This mandate ... requires us to do all we can to minimise whatever is damaging creation ... and to promote all that is good and that brings the Kingdom of Heaven into ever greater realisation on Earth”.

Climate change is the most complex and important social, economic, environmental and moral issue of our time. It is claiming lives and ruining livelihoods. And the National Investing Bodies know that it is a wicked problem in every sense of the word. Because whatever we conclude today about what should happen to the Church’s money in the next few years, we will all go home to lives that remain, for the time being, fossil-fuel dependent.

But we cannot emigrate to another world; we cannot negotiate with the weather. We need real-world urgent practical change to cut carbon emissions dramatically. We all have to embrace that big shift away from fossil fuel dependency to embrace new forms of energy as fast as we can.

At the end of 2017, we, the Church Commissioners, had under 5% of our listed equities portfolio in the world’s big oil and gas companies, and I am glad to say companies working on climate solutions comprised nearly 10%. We are already making the big shift.

Still, it was absolutely right in 2015 that the EIAG advised the National Investing Bodies that we have a responsibility to promote the urgent need for change. As I said in the video, our investments give us the opportunity to be in the room and frame the conversation with fossil fuel companies, to keep the pressure on them to play a full part in the transition. That is a mandate that we have taken very seriously.

Persuading a big company to change generally requires winning the hearts and minds of institutional shareholders. We have shown that we can do that time and time

again. Leading a massive shareholder revolt against Exxon Management last year is our best known example. Having this huge opportunity to press the case for change brings with it a huge responsibility to make the absolute most of it. In my first eight months as First Commissioner, I have seen close up just how much the National Investing Bodies have achieved - so much more than I ever imagined. I see now with greater clarity the powerful role institutional investors can play.

I am now going to hand over to Jonathan Spencer to explain what we have been doing since 2015 on each of the specific commitments we made.

*Dr Jonathan Spencer (ex officio):* Thank you, Loretta. In the next few minutes I shall set out how the National Investing Bodies, or NIBs, have delivered against the commitments we made following the Synod-backed Resolution of 2015.

We had six key areas and in the following slides I shall address each in turn.

We made a commitment to engage robustly and I shall set out to Synod the five steps that we have taken.

The first step was to identify how we would know if we were actually seeing reductions by companies in their carbon emissions.

It was also essential to the NIBs that we were engaging on our terms.

There is no shortage of glossy company publications and we needed an independent tool that could clearly and practically cut through and give us authoritative assessments.

We needed assessments of whether a company was equipped within its management to address climate change and then assessments of whether a company was actually reducing its emissions in line with the objectives of the Paris Climate Agreement.

Our action was to create the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) already mentioned in the video.

With careful legal advice we made this an open source tool as we wanted transparency so that anyone can judge what progress is being made.

In fact, any member of Synod can go online - and I would encourage you to do this after the debate - but when you do you can check for yourself what rating we give any of the assessed companies from Shell to Ford to many more.

Once we had built the tool, our second step was to build the support. £7 trillion of funds are currently supporting the TPI. This £7,000 billion is many times greater than the £13 billion of assets the NIBs have on their own.

From this next slide you can see the opening on the London Stock Exchange by the Archbishop of Canterbury last Monday ahead of the State of Transition Summit.

Together with the Environment Agency Pension Fund we convened asset owners from around the world to review progress since launching TPI. There were chairs, chief executives and senior representatives from funds with over \$9 trillion in assets in the room.

The Archbishop challenged us all to go further and to go faster and to flex our muscles. A challenge we will meet. As of Monday, TPI has now assessed 183 companies across seven energy-intensive sectors.

This past week we have also had the first re-assessment of companies to which I refer to later on.

Our third step was to set the terms of the debate with oil and gas companies based upon the TPI tool. Our strategy is not only to be at the table but also set the rules of the table. TPI enables us to do just that.

Our fourth step was to integrate TPI's analysis into our engagement and deploy our tools, our voting, our AGM interventions and our support for shareholder resolutions. This we have done and voted against chairs of companies ranked poorly by the TPI. We have also come out publicly and called for targets aligned to Paris across the oil and gas sector. This call was subsequently adopted by funds with £9 trillion in assets, giving us greater leverage than before.

It is striking to me that we are beginning to see clear signs this strategy is working in Europe amongst the major oil and gas companies. Importantly, with TPI we will be able to determine if company plans are sufficiently ambitious and aligned with the goals of the Paris Agreement. If not we will engage further until they are. If they are not responsive, we will take our fifth step in 2020 to begin targeted disinvestment.

I should note that our efforts have been a partnership with the Chair of the Environment Agency, Emma Howard Boyd, which we greatly value.

In line with the original EIAG policy, which encouraged us to engage collaboratively, we have built a powerful coalition as we know we cannot do this all by ourselves. Our engagement is further reinforced with our involvement in the Climate Action 100 Plus initiative targeting the 150 most carbon-intensive companies in the world, accounting for some £30 trillion in assets under management. This engagement programme runs until 2023 and we are key members. Investors across the world are collaborating as never before and we have the tool in TPI to track the progress.

So, turning to public policy, public policy is critical to the transition to a low-carbon economy. Governments' own commitments and actions to date are yet to align with 2

degrees or below 2 degrees of warming. Further work needs to be done. We, along with other asset owners, have been making key public policy interventions to highlight this and encourage greater action now and in the run-up to the successor to Paris. But investors need to do more and flex their muscle in the public policy debate and we intend to do so too.

Our work with energy companies has been considerable and the TPI analysis released on Monday showed the progress in these sectors. We are beginning to see the transition and there is demonstrable evidence of the impact of our and other investors' pressure. In the oil and gas sector we see Shell, Total and just this week Eni announcing serious emission reductions covering all their activities, including how people use their products. In the diversified mining sector we see Rio Tinto has left coal production. In the electric utilities sector, TPI has shown this past week that 11 major electricity companies have targets aligning to below 2 degrees of warming. With TPI, through our engagement and by being at the table we are seeing change.

Is this enough? The answer is no, not yet. But are we having an impact? The answer to that is yes and we can do so much more.

Turning to our investments in renewables, all three NIBs have been increasing these investments across all three funds. The Commissioners have a large investment in wind farms and remain one of the largest owners of forestry. This trend in investment in renewables will continue.

But we are also looking at other market interventions, for example the Pensions Board has about £650 million in passive investments. At the summit this week, we announced our intention to create a stock index for these funds that would be informed by TPI. This would reward those companies that are transitioning whilst removing actual capital from those that are ranked poorly. We are working with FTSE and the LSE to deliver this.

Lastly, reporting back to Synod, we want Synod's confidence in our strategy. It is not an easy strategy, as that would be to walk away and leave the heavy lifting to others. Our approach is to do all we can to drive long-term systemic change. But this is not a short-term task and cannot be completed within the next 18 months.

Our last slide is just some of the messages from those outside of the Church family that represent the major investor networks and key partners asking us to get on and finish the job. They are part of a much larger global effort and to walk away from that would be to remove our leadership when and where it is needed most.

I will hand back to Loretta.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* I co-chaired the TPI summit at the London Stock Exchange on Monday and other investors kept coming up to me at the summit thanking

me for the Church of England's leadership and urging us to keep going, saying that they need us.

I am too new to take any credit for it, but as a member of the Church of England I am really proud of what the investing bodies have achieved. The credit goes to the people sitting behind me: Edward Mason, the Commissioner's head of responsible investment and Adam Matthews, Co-Chair of the Transition Pathway Initiative and Director of Ethics at the Pensions Board. They were both voted in the top five in a global survey of responsible investors. With a problem of this magnitude, Synod, I am so grateful, that we have some of the world's best people on our team.

Time is not on our side. When TPI was launched last year, we made clear that we would need to start to separate the sheep from the goats in 2020; to separate the ones who are making a real effort and the ones who are burying their heads in the sand or who are simply too arrogant to change. In some cases, there will be a clear-cut case for disinvestment and if that is our view in 2020, based on our TPI data and our engagement experience, please be clear that we will divest. This is also my message to any fossil fuel companies listening to our proceedings.

But there will, at that point, still be companies that are ready and willing to change, which have indeed started to change but which can and must urgently do more to make themselves safe. Those are the ones which will require the most intensive engagement at that point, because if all financially and environmentally significant companies aligned behind our tool in the next few years, and got their business plans publicly in line with what is needed, it would be transformational. We want to do everything to make sure that happens.

At this point, I will invite the Bishop of Oxford to speak.

*The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft):* Good afternoon, Synod. Thank you, Loretta, Jonathan, and your teams, and for all that has been achieved, which is indeed of great significance.

However, as a measure of how far we have to go, 2017 was BP's biggest year of oil exploration since 2004. Shell still claims on its website, "We have no immediate plans to move to a net zero emissions portfolio in our investment horizon of 10 to 20 years".

At Shell's annual meeting in May of this year, only 5% of investors supported a resolution calling on the company to set emission reduction targets in line with the Paris Agreement.

According to the 2017 Report from ShareAction, Shell and BP's best-case synopsis for business planning was found to be consistent with 3 to 5 degrees Celsius plus our global warming rise, a trajectory to a catastrophic climate change if nothing more is done, giving all of us a much greater urgency in this debate, grounded in hope that things can change.

I am privileged to sit as a member of the Advisory Board off the Oxford University Environmental Change Institute, one of the most respected global institutions working in this field. I was invited to join the board meeting months ago in recognition of the key role that the faith communities need to play in leading the change we need to see and which, by and large, we are not yet playing.

Myles Allen is Professor of Geosystem Science at ECI and closely involved in the International Panel for Climate Change. Myles has argued that the most important figure from the scientific point of view in the Paris Agreement is not 1.5 nor 2 degrees; the most important figure is the zero. We need net zero carbon emissions to stabilise global temperatures at any level, whether 1.5 or 2 or 3 or more. That will not happen until we have reached net carbon zero, whether that is in 50 or 100 or 150 years.

If the Paris Agreement targets are to be met, the world needs to meet net zero as early as 2050. Therefore, any company making 40-year investments that does not have a plan for net zero and is neither counting on Paris targets not being met is neglecting its duty to its shareholders.

The goal of the Paris Agreement is peak emissions in 2020 and then falling. Therefore, the most important question to ask fossil fuel companies now is, "What are your plans for the reduction of carbon emissions to zero by 2050? What are the measure of the staging posts along the way? How do you intend to maintain profitable through that transition?"

I am sure that 2050-2020 is the right period for vigorous engagement. I am really grateful for all the NIBs have done for the Transition Pathway Initiative. Their work has been understanding. The TPI will be a tool for many, many years into the future, whatever the outcome day to day. There is a growing community of Church-led institutional investors who have realised that engagement is not enough and more urgent action is needed. Incremental change is not fast enough. Internal engagement needs to be combined with external pressure.

We have a really serious ethical issue before us as a Church. Achieving the aims of the Paris Agreement for the world requires 30% of oil and 50% of known gas reserves remain unburnt. If we continue to invest in these companies beyond 2020 we will be generating profit from practices which will harm and exacerbate the issue of climate change.

The threat of imminent divestment beginning in 2020 is not an alternative to engagement but a vital part of that engagement. We will not, in my view, be walking away. Engagement can and should continue by different means.

I believe that as a Church we have responsibility to lead on this issue within the UK, society as a whole and internationally through the Anglican Communion. That role of leadership depends on aligning our investment practice and our lifestyle in our second debate this afternoon with the global vision for a net zero carbon world by 2050. Thank you.



*The Chair:* Loretta, if you are able to respond fairly quickly.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* I will do, thank you very much. Thank you, Bishop Steven. There is a great deal of common ground I think between the National Investing Bodies and Bishop Steven. We are very grateful for the opportunity to debate this this afternoon.

We agree that many of the companies are not on track. We agree with the aim of honouring the Paris Agreement. We are in direct conversation with the companies that he mentioned.

The important difference between us though boils down to this: to say now that we should be forced to blow the final whistle on our holdings based purely on a company's progress by 2020 is dangerously blunt given where we are. We need to be able to judge based on our data and our engagement experience whether this is indeed the moment to divest or whether a further final period of intense engagement could yet pull the company over the line, because we do not need these companies to fail, we need them to change. If we believe we could achieve a greater impact on climate change by staying in the conversation, to disinvest would be an abdication of responsibility, given the leadership position we now occupy, because premature disinvestment leaves us unable to rely upon our own judgment, out of the room without a voice and meanwhile our shares would have changed hands and perhaps gone to people who do not care about climate change at all.

In the next five years we have a mountain to climb and we are not naïve about how tough it will be. Please do not set us up to fail. Right now, we are looking for your affirmation, your prayer and your support and in my mind's eye, as your First Commissioner, there will always be one woman asking, "What are you doing about climate change?" and I want to be able to say her and to all those suffering its impacts, "We see you, we hear you and you do not have to keep on swimming any more". Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you to all our speakers. We have got time just for three questions I am afraid, and these have to be real questions of clarification and not a speech that you would like to make. So, if there are not any questions we can move on to the main debate, but are there questions of clarification that need asking? Mr Freeman? Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Mr Chairman, a question for Loretta. In her first speech she was encouraging us to invest individually in small outfits. It would be very helpful if we had an idiot's guide as to where to look for them because some of us are not as internet savvy as learned people on the platform.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much for that.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* I think that was a request and I will follow up with you afterwards. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you Synod.

## **ITEM 11**

### **CLIMATE CHANGE AND INVESTMENT: A PRESENTATION FROM THE NATIONAL INVESTING BODIES AND THE DIOCESE OF OXFORD (GS 2093 AND GS MISC 1196)**

*The Chair:* So, we now move to Item 11, a debate on the motion from the Diocese of Oxford. So, I invite the Bishop of Manchester to move Item 11.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I beg to move

‘That this Synod:

- a) welcome the worldwide agreement in Paris in December 2015 to hold “the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels” and to pursue “efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels”;
- b) affirm, as it did in 2015, its support for the climate change policy recommended by the EIAG and adopted by the National Investing Bodies (‘the NIBs’) in 2015;
- c) welcome the NIBs’ disinvestment from companies focused on thermal coal mining and the production of oil from oil sands;
- d) welcome the NIBs’ establishment of the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) to track whether major companies associated with high carbon emissions are aligning their business plans with the Paris Agreement;
- e) urge the NIBs to engage urgently and robustly with companies rated poorly by TPI and, beginning in 2020, to start to disinvest from the ones that are not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition to a low carbon economy;
- f) urge the NIBs proactively to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and low carbon technology; and
- g) request the NIBs to report to Synod within three years on progress, with a timetable for rapid continuing action.’

Thank you Chair. I am delighted to propose this motion on climate change investment. I do so in my capacity as Deputy Chair of the Board of Governors to the Commissioners and as you are probably also aware I am currently Acting Chair of the Church of England Ethical Investment Advisory Group as well.

Three things I want to speak about, firstly the importance and urgency of climate change as an ethical investment issue, secondly why the national investing bodies' approach to climate change and investment asset out in the motion is the right one, and third the importance of sending the national investing bodies back to work on climate change supported by the affirmation of this Synod. I will try not to repeat too much of what has been said already by the First Church Estates Commission and the Chair of the Pensions Board, the Bishop of Oxford. I think we are all agreed that there is hugely important and huge urgency of action on climate change, from the way that climate change will be so damaging to creation, to the world's poorest and most vulnerable, that failure to arrest it is not an option.

We need to see the emissions peak happen without delay and then rapid decline so the world achieves net zero emissions at some point the second half of this century. And of course, we do not have much time. There is a huge task and we all have our part to play.

Three years ago, I led the last Synod debate on climate change and investment but since then we have had the Paris Agreement, the world has now by and large agreed a framework. We have a global goal to hold the increase in average temperature to well below two Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5 Celsius if we possibly can. We welcome this long-awaited agreement and the framework it has created and that is the first ask of today's motion, Synod's chance to welcome the Paris Agreement.

But what does it mean for investors? What does it mean for national investing bodies as church investors. The national investing bodies are advised by the EIAG on how we can witness to the Christian faith through our practice of institutional investment. As you heard we made our seminal policy recommendation on climate change and investment in 2015 after a two-year review process. This is the policy that has driven the work on climate change that the national investing bodies have followed since and that Synod is being asked to affirm again today. In 2015 our voting figures were 255 in favour and none against, let us see if we can better that today. The National Investing bodies' policy acknowledges there is no single means by which investors can bring about the urgent transition for low-carbon economy. No simple solution, no one silver bullet.

The policy makes clear that the investing bodies that have helped us hasten transition need to make determined, sustained and long-term use of all the tools at our disposal. And the motion today enumerates these clause by clause, divestment, engagement and positive investment. Immediately after the adoption of the climate change policy the NIBs sold £12 million worth of shares in companies that were focused on the mining of thermal coal, of the production of oil from oil sands. Those are the highest carbon fossil

fuels, the ones for which we have viable lower carbon replacements, the ones that we have to get out of with the greatest speed, and our divestment policy signalled this loud and clear.

But the whole basis of our climate change policy is there is no easy escape from climate change as an investor, no exit from the taint of carbon emissions via divestment because carbon emissions are everywhere in every part of our economy. Yes, they are in oil and gas companies, they are also in diversified mining companies, the electricity utilities, steel companies, cement companies, paper companies, the manufacturers of those cars that are illegally parked in the staff car park and everybody else's. The high carbon sectors of the economy are many. We have all got to transition to lower carbon business models consistent with the goals of Paris. That is why we worked, as you saw on the video, with the Environment Agency pension fund, the Grantham Research Institute, the London School of Economics to create the transition pathways initiative. That is why the next of our actions on climate change comes as mentioned in the motion.

Establishing that transition path that companies have to be on, tracking whether they are on it, is proving a very powerful way of driving change and supporting evidence-based engagement. We had the Stock Exchange at our conference on Monday, we could see where the companies are beginning to move from level zero to one, to two, to three, to four. All of them are at different places. We launched our initiative in January 2017, eighteen months ago, at that point I think we had something like \$2 trillion worth of assets under management supporting us, that figure is now over nine. We head a coalition over five hundred times larger than our own total investments. It is an incredible position of leadership for the Church of England to find itself in.

And then there is the other side of transition, the fast-growing low-carbon economy. We are committed to putting our capital to work in that economy. Again, you have seen methods of that in our presentation. So, we are saying please send us away and encourage us to do more to do our utmost to seek out and scale up investments in renewable energy and low-carbon technology that meet our risk return criteria. Finding the right way to approach climate change as national investing bodies with important financial obligations to the wider church is not easy either ethically or practically, especially as the climate change challenge gets ever more acute year by year.

And it is right that we should be debating this afternoon whether we have the right approach, whether we can do more. I am grateful the Bishop of Oxford for the questions he is raising about the role for divestment from fossil fuel companies. And yes, our climate policy has divestment as an ongoing tool of our climate policy. If companies set themselves against transition and against engagement then we will divest, make no mistake about that. Our motion invites Synod to urge us to start our next round of divestment in 2020, using the transition pathway initiative assessment. The Bishop of Oxford's amendment does not propose a minor change to our strategy, we believe it cuts the legs from under it. We are creating the best tool in the investment industry for tracking whether companies are aligned with Paris, we are building a reputation far beyond the

church for conducting some of the best and most robust engagement with companies on climate change. We are showing we can help shape the approach to climate change and investors who have trillions of dollars of assets under management.

Unilateral wholesale disinvestment from fossil fuel producers in 2020 or beginning in 2020 based on assessment in 2020 would leave that strategy and that influence in tatters. Even the risk of such early wholesale investment would. It would not spur companies on for change further and faster, it would do the exact opposite, it would take the pressure off them, they would know wait a couple of years and the Church of England will be out, we do not need to worry about them anymore.

I am however sympathetic to Canon Goddard's amendment, which appears also on your order paper for this afternoon. 2023 accords better with our strategy, it gives engagement the time it needs, we have only had this coalition going 18 months. We need the time. We will align with a timeframe for Climate Action 100+. They bring together an alliance with over \$30 trillion in assets. These are telephone numbers but telephone numbers have an influence. Members of Synod, I ask you again to back the church's investing bodies on climate change. Strengthen our hands as we implement determinedly the ethical investment policy recommended by the EIAG, strengthen our hands as we seek to drive the transition to a low-carbon economy with the very best of our abilities and resources. I hope, Synod, you will overwhelmingly vote for this motion.

*The Chair:* This motion is now open for debate, would those wishing to speak please stand. Can I call, then, Valerie Hallard, to make a maiden speech, followed by Professor Martin Gainsborough, followed by the Archbishop of York.

*Ms Valerie Hallard (Carlisle):* I would like to make a case for prioritising the call to the national investing bodies to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and low-carbon technology, bullet point (f). The shift from fossil fuel to renewable investment I will illustrate from a couple of swords to ploughshare stories in a local context, where we can see signs of God's kingdom breaking in.

I hail from West Cumbria on the Lake District coast, a somewhat economically depressed coastal strip whose economic development was originally founded on high carbon industries of coal, iron and steel. Today West Cumbria is designated Britain's energy coast innovation zone and is seeking to become a diverse, resilient and low-carbon economy. At the last census we were found to have 11% of the area's working population employed in the energy sector, in percentage terms, the highest nationally.

Our first major investment in renewables was onshore wind. As well as generating low-carbon electricity, the projects have benefited local communities. Village halls and church buildings and projects have been able to draw on the socioeconomic funds made available by the sponsors. We have since seen the development and expansion of the Robin Rigg offshore wind farm in the Solway Firth. Initially there were concerns for the wellbeing of migratory birds, but a friend who takes out the RSPB monitors on his boat

reports that the 10-year survey has indicated no significant impact, with some benefits to particular species. The Robin Rigg socioeconomic fund supports a range of community projects which use energy more sustainably or conserve or improve the local environment.

But wind is by its nature episodic, so having one of the UK's highest tidal ranges, the Solway Firth holds significant potential for energy generation through the construction of a tidal barrage providing more predictable generation. The plans for a full scale tidal lagoon on the coast north of Workington were contingent upon the Swansea Bay pilot scheme. So, you can imagine that the Business Secretary's recent decision not to support the Swansea scheme was a major disappointment locally. Greg Clark's statement comes only 18 months after an independent government review strongly backed the scheme, so there is still a need for investment.

You were probably wondering when I would get around to Sellafield. Sellafield was a wartime munitions factory, and in 1947 the Windscale nuclear piles were built to produce weapons grade plutonium in response to Cold War tensions. Later, the Calder Hall nuclear power plant was the world's first power station to generate electricity on an industrial scale from nuclear energy both for military and civil use and it is now decommissioned. In Britain our nuclear power stations, though often opposed and delayed, provide us with low-carbon electricity. In West Cumbria we await commencement of a new nuclear power generation plant because in my view in order to meet our targets we will always need baseload generation. And we need to replace fossil fuel generation sooner rather than later.

Finally, I would like to illustrate an example of investment from our own diocese. Two small scale hydropower projects on the Cumbrian fells at Rydal and Scandale Beck have been estimated to produce sufficient power to make the diocese carbon neutral in electricity for all its buildings. The government's regrettable retreat from investment in renewables means that we will fail to meet our Paris Agreement target. It also leaves an investment gap. To fulfil the role entrusted to us by God as stewards of creation, we must undertake it in a spirit of generosity, drawing on the promises of God as delivered to us by the prophet Malachi. 'Bring the whole tide into the storehouse that there may be food in my house.' 'Test me in this says', says the Lord Almighty, 'and see if I will not throw open the floodgates of heaven and pour out so much blessing that there will be not enough room to store it.'

We might not literally be seeing the floodgates open above Rydal at the moment, but we do sense God nudging us to hope. What would hope in the future look like to all of us and to future generations? Surely it would be that we and all God's people shall be free and the whole earth live to praise God's name.

*The Chair:* Martin Gainsborough followed by the Archbishop of York. I should have said you have five minutes.

*Revd Canon Professor Martin Gainsborough (Bristol):* I am quite clear that the Church should be using its influence to persuade companies to align with the transition to a low-carbon economy but I am speaking today in order to highlight concerns I have about the church's stance on creation care. Too often in matters of social justice the church comes late to the table, saying things not very different from wider secular society and as for our scriptural inheritance. This can sometimes just be added as a gloss after the event, so I am wondering if we cannot do a little better. The dominant perspective on green issues in the world today is what is known as a green growth or green capitalism approach, the sustainable development goals, for example, are fundamentally a green growth perspective.

And what this perspective says essentially is that we can continue with our economic model, that is a perpetual economic growth model, because technology will enable us to solve our problems or clean up our mess. I am pretty certain that this is the perspective of our national investing bodies and things that have been said earlier have confirmed that for me. The trouble is that this perspective is too conservative. Of course, technology will help us, is helping us, up to a point, but we are kidding ourselves if we think technology will solve all our problems, something more radical is needed. The question the green growth perspective never asks, but is absolutely critical to ask, is why are we so addicted to economic growth in the first place. Asking this question will without doubt take us into some very tricky and political terrain, far more tricky than any of the motions on the floor of Synod today acknowledge. But this, I believe, is where we need to go.

So, what are the implications of this? What you find if you ask the question of why we are so addicted to economic growth is that the logic of our financial system requires growth, to repay debt, to stop the whole system crashing. So counterintuitively to save the planet you need to reform international finance, which points up to me the irony of what we are talking about today, how the church does or does not invest its money in an unreformed financial sector.

To conclude, of course what we are debating today is not wrong, it is important, but it is not enough. And I want to encourage the church to lock horns with some of these really difficult, thorny questions, why are we so addicted to economic growth, to follow them to their logical conclusion and to bring our inheritance to bear, which is Jesus Christ, to advance us to a distinctively Christian response. Thank you.

*The Chair:* The Archbishop of York, after which we will be looking at the amendments.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Members of Synod, as you may remember from my speech in November 2015, Margaret and I had the privilege of visiting the Diocese of Polynesia, Fiji, Tonga and Samoa for three weeks at the invitation of Archbishop Winston Halapua who was due to be with us at this Synod, and his wife, the Reverend Susan Halapua. I have seen the impact of climate change myself in Fiji, I have heard children's stories of rising sea levels, I have heard the cry of the small island states.

The head of state of Samoa, who is also an academic and a scholar in the subject of climate change said these words to us: 'Fundamentally the problem of climate change is a problem of arrogance and greed. If we want to address it as the critical issue that faces our world today we have to come to terms with something that is bold enough to allow us to say the unsayable.' In other words, what is constructive in this search for answers is also what is most hard to say.

Arrogance and greed are human vices that speak to the weaker side of ourselves, to our vulnerabilities as human beings, the arrogance that pervades the modern psyche is an arrogance that compromises the soul, over people, person, leader, parent, child. Arrogance and greed, while seemingly easy to identify are difficult to make transparent, even to avoid. Arrogance is the condition of resuming unfettered dominion of our environment and all living things. It is the ability to rationalise and believe that what is wrong is right. Greed is the ultimate unhealthy occupation we have with profit. That is accumulation of pecuniary or material gain for individual benefit at the unreasonable expense of others.

Modern technology and industrialisation have allowed us to live a life of comfort literally at our fingertips, but this has come at a great cost to our natural environment and spiritual health.

The head of state of Samoa said something wonderful, that in this one indigenous reference, the aiga, or family, in this traditional framework sees a geological connection between all living things, between people and their natural environment, between people and animals, between people and the cosmos, the plants, the seas, the rivers and between people and God. In other words, God, people and all living things are family, treating the environment as family in this way can reorient our hearts and minds to the new, because what ultimately matters is not scientific knowledge or technology or change of economic system, vitally important as these are. What matters is how we see ourselves in God's world, how we as human beings relate to the rest of God's creation on which our life actually depends.

In 2015 I said the concern of the planet is not a Christian add-on, but intrinsic to our understanding of the Gospel today. Synod, it is now 2018, every year we fail to cut CO2 emissions, we pile misery on our brothers and sisters, the poorest and the most vulnerable of the world, not just our brothers and sisters today but their children and their children's children and all their children to come. As Christians the world over and as the Church of England we can speak out about climate change as we are doing today, and it has a powerful, prophetic and moral voice. And as the Bishop of Manchester said, as shareholders the church's investing bodies can do something else, not just speaking. They can get into the boardroom of companies, they can galvanise other investors to action they would not otherwise take. They have a seat at the table, and boy, they use it and use it powerfully. As a Church Commissioner I am proud that we are shaping



corporate strategy. I am proud that we are leading the way in the investment world. I am proud of the change we are making, but friends we cannot stop our work entirely in 2020.

That is why I will not be voting with the Bishop of Oxford's amendment. I want to ask a question; by 2020, will we stop using gas, electricity, fossil fuels, petrol and diesel in our cars, we are investing in that indirect way in those companies whether we like it or not. Are we going to do it by 2020? I do not think so. So, what should we do? Canon Goddard has set a smart framework, so let us unite around it, let us thank the Bishop of Oxford for helping to define our position so clearly. Let us send Loretta from Synod as she has asked, with an affirmation and our prayers of support, not burdened by a motion she does not in conscience of analysis actually support. Loretta, we support for you, we will pray for you, be bold, be strong, but it is not 2020. 2023 seems more reasonable. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* I now call the Bishop of Oxford to speak to but not to move the amendments at number 34.

*The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft):* Thank you Chair. The Oxford amendment has its roots in a growing sense in parishes and deaneries that the issue of climate change is becoming, as we have heard, the greatest ethical issue of our age and that we are not yet addressing it with sufficient urgency in a number of ways. The motion has its roots in our relationship with our linked diocese, in Kimberley and Kuruman in South Africa and Nandyal in South India, both already experiencing the serious effects of climate change. The debate needs greater urgency and firmer action.

And I am very pleased to speak to this amendment, on behalf of our Diocesan Synod and want to pay tribute to my colleagues Daryl Hannan and Hugh Lee and others who have done much of the pioneering work to raise the issue in our diocese over many years. I agree with and support every clause of the motion before us except clause E and if our amendment falls I will support and vote for, gladly, Giles Goddard's helpful amendment which will follow.

The first clause of clause E has my full support. The NIBs need to engage urgently and robustly with companies rated poorly by TPI. I do believe that TPI criteria themselves need to be much more robust and focus on the goal of a carbon zero future by 2050. TPI, as acknowledged, is a tool in development and there is great openness, I think, to that dialogue and strengthening what is asked. But the second half of the clause, as presently drafted, is neither urgent nor robust. I do not want to tie the NIBs to an automatic or forced timetable. We are leaving in the words "beginning in 2020", our investment managers need some flexibility. But the norm and expectation from 2020 should be divestment for the reasons I explained earlier.

Five years into the Paris Agreement, and in the year of peak carbon emissions, the balance between engagement and divestment needs to be reversed. The world is not aiming for a low-carbon economy. That is not enough. The world is aiming for a carbon

zero economy, at some point, hopefully by 20150. Nothing less. Not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition is not enough. How can you measure that?

We need to see an unequivocal plan for a business to align its investment plan over 30 or 40 years with the Paris Agreement. And that does not mean, and I here disagree with the Archbishop of York, that we are looking to see an immediate ceasing of use of those fossil fuels, they are needed for the transition. Synod, this amendment has attracted significant support beyond this chamber, the support of Christian Aid, the support of Tear Fund, of Operation Noah, of USPG, all of whom work with some of the poorest communities in the world. We have received messages of support for this amendment through the Green Anglicans Network, from many parts of the world who are praying for us this afternoon.

The Methodist Church, the Church of Ireland and other churches have joined already the growing divestment movement. This is not just an argument about timing and tactics, not a single extractive fuel company yet has a plan for existing in a world with net zero emissions by 2050. They are all investing funds, some of our funds, in equipment and infrastructure that will be digging up and burning fossil fuels well beyond mid-century. I urge Synod to support this amendment because the timescale for change is so urgent. If you cannot in conscience support it then support Giles Goddard's amendment which will follow. Synod, the earth is the Lord's and everything in it. It will take the whole world to keep the earth from catastrophic global warming. Let us move this issue front and centre and play our part. Thank you.

*The Chair:* I call Canon Giles Goddard to speak to but not move his amendment. Again, you have five minutes.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* Thank you for calling me Chair. I have been very involved in these conversations since I moved an amendment in this chamber to the 2015 motion which asked the NIBs to develop clear framework to demonstrate whether or if the policy of engagement was producing any results, so I feel slightly avuncular about the transition pathway initiative, so I suppose I should declare an interest, although the little child which we then thought we were producing has become much bigger and much more far-reaching than anything I had imagined at the time and in that context I am proud of the work that the Church of England is doing. So often we pass motions urging others to take action in public policy but here we are acting as well as encouraging others to take action. I need to stress too that that it is very clear that the TPI is an evolving tool. It has changed since it was introduced and it is being revised all the time, and that is a good thing.

I am also grateful for Mr Gainsborough's challenge, which I hope we will take seriously, about the place of economic growth in our polity. I am a former board member of Operation Noah and I am a strong supporter of Christian Aid. I set up something called the Faith for the Climate Network, which works hard to encourage greater interfaith co-operation on climate change. I am a member of the Church of England's Environment

Working Party and the Synod Environment Group, so I hope you can see that I am absolutely aware of both sides of the divest and engagement arguments.

I am proposing this amendment because it would, if passed, ensure that Synod continues to hold the NIBs to account on climate change but at the same time gives the TPI enough time to demonstrate how effective it can be.

The task of moving to a zero-carbon economy is urgent, necessary and huge. None of those involved in this conversation disagrees about that. You have heard the personal commitment to reducing climate change from the First Church Estates Commissioner to the NIBs making a real difference.

The question is: how do we get there? Do we simply, in the end, pull out of the extraction industry and take our bat and ball away or do we stay and try and move this huge sector of the economy? If we are going to stay, how do we ensure that we can keep up the pressure to make the huge changes that we know are needed?

I welcome the NIBs' commitment to investing in green and renewable industries. As we all experience this heatwave, I understand the time pressures. The Churches are in a unique position here. We have, alongside others, such as the Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts and 350.org, been right at the forefront of the work on finance and climate change.

Do not take my word for it; listen to Christiana Figueres, the former Secretary-General of the UN's negotiations on climate change and more responsible than anyone else for the Paris Agreement. She said recently, and I have been in touch with her office to confirm the quote: "Religious institutions are doing a fantastic job on investment, on putting down questions at AGMs, on challenging the fossil fuel companies". "Fantastic job", she said.

So, there is convergence in this debate, but I do have a slight anxiety about the relationship between haste and urgency, and that is why I am proposing this amendment. It allows us to continue to work hard to bring about the vital change with the 2020 focus remaining, which is necessary, but it gives a very clear endpoint of 2023 by which, if there is not clear evidence of change, we would divest.

This amendment will strengthen the motion by giving added urgency but not forcing haste to the work of the NIBs and the EIAG. It would show that Synod is serious about addressing climate change and it would enable us, crucially, to present a united voice to those who are very interested in and following our actions in this area. I urge Synod, if the Oxford amendment falls, to support mine and then to vote wholeheartedly for the revised motion.

*The Chair:* Before we get into debating these amendments, I call Caroline Spelman, the Second Church Estates Commissioner.

*Rt Hon Mrs Caroline Spelman (ex officio):* Good afternoon. This marks the 10th anniversary this year of the Climate Change Act. It was a really pioneering piece of legislation and it put the UK at the forefront of global efforts to tackle climate change. I really wanted to speak in this debate today not just in my capacity as Second Church Estates Commissioner but as someone who has been working to improve our shared global environment most of my working life, culminating in being Environment Secretary.

I have been at the front end at both intergovernmental level, not only at the Rio+20 Summit and the run-up to the Paris Conference but also as Shadow International Development Secretary visiting those countries affected by extreme weather events, like Bangladesh, Malawi and the Sudan. That experience taught me that the most effective way to achieve lasting change is through a policy of engagement, with Governments, with business, with investors, civil society and the public. It is only when these coalitions come together and speak with one voice and with a targeted ask that Governments and international bodies get serious about finding global answers, such as in the Paris Agreement.

It is my fourth year now as your Second Church Estates Commissioner and I think one of the most impressive things I have seen is the Transition Pathway Initiative and the prize-winning work of the Commissioners' Responsible Investment Team. They have helped the Commissioners to be global leaders in ethical investment. That status and that influence should not be underestimated. It is the result of sustained, patient strategic engagement and if the Church is to direct and shape the agenda on these vitally important issues, it is this emphasis on engagement rather than pulling out of investment that will be most likely to produce movement in the direction we want.

In the last few years, churches and their communities up and down the country are increasingly being affected by extreme weather events themselves, such as the floods in Carlisle and Exeter Dioceses, the recent fires in the national parks in Manchester and Blackburn Dioceses and droughts across most of England at the moment. This is not just a phenomenon in the UK. We know we are part of a global challenge.

Divestment will not stop climate change, nor the extreme weather events. I know that the Oxford amendment comes with the very best of intentions, but I urge Synod to engage with the Commissioners. Lobby them to be firmer, go further, faster, but allow them to have the flexibility they need to rise to the challenges we give them. We can prove that consistent engagement has a consistent impact on companies' behaviour. Divestment offers little more than a one-off piece of media coverage and a listing in the divestment campaign's catalogue of supporters. All it will do is spread relief across the business sector that one of the key actors who are prepared to challenge them regularly is leaving the stage.

I take questions on the Floor of the House of Commons. Indeed, next week I shall reflect what was discussed in Synod. I am regularly asked about the Church's investment strategy and it is good to be able to point out what we have achieved by getting big

corporates, like Exxon, Shell and some of the extractive industries to change their policies as an influential shareholder. Please do not underestimate the impact of this in Parliament. These are the fruits of engagement and they would not have been achieved by a policy that prioritised withdrawal.

As a Church, beyond the investing bodies, we can do much more to give the environment and good stewardship a higher profile. We heard some really good examples earlier today of churches in Ryedale really being consistent about achieving zero carbon for themselves. Indeed, we need a diocesan-wide level change in behaviour, whether that is our own car usage, changing energy suppliers or even generating our own energy; a commitment that starts when the individual uses the power of congregations to change society complementing the work of the Commissioners and what they are doing to change corporate behaviour. This will be more successful than the approach I fear will be suggested in the Oxford amendment.

The Government is moving towards a zero-carbon economy and the UK is already a world leader in green finance. The transition to a low-carbon economy is a major opportunity for the UK and the Government's commitment to the Paris Agreement and to new technologies also presents an important opportunity for investors such as the Commissioners. Sustaining change needs moral leadership and investment, walking together, engagement, including from the Church's National Investing Bodies, inspiring others is essential if we are to maintain the UK's position as a world leader in green finance in the long term. Synod, I urge you to back the motion and reject the Oxford amendment.

### **ITEM 34**

*The Chair:* Thank you. That neatly leads in to me asking the Bishop of Oxford to move his amendment, please.

*The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Steven Croft):* I beg to move

'In paragraph (e) leave out –

“to start to disinvest” to the end

And insert –

“to divest from any fossil fuel company which is not on an unequivocal path by 2020 to aligning its business investment plan with the Paris Agreement to restrict global warming to well below 2°C.”

I am pleased to move the amendment standing in my name on the Order Paper.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I call on the Bishop of Manchester to respond to that. Bishop, you have up to five minutes.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I will be very brief, Chair. I gather there is a panel in some of the Bayeux Tapestry that carries the caption and the words,

“Harold encourages his troops”. If you look above the caption to the picture, he appears to be prodding them rather vociferously in the backside with a sword. The words speak of encouragement; the picture looks more like grievous bodily harm. I think that is my view of the Oxford amendment today. The words are, “Yes, this will encourage us. It will strengthen the hand of the Commissioners, make us stronger in negotiating with companies”, but it will not. As soon as companies know that if they remain motionless until 2020 we are out, some of them will take the view, “Well, we can abide 18 months. We can lose this uncomfortable shareholder and the pressure will be off us”.

We need to keep the pressure on and the best way to keep the pressure on is the motion as it stands originally or, as I said in my opening speech, we are very happy to support the amendment in the name of Canon Giles Goddard. It is a tough ask. Giles has been a strong advocate, as he made very clear, on these issues for many years, but we think we can make that work and that will strengthen our hand. The Oxford motion will be like poor old King Harold’s troops and they did not come off very well.

*The Chair:* The amendment is now open for debate. I am going to reduce the speech limit to three minutes and I call on Eve Poole, followed by Sue Booy.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Dr Eve Poole (ex officio):* I would like to speak against the Oxford amendment. This is my maiden speech. I am nervous because I am a huge fan of Synod because when I wrote my PhD I spent many long weeks with your proceedings in Lambeth Palace Library. I read your every word over a 20-year period, which I think is a record. I think it is a record few can match and I can see how the Archbishop of Canterbury gets to sleep at night. I do know a thing or two about your debates on ethical investment and of the Commissioners’ track record over the years on the matter. Their report card from the 1990s “not good”. There were lots of rather polite letters that went something like this: “Dear John, Synod says we should tell you how naughty you are. There, said it. See you next week for golf. Love the Commissioners”.

In those days, the one thing that saved us was the Diocese of Oxford. Without fail, whether it be the Oxford Judgment or repeated questions and motions at Synod, Oxford would call us out on our rather thin approach to ethical investment. It took a while for us to hear, but thanks to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and now the brilliant team, led by Edward Mason, I am delighted to see that things have really changed. We do take it seriously now and we are really proactive.

Today, we stand here having won for the Church some incredible victories. We lead TPI, which is now becoming a global standard, and everyone is following the Church’s lead. We are achieving the kinds of concessions that you can only get if you are a syndicate investor. For as long as the shareholder value cult prevails, the only voice that can achieve this level of strategic and cultural change is the voice of the shareholder.

The Church's social liturgy is most often seen at work through food banks, homeless shelters, street pastor and community work, but our social liturgy, engaging with the principalities and powers in the House of Lords and in the investing community is how we effect change upstream to reduce downstream effects.

Engagement for us is both moral and strategic, but not at any cost. If they do not listen, we will shake the dust from our feet. We know that being on the pitch allows us to score the goals we could only pray for from the sidelines. Today we are asking Synod to protect our negotiating position so that the Church can continue to lead this extraordinary work. If these companies know that you have told us to divest anyway, why would they even try?

If you have been to the Tate you will have seen the famous Epstein "Jacob and the Angel". It was created in 1941 and looked so wrong that it was relegated to the freak shows in Blackpool until Tussauds bought it in the 1950s. What we are doing, eating with tax collectors and sinners, may look freakish to the average passer-by, but, like Jacob, we must wrestle until daybreak even if it puts us out of joint until finally the angel blesses us. We would ask Synod to bless us too and vote down the Oxford amendment. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Synod, I must say I speak as a convert. Oxford Diocese debated this motion twice and, naturally cautious, I voted against and then abstained. I have never spoken in this debate because I had to chair both of them. As Chair of the Oxford clergy and Vice-Chair of Synod, I speak on behalf of many members of our diocese who have contacted me over the last week or so.

My conversion has happened through my relationship with a parish in our link diocese. In October 2013, when it began to rain on our visit, the children ran out of church into the rain; many did not remember what rain was. Last October, at the same time of year, it did not rain and did not rain for another eight weeks.

I first met Rachel Mash, the climate change officer for Cape Town, when she was HIV/AIDS officer there. She says now, "I never thought I would see anything worse than HIV, but climate change is causing more harm".

We heard from Archbishop Thabo in February about the plight of South Africa warming at twice the global average. In the Commissioners' video that we saw, Bishop Christine said that our values should drive the way we invest. Which values? Looking after the Earth? Caring for our neighbours, for our sisters and brothers? Perhaps we are caught out by the expectation present in these hymns that we love: "This world is not my home", "I am just passing through", "Pilgrims through this barren land". Do these breed in us an expectation?

Since 2015, we have seen significant work through the TPI, and nobody would want to do anything other than praise the work of Edward Mason and his team using influence for change, but the question before us now is what change and how. Loretta spoke of 10%

of companies changing. Is that the change our values require? Is it enough? Is it fast enough? I have come to think not enough and not soon enough.

The Oxford amendment offers this Synod the opportunity to be clear about whether our influence as a large investor, our clout, is best used to change hearts and minds or to draw attention to the plight of our brothers and sisters and to say clearly, "This is enough; act quickly". Thank you.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* At the outset let me declare some interests in this subject. I spent the whole of my professional career working primarily with companies in oil and gas, power and mining. I am a non-executive director of the board of EnQuest plc, an upstream oil and gas company listed in London, and I am a fellow of the UK Energy Institute.

Before directly addressing the proposed amendment from Oxford, may I ask you just to think for a moment about energy? As the Archbishop of York said, energy is fundamental to every aspect of our daily life: the generation of electric power for transportation, for heat and for light. We need energy to move people and freight by road, rail, sea and air, but we do have a problem. We need to transition our energy systems to a new low-carbon basis and we need to address the fundamental issues of global warming and climate change as set out most clearly in the Paris Agreement, but whilst ensuring that we can still produce enough affordable energy to meet the world's energy needs.

Demand for energy is not static. Globally, we are contending with population growth, increasing urbanisation and a growing middle-class, all of which combined have meant that the total demand for energy in the world has increased by 50% since 1997 and is expected to increase by a further third over the next two decades to 2040, the equivalent of adding the energy requirements of another China and another EU to today's energy demand. Even after investing trillions of dollars in renewable energy, today's global energy demand is met one-third by oil, a quarter by each of coal and natural gas, 11% by nuclear and hydro, and 4% by other renewables such as wind and solar.

This is why the word "transition" is so critical in this debate. Moving to a low-carbon world cannot happen overnight as we need to change a large, complex global energy system and we will continue to need oil and gas to meet the world's energy needs for some time to come. However, the reason that carbon emissions are beginning to fall is that the bulk of the increase in world energy demand is actually being met by a move to natural gas and, even before any form of carbon sequestration, the burning of natural gas emits 60% less carbon than coal.

So, how are we most likely to ensure that our energy system does transition as quickly as possible, bearing in mind those enormous related costs? I would suggest that the companies with the balance sheets and capabilities to do this do include the world's largest oil companies and the likes of Royal Dutch Shell and BP are already investing billions of dollars in low-carbon fuels and technologies. The National Investing Bodies



have played a critical role to date in promoting the need for companies in which the Church invests to have clear strategies for that transition to a low-carbon future, including through the Transitions Pathway Initiative.

*Mrs April Alexander (Southwark):* I must declare I am a Church Commissioner. Breaking up is hard to do. Well, that dates me, but do not the politics of the last couple of years prove that this is so? We have learned how damaging it is if one party to a multi-party agreement changes his – and it usually is his – mind and stomps off. Think Paris Accord, think Iran, think the North American Trade Agreement. The Oxford amendment would require the Church of England to do just that with their new-won partners in TPI.

New members will not have been here in July 2015, but that was the year when the Synod unanimously asked the NIBs to “engage robustly with companies and policymakers” and “encourage the work of those energy companies”, as Giles Goddard has reminded us.

The NIBs went away and have done just that, and they have been successful beyond our wildest imaginings and, as you now know, they are partnered in the TPI with other investors to the tune of £7 trillion. Now it is suggested that they break away from that agreement long before they have had time to see how effective it will be in reaching the goal that it has set. What would happen then? Considerable disruption and confusion if the other examples I mentioned are anything to go by.

The other members of the TPI coalition might soldier on, but punching above one’s weight in any sphere brings responsibilities and our partners in TPI might well find they have much less leverage without the C of E. Who then would continue the work and what would the Oxford Diocese expect to happen? The team at Church House has done exactly what Synod required of them, and much, much more, and now they are reporting back. No one asked them to disinvest and walk away and nor should they do so now. Now is not the time and neither will it be in 2020. We would lose the very considerable leverage we have and would be renegeing on a binding agreement. Thank you.

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

*The Chair:* I am growing in interest. I will declare an interest a bit later on.

*The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam):* This debate is a really good opportunity for Synod and the Church of England to engage with the environmental issues connected with the Fifth Mark of Mission, to strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the earth. There is a lot more going on than a debate about investments in both the motions before us this afternoon.

We have heard about the Transitions Pathway Initiative going from nought to 18 months old and a world-class initiative. Christiana Figueres, who chaired the Paris climate change talks, at a conference I was at four weeks ago, singled out the Church of England for a model of shareholder engagement and for making use of our investments in the way

that we are. The Al Gore Foundation featured the Church of England as its example of leadership in western Europe for the way we are dealing with the environmental issues, TPI among them.

When we began on a new track with the environment – was it four and a half years ago – we set up the Environmental Working Group, which I chair. In addition to what is happening with TPI, which we have heard a lot about, we have been doing a great deal through the Environmental Working Group to engage the local churches with this agenda. We have had some notable successes.

The Archbishops have talked about the way they have heard in the Anglican Communion that this is the top priority that is coming from the Primates around the world. The Church is one of very few institutions capable of building that global view, a God's eye view of what is happening with the environment. That is relational, as we have heard in some of the speeches today. We have worked with A Rocha to create Eco Church, which is actually set at quite a low threshold to get people engaged and 900 churches have engaged with Eco Church though we have yet to have a single Eco diocese.

We have tried to encourage people to shrink the carbon footprint and the initiative of the Big Shift was really successful, 2,000 churches engaging with that. The *Church Times* Green Awards attracted 112 projects; way up on anything we have done before. Something new is happening. Absolutely brilliant.

At the seminar yesterday afternoon, a number of people commented on how it was great that we had a plastic-free Lent. What about a plastic-free Synod? It would be extremely difficult to do here in York given what happens in the lobby down below us.

Those 900 churches on Eco Church is a brilliant 6% and 12% engaged with the Big Shift. Synod, I do not think, with integrity, we can claim that we are on an unequivocal path by 2020 to aligning our business investments with the Paris Agreement. I therefore think we cannot vote for the Oxford amendment.

*The Chair:* Kathy Winrow, after which I would be very interested in a motion for closure.

*Mrs Kathryn Winrow (Oxford):* I am standing here not just to support my diocesan Bishop but to speak for a real groundswell from parishioners that I really do not think I have ever seen or heard before. We have heard very eloquently this afternoon from the Church Commissioners. Thank you for all the work that you are doing. I fully understand that. We have also heard that this is not a short-term solution. We have heard at least four times that time is running out, and time for debate this afternoon is running out. If you are child or a parent in Bangladesh or Fiji or South Africa, or wherever, time has already run out.

I speak with passion on that because it is all very well sitting in chamber to discuss and to talk about investments, which I fully understand, but let us talk about people and let us

talk about humanity. We are looking to transition to a low-carbon economy but we are also looking to transition to a net zero carbon economy and, as the Bishop has just said, so many parishes have worked, and are continuing to work, on becoming carbon neutral. But this is not just for us; this is about the world that we look after. While we take time to transition away from fossil fuels to a net zero carbon economy, the Church simply cannot continue to benefit from companies which place profit margins above the environment and, consequently, above God's children.

I urge the Church Commissioners to continue to work with and engage with the energy and extractive companies and also to increase investment in impact assessments. I urge you, Synod, to support the Oxford amendment.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Motion for closure on Item 34.

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

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

*A Speaker:* Could we have a vote by Houses?

*The Chair:* You can have vote by Houses if 25 people are standing. There are not 25 standing. Therefore, I put the amendment to the Synod.

*The motion*

*In paragraph (e) leave out –*

*“to start to disinvest” to the end*

*And insert –*

*“to divest from any fossil fuel company which is not on an unequivocal path by 2020 to aligning its business investment plan with the Paris Agreement to restrict global warming to well below 2°C.”*

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly lost. I now ask Giles Goddard to formally move his amendment.

## **ITEM 35**

*Revd Canon Giles Goodard (Southwark):* I beg to move

*‘After paragraph (e) insert –*

*“( ) urge the NIBs to ensure that by 2023 they have disinvested from fossil fuel companies that they have assessed, drawing on TPI data, as not prepared to align with the goal of the Paris Agreement to restrict the global average temperature rise to well below 2°C,”*

Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The amendment is now open to debate.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* I think I am supposed to say that I support it.

*The Chair:* Thank you.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: would you be prepared to accept a motion for closure on this item?

*The Chair:* You know what, I would like to hear a few speeches, but I might need your help later.

*Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield):* Synod, I passionately believe that we need strong action on climate change and the Paris Agreement is a good start. I am glad that today as Synod we will say strongly and clearly that climate change is destroying the world and putting millions of lives of our brothers and sisters at risk. We recognise that we hold substantial resources which, on the one hand, we need to invest wisely to get the best return for the Church's mission and for our pensioners, but, on the other hand, to use them ethically to leverage real change. There is no greater change than saving the Earth from destruction.

The First Church Estates Commissioner and the Bishop of Manchester have come today to say that the telephone number figures that they hold give us that leverage on this industry, and I want to support my friend Giles Goddard's amendment, and I will tell you why. The Transition Pathway Initiative is critical as we now head a coalition of £9 trillion-worth of investment. The world is looking to the Church of England for leadership on this issue. We also want to say that time is short. I felt the Oxford amendment cut the time too short. Giles's amendment keeps the pressure on but gives us some more time.

In case we are in any doubt about the importance of TPI, let me quote from the Executive Secretary of the UN Climate Change Convention who said, "I applaud the TPI. It represents a powerful way of aligning our investments with the urgency of the Paris Agreement". Synod, the UN believes our strategy is right because money talks and we can use our money to talk the Kingdom of God.

Bishop Steven, if I may correct you on one point. I have a wee bit of knowledge of the Church of Ireland. They did support this direction but they voted down 2020 and backed 2022.

I want to make one other point and I make no apologies for this. We have a new First Church Estates Commissioner. Loretta Minghella has spent her life fighting for social justice, fighting for the poorest people in our world. Justice flows through her veins. Anybody who has met this woman will know she is no pushover. She will use our

investments to challenge and challenge and challenge and this amendment gives her some teeth in that. Friends, let us back this amendment and back this motion solidly as it strengthens the hand of our investment bodies. Friends, the Bishop of Manchester says we have telephone number investments. Let us use those telephone numbers and call for change.

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* I do not imagine that anybody in this chamber disagrees with the desire that has emerged from Oxford, apparently as a groundswell from parishes, to see the sort of change that will help to prevent the world's poorest being flooded out of their homes and all the other terrible consequences of climate change. There is no dispute about that. The dispute is only about what is actually going to work. I have to say that even this amendment seems to me to be premised on the idea that there is some power in disinvestment to bring about change. I have to say I simply do not believe that is the case.

Just imagine you are the chief executive of an oil company, possibly an easier exercise for some than for others: what sort of shareholder would you rather have? One who was relentlessly pressing them to change direction, never giving up but continually there year after year after year at the AGM, moving motions, voting against appointments of chairmen, generally making a thorough nuisance of themselves, like the widow who Jesus talked about who persistently badgered the unjust judge - and even the unjust judge in the end gave in to her.

To put any sort of timescale publicly on the record, whether it is 2020 or 2023, weakens the effect of that persistent year in, year out pressure, because the alternative is to be the sort of shareholder that quietly take their dividends and lets the board get on with its own direction. That is what happens if we go for disinvestment. We would get probably quite substantial capital return from selling our investments. We would make money out of it and give all the influence to people who do not care. How does that in any way advance the cause? Maybe a few important headlines, maybe a few weeks of embarrassment for the company, maybe even a dip in the share price for a little while, but after a few weeks, other things come in, it all gets back to normal and we would have lost every bit influence, whether it is in 2020, 2023, or whenever it is. I cannot see that if we want to achieve real change for the world's poorest so their homes are not swamped by the ocean or any other natural disaster that it makes any sense - ever - to give up that influence.

*The Chair:* Thank you for wearing the right coloured shirt for this debate. Annika Mathews, after which I would be really grateful for some help with a motion for closure.

*Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council):* I will be speaking for this amendment. As Christians, we have a responsibility to have our voice in matters affecting the world, though we should not be of the world. I believe that what the Church has been doing in engaging with these companies and the steps they have already been positively taking to try to disinvest from them are very positive at the moment, but more can still be done. If we consider the question of what would Jesus do, we see that He talked with

those with whom He disagreed, and He spent time with them, perhaps even for uncomfortably long amounts of time, although He did not necessarily endorse what they were involved in. However, there came a point where He sometimes took urgent action, for example, when He turned over the tables of those selling things in the temple.

A quick Google search, which may or may not be reliable information, elicits the shocking truth that within my lifetime, and definitely in the next generation's lifetime, so my generation's children, fossil fuels will run out. The ways that these companies are trying to get new ways of extracting oil by fracking are highly damaging to nature and the countryside. In February, we heard from a visitor from the Anglican Communion the extent to which their country was being destroyed by climate change. Setting a date for disinvestment is needed as it will underline the fact that the Church is taking this matter seriously. It is good to have a deadline to aim for. I think the 2023 deadline will be a positive deadline for this, for the companies and for the Church. Although the earlier date was appealing, the Church needs to make sure it delivers its promises and it does not shoot itself in the foot in what it has set out to do, which I think the 2023 date will give it time to do.

We must remember, however, that both God's creation and our money are gifts from God and we must, first and foremost, be stewards of our resources in the world we live in and ensure we look after creation for not just us but those future generations after us.

*John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: motion for closure on Item 35.

*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:* That is clearly carried. Therefore, I put the amendment proposed by Canon Giles Goddard to the vote.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (e) insert –*

*“( ) urge the NIBs to ensure that by 2023 they have disinvested from fossil fuel companies that they have assessed, drawing on TPI data, as not prepared to align with the goal of the Paris Agreement to restrict the global average temperature rise to well below 2°C,”*

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried. We now move back to the debate on the amended motion.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Huddersfield (Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs):* This has been an enormously positive debate. It is a hugely important debate. I am so glad that we have moved beyond the question of tactics. This has been about how we fulfil the goals that all of us in this chamber share, which are mitigating the effects of climate change and working towards climate justice. I am glad that we have the text up in front of us here. There has been a danger if we had carried on much further with the debate on the amendments of losing sight of the wood for the trees. We need now to unite around this motion and give full support to our colleagues on the platform and to the Church Commissioners for the hugely valuable work they are doing. Let us not lose sight of that. This is global leadership for one of the most pressing issues of our day.

We have also heard challenge to us from across this chamber this afternoon: what about us? What about the work that is going on in our parishes, our dioceses and the way we use our own income and expenditure at every level? We need to hear that challenge back to us now and to join with our colleagues in reinforcing the work they are doing in offering global leadership on this hugely important issue and making sure that, with integrity, we follow that through in our own lives, in our parishes and our dioceses.

*A Speaker:* Point of order: the text on the screen assumes that the Oxford amendment was carried.

*The Chair:* Thank you for pointing that out. We come to a very exciting moment in the life of Synod. Mr Freeman is going to speak next, after which I will be really interested in a motion for closure. He cannot do it, so it gives you an opportunity.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* A word to Annika: every year since I was at school it has been said that oil is going to run out in 40 years. I am now 80, so that is how much you have to take note of that.

I want to talk in ordinary numbers. During the last month I have put a megawatt of electricity (1,000 watts) into the system, and my total energy usage at home has been 200 watts, so I have done my little bit. I am here to appeal on behalf of my friends in the Western Pacific where a group from the Diocese of Chester went out in 2006 and filmed 1,000 people living on an island. There is one family left now because the sea levels are rising. You have heard from other people that that is typical. If you think of that in context: just imagine your village and all but one family was left in it. That is what we are going to be voting for if we vote for this, so please support it.

*Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle):* Point of order: would you be prepared to accept a motion for closure on Item 11?

*The Chair:* I would be very pleased to accept that, thank you.

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried. I now call on the Bishop of Manchester to respond to the debate. You have five minutes to do so.

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Synod, for a very powerful debate this afternoon. Thank you to all who have engaged with it. Valerie Hallard made the first speech and encouraged us to invest more in low carbon. Yes, we are doing that. Nuclear is quite an issue. My dad worked at Sellafield so I remember it as a young boy. We do from the Church Commissioners own a solar farm somewhere near Carlisle, so we are actively involved in low-carbon energy in your part of the country.

Martin Gainsborough, thank you for reminding us that green growth is not as straightforward as some may think it is. It is not guaranteed to solve our problems.

Archbishop Sentamu, yes, we have real influence in the board rooms, and that influence needs to go on.

I am grateful to the Bishop of Oxford in challenging us today. I am also grateful that we have taken a clear view on that. The balance between divestment and engagement at this stage is a balance towards engagement.

Giles Goddard or “Uncle Giles” as I will call you hereafter - boy, hasn’t baby grown! TPI is an evolving tool but it gives us a unique position in the debate, and you and others spoke of the plaudits we are getting from the United Nations and from Christiana Figueres in particular. I am grateful to Caroline Spelman, the Second Church Estates Commissioner, who has fought these battles in another House as well as here.

Extreme weather, yes, thank you for mentioning my diocese and neighbouring dioceses where that is very much a factor at the moment.

I remember a major insurer at one of our conferences a couple of years ago, and we were working on TPI, saying they had made their biggest ever pay-out in history over Canadian wildfires caused by extreme weather events. Insurance companies are backing us because they know which side their bread is vegan spread.

To Eve Poole, in her maiden speech as Third Church Estates Commissioner, thank you. I think we already have an idea that you will bring both a clarity of thought and a passion to your work with us in the Church Commissioners. Thank you for sharing that with us today. Engagement is both moral and strategic and you were the first to bring up an explicit footballing analogy. Thank you, Synod, for being forbearing on that until that moment.

Sue Booy, Synod members can change their minds and, even if I do not agree with the way you have changed your mind, I am glad that you are a good example of a Synod



member being prepared to listen to debate and to change their minds; it is one of the things we are here for.

Carl Hughes, yes, we do need to transition to Paris while meeting the world's energy needs. They are not going away.

April, if you had sung "Breaking up is hard to do", I might have said more about it, but thank you for the point that we need to stick with our partners.

The Bishop of Salisbury again reaffirmed our work with the United Nations.

Kathy Winrow, time is running out; it has already run out. Yes, that is precisely why, as we were reminded, haste and urgency are not the same thing. We are tackling this with huge urgency but not with haste.

Mark Russell, yes, keeping the pressure on us. Our money can talk the language of the Kingdom of God; yes, it can.

Thank you, Clive Scowen for reminding us that disinvestment is never an easy thing to do, but we believe there is a place for it. When we are making no headway, if disinvestment became an empty threat that it was known we would never act on, we would lose that edge to the work. Disinvestment remains one of the tools in the kit. It is that big ugly hammer at the bottom of the toolbox. You pull it out when everything else has failed, but it is not the tool of choice; it is not the tool you go to first.

Annika, I am looking forward to welcoming you in Manchester soon. Thank you for your clarity in bringing us back to the Scripture and reminding us that we need deadlines if we are ever going to deliver.

Bishop Jonathan, yes, we have moved beyond tactics and we are now uniting, I hope, in great numbers around the strategy set out in this motion.

John Freeman, you challenged Annika and I shall challenge you back. A megawatt is a million watts; a kilowatt is 1,000 watts. But I am just an old mathematician.

Synod, please vote overwhelmingly for this motion that stands in my name.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Could we have a counted vote, please?

*The Chair:* If I see 25 people standing. Yes, there are 25 people standing. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The voting on Item 11: 347 in favour, 4 against and 3 recorded abstentions. The motion  
*That this Synod:*

- a) *welcome the worldwide agreement in Paris in December 2015 to hold “the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels” and to pursue “efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels”;*
- b) *affirm, as it did in 2015, its support for the climate change policy recommended by the EIAG and adopted by the National Investing Bodies (‘the NIBs’) in 2015;*
- c) *welcome the NIBs’ disinvestment from companies focused on thermal coal mining and the production of oil from oil sands;*
- d) *welcome the NIBs’ establishment of the Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) to track whether major companies associated with high carbon emissions are aligning their business plans with the Paris Agreement;*
- e) *urge the NIBs to engage urgently and robustly with companies rated poorly by TPI and, beginning in 2020, to start to disinvest from the ones that are not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition to a low carbon economy;*
- f) *urge the NIBs to ensure that by 2023 they have disinvested from fossil fuel companies that they have assessed, drawing on TPI data, as not prepared to align with the goal of the Paris Agreement to restrict the global average temperature rise to well below 2°C;*
- g) *urge the NIBs proactively to seek and scale up investment in renewable energy and low carbon technology; and*
- h) *request the NIBs to report to Synod within three years on progress, with a timetable for rapid continuing action.*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair:* The motion was carried. Thank you, Synod, for a very good debate. We now move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 4.27 pm.

**ITEM 12**  
**SPECIAL AGENDA IV**  
**DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTIONS**  
**ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMMES (GS 2094A AND GS 2094B)**

*The Chair:* Good afternoon, everyone. We come to the Diocesan Synod Motion which comes from both the Dioceses of London and Truro, Item 12 on the Agenda, Environment Programmes. For this item members might like to have GS 2094A from the Dioceses and the related note from the Secretary General GS 2094B available, both of which are green. Please also refer to the financial comments on the Eighth Notice Paper. We are all very coloured co-ordinated this afternoon; that is also green. The Diocese of Truro submitted a motion in the same form as the Diocese of London. The Business Committee, therefore, agreed to a joint Diocesan Synod Motion, which we have before us this afternoon.

In order to do justice to this arrangement, I, therefore, propose these steps: to call the Revd Andrew Yates from Truro to speak from the platform immediately after Mrs Enid Barron from London who is formally moving the motion. Can I also ask for your consent, please, for Andrew Yates to be called again to speak last in the debate immediately prior to the closing speech from Enid Barron. I need for this the formal consent of Synod to allow him to do this as he would be speaking twice in the same debate. Does this have your consent?

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

*The Chair:* Lovely, that is marvellous for all those who voted for. That is clearly carried. So, Andrew Yates, you will be able to speak twice in this debate.

There are two amendments tabled, one from the Revd Canon Catherine Grylls and the other from Canon Dr John Spence. I shall call them to speak and move their amendments fairly early on in the debate in order that we can have a debate on the main motion as may or may not be amended.

*The Chair:* I call upon Enid Barron to move Item 12. You have up to 10 minutes.

*Mrs Enid Barron (London):* Fifteen years ago, I suggested at a PCC meeting that our church should have an environmental programme. From the reactions I got, you would have thought I had suggested we all became pagans. There was a mixture of horror, anger and derisory laughter, "Environment may be a nice little hobby for you, Enid, but it has nothing to do with the Church". I think the last debate has given the lie to that.

I thank God that things have changed enormously. Our church now includes environmental action in its mission action plan. We have a Creation Care Group. We have installed a more energy efficient boiler. We have included environmental

improvements as we refurbish part of our building and in Eco Church we have got our first level award.

I reflect that in the national Church there has been a similar progression on environmental awareness over much the same period. Both locally and nationally - and I think we have heard a lot about this in the last debate - work is now being done to address climate change and other environmental issues. The London and Truro motion seeks to support and advance all this.

We have been called to up our game. We are calling for an even greater commitment by the Church of England to combat the ever increasing and potentially disastrous threat from climate change. I feel so many people in the last debate did all my work for me because we have heard all about this too.

The motion you have before you combines separate motions which complement each other. They are not identical but they complement. That from London has clauses (d)(i), (ii) and (iv) within it. This asks for action from the national Church. The motion from Truro is reflected in clauses (c) and (d)(iii). It proposes actions which will strengthen and support the national Church through enhancing arrangements at diocesan level.

As you have heard, my colleague, Andrew Yates, will speak about these. Central to the London part of the motion is the call at (d)(ii) of the motion, which you might like to look at. It is a call to set up a national system for measuring the Church's progress towards meeting its published targets for decreasing CO2 emissions. These targets are 42% by 2020 and 80% by 2050. Those are target reductions.

To support that, the motion calls for a framework plan and for reporting to Synod in order to give Synod the opportunity to know where we are going and make comment and support further action and comment on the agenda. Those are sort of back-up provisions. All this can be found in our background paper. I believe there is much common ground between our paper and that from the Secretary General. However, we diverge on the very important issue at (d)(ii) which is to set up a system to monitor the Church's own carbon footprint.

Sadly, it would appear that the Secretary General's paper shows no enthusiasm for this. This may be the result of unfortunate experience of over complex efforts to do this in the past, or some confusion between one or two of the previous studies. What we do suggest that a measuring system is absolutely essential. It cannot be taken for granted that all the wonderful work we are doing is actually reducing the Church's own CO2 emissions. These are reductions which are absolutely essential to protecting our planet and all God's creatures who live on it.

Measurements do need to be taken. Only by doing this can we establish and, if necessary, adjust priorities, otherwise we are simply boxing in the dark. I believe the Church is to be commended for its brave move in setting targets in 2006 and then they

were revised slightly in 2009. However, setting targets without establishing a system to measure them is like agreeing a budget without keeping accounts.

We will be agreeing a budget tomorrow, is anyone going to keep accounts? I would think so. We need to know where we are going. Lots of public organisations have to measure their CO2 emissions and I believe that the National Investing Bodies do actually ask some of the companies in which they invest to measure their emissions. It is absolutely essential. If others can do it, why cannot the Church?

I think the other point has really been very well made for me by many of the previous speeches. The Church has a really significant role as an advocate for action on climate change. We do punch well above our weight, but without having any idea of our own direction of travel is not our leadership role untenable and really rather hypocritical? Simply wringing our hands and saying "it is all too difficult" is just not good enough. We cannot do that.

Now I must stress that our motion proposes a simple tool - it might be easier to say a simple scheme - for measurement. We are not asking for anything complicated. It is not rocket science, as they say. We have tried to be helpful by mentioning a system and describing it, the system we run in London, which we have actually run pretty successfully for a decade.

It is not complicated. I think a lot of people I have spoken to during the last few days have said this is going to be a huge burden on the parishes. It really, really is not. I spoke to the lady who does the input from our parish. All parishes are asked to do is to read their utility bills and fill in two or three figures on a form. Our parish administrator said it takes her 10 minutes a year, no more. We are not asking parishes to do anything complicated and they have to look at the utility bills already to do their annual returns.

Some people have tried to make play of the fact in some of the papers that London is somehow special in this respect. It is not. We have parish churches. We have a cathedral. We do parish returns. If we can read utility bills, people in the rest of the country can. We do not believe that the dioceses need to be particularly involved in processing the figures. They could come straight to London to headquarters. We do not believe there is a big and expensive role for dioceses, although they would have a part to play in promoting the scheme and communicating it to others. We think that the difficulty of this scheme has been exaggerated in some of the other papers.

We also, I am afraid, think that the resources required have been exaggerated. We are suggesting a ballpark figure of about £25,000 to set up a system and about £5,000 a year running costs. I will admit that our figures do not include staff costs. However, we do question the need for an extra person, full-time, over three years, or I think the one and a half people suggested in the financial assessment.

We do question that level of human resources. Based on our experience, we think about five person weeks per year would be required. In London, dealing with the system annually takes two person days but there is a bit more required, obviously, at set-up time. We do think, as I say, it is not a burden on parishes and minimal requirements for dioceses. Yes, input at headquarters but not as huge as has been suggested.

I do fully understand the Secretary General's concern about resources and we certainly do not want to see efforts on other programmes reduced. At (e) of the motion we call on the Archbishops' Council to make the necessary resources available to implement the motion. We have not said it in the paper but part funding from other organisations could be explored.

Tackling environmental issues and particularly climate change really is a first order issue and it is one for which the Church needs to be more adequately resourced. As Christians, dare we doubt that our Lord will provide if we are doing His will. Jesus assures us that with God all things are possible. I want to conclude with these remarks.

I will go back to the challenge put to me by our PCC all those years ago that this is nothing to do with the Church. Creation care is very much to do with the Church. It is in line with our Fifth Mark of Mission. The Archbishop of Canterbury has said responding to climate change is an essential part of our responsibility. Just under a week ago at the Stock Exchange he said that we must step up our ambition.

I think it is also an evangelistic opportunity. Showing serious commitment to creation care can help to grow the Church, especially by making it more attractive and relevant to young people. I believe that the proposals in this combined motion will provide a really strong basis for ratcheting up the environmental action, which is very much the Church's business, and that this will open a new chapter in the Church's engagement with climate change, thus also enabling us to continue to give credible leadership to others on this critical issue. I beg to move this motion on behalf of the Diocese of London.

*The Chair:* Item 12 is now open for debate.

*Revd Andrew Yates (Truro):* I must begin by congratulating Enid not just on her speech but this weekend is her golden wedding anniversary. It is a measure of her commitment to this issue that she is in York, with her husband James in the public gallery, and not on a romantic love island somewhere celebrating. She deserves your vote just for that alone.

Seriously, the Truro elements of the motion, (c) and (e)(iii), seek to ensure that every diocese has a clear environmental programme that is championed at the senior level and to see a sharing of good practice between our dioceses. Truro supports the London proposals, endorsed by our Bishop's Council for a new scheme to measure our impact. It is our vision, our Christian vision of God's creation, that will make us adopt behaviour change, for our contribution roots this work in our Christian faith.

This is not a new insight. It is core to our history. The Celtic saints of Cornwall, deeply aware of a closeness to God through the natural world; Julian of Norwich with her precious hazelnut seeing a God loving and sustaining creation; and right down to our own Archbishop this week at the Stock Exchange.

Fifteen years ago, as Enid struggled with her PCC, I became the social responsibility officer for Truro Diocese. Alongside co-chairing poverty forums, CUF Link officer, running food homeless networks, magicking grants for church halls, I was expected also to promote their environmental agenda in our diocese. It was squeezed out, leaving me, just like Enid, out on a limb.

But things are different now. Two key milestones on that change in our diocese. Firstly, making an archdeacon chair of the Environment Core Group means the issue is lobbied at senior level. Secondly, our confidence in the Gospel programme highlighted environment as a significant theme with a financial commitment to fund a part-time DEO, environment officer, for three years to start with.

We used the Fifth Mark of Mission to draw up our environmental programme, starting with energising individuals, asking them to take action, inviting them to join in 10 simple pledges and then promoting an Eco Church award scheme to introduce a variety of actions for churches and congregations to sign up to.

Our DEO, Lucy, behind me, complete with product placement on the chair, has been vital in implementing that programme; speaking at Sunday services from Torpoint to Penzance; connecting with congregation members; a clear message that our responses to climate change must be at the heart of our Christian calling.

She arranged an inspiring training day for clergy and lay to explore the many ways that care of creation can be mission, and then using her existing contacts in the wider world to set up the potential for developing a piece of glebe land for renewable energy generation and battery storage and a significant income for the diocese in the weighting too.

Good environment work can generate cash as well. There is work done in schools too, but often it is the question of us as Church catching up with those young people and their projects. They have got the importance of this issue far more than we grown-ups have. It is for each diocese to decide how to implement this programme. It might or might not need a half-time environment officer.

The financial paper suggests this will cost the Church £0.6 million. Put like that, it sounds a lot, but if we are really saying that from our diocesan budgets we cannot find at least £15,000 to bring comfort and hope as a response to the greatest challenge we are facing as a planet, if we cannot do that, what will the world say about us? There is a cost to doing nothing.

Earlier debates and our paper highlights the impact of not keeping to the 2 degrees: huge expenses in pounds and in human lives. As a Church, we have a unique opportunity to lead our communities to make the necessary changes required and it needs dedicated officers to make this happen.

The first draft of my speech was written exactly two weeks ago. We were celebrating the birth of John the Baptist. Enid and my experiences of 15 years ago put us close to Zechariah, speechless and in a corner, frozen out from the big decisions being made around him. My hope is today we can take a slate and write on it “yes” and ask God to continue to guide our feet into paths of peace - integrity of creation, sustaining and renewing the life of our earth. I beg you to support this motion.

*Revd Dr Ben Sargent (Winchester):* My 11 and 13-year-old sons have become a bit obsessed recently with an American infomercial on YouTube proclaiming the virtues of Flex Tape. Flex Tape is super-sticky, tough and waterproof, the host tells us. To demonstrate, he bisects a speedboat with an angle grinder and sticks it back together with Flex Tape and, before you know it, he is zooming through the Florida Keys, dodging the alligators in his boat held together with tape. It might seem that tape is perfectly good for fixing speedboats but it does not strike me as the best solution to the problem.

Well, climate change is a problem. The solutions in this proposal are good, but my impression is that they are not the right tool for the job. You see, the problem with climate change is that it is religiously motivated. The religion is called consumerism and it is more popular than any other way of seeing the world and life in our society and others like it.

Consumerism’s key doctrine is that you and I are autonomous consumers of things. We find our true purpose and identity in acquiring things. The more we have, the more valuable and meaningful our lives. Adverts. The consumerist sermons offer us youth, popularity, beauty and so much more when we make the right purchase. Consumerism is deeply spiritual. There is nothing quite like the thrill of the new car you could not quite afford and the wearing of the new clothes you could not quite justify. Consumerism is fundamentalist. It cannot be questioned.

Consumerism is the reason why so many people are in debt. Consumerism is the reason so many people scarcely know their families because they are so busy making a success of the work that gives them wealth, that gives them stuff, that gives them identity. Consumerism is the reason why the oceans are full of plastic. Consumerism is the reason we buy bigger and bigger cars and use them more and more and more in our busier and busier lives.

Climate change is a symptom of religious extremism. The solution to it is not so easy as a matter of appointing advocates to advise and working harder at heating our Church buildings in a way that is sustainable. The ultimate fix for climate change is already in our possession. It is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Consumerism is spiritual and needs to be



outclassed by a better story of life in all its fullness. Jesus said life does not consist in an abundance of possessions.

The Gospel offers our consumerist society freedom from the relentless need to acquire and consume more than we need. The Gospel offers us an identity that we could never buy, win or earn; the unparalleled status of being children of God, born not of the will of man or of the will of the flesh but born of God. The Gospel alone is the key to the contentment that leads to simple living. For us then as the people of God to proclaim the Gospel is our mission. We need to live it too by showing contentment and simplicity in our daily lives.

It would be much better for the environment if Christians gave up glamorous international holidays and took public transport, a much bigger impact on the environment than the way we heat Church buildings. If we need to spend some money, why not invest it in a clergy cycle to work scheme? This is not available at the moment because clergy do not technically have to travel to work. Why not come up with our own cycle to work scheme?

People in my parish cannot believe that an employer as big as the Church of England is not part of this scheme. We might even end up with healthier, happier and more visible clergy as a result. Climate change is a symptom of a spiritual problem. Let us use the right tools to fix it and think bigger than the proposals offered today.

*The Chair.* After Ruth Newton has spoken, we will move on to the amendments.

*Revd Ruth Newton (Leeds):* I wish to speak to the first three clauses. I am speaking about my concern that this area has hitherto been under-resourced despite its great importance, yet it has achieved much with what it has had. Limited resources in Church life mean that hard choices must be made, priorities agreed and stewardship applied. There is much deserving of support: children and young people; stewardship; disability awareness; safeguarding; the missing generations, you can make your own list.

Against such a background, resourcing environmental programmes can be seen as one priority amongst many, but all that we have heard this afternoon suggests that the environment is the priority for us. It is core business. It is a question of survival, a question of justice, a question of advocating for the poorest in our world and to ensuring intergenerational justice. It is about looking where we put our money where our mouth is. With our investment we are saying that our money is where our mouth is, but is it in the case of resourcing? It is a case, I believe, of seeking, first, the Kingdom of God and finding everything else added.

I speak from the perspective of being blessed by my church's engagement with a churchyard biodiversity project and with Eco Church and being extensively supported by our Leeds Diocesan Environment Officer, Jemima Parker, in doing so. Our project is based on the idea that our churchyard, which is managed for wildlife, acts as an ark for vulnerable species whose habitat is scarce.

This engagement with the environment has had far-reaching and positive effect. Firstly, it has had a Heineken effect, reaching the parts that others cannot reach. It has enthused young people, allowing us to nurture the next generation of leaders. Two people who manage the project are under 25 years old and they have harnessed youth funding to enable conservation awareness weeks to take place.

The school has had churchyard weeks which have included bug hunts and moth hunts, but also teaching about Christian understanding of what happens when we die. We have gained credibility and earned the right to speak with authority in the public arena as academics, wildlife professionals, charities and the local council have both worked with us and sought our help. We have made connections and sparked the curiosity necessary for pre-evangelism and our social capital in our community is sky high.

Although our work has been predominantly in the area of biodiversity rather than climate justice, although we do both, I believe the opportunities presented are the same: to engage meaningfully with those who have hitherto found Christianity irrelevant or even immoral, to speak coherently with a united voice on an ethical issue of global significance around which we can build a diverse coalition of those of faith and none, and to concern ourselves with the common good.

I want to support the motion. I would like to see money spent on environmental programmes and DEOs. It is money well spent. I would like you to prioritise the environmental engagement in your parishes, in your dioceses and as a national Church and prioritise it in your budgets.

I would like to see our money where our mouth is again, in resources as well as in investment. It has been said that everything has a cost and there is a cost to passing this motion, but there is a cost to under-resourcing and side-lining the environmental aspects of our mission; not only the obvious cost to future generations and to the poor, but the cost of a lost opportunity to speak good news to our nation and, finally, to be listened to.

*The Chair.* Thank you.

The *Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

## **ITEM 36**

*The Chair.* We come to the amendments. The amendments are listed on Order Paper III. First of all, then, we come to Item 36. I invite Revd Canon Catherine Grylls to speak to and move the amendment standing in her name.

*Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham):* I beg to move

'In paragraph (d), leave out sub-paragraph (ii) and insert–

(ii) “to continue developing, and making available, tools for the annual collation of the energy consumption of cathedrals, churches and church halls and calculation of their total CO2 emissions to enable monitoring of progress towards the Church’s target of reducing CO2 emissions by 80% by 2050.”’

My nine-year-old son, who in 2050 will be slightly younger than I am now, keeps asking me when it is that all cars must be electric. He is worried that because they are so quiet they could be dangerous to pedestrians. God spare my life, as my Caribbean sisters and brothers would say, I will be 80 in 2050.

I am all too aware that for my sisters and brothers in other parts of the world, life expectancy has never been anything like that high and of the grave injustice of that. I cannot imagine what it will be like to live in a low-carbon economy or even a net zero carbon world, but I am absolutely certain that we need to get there and each of us and our churches must commit to living in a way that is moving towards that as fast as we can.

Since last year, I have been a member of the Environmental Working Group at their invitation because I am chair of the General Synod Environmental Group. Both Enid and Andrew are members of the steering group of that group. We have talked over many months about these motions and the most effective way to engage General Synod in environmental matters and I am delighted that we are speaking about them now.

This amendment is designed to help us to ensure that we as Synod commit the Environmental Working Group to action that it can realistically hope to achieve. As GS 2094B states, the environment programme is supported at present by two staff equal to one full-time equivalent.

The Environmental Working Group has an extensive three-year plan to which it is working and on which it reports annually to Archbishops’ Council. Workstreams in the plan include developing support for diocesan environmental officers, support for the roll-out of the Eco Church programme and encouraging parishes to focus on creation in their decisions about buildings.

Work has been done, as the Bishop of Salisbury said in the last debate, predominantly through the Eco Church programme but also the Big Church Switch to support parishes in reducing significantly their CO2 emissions. That has been done through partnership working principally with Historic England and the National Trust and tools have been developed and used to carry out audits.

This amendment simply seeks to amend what the motion asks for, to recognise work already underway and to enable Synod to vote for action which can be realistically achieved. Whilst London Diocese is to be applauded for the work it has done in measuring energy consumption, I fear that scaling up that work across all the dioceses is by no means as straightforward a task as we might wish it to be.

As in the last debate, that timely action is what is required of us is not, I would assume, a matter of debate. If Synod wishes to see more resources invested in enabling the whole Church to address climate change then please make that known loud and clear through speeches in this debate. From where we are now, with the resourcing we have, I would urge you to vote for this motion with both amendments to play your part in the actions called for in (d)(iii) such that in our life together we are seeking to hold all Five Marks of Mission together - to tell, to teach, to tend, to transform, and to treasure all that God has made. I move the amendment in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I invite Enid Barron to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mrs Enid Barron (London):* I would like to thank Catherine for her amendment. I must assure you that Catherine and I are both batting for the same team but we have maybe got slightly different ideas about how to go about it. I know that this is made with the best of intentions and intended to make the motion more acceptable to Synod, particularly with regard to resources. I will reiterate what I said before that I think the amount of resource required has been considerably exaggerated.

I wish to reject the amendment. I do not accept it, and there are two main reasons for that. I think it misses the urgency of the action we now need to take. The Bishop of Manchester said that we need deadlines to deliver. I do not want to embarrass him but I could almost hug him for saying that, wherever he is. We do need deadlines and we do not have deadlines for getting some work done on measuring our carbon footprint. I think action does need to start very soon, as we have asked for it to start from 2020. I think this amendment misses that point.

Catherine also refers to continuing to develop and make available tools. The national Church has been sort of trying different schemes over 10 years and we still have not settled on anything. I do think it is terribly important that we do settle on something now and it really, really does not need to be complicated. We are calling for a single system, not lots of different tools, to be settled on now and to be run consistently and annually across the whole Church. I do not believe it is difficult. I know that one of the schemes that was used by the central Church required parishes to input something every two weeks. We do not need that: once a year is enough. I think we have spent too much time testing tools, not settling on one. We need one tool and we need to do it now. Church House can decide what system they use but, please, let us settle for something, let us get on with it and let us use it consistently from as soon as we can.

I will be asking later that we really do pray that the resources we need to do this are made available, but they are not huge. I reject the amendment.

*The Chair:* Item 36 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* I am also on the Environment Group. I am a friend of Enid's, I am a friend of Andrew's, I am a friend of Catherine's, I am a friend of everyone, and it is lovely to be here. I do very much support Catherine's amendment and I also support Canon Spence's amendment because I think they will both, if passed, enable Synod to support the whole motion more wholeheartedly, which is what I want to happen.

I hear exactly what Enid is saying. I know quite a lot about the London scheme, and it works very well, but I think being realistic it is going to cost probably significantly less than the estimate in the papers, but I am guessing around £50,000 for the first year. We have heard a lot about the amount of work which is going on within the Environment Working Group on two half-time posts. I think we do need more resources to go into it, but, knowing how difficult it is to get resources, I think we need to be very careful about committing ourselves to spending more money on a particular project when we are not sure that that is the best way to use those resources to raise the profile of our environmental work within the Church. I am wondering how we would best spend £50,000. That is a question. That is why I welcome Canon Spence's amendment, because I think if we can look at the costs of all these things and then come back in the future and think about how we spend it that will help us to do our work better.

I am also aware that there are a number of possible options of ways of measuring our carbon output. I am also very conscious of the way in which Eco Church is getting more traction across the Church of England and that will also help us to think about these matters. I urge you to support Catherine's amendment and then support the motion with great fervour at the end of the debate. Thank you very much.

*Mr Bill Seddon (St Albans):* I too am a member of the General Synod Environmental Group Steering Committee. Many thanks to the London and Truro Dioceses for their perseverance in bringing their motion to give Synod an opportunity to affirm its commitment to the Fifth Mark of Mission.

If we are to be serious about shrinking the footprint, it would seem to me that we need to know our starting position. It is therefore important that a consistent measurement tool is available. However, I take the point made by the Secretary General that the cost may prove greater than that suggested by the proposers of the motion. I would also agree with his comment that the scale of the Archbishops' Council overall commitment to its existing environment programme in relation to other priorities would inevitably have to be considered if Synod wished to see a full national programme of annual energy measurement become a priority. Well, it should be a priority and money does need to be spent, but I would nevertheless support the pragmatism of Catherine Grylls' amendment and also that of Canon Spence.

I would like to make two other points. In the supporting paper, mention is made of diocesan investment activities and we have already had a debate on the NIBs today, but it is worth noting that not all dioceses have environmental, social and governance policies in line with that of the NIBs. It would be good for dioceses to expose themselves to what is happening in Church investment circles by joining the Church Investors Group, of which I am a former chair. This would help them keep up with the latest thinking on environmental matters related to investment and to hear how their peers both in the Church of England and other denominations respond to the challenges.

I also wonder if we could consider measuring the carbon footprint of General Synod itself. We have already heard about the number of trees that fell to facilitate this meeting. It would be interesting to see if we could reduce the emissions resulting from our travel arrangements. This may only be a symbolic gesture but one that all of us would be able to participate in and make a small difference. A proposal for an Eco General Synod would certainly get my vote. Thank you.

*Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford):* I only want to make a brief point. As many of you will know, I am a very enthusiastic parish treasurer. I am afraid that when back about 10 years ago I was asked to provide details of our electricity bills for shrinking the footprint, it was a step too far for me. I do think there is quite a lot of effort involved in collating this data, possibly more than is being made out to be, and I am therefore in support of this amendment because I do wonder if there is another way. I do wonder if we could get some base data that could perhaps be extrapolated using the churches that are signed up to the Parish Buying Scheme Energy Basket, which is entirely green and, therefore, in support of what we are doing here. This information could be, perhaps by permission, supplied directly in electronic format and analysed. It might not involve adding to the burden of many people who are probably less enthusiastic treasurers than I am.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the amendment? I see no one standing. We move to vote on Item 36.

*The motion*

*In paragraph (d), leave out sub-paragraph (ii) and insert–  
(ii) “to continue developing, and making available, tools for the annual collation of the energy consumption of cathedrals, churches and church halls and calculation of their total CO2 emissions to enable monitoring of progress towards the Church’s target of reducing CO2 emissions by 80% by 2050,”*

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

## **ITEM 37**

*The Chair:* Item 36 is clearly carried. Moving on to Item 37, I now invite Canon Dr John Spence to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to three minutes. Thank you.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I beg to move

'In paragraph (e) leave out "and furnish such human and financial resources" to the end and insert –

"what human and financial resources would be required to enable the work in (d) above, and to report this back at the February 2019 group of sessions".'

Let us be clear, I am overwhelmingly in support of the wording of this motion. I sometimes regret that issues that are aimed to limit climate change can sound as if they are not in accord with other things we would want to do anyway. Only two weeks ago, at one of the too many boards I have to attend in Church House, we were debating how we could not only reduce our carbon footprint across the NCIs but measure that. We observed that modern technology enables telephone and video conferencing of such a quality that you feel as if you are in the room. That is great, and not only does it cut the carbon footprint, it removes the cost of tickets. It means participants are fresher because they have avoided the stress of travel. It makes diaries easier to arrange meetings because we have cut out the time of that travel. I may say in this particularly hot weather it can even enable you to avoid the perfume of excessive perspiration – some might call it BO.

It does have many advantages and we are all in favour of doing this work and finding ways to measure it, but it would be disingenuous of me to accept that we must, as paragraph (e) calls us to do, both "assess and furnish" the resource. Until we assess it, we do not know what the resource is, and we have heard many different estimates this afternoon of what that resource might be.

Enid, many congratulations on your Golden Wedding. I am up to 43 and a half years and Mrs Spence is very dubious about the other six and a half. I think you gave away why this disparity might exist. You talked a lot about utility bills but the motion covers energy and CO2 emissions and that takes us into all the worlds of things to do with travel, out-of-premises activities where we hire premises elsewhere, places like this. We talk about the carbon footprint and, incidentally, many have commented on the improved air cooling in the hall this year, which has of course increased the carbon footprint of this Synod.

All I ask is not any release of urgency. We will assess. We commit to come back to the Synod next February with the results of that assessment after we have sat down with Enid and Andrew and been clear as to what the specification is, and then on the instructions of Synod we can build what we do into the budgeting and thus ensure the resource at the appropriate level is allocated. It would be wrong to commit now to assess and furnish. I commit to this Synod that we will assess and report back in February. I move the amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I invite Enid Barron to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*Mrs Enid Barron (London):* I am going to be, I think, uncharacteristically equivocal over this amendment. I do not want to either accept or reject it; I would like to leave it to Synod to decide. I am quite sure that it is intended to be helpful and it would particularly be reassuring to those who are nervous of committing the Archbishops' Council to writing to what amounts to a blank cheque. Understandably, Canon Spence himself would be one of the most nervous people there.

I have said it before, and I will say it again, that I think the costs of what we propose have been exaggerated but others have taken a different view. I would prefer the motion to remain as it is calling on the Archbishops' Council to furnish the resources needed as well as to assess.

I believe that the importance of the environmental programme and the urgency of making rapid progress is so great that more resources than are currently in the budget must be provided for the Church's environmental work. I just want to make the point that Canon Spence suggested we ought to start measuring lots of other things. Yes, that would be great but we are suggesting we start simple. We need to know from the simplest way we can our direction of travel and using the Church's electricity, gas and oil bills is a starting point, it is not the endpoint, but we are not trying to make this oversophisticated to begin with. I leave it to Synod to decide whether the amendment should be accepted or rejected.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Item 37 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* A few years ago in a sitcom, Gyles Brandreth was proposing that he was going to buy a new 4x4 and his ecologically friendly landlord said to him, "Aren't you worried about climate change?" and he said, "No, once I've got the air conditioning on I won't feel anything".

In answer to John Spence's amendment, I do not think it actually adds anything to the wording that is already there. I do not think the wording that is there at the moment is prescriptive. It does suggest "assess", it does suggest "to furnish", but there are no timescales. I think that if we do things properly February 2018 may well be the time at which the assessment has taken place and we are furnished, if you will excuse the pun, with more information about what the cost of that additional resource might be. I understand why there is a need for being ambivalent about this particular amendment.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I think if you read (e) as it stands, it is very clear what it is calling for. It is calling on the Archbishops' Council "urgently to assess and furnish such human and financial resources as would be proper and necessary to enable the work above", which is in dioceses and everything else. It is quite a big undertaking. John Spence, whom I have grown to admire for his ability when it comes to financial matters to comment very intelligently, I am actually surprised he is



saying this: “what human and financial resources would be required to enable the work in (d) above, and to report this back at the February 2019 group of sessions”. Do you know why? Because the Archbishops’ Council cannot just agree the budget without you agreeing with it. He wants you to be part of this.

Whereas the motion seems to think and suggest that we can find these resources and then when we have found them we will come back here, and Synod does not agree with it, because who is going to be paying for it. For me, the logic of what he is suggesting is synodically right and, therefore, I ask you please to support the amendment because it is coming back in February. He will do the assessment. I have got every confidence that he work will be done diligently and will come back here with very clear information which then you can take a decision about. Please do not write a blank cheque to somebody who may not have the money to do it.

*Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro):* I will not speak for very long. As an ex-geography teacher, I am passionate about seeing the environment cared for and looked after. As a passionate evangelist, I listened very carefully to what Benjamin Sargent said earlier about the Gospel being an answer to these things and therefore I would want to support this amendment because I would want the Archbishops’ Council to consider one problem, I think, in (d)(ii).

We are looking to save 42% of energy consumption by 2020, 80% by 2050. There is a little bit of me that would love it if we doubled our energy consumption because our churches were overflowing and we doubled the number of them. There is nothing in here that says per person who is part of the Church of England. There is nothing in here that suggests that the way to do this would not be to close down 80% of our churches by 2050. That would be a shame. It would be great for us to consider the way in which we can do these things looking for evangelistic opportunities as well as just thinking about climate change. Thank you.

*The Chair:* After this gentleman has spoken I shall be looking for a motion of closure on Item 37.

*Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle):* I am grateful for Canon Spence’s amendment because it addresses the deep concerns I have on behalf of the very small parishes that I serve in one of the poorer dioceses of the Church. The Carlisle Diocesan Synod took a brave decision some years ago to restrict the cost of central diocesan operations to 20% of our total diocesan budget and, as our finances have come under increasing pressure during the 13 years I have served in the diocese, I have watched as our Bishop’s staff has struggled with diminishing resources whilst dealing with increasing demands placed upon it.

This in turn has a knock-on effect at local level. The 10 village churches in my benefice, the 33 village churches in my deanery are manned by wonderfully dedicated people who give very generously of their time and money, and yet I am hearing increasing voices of

anguish telling me that the central Church gives them less and less support with more and more expectations placed upon them. This may only be a small straw but our camel's back is already creaking dangerously and we cannot just log good ideas at our churches without considering the additional burden we are putting upon them and placing them within the context of the priorities that we have already agreed and budgeted.

That is why I worry very deeply when I read of the Secretary General's estimate of the additional costs on the Archbishops' budget but also the additional cost that (c) in fact puts upon diocesan budgets. I wish that Canon Spence's amendment actually went further and dealt with that also. Even if we simply do our usual thing of giving the additional responsibility to somebody who is already overworked, the additional burden is going to have a critical impact on the mission and ministry of the Church at national, diocesan and local level. I do wonder, like previous speakers, whether this is in fact the best use of the resources that we have available. Above all, I simply cannot go back to my parishioners and tell them that I voted for a motion that will require their participation in yet another central initiative without new support to support them in it, and can we really, as a Synod, commit to something that the Secretary General has told us will compromise already agreed work streams?

Please, can we give this motion the careful scrutiny it needs before we agree it to ensure that it really is doable at local and national level and represents the best thing we can do with our resources and is consistent with our already agreed priorities?

*Canon Dr John Mason (Chester):* Point of order: motion for closure on Item 37.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, that has my consent. Will all those in favour of a motion of closure on Item 37 please show?

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* Point of order: would you consider a motion for the adjournment of this debate?

*The Chair:* Adrian, if we could vote on Item 37 first and then for you to make your point because I have already started to move that. We move to vote on Item 37.

*The motion*

*In paragraph (e) leave out "and furnish such human and financial resources" to the end and insert -*

*"what human and financial resources would be required to enable the work in (d) above, and to report this back at the February 2019 group of sessions".*

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

*The Chair:* Thank you. That is clearly carried, so Item 37 is now added to the whole Item 12. Adrian Greenwood, would you like to make your point, please?

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I am the lay Chair of Southwark Diocese, so it is with some reluctance that I make this intervention in relation to a Diocesan Synod Motion, but the longer that I have sat through this debate the more I am concerned that this is one of those classic General Synod motions which is asking loads of people to do stuff which we have not really thought through. We have already said we will get the financial information back in 2019. My suggestion is we adjourn to February 2019, by which time we will have that financial information.

I would urge the Environmental Group - Catherine, Giles and the rest of them - that I think we need some real guidance on what are the next steps. Now, it may well be that this measurement is the next steps but there may be other things which are good next steps for us all to take. It is not about not supporting the ethos. We are committing the whole of the Church - we are talking about every diocese in one of these clauses – and I just want to be sure that we really are clear as General Synod that we know what we are asking people to do. I think a bit more time would enable us to come up with the right answer for that. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* Enid Barron, I invite you to respond to that. You have two minutes, please.

*Mrs Enid Barron (London):* I knew somebody would bowl a googly, and they just have. After a quick consultation with my colleagues, I suppose I have to say that it is for Synod to decide. It seems very clear that most people want more time to think about our proposals and to have them formally costed by the Archbishops' Council and so I would find it very difficult to argue against an adjournment if that is what Synod wishes. If Synod does not wish I am very happy to carry on.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I do not propose to allow any more speeches on the possibility of an adjournment, so I shall put it straight to the vote. Point of order, Bishop Julian?

*The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson):* On an adjournment, does that mean that this cannot come back during this group of sessions?

*The Chair:* Please, bear with me a moment. Thank you. Thank you, Bishop Julian. Yes, that is correct. If this debate is adjourned then this item cannot return during the life of this quinquennium unless it is under the direction of the Business Committee. I hope that is clear, everyone.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I mean, the motion definitely needs a bit of work but I have always felt that Diocesan Synod Motions, which have come through the dioceses, been debated and had their cue, should be properly treated.

*The Chair:* I am sorry, Archbishop ---

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I am opposing the adjournment.

*The Chair:* Yes, I am very much aware of that. The only thing is that I have just announced that I was not going to take any more speeches ---

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I did not hear that.

*The Chair:* --- about the possibility of adjournment. I will need to stick to that to be fair to everyone. Thank you for understanding. Thank you. Adrian Greenwood, we need some clarification on what exactly you mean by your adjournment. Is it for the life of this Synod or is it until next February? Would you mind going to the microphone so we can all hear clearly?

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* Sorry, I thought I had made it clear, I suggest an adjournment to February 2019, by which time the Archbishops' Council will have done their work and hopefully the Environmental Group as well.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, that is most helpful. Thank you everyone, and especially you, Adrian.

*Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford):* Point of order: since the Chair of the Business Committee has been public, it can only return with the permission of the Chair of the Business Committee.

*The Chair:* No, not now, Adrian has clarified, thank you, David. We are going to vote on the possibility of an adjournment of this item until February 2019.

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

*The Chair:* So the adjournment to next February 2019 is carried. That completes this item of business.

I need to make an announcement, if everyone could pause for a moment, please. We have timed business coming up. In order to enable the good order of business, I will now adjourn the sitting for 10 minutes to allow fellow members to take a short break. The next item, Item 13, will resume promptly at 5.40 pm. You are encouraged to return to the hall then. A bell will be rung one minute before.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 5.40 pm.

## **ITEM 13 THE ETHICS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (GS 2095)**

*The Chair.* We come now to Item 13, a debate on the ethics of nuclear weapons. For this item, members will need the report prepared by the Mission and Public Affairs Council, GS 2095. I now invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to move Item 13. He may speak for up to 10 minutes.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* I beg to move

'That this Synod, mindful that a faithful commemoration of the centenary of the 1918 Armistice must commit the Church afresh to peace building; and conscious that nuclear weapons, through their indiscriminate and destructive potential, present a distinct category of weaponry that requires Christians to work tirelessly for their elimination across the world:

- a) welcome the 2017 UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and the clear signal it sends by a majority of UN Member States that nuclear weapons are both dangerous and unnecessary;
- b) call on Her Majesty's Government to respond positively to the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons by reiterating publicly its obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its strategy for meeting them;
- c) commit the Church of England to work with its Anglican Communion and ecumenical partners in addressing the regional and international security concerns which drive nations to possess and seek nuclear weapons and to work towards achieving a genuine peace through their elimination.'

Good afternoon, Synod. One of my predecessors, the Rt Revd H A Wilson, Bishop of Chelmsford from 1929 to 1950, only ever made one speech in the House of Lords. It was in a debate about nuclear weapons after the end of the Second World War and he said that the use of nuclear weapons meant breaking one of the few conventions which civilisation had succeeded in setting up to mitigate the brutality of war. He was speaking about what is known as just war theory, which does not mean justifying war but limiting war by the requirements of justice.

Our present Government says nuclear weapons are a deterrent and that so far the deterrent has worked but, as a previous report to this Synod maintained, and, as the Government concedes, for deterrents to work there must be a possibility that the weapons might be used. But this motion calls them unnecessary and dangerous. Why? Because

nuclear weapons are disproportionate and indiscriminate in their capacity to kill and destroy by design, and these are the very tests whereby Christians have discerned what force could be used.

Bishop Bell bravely challenged the allied saturation bombing of German cities saying it was not a justifiable act of war. Why? For the same reasons: it was not minimum use of force but maximum. What happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki fails the same moral test. Even today's so called "low yield" missiles would be devastatingly indiscriminate towards civilian populations and the land itself and the air we breathe. Their impact would not be constrained by national borders. No state could address the consequences.

Therefore, according to just war theory there are no circumstances in which they could be used, and yet they exist. They exist and they could be used. We are prepared to use them. Others want to procure them. Our holding on to ours only makes them seem more attractive to other nation states, often those with the most repellent governments. They want to sit at the nuclear table and enjoy the power and leverage it brings. Our nuclear deterrent has not deterred them from wanting the weapons themselves. The world gets steadily more dangerous. It seems to me to be good fortune not good policy that there has not yet been a nuclear conflagration. Pope Francis has said that their possession is as immoral as their use.

Therefore, the world at some point must choose another way. My predecessor said this: "The only sure preventive is the recognition of the law of God", but, unhappily, the world was in such a state of spiritual bankruptcy that it was difficult to believe that such a remedy could be applied. Hopefully, the General Synod of the Church of England will not make the same mistake.

In his memoirs he recalls how his speech was received, "Nobody took the slightest bit of notice", he wrote. "I sat down in dead silence. I was conscious that all the noble Lords considered that I had made an ass of myself. Probably I had but the ass's burden no longer included an uneasy conscience".

It is 11 years since this Synod discussed nuclear weapons but this year, as we remember the 100th anniversary of the ending of the First World War, it is fitting that we turn our attention to this most pressing of moral issues, for if we as Christians, as the established Church of this land, have nothing to say about making peace, then we are failing in our moral responsibility.

But why this motion at this time? First of all, the issue is as relevant as ever. Some 122 states have voted to adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize last year. ICAN represents the hopes of a great mass of ordinary but organised people rather than those who lead them. Nevertheless, this is against a backdrop of a world where more nations are developing nuclear weapons capability. Even if leaders like Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un could agree to the denuclearisation of North Korea - their

meeting was, we would agree, puzzling - what they were seeking was something we all hope and pray for. But this does not change, rather, it sharpens the focus on the Church's responsibility to seek peace, and to encourage our Government to give added momentum to its efforts to control, and ultimately prohibit, the possession of nuclear weapons, for any hope of genuine peace requires their elimination.

This motion does not present the Synod with a binary choice between unilateral and multilateral approaches to nuclear disarmament, but, rather, seeks to give fresh impetus to the whole debate and to ask our Government to tell us what its plans are. The fact that it has not signed the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is for many of us hugely disappointing, but its failure even to engage with the process looks like complacency.

Hence, we call upon Her Majesty's Government to reiterate its obligations under Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which it has signed, and tell us how it proposes to meet them. What account is it taking of the overwhelming view of the non-nuclear states of the world? What does it consider is the place of nuclear weapons in a world where one of the main threats to our security is a determined fanatic getting on to an underground train with a home-made bomb in his duffle bag or driving a van on to a crowded pavement? And with the increase in cybercrime across the world, exactly how secure are our "secure" systems?

Even many voices in the military are now asking whether the huge expense of renewing Trident is relevant or appropriate for the peacekeeping challenges we face across the world and the security we require at home. If there is £50 billion, £60 billion or £70 billion to spend on Trident - and let us be honest, nobody really knows how much it is all going to cost - are there not better ways of spending this money to secure our defence and to promote peace?

What we are voting for this evening is for a new national debate about the retention and development of nuclear weapons. We have reached international agreements about other indiscriminate weapons, such as chemical weapons and cluster bombs. These agreements are based upon established principles in international law around the need for discrimination in conflict. So, why can we not fill the gap in international law and develop plans towards a world without nuclear weapons as well?

Then there is the question that this Synod raised back in 2007, namely: how can we argue that these weapons of mass destruction are vital for our security and the security of the world, that they are an effective deterrent that maintains peace, and then argue that no one else can have them for their security?

Sisters and brothers, all of us long for a world that is free of nuclear weapons. How could it be otherwise as followers of Christ? But whether our personal view is to seek unilateral or multilateral disarmament, we can all vote on this motion and we can all ask our Government to make good on the promises it has made.

Whenever a bishop, or for that matter a Christian, gets up to speak on this subject, there will be all sorts of people queuing up to tell us that we do not know how the real world works. However, as Christians, we hold on to a vision of peace that is rather more than the silence after the guns have finished firing or the stand-off before they have started. Our Scriptures tell us that in God's Kingdom swords are turned into ploughshares or, as happened in the trenches in the First World War, rifles were turned into goalposts.

Peace, the genuine peace this motion refers to, is possible, but it requires capacious vision, reconciliation painfully embraced and justice secured for every nation. In this motion we are not telling our Government what to do. We are asking them to stop telling us what they are not going to do and work towards plans to make the world a safer place. Let us simply be guided by this: what would Jesus do? And I for one am happy to stand alongside my predecessor making a fool of myself in the cause of peace.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* Under Standing Order 33, I would like to move next business.

*The Chair:* Miss Dailey has moved a procedural motion "that the Synod do pass to next business". If that motion is carried, the motion at Item 13 lapses and the matter cannot be brought up again for debate in the lifetime of the Synod, except with the permission of the Business Committee and with the general consent of Synod. Miss Dailey, will you now speak to your procedural motion?

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* If I were being facetious, at the risk of sounding like Justin Trudeau, I would say I am proposing this because it is 2018 and this is not a particularly topical subject at this time. The really important reason why I am proposing this is because we have contingency business and Mr Gray's motion on homelessness, which is a really critical topic that the Church can do something practical about. My church was involved last year and this year in a project to house homeless people in churches in Oxford. If we get a move on with this motion now, we might be able to get things moving for this winter, and so by making space in the agenda for Mr Gray's motion it might be doing something practical to help people who desperately need our help this winter.

*The Chair:* I call on the Bishop of Chelmsford as mover of the main motion to speak. After I have heard him, I will decide in my discretion under Standing Order 32 whether to hear any more speeches on the procedural motion.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Needless to say, I am resisting this. I find it hard to think of an issue that is more topical than the peace of the world. As I mentioned in my speech, the International Campaign for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons won the Nobel Peace Prize last year. We have recently had the talks about the denuclearisation of North Korea. The renewal of Trident is going on in our nation at the



moment. A point I could not make in my speech which I can now make - so thank you, Prudence - is that we are seriously out of kilter with our ecumenical partners on this. We are probably the only Church which has not got in line with various ecumenical convergences in asking for a new debate about these issues.

I think the General Synod of the Church of England needs to speak about these things and we need to come to a decision about where we are, and so, much though I care about homelessness and look forward to that debate, I think it would be a serious mistake for us move to next business now.

*The Chair:* I do not propose to allow any more speeches. I am about to put to the Synod the motion "that the Synod do now pass to next business". If the procedural motion is carried the motion at Item 13 lapses. If the procedural motion is lost, debate on Item 13 will resume. I now put to the Synod the motion that the Synod do pass to the next business.

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

*The Chair:* That is very clearly lost. Item 13 is now open for debate. I should explain that a large number of members have indicated a request to speak and it will not be possible to take many, and I apologise for that in advance. The speech limit will be five minutes for first two speakers and three minutes thereafter.

*Revd Martin Gough (Armed Forces Synod):* From the Armed Forces and from the Royal Navy. The submarines that carry our nuclear deterrent are really foreboding places. Having had the privilege to visit them on many occasions, the complexity and the austere living conditions there, and a very, very real danger of never surfacing again is a daily challenge for the women and the men who work there.

I am not going to go through the political arguments for the validity and the necessity of that ultimate deterrent. I am just going to ask you to think for a moment about three people who I know live and work there. Amy, a young lieutenant on her first tour looking after probably somebody from your parish in her logistics department who has joined up to try to serve their county. Jumper Collins, who has a son with special needs and is on yet another patrol out of Scotland, his third in three years. Or Captain Graham yet another tour, a third four-month patrol in two years. Men and women who simply seek to serve God, the Queen and our country.

These are the men and women who leave their families behind for three or four months every year - no internet, no Facebook, no Snapchat. No contact with anybody in the outside world. No surfacing, no medals to put on their chest, but they carry that dreadful, dreadful responsibility for you and for me. We need to bear in mind that this is a dangerous place to be and being submerged could be the last time that they see daylight.

If the Prime Minister orders them to press the button to launch the ultimate destruction of our world, the moral and the ethical pressure on that young commanding officer is something that none of us can understand or try to face.

I have responsibility for placing chaplains on board, who will live cheek-by-jowl with ratings and officers. They will hot bunk. They will live out of a box no bigger than an apple crate. Mark, my current chaplain out there, will say his daily office day in, day out. He will offer the Eucharist many times on a Sunday trying to catch people as they come off watch or go on.

In a submarine, you do not know if it is day or night. You do not know where in the world you are. You just get on with doing your task; serving your country. The chaplain is the only one who can listen to those serious concerns of command, the worries of command, what it means to carry our nuclear deterrent.

The submarine is a quiet place. It is a place living on the edge, but these men and women are simply working out their calling to serve our country. Much, much more work needs to be done. Some of the questions need be raised as to why we have it. None of us likes having bombs, but some of us understand the complexities of doing so. This is a complex and an emotional subject, so, please, as you consider the rights and the wrongs of a nuclear deterrent, remember and pray for the men and women of the Naval Service who for the last 50 years have tried to keep our peace.

*Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester):* Thank you for inviting me to speak on a subject which draws close to many of my abiding concerns. I speak as one who has written about war, military power, remembrance and their place in British cultural myths and identity. I also speak as a recovering teaching fellow in philosophy and ethics.

I speak in support of this motion, but I wish to offer what I feel is a deeply Anglican caution. As a student of war and its obscene, if sometimes unavoidable, effects, I feel confident to say that nuclear weapons are the final iteration of war's most savage logic: that war is in the business of injuring; it abridges hope and struggles to limit its effects. The specific perversity of nuclear weapons lies in their inability to control their effects at all, even at the tactical level. Their use salts the Earth for the innocent and the blameworthy alike. They harness power so titanic it can wipe the Earth clean and create seas of crystal glass. Even if we major on their deterrent effect, we do so on the presumption of threatened use. Brinkmanship with such weapons represents living less on the promises of the living God and more on the threats of human vanity.

The poet Milton reminds us that one of the names of Satan is Lucifer, the light-bringer. The nihilistic brightness of a nuclear blast represents one vision of Lucifer's light and yet I suggest Anglican ethical thinking requires an acute attention to the located and grounded. We might find it burdensome or irritating, but we are still a parochial church grounded in local community. Synod, I say be bold in supporting this motion, but let us avoid the risks of gesture politics. There are communities in places like Barrow-in-

Furness that have found their past, present and futures deeply woven into the nuclear art of defence.

At a time when many of our poorest communities are breaking under a lack of central funding, the absence of rewarding jobs and profound anxieties about the future, the defence industry and the remarkable senior service of Her Majesty's Armed Forces offer one kind of stability; a precarious one but stability nonetheless.

I was raised in a working-class world where the work was taken where it could be found, sometimes in the Armed Forces, so Synod, while I commend this motion, I do so while inviting us to recognise that should the UK abandon its commitment to Trident, there are real implications for work and prospects, often (but not exclusively) in the underfunded north.

An Anglican response surely requires attention to what comes next for human beings. Should we abandon unusable hardware? Anything less sends a signal that for the Church of England there are some people in hard-pressed and ignored communities who are easy collateral in our politics of faith.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster):* It was my privilege and joy to ordain 17 rather wonderful men and women in Portsmouth Cathedral last weekend. The words I spoke at those two ordination services have stayed with me as I have repeatedly thought about our debate this afternoon: that we are called, as those services say, to be "heralds of Christ's Kingdom", in how we order our lives, our words, our actions, and who we live them for, and, in so doing, show what that Kingdom looks like. I can think of nothing less that speaks of God's Kingdom than nuclear weapons, and I earnestly pray for a day when the Earth is rid of them. I pray with equal earnestness that we, God's people, strive with even greater efforts to create a world in which they will be no longer necessary.

To contribute to that sign of the Kingdom requires of us the attributes Christ himself required of his Disciples; words perhaps that might be included in a bishop's advice to the newly ordained that we be as wise as serpents and as innocent as doves. Innocent? Absolutely. Innocent in holding to what is good and true to help us discern the coming of the Kingdom and bodying it forth in the world, but wise, too, in knowing that this world is fallen, and fallen people seek and abuse power, and that we must be wise enough to meet their challenge and keep safe what is good.

I would welcome all wise attempts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, but we must demonstrate the wisdom of disciples in doing so, lest we leave ourselves open to the suggestion, perhaps even the accusation, that the good looks more like the naive.

I would make one further point. As I stood in Portsmouth Cathedral last Saturday I was reminded once again that it is the “cathedral of the sea” and a particular home to those who serve in peril on the sea. We, the Church, and the Church in a city like Portsmouth in particular, have a special duty towards those tens of thousands of fine young men and women in all the Armed Forces who put themselves in harm’s way to keep us safe. That they must do so is, alas, a sign of how fallen our world is, but we must honour the service they give and know that our own freedom, freedom to follow God’s call, is guaranteed by their service. We live in a world where they are necessary. We must work with even greater vigour towards a world where they may beat their swords into ploughshares.

*The Chair:* After Mrs Grivell, I will invite the Revd Dr Sean Docherty to speak to and move his amendment.

*Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby):* I am wholeheartedly in favour of this motion. The idea of nuclear weapons and nuclear war is completely terrifying to me and anything we can do to encourage our Government to make the world a safer place is a good thing in my book.

Looking to the future, I am certain in my lifetime, or my children’s lifetime, we will see nuclear weapons deployed if the current political climate continues. As a politics graduate, I do believe we will see a second term of Donald Trump in the White House, which only makes my fears greater.

However, it seems odd to me that we are here debating the ethics of nuclear weapons but hosting arms companies (and therefore profiting from them) at Church House in Westminster. As we are reminded each year, all Synod members are *ex officio* members of the Corporation of Church House, which includes the conference centre facilities. Therefore, we are complicit in hosting them and I am pretty sure it goes against our ethical letting policy. We do not let our churches and church halls to the British National Party or the English Defence League, so why is it okay to go against this policy at national level?

We have spoken this afternoon about ethical investment and making sure we are striving to be as ethical as possible in all we do in a variety of areas. We must urge HM Government to advocate diplomacy over arms in all cases where possible, particularly in striving for nuclear disarmament, but, Synod, we cannot continue to say one thing here and do something different elsewhere in the Church. We must get our Church House in order if we want any chance of making an impact outside this chamber on this matter.

## **ITEM 38**

*The Chair:* I now invite Dr Doherty to speak to and move his amendment at Item 38. He has up to five minutes.

*Revd Dr Sean Doherty (London):* I beg to move

'In paragraph (b) leave out from "respond positively" to "meeting them" and *insert*  
—  
"publish its strategy for meeting its obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and to sign up to the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons".'

I teach ethics and, unlike the previous speaker, I still teach ethics at St Mellitus College. I always say that it is my job to try to make our students into more moral people. It is a difficult job but someone has to do it. There are only a couple of my students here this afternoon so, hopefully, I will get away with that one.

Thank you, Synod, for considering my amendment. I think it is worth testing the mind of Synod on whether we might want to call on the Government to take slightly more specific action than the motion currently calls for. If my amendment is not carried, for clarity, I will certainly still be voting enthusiastically for this motion. I speak as a just war supporter. I am not a pacifist. I believe that the use of force by government even in war can be right, but, as we have heard from previous speakers, the just war tradition sets careful limits on the use of force in war, particularly in terms of its proportionate use and its discriminate use.

Even though I speak from within the just war tradition, I still think we should call on the Government to do more than, as it says in part (b) of the motion. to respond positively to the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. It is quite true that the Government has in fact, as the accompanying paper from Mission and Public Affairs points out, said that it will not sign the Treaty, but I do not think that should deter us - no pun intended - from calling on the Government to sign it - for two reasons.

Number one, the motion in asking the Government to respond positively to the Treaty, as I said, is slightly vague. Responding positively could mean lots of things and, clearly, it is better than responding negatively. If we really think that as a matter of principle that nuclear weapons are so terrible that, as the motion says, "Christians should work tirelessly for their elimination", then surely it makes most sense for us to sign up as a nation to a treaty which commits us to their eradication?

Number two, it would be strange if we treated government policy once announced as eternally fixed and not open to any persuasion or moral growth. That is why I think we should call on the Government to sign it.

Why do I think it would be better if the Government did sign it? First, as the motion already makes clear, the UK is already committed to non-proliferation and disarmament. Indeed, we are legally obliged to negotiate on disarmament by virtue of our membership of the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty. That is why my amendment also asks the Government not simply to reiterate its commitment to that Treaty, but to spell out how it is going to meet its obligation under that Treaty.

Secondly, the reality is that we have not seen progress globally towards denuclearisation for decades, because the nuclear states have not shown a willingness to denuclearise. If we are going to live in a world without nuclear weapons, we are going to have to get rid of them at some point. But far from it: we have committed to renewing Trident.

The Treaty, by contrast, offers a framework under which denuclearisation can actually take place. Rather than waiting for America and other nuclear states to get on board, we can lead by example and make the holding of nuclear weapons by other countries seem increasingly marginal.

Thirdly and finally, this aligns us with the rest of the world, or at least the majority of the rest of the world. The United Nations of 122 nations voted in favour of adopting the Treaty and just one against. Rather than keeping on waiting for other states to take action, this is simply the regime under which the rest of the world will probably now be operating.

The UK response to the Treaty ironically said that the Treaty did not recognise either the global context or the consensus-based system. First, you might ask what has the consensus-based system achieved and, secondly, what can be more of a consensus-based system than ones which the rest of the world has subscribed?

I move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Dr Doherty. I invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to respond. He has two minutes.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Thank you, Sean, for the amendment. I think it will be good to test the mind of Synod upon this. There are two parts. I entirely happily accept the first part and I also happily accept the second part but with a little “but” that I would like to attach to it.

As I said in my speech, I think the thrust of this motion is asking our Government to stop telling us what it is not going to do and start telling us what it is going to do. It has already told us that it is not going to sign up to this, so we as Synod need to vote for this if it is what we believe is the right thing to do. It is important that we have a prophetic voice and if that is the view of Synod let us hear it. I think the motion is just as strong, you could almost say stronger, without this. It is whether we believe this is the right thing to do that is the crucial question here, and, therefore, I think it would be good, if possible, to hear a few speeches and then to see what Synod decides. I happily accept this but I think it is up to Synod now to decide.

*The Chair:* Item 38 is now open for debate. May I remind members that speeches should be directed specifically at the substance of the amendment.

*Brigadier Ian Dobbie (Rochester):* I regret that I have to resist the amendment of my friend, Mr Doherty. I believe that he is driving us towards nuclear pacifism. It is idealist

but unrealistic. Nuclear weapons, as has been said already, cannot be uninvented and, horrendous as their destructive capability is known to be, when owned and handled responsibly in our own lifetime their very existence has arguably prevented cold wars from going hot.

There is no appointment in public life for which I am more grateful for not having held than to have been President of the United States in August 1945 when President Truman faced a horrendous double effect situation but an appreciation was carried out that revealed that if the rest of the Second World War in the Far East had been prosecuted using conventional weapons only, the number of civilian and military casualties would have been even greater than those at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the fact that it took two atomic bombs not one to secure Japanese surrender seems to confirm that assessment.

In consequence, a military strategy emerged on deterrence. To have achieved the same degree of deterrence based on conventional weapons only would have involved a cost so high as to be incalculable. Nuclear deterrence was much cheaper. Now, I served myself for 15 years in the erstwhile British Army of the Rhine when we had to plan on facing the Warsaw Pact forces outnumbering NATO at times in conventional weapons, and the design and location of Warsaw Pact weapon systems combined to provide a threat which was at times considerably greater than was realised.

The fact that NATO had nuclear weapon systems to achieve realistic deterrence was nothing less than a comfort to us to those who had no ambition to fight in World War III. The fact that not one square metre of NATO territory in those years went into the hands of the communist world is a tribute to the effect of nuclear deterrence.

Yet, the international effort in recent years to achieve non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is surely to be applauded. Nuclear superiority is unnecessary. Nuclear sufficiency is enough. The United Kingdom has played its part in this noble process. Atomic demolition munitions, nuclear artillery pieces and the RAF V bombers have all been discarded and Trident remains the United Kingdom's only nuclear weapon system.

We have no knowledge in a fast-changing world to know from where all future threats may emerge. Unilateral disarmament is unrealistic and fails to take into account the fallenness of human nature. There is no historical precedent for the effectiveness of unilateralism. If, say, a country like Israel has nuclear weapons, it is unrealistic to expect it to abandon them, thereby surrendering to those who retain them. I ask Synod to resist this amendment.

*Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle):* I think my grandmother would have loved this motion and this amendment. My grandmother was born in 1919 and was a student of French and German at King's, London. In August 1939, she went to Germany to begin her year there which formed part of her studies. She was almost immediately recalled by the Foreign Office just before war was declared.

Throughout the war, she remained in as much contact as possible with the German family that she had stayed with and returned to them after the war. They also came to visit her in Lancaster in 1948. Muriel was a great storyteller. When my cousins and brothers and I visited our grandmother, we would always try to get her onto the subject of being a young adult during the Blitz.

Muriel was strategic in the way she told her stories. She made a point of never telling us about the German bombing of London without telling us about the British bombing of Berlin. Muriel's war was not one of winners and losers but of the personal cost to both sides. Like most of her generation, Muriel's experience of the Second World War stayed with her throughout her life and informed her views of all war and conflict afterwards.

A few months before her death in her nineties, Muriel wrote a letter to the Ministry of Defence opposing the renewal of Trident. Muriel's experience of the Second World War deeply affected her perspective on nuclear weapons. The voices of Muriel's generation are gradually falling silent and they are important voices to remember because they saw the effect of war on their land in a way that many of us and those who lead our countries increasingly have not.

Muriel was a committed Christian. After the war she had seen, she believed it was part of her Christian commitment to make sure that the massive moral issue of war in general and nuclear war in particular continued to be discussed by the Church. Muriel would have rejoiced to see this motion and this amendment brought to Synod and would have seen it as a sign that the Church is remembering its responsibility to promote peace and the truth central to the Gospel, which is often forgotten in wartime, that all humanity is made in the image of God, no matter what side they are on.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I declare as an interest as a former naval officer and someone who did serve on a surface ship that carried, for a short period of time, a nuclear weapon. I have been struggling with the debate and whether I could vote in favour of the main motion. I think I can but I could not vote for the motion as amended.

In the debates that went on in the United Nations, there were those who engaged in the debate around the Prohibition Treaty and another group of nations who did not want to sign up to the Prohibition Treaty because they felt that the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and particularly Article VI of that Treaty, was really the most important game in town, that non-proliferation was really the stakes that matter.

Countries as enlightened as Australia, Canada, Turkey and Romania and all sorts of other countries, very diverse, South Korea and other places, all felt that the concern would be that by focusing on the prohibition the important work of ensuring non-proliferation would be undermined and that the work that is going on currently up to 2020 to try and achieve an outcome to the consensus around non-proliferation that is going on would be undermined.



My view here is that we must resist Dr Doherty's amendment. I am not a unilateralist and I would broadly align myself with Brigadier Dobbie in this. This is not about unilateralism versus multilateralism. It is about the best way in which we can prevent these weapons spreading their influence and their extent in the world. It seems to me those nations that take that seriously around non-proliferation are worth taking very seriously and, as a result, I prefer the motion unamended.

*Canon Peter Adams (St Albans):* I support the amendment as well as the motion before us. I am a realist. I am not a pacifist but I am a peacemaker. I seek to wage peace. I would love to believe we could make war go away but as a conflict mediator, a community conflict mediator, I know it is unlikely. I would love to believe the best about the other side, our enemies, whoever they are. I do, personally, intervention work with extremists. I could introduce you to a few who would not hesitate to push the button and a few of them most likely could call on a person who could.

That said, I believe we should ask a question: do we want today to say okay to more decades of the same? That is why I want to push the Government as hard as possible and why I support the motion. We want our elected leaders to be sure they will not push the button, even if it is only defensively. Are we content that tens of billions of pounds will be swallowed up in weapons systems to which we have almost become enslaved, which we cannot bear to imagine life without? Are we satisfied to spend money on the technology of death rather than war?

My hope today is that we can lift our eyes to a different reality, the reality of that kingdom of peace that Bishop Stephen reminded us of, a kingdom for which we kneel to pray day by day in the midst of the injustices, the devastation, the conflict, the reality of death in the world around us. We here have the opportunity to do more than pray. We have the opportunity to add our voice, energies and resources to many others that work for that day.

Can we as a Church hold up to the nation and the world a vision of a future of peace where we are not enslaved to that awful button we know we should never press and where we actively wage peace not war? We have had reference to the visions of the prophets, Isaiah and Micah. In the midst of the judgments they declared on the realpolitik of Israel, they glimpsed a future of a mountain where God's people dwelt, where God dwelt amongst his people, where people went to learn the good life and especially the ways of peace, a place where swords were beaten into ploughshares, where people did not train for war anymore.

Amidst the growing nationalism around our continent, the threats from Al-Qaeda, ISIS and whatever comes to replace them, the threats or perceived threats of North Korea, Iraq and others, the internal threats of terror, I suggest we as God's people should dare to hold up a bold hope for a vision of peace.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: after the next speaker, could I tempt you with a motion for closure on Item 38?

*The Chair:* I think you could probably tempt me after the Bishop of Coventry.

*The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth):* I have great respect for Brigadier Ian Dobbie and I was moved by his speech. I have great respect for the Bishop of Portsmouth and great affection for his See. Catherine Pickford has talked about her grandmother. My grandfather turned up at the naval dockyards in 1908 and joined up and spent his naval career and came back again in the Second World War.

I think the prohibition on nuclear weapons, this new Treaty, has introduced a new reality into international law which undermines or questions. It is not at all convinced by the nuclear sufficiency argument, or, what I thought I heard and I may have got this wrong from the Bishop of Portsmouth, creating a world in which nuclear weapons will no longer be necessary.

What the Treaty is doing is delegitimising the possession and the threat to use nuclear weapons. It aims to create a new normativity in the world based on humanitarian principles that counters the justification of the possession of and threat to use nuclear weapons made, as we have heard today, on security grounds.

As we have heard from the Bishop of Chelmsford's brilliant speech, it is a moral logic which the Pope has affirmed in his November statement and that the Vatican confirmed by being the first state to ratify the ban. It is a moral logic that the World Council of Churches' Executive Committee urges all states to ratify and calls on member churches to enter in "constructive dialogue with governments that reject and refuse the Treaty".

The moral question that I think faces the Church is whether we will join this turning of the legal, humanitarian and ecumenical tide. I have been in a dilemma over this motion, whether tactically it is better to not vote for it and to wait until we are able to engage the Government because we accept that the Government will not do it, of course.

I have come to the view though that we, as the Church, should affirm this Treaty. That is the moral case I want to be part of, the tide I want to roll in that I think this new Treaty has introduced into international law and, thereby, the moral ordering of the world.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 38.

*The Chair:* Mr Freeman has proposed a motion for closure on Item 38. That has my consent.

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

*The Chair:* I now put to the vote the amendment at Item 38.

### *The amendment*

*In paragraph (b) leave out from “respond positively” to “meeting them” and insert –  
“publish its strategy for meeting its obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and to sign up to the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons”.*

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

*The Chair:* We now resume the debate on Item 13 unamended. The speech limit remains three minutes.

*Lt Gemma Winterton (Armed Forces):* This debate is about the ethics of nuclear weapons. Despite the fact that I have thought very carefully about this matter on numerous occasions throughout my career, it is not my job as a member of the Armed Forces to comment on the morality associated with the weapons that society asks us to hold and, if necessary, use on their behalf.

Instead, as my contribution, I would like to draw Synod’s attention to the knowing and willing sacrifice that has been made for nearly 50 years by those sailors and their families that man the submarines that form the UK nuclear deterrent. I want to tell you about one of my best friends. She is married to a submariner engineering officer, married to an intelligent, educated Christian man who has chosen to work on the nuclear deterrent and who does one of the critical jobs on board working with a nuclear reactor. I have her permission to talk to you.

They have three young children, a boy and twin girls two years younger. A normal deployment of our nuclear deterrent is three months, but either side of that there is at least three weeks’ hard work to get ready to go away and, afterwards, there is the potential of maintenance or unavoidable delays for operational reasons. Between when my friends’ twin girls were one month and seven months’ old their father was at home for approximately 10 nights in total.

This separation is not actually that unusual in the Armed Forces. The difference with the submarines that form part of the nuclear deterrent is the total isolation. You do not have access to any modern communication. When a boat is deployed, the only contact families have is a single 120-word familygram that can be sent by a pre-nominated family member to that service person. This familygram is checked before it is sent to the boat to ensure that it contains no bad news and the family receives no reply in return.

I leave you to think about the reality of what that means. Dad missing almost all the changes in those first six months; mum looking after three children under the age of three entirely on her own; a young boy, whose life has been turned upside down by the arrival

of two baby sisters at a time when his dad is not around. Despite all this, the work continues. Submarines go to sea. People think that it is important enough for our defence that they are willing to make the sacrifice on our behalf.

Again, I say to you, members of Synod, you might not agree with the means, you might wish that nuclear weapons did not exist, but we currently have a nuclear deterrent and I ask you, please, to recognise the human cost that has been knowingly paid for 50 years and continues as we speak.

*Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities):* I wish to speak in support of the motion and, if I may, I want to broaden the context. It is the business of actually what we think it is possible to give to the world in the way the world is. I was at the CCU meeting last night and heard from the co-chairs of the Meissen Commission and reference was made to Robert Runcie and to a visit to the former German Democratic Republic in 1983, which led to the formation of the Meissen Agreement.

Archbishop Runcie went to East Germany and had an interview with the Secretary of the Communist Party, Herr Willi Stoph, who spoke a great deal about the importance of peace and how we needed to get away from the Cold War. Archbishop Runcie, who as you know served in the Army and was awarded the Military Cross, I think, pointed out that the peace which the Cold War had stood for was a cold peace and that Christians stood for a warm peace and warm peace meant that people could relate to each other and that barriers were broken down. He read a list of names of many clergy and many not clergy in East Germany who were forbidden from visiting their families in the west.

I think that as long as we hold on to dependence on these massively destructive weapons, we are assuming that the only peace available is a cold peace. Peace needs to be warm, it needs to be trusting and it needs to proceed more by agreements, however painstaking, rather than by threats.

One of the big problems about the possession of nuclear weapons, however modified, however low yield, is that they threaten a destruction which suggests that the security value has almost absolute status. If you are prepared to wreck the planet, which is one possible outcome - it is certainly a terrible scenario but a possible one - you are placing your own security on a level with the value of the survival of the planet. This I think is something quite close to being idolatrous. There is a theological imperative to getting rid of these weapons and I think that is related to the worship of the true God.

*Mrs Gill De Berry (Salisbury):* Synod, I declare an interest. I have always been a great admirer of the Campaign Against Arms Trade. On their website, they recently publicised a CND survey of 2017. For a moment, I would like us just to consider the financial cost of these weapons.

CND have calculated that, without Trident renewal, we could as a country build 120 state of the art hospitals and employ 150,000 new nurses; or build three million affordable

homes; or pay the tuition fees for eight million students; or install solar panels in every home in the UK; or, for one-twentieth of the cost of replacing Trident, give everyone whose job is directly dependent on Trident - and that is 11,500 civilian employees - a cheque for £1 million. Synod, I give my support to this motion and I do ask that we consider the costs involved as well.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order.

*The Chair:* I would just like to explain to Mrs De Berry that my confusion was simply that she is clearly so much younger than her photograph looks. Point of order. I think you were probably asking for a motion for closure after the next speaker. I think we might just try and see if we can fit one or two more in and then we will see where we get to. Thank you.

*Canon Dr John Mason (Chester):* Two years ago, I was fortunate enough to visit Japan to meet up with my daughter on her round the world trip. I had never been to Japan previously but it lived up to its reputation that was given to me by all those who have been there. It is an extraordinary place with gracious and generous people who will go out of their way to help anyone lost like myself.

During the course of the trip, we decided to go to Hiroshima to visit the Peace Memorial Park and, within it, the Peace Memorial Museum. As I had expected, this was a moving and, at times, gut-wrenching experience. I cannot possibly do it justice but the devastation depicted, the artefacts that were on display illustrating the effects of a nuclear explosion, the stories from the bereaved, and especially from parents of so many children who were killed in that attack, could not fail to make a deep impression on anyone.

For me, an equally significant impression was the reaction of the Japanese people to this horrific episode of their history. There was no malice against those who had carried out the attack and, as far as was possible, the events were described in an objective fashion with no attempt to apportion blame or to politicise them. What came out most clearly was the desire for peace and for the ridding of nuclear weapons to ensure this could never happen again.

How ironic that nuclear weaponed armed states such as the UK see the way to prevent a nuclear attack as having weapons of their own, whilst the only country that has actually suffered a nuclear attack and has experienced its horrors does not see the way of preventing a recurrence as to arm themselves but to put their efforts into seeking a way to eliminate them entirely.

Are we listening and giving weight to the views of those who have actually suffered, the victims and survivors? Are we truly aware and do we take into account the humanitarian aspects of a nuclear exchange, or is the UK continuing to follow policies that are determined more by its perceived global role?

Now, I am not an out and out unilateralist. I do appreciate that disturbing a balance of power can create instability and risk, but I am also conscious that it is also too easy to use this as an argument to do nothing that would materially lead to disarmament. This gets to the heart of the motion we have before us.

What the motion seeks to do is to get renewed momentum into that process, to seek some signal that we are not being swayed by a desire to fulfil a global role that is no longer appropriate but are serious about fulfilling our obligations under the NPT, and that we will be more prepared to engage with the 2017 Treaty rather than condemning it as unworkable or flawed and to address elements within it. As a Church, I would like to offer one further suggestion, but you will just have to wait to find out what it is!

*Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham):* Growing up in 1980s Britain, I can still remember the fear around *Threads*, the TV docudrama about a nuclear attack on Sheffield - if the Bishop is here do not worry - or the leaflet, *Protect and Survive*. We certainly never got around to building the fallout shelter in the under stairs cupboard. The latter made us laugh and the former made us weep, but both remind me that this debate is, in the end, about the future of human society and the created world.

GS 2095 rightly highlights the complexities of international security and policy in paragraphs 28 and 29, but, Synod, please remember, as many speakers have bidden us, that this is about individual lives on every side of the conversation. War always demands a payment. Nuclear war requires a price that few can conceive we would ever pay, undermining the very deterrence on which it is apparently based.

The Report is, however, weak in two ways. Particularly, paragraph 65 notes the ground of strategic security and ethical debate has shifted but we need more acute theological interpretation of both policy and treaties. Likewise, Bishop Stephen referred eloquently to the "Just War" which gets scant attention in the Report but has been helped by the quality of this debate. It gives no succour to any of the positions actually outlined.

It was just on 30 years ago this weekend that I resigned my commission as a pilot in the Royal Air Force. If I thought being an archdeacon was a dream job, I have to say flying tornado jets was somewhat further up the scale. But when I found myself in a briefing about a limited nuclear strike in Central Germany, the then frontline, and hearing numbers being plotted on a map - six, one, two, five - I realised, in fact, they were charting the deaths of millions of people, the acceptable casualties of a small scale low-yield limited nuclear exchange.

In a moment, I knew I could not continue to be party to the desecration of land and the deaths of so many and I walked out of RAF Cranwell a year later as a civilian. In the process, I also noted that, in 15 years of Christian, Anglican discipleship, it had failed to help me address these issues.

Without this motion, Synod, what will we do to help today's young people become active Christian peacemakers in the world? How will they hear and sing the sons of a peaceful desire, as we did this morning? I hope members have had a chance to attend to mark Professor Margaret MacMillan's 2018 Reith Lectures on War and Humanity. She makes a good case that we are not irrevocably drawn towards death and destruction.

With this motion, to proclaim such hope is not to betray trust in our Armed Forces, but it is, in fact, to support a better wider vision for the whole world. I want to commend this motion to Synod and ask us to take the prophetic step to which we are called, that we might affirm the call and mission of God in all his glory.

*The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes):* I support this motion. I strongly commend it to the Synod. I want, further, to exhort this Synod and to exhort all Christians to connect or reconnect with a sense of urgency in this matter. Nuclear weapons have been around for too long and we have got used to them.

35 years ago, in the early 1980s, when I was young, it was my privilege to serve as national co-chair of Christian CND with responsibility for liaison with the churches. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to all those who have worked for Christian CND in those years and since.

That was the time of the Church and the Bomb Report. I well remember observing from the gallery the heated and passionate conversations in this Synod and in the wider Church and in the press and I remember some heated conversations of my own with my then Bishop, Richard Harries, who stood against the unilateralist recommendation of that Report. His view prevailed, as Synod will know, and the recommendation was not approved.

Instead, we decided that our job in the Church was to be wise old heads, lecturing and pastoring those with their fingers on a button with the existence of which we were content. It seems to me that the nation was younger then. At least that conversation took place between people who were awake to the risks and realities of these weapons and within a nation that was interested in these things.

Time has passed on since then and, as Prudence suggested, we seem to have gone less interested. We have lived for so long with the threat of indiscriminate mass destruction that we have been lulled into sleep and in that sleep we may yet sleepwalk to the destruction of the world as we know it. GS 2095 helpfully explores what you might call tensions in Christian ethics.

As Bishop Stephen has said, paragraph 20 offers a resolution to these tensions which is located in our universal agreement that the existence of nuclear weapons is not good and I have never heard anyone say that it is good that these things exist.

The motion invites us to welcome a Treaty which is not a wise old heads Treaty, not a realpolitik Treaty. Those who advocate for it will, therefore, be accused of being naive or childlike or childish, as has courteously happened today. As a 64-year-old man, I am happy to be so accused. I agree with those who say that the Church should stand for what it believes to be right, even if that makes us look stupid, even if that makes us look naive, even if it makes us look young.

If we vote for this motion, we will be acting with integrity as people of peace, as we will not be if we say that nuclear weapons are an evil thing but because we are so sensible we will embrace them anyway. I am 35 years older now, but I exhort Synod to stay young with me or grow young with me and advocate for a step which fits with our belief in a Lord who is the prince of peace. I strongly commend the motion to you all.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* John Freeman. Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 13.

*The Chair:* That has my consent. I put the motion for closure on Item 13 to the Synod.

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

*The Chair:* I invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to respond to the debate. Bishop, you have about three minutes.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Well, thank you, everybody. There is clearly not time to respond to everything that has been said. Thank you to Sean for putting the amendment, which would have sharpened the motion but is not at all a problem for me that it has not been carried. Thank you, particularly, to the Bishop of Coventry who emphasised the point that what we are looking for is a coalition across the world for what could be a change in international law.

We cannot let this debate pass without making it absolutely clear that to vote for this motion is in no way not to support men and women in our Armed Forces. Far from it, we absolutely stand with them. Thank you to Martin Gough, to the Bishop of Portsmouth, to Gemma Winterton and to Ian Dobbie who made that point. We stand alongside them, we pray for them and we support them. This is not what this motion is about.

Also, thank you to the Bishop of Liverpool for helping us to remember those who have worked and witnessed for peace over many years in CND, Pax Christi and other organisations. Thank you to Simon Heathfield, who also pointed out that we need to do further theological work on this. Please do not forget part (c) of the motion, which is about what we are going to have to do with our ecumenical partners and with others across the word to build a coalition for peace.

Finally, because I have not got much time, let me give the last word to St Francis of Assisi, somebody who, like whoever it was who said it, waged peace. St Francis said this: "Start



by doing what is necessary, then do what is possible and then, suddenly, you will find you are doing the impossible”.

So, Synod, it is necessary as the Church of this land that we say nuclear weapons, with all their indiscriminate power to kill, their terrible capacity to destroy, are simply wrong. It is necessary that we simply say that. It is possible that we could join with other nations and other people of goodwill, those who have nuclear weapons and those who do not, to work towards reducing them in the world and create a road map.

If we do what is necessary and if we do what is possible, then we may find that we are doing the impossible and ridding the world of the scourge of these weapons of mass destruction. Sisters, brothers, I do hope that you will vote for this motion.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* Point of order: under Standing Order 37, could I request a count of the whole Synod.

*The Chair:* Prebendary Cawdell has requested a count of the whole Synod. I am prepared to order that myself under Standing Orders. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 13.

The vote on Item 13. In favour, 260, against 26, with 21 recorded abstentions. The motion

*That this Synod, mindful that a faithful commemoration of the centenary of the 1918 Armistice must commit the Church afresh to peace building; and conscious that nuclear weapons, through their indiscriminate and destructive potential, present a distinct category of weaponry that requires Christians to work tirelessly for their elimination across the world:*

- a) welcome the 2017 UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and the clear signal it sends by a majority of UN Member States that nuclear weapons are both dangerous and unnecessary;*
- b) call on Her Majesty's Government to respond positively to the UN Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons by reiterating publicly its obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its strategy for meeting them;*
- c) commit the Church of England to work with its Anglican Communion and ecumenical partners in addressing the regional and international security concerns which drive nations to possess and seek nuclear weapons and to work towards achieving a genuine peace through their elimination.*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* That concludes this item of business and today's proceedings. I have two notices to give to members.

The first, a message from Dr Eeva John. The interactive workshop material which allows members to contribute ideas and reflections to the learning process will remain open in the Spring Lane Building until 8.00 pm. She invites you to take the opportunity to visit and add your contributions to these key questions. Evening prayer follows shortly and will be led by the Revd Dr Sean Doherty supported by musicians from Resound Worship. Thank you.

*Revd Dr Sean Doherty* led the Synod in an act of worship.

## **Full Synod: Fourth Day Monday 9 July 2019**

### **MORNING WORSHIP**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 9.00 am.

*The Chair:* Members of Synod, before we move to Item 14, I have been asked to say two things. The first is that you will not be surprised to know that the Archbishop of Canterbury is not with us today. I think all of you will know why that is. Can we hold Prince Louis and his parents in our prayers as he is brought to baptism today and pray for all the Royal Family, especially Her Majesty the Queen.

I have also been asked announce that the open Synod quiz night, in which Newcastle Diocese did reasonably well, raised £229.60 in the collection for Christian Aid.

### **ITEM 14 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2096)**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 14 on our Agenda, which is a presentation under Standing Order 107 on the work of the Archbishops' Council and their Annual Report. It is my pleasure to introduce Mrs Mary Chapman and Mr Matthew Frost who will make the presentation.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Good morning, everyone. Matthew and I are really delighted to have been asked to give a flavour of the work of the Archbishops' Council during 2017. We both serve on the Council. As some of you know, I am Chair of the Audit Committee and Matthew has led the work on *Setting God's People Free* and is also a member of the Strategic Investment Board. I am also a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group so you can see that we are quite involved in the Archbishops' Council's work.

The presentation today is designed to be more "show" than "tell" and that is to take advantage of some of our new digital material. The Annual Report itself contains a wealth of detail so we will endeavour to answer any questions that you have at the end.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* Before we go any further, we thought it might be helpful to remind you of the composition of the Archbishops' Council in case you did not know. We look clearly to the Archbishops to provide spiritual direction and vision to the Council. It also brings together representatives from each of the three Houses of Synod: the House of Bishops, the House of Clergy and the House of Laity. It is worth mentioning that six of us, Mary and myself included, are appointed to bring a wider range of background experiences to the Council. The First Church Estates Commissioner Loretta Minghella

also participates, which is of course vital to make sure the work of the Council is aligned with that of the Commissioners.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Our purpose is clear and unashamedly missional.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* And as you would expect, the Council is utterly committed to Renewal and Reform as a vehicle for transformational change. Let us take a moment to look at this video to give you an overview of a few aspects of the start we have made.

*(Video played)*

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Our three priorities are the familiar quinquennial goals of the period 2010 to 2015, which Synod agreed to carry over into this period of 2015 to 2020. At the beginning of 2017, the Council set new objectives, one in each of the nine areas on the screen. They are clear statements of what we are trying to achieve both last year and over three years. You will have seen that the Report is structured to describe what is being done to achieve each of the nine objectives so far.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* We do not work in isolation. Clearly, we seek to work hand-in-glove with you and with other bodies across the whole family of the Church. This is vital.

What I am going to do is give you a quick overview of the financial situation and then quickly run through each of those objectives in turn to give you a snapshot of some of the things that have been going on this year.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* As Chair of the Audit Committee you would expect me to have more than a passing interest in the numbers and these next two slides give you a brief financial overview in terms of income here and expenditure next. The most salient point in our financial statements this year is the increase of both income and expenditure of more than £50 million. This reflects the new funding arrangements for investment in the strategic development of the Church. The Church Commissioners have made available to the Archbishops' Council resources to fund grants to dioceses for projects on evangelism and church growth and also significant sums for ministry in dioceses with the lowest-income communities.

From this new funding stream, 27 dioceses were awarded Strategic Development Fund grants totalling £44.6 million. These grants were made by a new committee of the Council, the Strategic Investment Board. The Board includes members of both the Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners, ensuring that the close partnership between the two bodies translates into good decision-making. You can see on the screen how our expenditure has been allocated across the nine objectives.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* Turning now to the objectives of Evangelism First, one of the most encouraging moments for me of the last six months was reading through the

detailed applications by 20 dioceses for the strategic development funding that Mary has just mentioned. All 20 proposals were clearly geared towards evangelism in many really creative, inspiring and often pioneering ways.

At a national level there is a lot going on as well. Many of you will remember the inspiring presentation that Adrian Harris, our Head of Digital, gave back in February Synod. By way of recap, the 2017 Christmas campaign *God With Us* reached 6.8 million people while the videos were viewed 2 million times on social media. There were also print resources made available to churches nationally, with 80,000 copies sold, and clergy receiving 18,000 of those for free. We are going to take a quick look at one of the videos now, and I make no apologies for showing you a Christmas video in the middle of the summer.

*(Video played)*

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* In 2016, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York invited parishes across England to pray between Ascension and Pentecost for the empowering of the Holy Spirit so that more people might come to faith in Jesus Christ.

In 2017, the growth was exponential. Christians from over 50 denominations in over 85 countries took part. Hundreds of thousands of people prayed, with three-quarters of those doing so for the first time. Every diocese in the Church of England and 85% of cathedrals were involved. Synod will learn more in this afternoon's debate about the vibrant programme of work initiated by the Evangelism Task Group and now being taken forward by the new Evangelism and Discipleship Team.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* Looking at ministry, this is a photo of our recent intake of Ministry Experience scheme participants in the Diocese of Southwell & Nottingham. 2017 saw the number of ordinands entering training increase by 14%, with the number of woman increasing by a fifth and an almost 40% increase in people under 30. This shows good and really encouraging progress towards the 50% increase by 2020 target you, Synod, set. Overall, the number of women entering training in 2017 was greater and rising faster than at any point in the last 10 years.

Turning to discipleship, the newly formed Evangelism and Discipleship Team at Church House has brought new energy and focus to whole-life discipleship. Work is well underway to implement the recommendations of the report *Setting God's People Free*, which you unanimously endorsed in 2017. Some 25 dioceses have joined learning communities to accelerate and strengthen their own plans to see deeper whole-life discipleship across their dioceses. A new framework for lay ministries has been introduced. This short film from the Church of England's website gives you a sense of what many Christians feel in terms of demonstrating and proclaiming their faith in schools and hospitals, in offices and factories, in families and homes, in the arts and the media; indeed in every sphere of life.

(Video played)

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Our objective for the Common Good is to contribute to transforming our society and communities more closely to reflect the Kingdom of God. Our work includes supporting Bishops in the House of Lords, taking forward campaigns in the public square following debates here, a notable example of which would have been the campaign to reduce the amount that could be spent on fixed-odds betting terminals, and also supporting initiatives that address violence and injustice.

In 2017, the Prime Minister and Archbishop Justin gave their backing to the Clewer Initiative which was set up to combat slavery in this country. As a consequence of this important work, 38 out of 42 dioceses have trained churchgoers to spot signs of day-to-day slavery in the society around them. This three-year programme has already gained traction with the launch of a campaign to stop carwash slavery, and you may already have received the postcard that describes that in a bit more detail. This short film gives you a glimpse of the scale of the problem that we are trying to address.

(Video played)

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* Turning to education, an area which is a particular passion of mine, I need to keep reminding myself that one million students attend 4,700 Church of England schools. At national level one of the priority areas has been to focus on strengthening school leadership and the whole area of leadership development, of new and upcoming leaders, of multi-academy trust CEOs.

Last February, the Church of England launched the Foundation for Educational Leadership to address a couple of priorities identified in the Report; “deeply Christian, serving the common good”. The Foundation aims to develop inspirational leaders. The first phase of the Foundation is over a three-year period and it is intended to build networks nationwide to bring school leaders together. In 2017, six conferences were attended by 670 educational leaders. They will also provide challenging development programmes and encourage education leaders to understand the Church of England’s vision for education.

Finally, it is also exciting for us to report that the Government has made a commitment to 31 new Church of England free schools with dioceses now ready to bid for a further 38 in the next wave of applications.

*Mary Chapman (ex officio):* The impact of digital innovation was keenly felt in all of our 2017 work, as we have already started to see, but none more so than in the work that we do to help dioceses and cathedrals in their mission. I hope that you have all had the opportunity to explore the new Church of England website, the various online toolkits, the new apps and also the digital links that you will see in the Annual Report and Accounts this year. *A Church Near You*, the website that helps people to identify their closest church, was relaunched in November 2017 and this slide is a reflection of that. It has

been an incredible success. The site receives 13 million page views in a year and in the run-up to Christmas, one and a half million people used it to find their local church services. Encouragingly, 81% of users are using it for the very first time, suggesting that it is a hugely valuable tool for evangelism.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* More generally, the Annual Report details a very wide range of initiatives that the national Church is focused on: tools, resources, initiatives, all designed to equip and serve dioceses and cathedrals to be as effective as possible in their own mission and ministry.

I want to spotlight cathedrals in particular. We all know our cathedrals play a central and vital role yet some have struggled with financial issues and challenges around governance, and because of this a Working Group was set up last November by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. The Working Group was asked to review the Cathedrals Measure of 1999, particularly considering financial management, major building projects, safeguarding, accountability, oversight and scrutiny. The group includes representatives from business, local government and the heritage sector as well as churchgoers, cathedral worshippers, deans and bishops. Tomorrow afternoon you will have an opportunity to engage in a debate on the Report of the Cathedrals Working Group.

Safeguarding - I am not going to spend much time on this because we spent a significant amount of time on this on Saturday morning, but I would highlight again the Council continued its work in 2017 to promote a safer Church, principally through training, through policy and guidance, through independent diocesan audits and engagement with the independent inquiry into child sexual abuse. Major areas of work include efforts to improve the consistency and the quality of safeguarding arrangements across the whole Church.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* One mark of the success of our safeguarding work will be when we can truly say that the Church of England is a welcoming place and a safe place for all people. At one stage, when we were reflecting on our objectives, we wondered whether we needed the last objective, to be a Church for all people, and that is because that vision essentially permeates everything that we do. However, it was in recognition of the fact that we do need to make progress much further and faster to include all our brothers and sisters in every part of the Church that it was made a specific objective. Positive steps last year include strengthening our ties with charities committed to working with issues of disability and the preparatory work for this year's conference on the role of disabled people in Church life.

Another item was the relaunch of the National Estate Churches Network and a conference on estates evangelism, with representatives from the Church Army, the Church Urban Fund, ecumenical partners and many theological institutions. We are trying increasingly in this area of work to reach out to as many people who share the things that we are trying to do.

Finally, also work supporting the College of Bishops with their annual meeting when 25 BAME clergy were invited to discuss a really wide range of items on the agenda. We have seen the renewed commitment from the House of Bishops to the inclusion and representation of BAME clergy at all levels in the leadership of the Church.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* Just to close, Mary and I wanted to share a few more personal reflections before we turn to a space for some questions. I have only been involved in anything at the national Church level for the last two and a half years or so and I guess I want to share two thoughts with you. The first is the reality that my experience of the Council over the last two and a half years is that it has relentlessly focused on serving the frontline, serving frontline parishes, frontline deaneries and dioceses. I was half wary that it was going to be an ivory tower, but it simply is not like that. We come as members of parishes, deaneries and dioceses to the Council, and there is a relentless desire to figure out how can we serve, equip, support and encourage what is going on at the grass roots, at the frontline. That is the first thing I wanted to underscore as a personal reflection.

The second is I have been really encouraged to see the way the Council has been wrestling more and more with that question of growth, but not just quantitative growth. Again, I was fearful that there would be a very narrow focus on just numbers. Far from it. There is a growing effort to really grapple with the growth and the quality of growth, a growth in terms of discipleship, a growth in every region and a growth in every generation.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* And although I have been around a little longer, I share some of the things that Matthew comments on. In particular for me I have been conscious of a much clearer focus on mission; that we test ideas increasingly against whether or not they serve the objectives for growth, for renewal, for spiritual deepening and for better discipleship. And also, and you will tell me whether we have been successful in this, I feel that there is a much greater focus on deepening our relationships with dioceses and cathedrals to serve where we can your mission and your strategies in your areas. We can beat ourselves up a lot, and it is true that there is an enormous amount to do, but there has been genuine progress in tangible ways in a number of areas. That does not mean to say the job is done. In fact, I was heard to comment in a very curmudgeonly Audit Committee Chair way at a discussion of risk, in particular the risk about whether or not we will have enough vocations to enable our ministry to grow, and my comment was, "Yes, all very good, but one swallow doesn't make a summer". Later I caught myself and I said, "Well, it's true one swallow doesn't make a summer but it is a beautiful encouraging sign of summer and better times to come", so let us take that and be thankful that, through God's grace, we have our swallow and look at what we can do in the future. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you, Mary and Matthew, for that informative and encouraging presentation. We now have time for questions and can I make the normal plea that is made from this place, which is please can you ask questions and not make a speech.



*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Thank you for the show and thank you for all the information. My question is about an explicit commitment to supporting families in passing on faith. I was delighted to see that the objectives this year mention youth explicitly. I am sorry they did not last year because research shows the importance of a concentration on that early stage in life for coming to faith. The research also shows the importance of families and reveals that fewer than a third of Anglican families see it as their own responsibility ---

*The Chair:* And your question please, Patrick?

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* Is there going to be an explicit commitment to supporting families in coming to faith?

*The Chair:* I will be doing them in groups of three, so I will be encouraged to see someone standing.

*Revd Bill Braviner (Durham):* I welcome very much the commitment to having a Church for all people and making that one of the nine priorities. Given that over a third of the population of this country has a disability or a long-term health condition, what progress can be made and what priority given in our evangelism strategy to seeing those numbers reflected amongst the body of the Church and also making progress to seeing those sorts of numbers reflected in the leadership of the Church?

*Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester):* I speak as a new member of Synod. How are we doing on simplifying legislation, do you feel? Are there any swallows in sight?

*The Chair:* I will call for responses to those three questions, please.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* On the question on supporting families, the answer is very simply "yes". There is a great deal going on on that at the moment. It is a core part of our discipleship and a core part of our work with schools. There is particularly some work underway to look at three areas of families, schools and how these work together. That is being developed with the House of Bishops. I think you can expect next year in the Annual Report there to be something pretty explicit on this.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* On the question of a Church for all people, and it was specifically focused around people with disabilities, on this objective as a whole, the Council recognises entirely that last year was very much a year of exploring what could be done. I spoke earlier about the fact that preparation work was done for a conference to look at issues to do with disability. In the building of the Council we try to be as inclusive as we can. I am sure they will not mind me saying that at least two members of the Council, to my knowledge, have some disability, although you would not notice it from the way they work and participate. We are conscious, as we seek to replace members of the Council who have either left us or are about to leave us, to think about our ethnic mix. We have lost one member from a BAME background this year because she has moved

on to do other things. That is very much in our minds as we think about how we rebuild the Council for the future. There are two strands of work. One is about doing it ourselves in the Council and the other is working with others to see how more effective we can be.

On simplification the short answer is yes. The slightly longer answer is that we have now formed the Legislative Reform Committee, I believe it is meeting for the first time this week and if anybody has any ideas that they want to put forward, I am sure that Simon Butler, who is the Chair of that Committee, would be delighted to hear from you.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* On page 54 of the Report we see the various heads of expenditure, which includes £1.61 million on safeguarding, and on page 22 we read that the Council has continued to engage with IICSA, supplying a range of information and witness statements as part of the investigation into the Anglican Church in England and Wales. I wonder if you could give Synod some information about the scale of what has been involved with the Archbishops' Council involvement in IICSA. It is a core participant in that inquiry and I understand there has been a large amount of documentation supplied, presumably also a large amount of time and how much of that £1.6 million is devoted to IICSA.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby):* Thank you very much for the Report. Thank you also for the good news of increase in vocations. The question I have relates to the number of women in training for ordained ministry because you gave us a lovely positive figure but the danger is that it hides quite a lot. Could you please tell us if there has been an increase in women being accepted for training for stipendiary and incumbent status ministry?

*The Bishop of Gloucester (Rt Revd Rachel Treweek):* Thank you for that presentation. Thank you particularly for the visual presentation. My question is if we are being a Church for all people, how can we hold one another to account to ensure that all our visual representations, our reports, our films, have a much higher percentage of people who are not white in them? I think we need to be clear on what our message is being given visually. I would like to know how we can do that and hold each other to account

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* So, the first question regarding the scale of AC involvement in IICSA. The first thing to say is that thousands of pages have been written, shared, reviewed by Church House staff. We have seen many of those at the Council itself. There are two dedicated members of staff on the Church House team and many other members of the Church House team have spent a very significant amount of time specifically on this. Regarding the question around younger women in the context of stipendiary training, the answer is yes there has been an increase but if you want more specific numbers could you please connect up with Julian later on after this session or during the break.

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Rachel, I could not agree with you more. I have not actually done the number count of visuals in the Annual Report, but one of the things that we sought to do was to ensure that we did have representative visuals. I would also say

- I do not whether some of you may have been to the events - the new Estates Evangelism Task Group video was launched last night. Work with the BAME community forms a large part of that work and there were many, many appropriate visuals in it. I think I said earlier, we have to keep it in mind the whole time so I am really grateful for your prompt and your encouragement for us to stick to it.

*Revd Sarah Schofield (Lichfield):* I need to preface this question with an apology to my fellow Archbishops' Council members. There has been a lot of "we" about the imagery and we did not all see the film before and, as one of the disabled people on Archbishops' Council these are the questions that I would have said in private. I would like to know whether we consulted with Deaf Anglicans as to whether subtitles might have been helpful, I do not understand the balance between signing and subtitles as to what is appropriate but I was very conscious that some of you were trying to watch the screen and watch the signs. When we thought about the choice of images did we try a focus group with the people whose images might not have been there? Again, apologies, I would have said this to your privately. We have been talking about communication, we are on the road. I apologise, I am not part of the "we" on that tiny bit, I am immensely proud of the Archbishops' Council, I am part of the "we" on the 99.9% of it, but please can we get better on that £400,000 a year which is on Objective 9, thank you.

*Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth):* Thank you for that Report and the encouraging news. It is fantastic to see the work that has been done. This is the national Report, if you like, the Report that the nation sees about our work. I struggle to find any reference to our work with our fellow Christian Churches and other denominations in England and further afield, other than, of course, mention of the Anglican Communion. I just wondered if you could say a little bit about your commitment to working with our ecumenical brothers and sisters.

*Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester):* Thank you for a very interesting and enlightening Report. I think the three key benefits was it is set out clearly where we are going, how we are going to get there and also how we are going to pay for it. Two very succinct questions. On the bottom of page 18, what extra challenges are there for you of administering and indeed bidding for running free schools and on page 19 when it speaks about the crossing the threshold resources, which again I enthusiastically welcome, do we know how many people thus far have made use of them?

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* With permission I am going to take the first and the third of those and Matthew will follow up. Sarah, thank you for calling us out. I think it is important that because we work together that we should be able to share honestly if we feel that there is something to be shared. It is true that we did not consult on the content of the presentation. There has been discussion, though, with the signers and we recognise that it is difficult to convey something which is both words and visuals and particularly I know on the Clewer Initiative film, where we did think about it quite carefully, there the double difficulty is that the words that one is hearing are not the words on the

screen, but we felt that it is such a powerful video that Synod would welcome seeing it. I think there are lessons to be learned and we will do it better next time I think.

There were two questions, one was about free schools and there is work going on at the moment to examine the funding at various levels within the Church. This is not money that comes through the Archbishops' Council. Much of the work of the Church of England on education, the responsibility for it lies with the National Society. There is a joint team at staff level and the strategic thinking is developed between the Archbishops' Council and the National Society and the whole question of funding of new schools is one that is under consideration at the moment.

The second part of your question was about the extent to which we know how many people use the various resources and measurement is something that is increasingly on our mind, evaluating the impact of the work we do. It would be foolish to pretend that I have all the detailed information of the measures that we do have but I am sure we could provide those two you in writing subsequently.

But there are also things that we are not yet measuring very well and the whole raft of work, some of which was set out in the Report from the Strategic Investment Board to talk about how we are evaluating the projects that benefit from grant funding, thinking about what we mean by Church growth and how we measure that, reflecting on our measures so that we capture properly the impact of new worshipping communities, and thinking too simply about if we have invested in the development of resources for the Church, we need to be sure that we invested that money in the right place so that we can learn for the future. So, yes, we are measuring and are certainly very happy to provide you with further information subsequently.

*Mr Matthew Frost (ex officio):* First, the question on working with fellow churches, fellow Christian churches. The first thing is this has not been drawn out of a particular objective, I think the aspiration has been to integrate that ecumenism in all of the objectives. We are members of the Council for Christian Unity, there are a lot of ecumenical activities going on in many individual areas. I think, though, it is pretty clear that it would be a really good thing to think about in the next Annual Report to try and draw this out much more explicitly, so I am very grateful for the suggestion. Next year we will try and draw this out more explicitly how we are working with fellow Christian Churches, so thanks for the suggestion.

*The Chair:* We have been working together to make sure that voices are heard over the whole range of experience, lay clergy, et cetera. We are very much not hearing, with one exception, voices from the Northern Province. I have time for one more question. If there is anybody standing from the Northern Province I would be delighted to take it. Please make it a brief one.

*Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield):* May I thank Mary and Matthew for this presentation which I think has been very informative and comprehensive of our work. I am a member

of the Archbishops' Council, but one thing I would ask you is would you agree with me that something the Synod really could hear loud and clear today is what we can do about this dreadful situation of modern day slavery. You may have gone to a presentation in your diocese on the Clewer Initiative. I was delighted to hear that 38 out of 40 dioceses have had these and I have been present at one of these. The question is, do you agree with me that every member of Synod should take this home with them and act upon it?

*Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio):* Yes! Please, it is enormously important.

*The Chair:* Thank you so much everyone, Mary and Matthew, and for all the questions you have asked and that now concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson* took the Chair at 10.01 am.

*The Chair:* Good morning everyone. We now come to the Archbishops' Council's budget and proposals for apportionment for 2019. This covers Items 15 to 22 on the agenda. For these items members will need GS 2097. Thank you.

## **ITEM 15 THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL'S BUDGET AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT FOR 2019 (GS 2097)**

*The Chair:* I would like to say at this point that when we come to debate Items 15 to 22, as on previous occasions I intend to call John Spence to respond after every third speech should he wish to do so. I call upon Canon Dr John Spence to speak to and move Item 15, "That this Synod do take note of this Report". You have up to 15 minutes as I gather that you will be moving the individual budget items formally without a speech. Thank you.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I beg to move

'That Synod do take note of this Report.'

May I say how excited I am to have this prime mid-morning slot. In the first two years of my incumbency in this role I had to compete first with a late running tennis Wimbledon final and the following year with the World Cup. So here we are in good daytime viewing territory and, like any good daytime viewing, there will be the mixture of high points and lows, maybe a bit of drama, a powerful but maybe a cliff-hanger ending, but I am afraid there will be no raunchy bits. Archbishop, if that was you I will do something later.

What I am going to do is I am going to place the budget in the context. I am going to be talking here about the 2019 budget but very much in the context of 2020 to 2022 and the '20s as a whole because that is where most of my energies are now lying.

Let us look at the context for this budget. For at least the last 50 years the attendance in the Church of England as measured by average weekly attendance has declined. That measure, I know, overstates the rate of decline, it is a number that we need to move slightly away from, but the direction is clear. Since 1979 our age profile, which at that time matched the population as a whole, is now one where we average 12 years older than the population. And there is that lovely statistic of the the eights: an 81-year-old is eight times more likely to go to church than an 18-year-old.

And that is having its impact on finance. The numbers of people in our planned giving schemes have declined by 13% since 2010. Our commitment has grown, the individual commitments have grown by 27%, roughly 4% a year, enabling the overall sum to rise by 10%. But in 2016, for the first time, the total coming out of planned giving declined. While overall parish incomes rose by 1.8% there was a 0.4% decline in the total of planned giving. When we look at parish share we see those strains coming through again. Parish share growth, under whichever scheme operates in your diocese, has struggled to get up to 2%. In the last two years you will see 1.4 and then 0.9% increases and the very worrying news is that year-to-date to May we are seeing a 0.4% decline in parish share giving. That, I may say, does come at the same time that we have seen a considerable increase of £130 million in the aggregation of parish reserves, which says something about the degree to which some parishes are harbouring their assets while others are struggling with income.

You could argue we are on a burning platform, but I want to talk to you this morning about a different sort of fire. The Renewal and Reform agenda is about our hearts going out, we walking hand in hand, burning, burning with the joy of the risen Christ, fired by the Holy Spirit, with such a magnetism that draws more people in to join us because of the transparent joy of our faith. Renewal and Reform is not about money, it is about souls, our narrative based on St Luke Chapter 9, the harvest is plentiful. But it does, of course, have financial implications. First, to reap the harvest you need to invest and we are in that investment phase now. You have heard from Mary and Matthew and I shall enlarge on that slightly in a moment. Second, the harvest which we seek, our souls and bodies coming to the joy of Christ, but we all know it is not enough to measure success in numbers of pilgrims, it is in the depth of their witness, in their living discipleship, just one evidence of which will be their financial commitment to Christ.

So, let us look through those investments again and we see the success that Renewal and Reform is achieving already. The number of new ordinands up 14.9% last year, over 22% across two years. A stunning number. The digital programme, regularly reaching 1.5 million people with their different campaigns and Patrick Richmond in Norwich, yes, if you look at their Alexa piece there are elements in there encouraging children to be taught how to pray at home. *Setting God's People Free*, an area of growth that has far more to do yet, as we have the learning communities and the development of resource, and of course the Strategic Development Fund, which the number you were given, £44 million since start of 2017, at last month's Strategic Investment Board we allocated a further £27 million across 10 dioceses, seven from the Northern Province, and what we are seeing is

both an increase in number but also an increase in ambition of strategic funding bids coming forward.

Carrying on, we have the peer review process in place, which enables mutual learning, the Simplification agenda, Alison your question earlier, Phase 1 completed, Phase 2 nearly completed, taking a lot of process out of this chamber to enable us to focus on issues of real substance. The working together strand has seen 13 dioceses already come on to the workstream on to the application around recruitment to save you cost and increase quality. But equally, I would say, much more to be done if we are going to develop the right sort of HR systems and people systems which will enable diocese and parishes to reap efficiencies in the future and which will ensure that our safeguarding is of the highest order.

And then all the work around strategic leadership and development programmes, which have so far seen 73 diocesan suffragan bishops taking part in modules, over 40 deans doing the mini MBA, and of course that is only a start because what we are all talking about, Martin Seeley in the Ministry Council, looking at how we can really create this learning piece as a lifetime activity for ordained and lay leaders alike.

So, they are the investments but, of course, as yet not the harvest. What dioceses are saying to us is firstly that they have found it quite tough actually to move away from Darlow. Since the Darlow ceased at the end of 2016, the transition has been considerable. For all the reasons I have just stated, the income is very constrained and we need to keep the tax, the apportionment we levy on dioceses down to manageable numbers as much as we can. They remain committed to growth, this is what is at the heart of Renewal and Reform, it is the response to every diocese, saying, "We wish to grow, we need the strategies to do it. Please help us work out how to develop those strategies and deal with the resource. We have got historic assets but we are nervous about using them in some cases lest it constrains us further for tomorrow. What we need is confidence, confidence that the longer-term funding position. It is not enough to know where we are for 2019, help us understand that the funds will be there across 2020 to 2022 and beyond so that we can invest with confidence".

What are the tasks of the Archbishops' Council as we look towards the next decade? Firstly, it is indeed to imbue that confidence. I am brimming with confidence. I am absolutely overflowing with confidence that we are going to achieve a satisfactory whole Church funding solution for the next decade and I will come back to the evidence for that later.

Secondly, we need to aggregate all the potential demands for investment that lie ahead. Yes, there is the work around ordinands and curacies, there is the work around lower income communities, we want to invest more in digital, quite clearly, we are building so far. Just across this weekend you have identified that we will probably need to spend more on safeguarding if we are going to get this really right and yesterday there were thoughts about how we might spend more in areas to avoid damage to our environment.

We will aggregate all of those and then we will, by consensus, look to prioritise all the different areas where we could be spending money. I say to my colleagues in the House of Bishops we will need you, gentlemen and ladies, please to work closely together to give us clear, consensual guidance on what your key priorities are. And from that we will develop a whole Church equitable solution, and I use the word 'equitable' because if there is going to be some pain, if there is going to be the need to draw on some of our historic assets in order to fund the investment which will enable the growth of tomorrow, that does have to be on an equitable basis and cannot be done by asking one body of this organisation to draw heavily on its funds when others are not drawing on theirs.

And then finally, what is very much clearly coming through, as we see that the ways in which people give and honour their financial commitments are changing, where planned giving is not the way that younger generations operate, we will need to think about how we foster greater spirits of enterprise, ever looking for efficiency, constantly exploring innovation. Church House serving the dioceses, the parishes, the deaneries alike, needs to move into a different phase and a different pace of innovation, shedding practices which were okay in the past, adopting those that we need for the future.

What are the features of the 2019 budget? Well, firstly we are accommodating the 13.7 cost associated with the increased number of ordinands, that is in Vote 1. In Vote 2 we are accommodating the increased spending predominantly driven on the safeguarding agenda but also the Renewal and Reform programme. We have set the Executive Team challenges around efficiency which will require them to find savings and there is a gap in the budget which they have got to close and they have already given me proposals on how they will do that. We will draw ever more on the funding from our partners and I am coming on to that in a second. Then, of course, we will need to keep going by this year alone drawing at an unsustainable level of our reserves of £2 million. It is the right thing to do as a bridging solution pending that whole Church equitable solution which I look forward to presenting you, if you will allow me, next year.

If we look at the budget from 2015 to 2019, you will see that the degree of that budget, covered by Votes 1 to 5, covered by apportionment, has gone down from 93% to 76%. That is because of the way in which we have worked with our partners and one of the reasons for my huge confidence is the willingness of our partners to help us along the way. I offer my thanks to the Church Commissioners who have not just given us grants but have changed their constitution to enable them to do so in the wider scheme of things and not have to come to devices in order that they can give us that increased level of support.

I want to thank the Corporation of Church House who have amended their Royal Charter so that their grant-giving cannot be limited to property and which is already in our budget to the tune of £2.25 million next year. I want to thank All Churches Trust Ltd, who of course drive their funds out of the profits from ecclesiastical insurance but who have gone through a whole strategic review of their grant-giving to ensure that they maximise the



impact of the grants they give. When we have partners, such as the Commissioners, the Corporation and ATL, we have the ability to create solutions at a bigger level to meet the needs of this massive investment that we are doing to create a Church ready for the 2020s and the rest of the century.

In my experience, ladies and gentlemen, there are two types of people. There are valley people. They are very good people. They work hard and ethically. They live in villages and towns. They enjoy a good life. They look after their families. They enjoy picnics by the river on a Sunday afternoon after being to church. They are good people. Then there are the mountain people, the people who decide to step beyond the village and to climb the mountain, taking the rough path which they know will have dangers ahead; a path where winds can blow them off course or landslides can come down upon them and make them wonder why they started on that route in the first place. They are the ones that face all the slings of fortune that come before them. They have a very difficult time and sometimes may even lose their way completely, but they know the destination to which they are headed. They are good people as well.

But only mountain people get the satisfaction of scaling the peak that they are climbing. Only mountain people get the chance to look beyond their valley into other valleys, across other mountaintops. Only mountain people can understand the totality of God's creation and the opportunities which lie ahead. I put it to you that when you all decided to vote for the Renewal and Reform agenda, when the dioceses collectively and individually said, "We aspire to growth, not to keep being this passive Church which is gradually sliding down in terms of its evidence to the rest of this country", you chose to be mountain people. We chose to take a difficult path which we know will have some boulders on the way. We know that we have the side streams of things like safeguarding that have to be dealt with in the very best way they can be, while at the same time enabling us to keep climbing that mountain so that we are evident to the whole of our country; we standing in the mountain, our hearts blazing with the love of Christ. Everybody can see us, in every community, where we are funding through lower-income community funding, strategic funding, all the different grant streams that we have.

That is why I do this role. If you want a Finance Chairman who will balance the books while the Church disappears down a plughole you have got the wrong guy. I want to walk with you climbing the mountain of great joy that brings Christ in to the centre of every community in this country. I am asked to move all the recommendations set out in your paper. I would remind you this is for the apportionment element of the budget; it is not covering those areas of strategic development funding, lower income funding, transition grants and restructuring grants, all of which I am happy to talk to. I move recommendations 15 to 22 set out in your paper.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Item 15 is now open for debate.

*Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford):* A warm thank you to Canon Spence once again for an inspiring and engaging taking us through of the Budget. On Saturday, I experienced quite

a conversion experience of my own. It was a heady mix in the afternoon of sex and football, football and more sex, until finally my soul grew weary and I stumbled into the Digital Evangelism lecture hall and I saw the light. Something I have been a little cynical of before, I suddenly saw how this was impacting on millions of people and really engaging not just something fancy at the centre but providing wonderful resources that every parish can be involved with and own. Thank you to the digital team, amongst many others, for their remarkable work.

I am, however, a little concerned about page 25, paragraph 84, to find the Corporation of Church House, of which I did not realise until this weekend I am a member, is directing a grant of £2.25 million to the Archbishops' Council as part of the 2019 Budget. Much of their work, of course, is greatly welcome and I am sure so is this grant but, as we heard yesterday and were reminded, they recently hosted a major conference on land warfare with arms trade sponsorship and sponsors in attendance. Is it right for the Archbishops' Council to be seen to benefit from the proceeds of such activity at the heart of our organisation? I fear that unless an ethical lettings policy is urgently adopted by the Corporation of Church House, the credibility of this Budget, wonderful in so many respects, will be put at risk. Thank you.

*The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson):* I welcome this Budget and I am grateful as ever for the clarity and vision of John Spence's presentation this morning. We are hugely well served by John and the team. My main concern, though, relates to Vote 1 and, indeed, to all the additional costs involved in training a growing cohort of new clergy. As Chair of the Ordained Vocations Working Group, I am regularly picking up concerns along these lines from those worried about rising diocesan apportionment figures at the same time as they are opening up new curacy opportunities and in some cases growing additional capacity in their vocations teams.

I welcome the one-year fix with Vote 1 drawing down half a million pounds of capital to help defray some of the training costs, but clearly drawing down capital is not a long-term option. One of the joys of chairing the Working Group over the last couple of years has been to meet with vocations teams from around the country who have been sowing and watering with fresh vigour and have seen God give the growth; a growth, as we have heard, of around 22%. That is about 100 new ordinands as compared with just two years ago. It has felt almost as miraculous as England's progress in the World Cup and is, arguably, more important.

The quality too, my BAP selector friends tell me, is excellent and we are making some progress on the diversity front as well, though there is certainly further work to do here.

Another joy of the job is that ours up to now has been a very widely supported task. Dioceses throughout the country have felt the need for more clergy, both stipendiary and self-supporting, not least when they have found themselves advertising a parish post several times over before finding a suitable applicant, and have embraced the ordination challenge warmly alongside the broader vocational vision implicit in *Setting God's People*

*Free*, but this growth feels a little like the growth of the economy. It is based, in part, on the confidence that John spoke of earlier. Over the past few months I have been picking up a less confident response in some quarters. A handful of dioceses need to make significant reductions in their stipendiary workforce, which acts as a disincentive to the proactive recruitment of a whole lot more, whatever the national need, while other dioceses are questioning the affordability of our growing band of ordinands, especially in the short term before large-scale retirements begin to kick in.

As vocations teams around the country pray and work towards another increase in the number of ordinands next year - the target is at least 30% over the first three years of this project – how important that we do all we can to make sure that confidence levels remain high.

John Spence has given me his personal commitment here, and our correspondence has been widely circulated, but we need a detailed plan of action by the beginning of next year at the latest with some Church Commissioner money, I suspect, alongside a wider partnership of contributors if that prayerful sowing and watering is to continue with enthusiasm and this remarkable new work of the spirit is not to be quenched.

*Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford):* I am a member of the Archbishops' Council Finance Committee but I am speaking here as a parish and deanery treasurer. I would say that possibly the most important part of the Report in front of you is page 11, which is the apportionment and where this budget begins its journey to the person in the proverbial pew. Page 11 sets out the amounts that are apportioned to be paid by each diocese and the increase in the apportionment is restricted – capped – at 4.3%.

Oxford, which is obviously my focus of attention, has an increase of 3.8% and, using a calculator, the amount apportioned is just over £40,000 over the 2% increase that we have limited our diocesan budget to. That is equivalent to 0.2% on our parish share, which is not insignificant when you are trying to limit your parish share to a 2% or 1.75% increase. That is set in the knowledge that that is the amount that the parishes can bear.

There is a job to be done in communicating with parishes what the money paid by the Archbishops' Council pays for. I have been astonished by the number of people who seem to think that their vicars arrive in their parish fully trained and eager to serve without it having cost any money. We need communication about that through the layers of Church.

There is also work to be done in parishes to increase generosity. Oxford Diocese has this year, finally – at last, we seem to have been waiting a long time – begun to roll out the Parish Giving Scheme, but I am saddened as a deanery treasurer to hear the number of parishes saying to me that they do not want to implement it. That needs work and, in fact, that is my work.

The key to everything, of course, is to spread the Word and grow the Kingdom and bring more and more people to know and follow our Lord Jesus Christ. Giving is a part of that walk. To communicate that part of discipleship we need to address some issues. We need to address the issue of giving by our millennial generation, the future of our Church, but they are saddled with student debt and looking at being unable to afford to buy a house. We need to put work and thought into how we do stewardship of them.

We also need to work out how to encourage and teach about giving in the context of Fresh Expressions Church, our new worshipping communities that do not fit our standard methods of stewardship.

There are challenges ahead in the parishes but we have before us a budget that has limited the budget increase to 3.3%, which is just manageable and remarkable given the things that we are funding. We are funding a blessed increase in the number of ordinands, which is vital to the Renewal and Reform of our Church. I commend this remarkable Budget. Please vote for it.

*The Chair:* I invite John Spence to respond if he wishes to do. You have up to three minutes. Thank you.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I do indeed, Madam Chairman. Thank you. Martin, thank you for the piece about the Corporation of Church House. They are, of course, an independent charity and it is entirely up to them where their boundaries are. I think I would merely point out, first, that this was a British Army official event, as I understand it, the one to which you refer. I am a bit thoughtful about how it would look to the world if we were to step away in raising objections to British Army events in Church House. Indeed, there are many government events that take place in Church House which yield valuable income, which is rising to the surpluses which enable us to have this dividend from them. We are tenants of the Corporation of Church House, they are our landlords, and so there are many complexities to this relationship. I do invite you to address your question to them at their AGM on 26 July.

Thank you to the Bishop of Guildford. He and I are indeed in correspondence. Again, I say to the House of Bishops, please, if your prime priority is that we find equitable bases to enable the funding of curacies over the next 10 years, that is where we will direct our resource and our conversations with the Commissioners. I will always believe that the support we give to dioceses must be on the basis of proven need and merit. I am always very nervous about propositions that take us back to days of blanket subsidy.

Julie, thank you for your contribution. We do indeed need to work with the millennials as to how we work on the basis on which they give. For anybody who watches TV, and I very rarely do for reasons you might guess, but when I do Yvonne always tells me that on commercial TV in the advertisements there are lots of charities advertising and inviting people to text money spontaneously. We are going to have to tap into the ways in which young people give. This is one reason, by the way, why the contactless card machines

being installed in parishes is so important. I have worried with my colleagues as to whether we have given sufficient training and if there is a demand for training please let us know in Church House because those machines can be very useful for churches that have significant numbers of visitors or when people come for weddings or funerals now they so often do not have cash in their pocket, they can be deployed then. These are the sorts of things we need to do to have a more enterprising future. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you. We return to the debate.

*Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TEIs):* As warden of Cranmer Hall, Durham, I want to speak to Vote 1, Training for Ministry budget, and to make two points. First of all, I want to speak to paragraphs 43 to 45 of GS 2097, which reminds Synod members of the Resourcing Ministerial Education initiative. In the TEI sector we are committed to delivering on the aspiration for an increase of ordinands of 50% by 2020. We have worked hard at a time of considerable transition to make RME work.

Certainly, from my perspective, the increased sense of partnership with dioceses has been welcome and we have found ourselves able to offer increased flexibility in a residential pathway for a number of students. I want to pay tribute to Ministry Division staff who have gone to great lengths to support TEIs getting used to the new arrangements. Teething troubles are inevitable, but a year on I am clear that the processes can and do work.

Second, I want to address the issue referred to in paragraph 54 of the Report concerning contingency funding for Band 3 candidates and, given the necessary brevity of this paragraph, I wonder if for those who do not live and breathe RME, as I do now, a word about context might be valuable. Band 3 candidates are those candidates aged between 40 to 54 at the start of training. The block grant apportioned does not cover the cost of two years' residential training for these candidates, meaning that dioceses that want to send them on a residential pathway have to find money from within their IME budget. Even with the commitment from Ministry Division to fund up to 50% of this shortfall, in 2017 we saw a 36% decline in Band 3 candidates entering residential theological training. I know many saw that as a concerning figure.

I realise other pathways are available and serve formation well, but I would argue that for someone aged, say, 42 with almost 25 years of ordained ministry ahead of them, two years in a residential theological college, giving them the chance to go as deep as possible in the theology and prayer that will feed their mission and ministry is a very good thing. I therefore welcome the decision of Ministry Council referred to in paragraph 54 to provide now 100% support for those dioceses with a block grant deficit who want to send a Band 3 candidate on a residential pathway and I support the inclusion, therefore, in the proposed budget.

Anecdotally, I would say that this is having some effect, with some suggestion from our intake that this coming autumn this is encouraging dioceses to consider a residential pathway for Band 3 candidates.

Synod members may recall that as the RME changes were being discussed in Synod, it was this cliff edge in funding at the age of 40 that was one of the most concerning factors. It was feared that candidates who had previously gone to a residential theological college would no longer have this option available. I am encouraged that this is being addressed but I would ask that it is considered afresh so that further consideration is given to tweaking the policy so that the cliff edge at the age of 40 is addressed. We are hugely encouraged by the numbers of women and men training under 30 but we want the biggest opportunity to be for those over 40 as well. Thank you.

*Canon Zahida Mallard (Leeds):* I want to welcome the Budget, however, I have a plea or a call-out on the previous debate about the priorities from the Archbishops' Council about including and welcoming all. The connectivity with John's presentation is the figure around *Setting God's People Free* of the three learning communities, where 120 people were mentioned. Are they inclusive of young and old, black and white, different abilities, all the equality strands so we monitor consistency, to be able to innovate and not just work in silos, so that we do the horizon-scanning and climb the mountain together and so that all communities now and going into the future are welcome? Thank you.

*Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council):* I was not actually going to stand to speak in this debate because I had not prepared anything, but I speak in relation to the comments made about young people and giving.

At the beginning of this year, I was challenged by someone on my attitude towards giving in churches and in general. However, being in the position where I have been self-funding and volunteering this year in my community and in church, I have been giving my time rather than my money. Indeed, this has happened for me in the last few years. I have gone from leaving university as a student to volunteering abroad and back to being a student and now volunteering this year. Next year, I will actually be earning some money finally and coming to terms with having a salary and what that will mean. I am unsure at the moment about tithing and I need to look into it: how much to give, who to give to, et cetera.

I think every church has a different way of giving. I have been to about four different churches over the last few years in moving around year after year. It would be helpful for young people to have some online ways of giving, maybe some monthly direct debits to the Church as we do not tend to carry – I speak for myself at least – change all the time with us to churches. We also may be away from a church. Students may be part of two churches. It would be good to have some online direct debits set up perhaps.

I would be interested to hear what support is given to churches and the dioceses and advice about encouraging young people to give and how to go about doing this. I also suggest that dioceses and local parishes could invest in community projects to fund-raise for churches as this will positively engage younger people in giving to the Church and will encourage them as well as giving money to share in church family life, to promote evangelism and also community. In my view, this will increase giving among younger generations and is perhaps a better way to do this than expecting us just to give in a church setting, as often, as I said before, young people do move from church to church from year to year and perhaps are not so committed to the giving side of things and are receiving from church. We would like to be a part of giving and support churches where we can. Thank you very much.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I invite John Spence to respond if he wishes to do so. Again, you have up to three minutes.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I love the way you keep saying “if I wish to do so”. You will not stop me, you know! Philip, thank you very much for your affirmation of RME and your pleasure at the way we are now dealing with the 40 to 54 year-olds. I know Bishop Martin Seeley is very keen to keep reviewing RME to make sure it works to best effect. Only this morning I was talking with a Bishop who told me how he is budgeting for this over a three-year period; cautious to begin with but now feeling more confident in the system. Not everybody aged under 32 who gets the biggest block grant will be appropriate for full-time residential. The great majority will. That should create surpluses that can be redeployed but we are committed to the deficit.

If I had a plea of the TElS, I would love you to join with us in being more enterprising. I would love to see you coming forward with ways in which you might devise training schemes to help, under the *Setting God’s People Free* label, the training of lay leaders of the future; enterprise training for people in the Church who are going to be in leadership roles to help them and us deploy those new ways of income.

I am going to come to Annika next because, Annika, I have got bad news for you. That was so helpful, thank you, in terms of the training we need to give and how to help young people give, I am going to invite you to come along to our Finance Committee and give us some advice, please. Annika told us that she had been giving of her time pending the day that she has a salary. I just wish other people all thought like you. Just to remind ourselves, the financial income of the Church of England is put at £1.4 billion. When you take into account the pro bono aggregate of voluntary time, it is estimated that the true income is more like £7 billion. That is every one of you and every one of the people that you are going back to in your parishes.

Zahida, of course we must walk in full diversity up the mountain together. I regret I could not tell you the diversity make-up of the three learning communities that exist; I just know we have to have far more of them. I just know that we have got to help the *Setting God’s People Free* team grow in the ambitions that they have and to develop resources. I keep

saying I look forward to the development of our lay leadership across the Church working alongside our wonderful ordained priests in such ways.

If you go back to the very start of this process, the dioceses told us they wanted about the same number of priests as before, which means the 50% increase in the number of ordinands required, and “while unlocking the talents of the laity in abundance”. Let us work TEIs, every one of us, down that route.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* Following concerns yesterday, and in view of the fact that the budget for 2019 has increased by 5%, and given that stewardship of the environment is a mission issue, also that the Council is drawing down £2 million from a Church and Community Fund and that in paragraph 4 of the commentary adequate sources are being made available in priority areas, is it not possible that the monitoring issue for Church energy bills and reduction of the carbon footprint is given priority, especially in view of the increased expenditure on utility bills noted in paragraph 21, which I assume will be for Lambeth Palace. Could I seek clarity on that?

Can I also thank everyone here who is helping us as a low-income diocese? That support is invaluable. Thank you.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* As a member of the Archbishops’ Council Finance Committee, let me be clear from the outset that I am speaking in support of motions 15 to 22. Let me also confirm that I do believe that the Committee has rigorously reviewed and challenged the budget which is now before you for your approval. Having said that, I can now relax with confidence that Canon Spence will not be arranging for me to be taken out and shot later.

My reflections on the budget relate to the longer-term trajectory for the funding of the activities of the national Church. The overall budgetary increase that you see in the budget paper of 9% translates into an overall increase of only 3.3% in terms of the £33 million to be funded by diocesan apportionment. Holding the increase in diocesan costs at this level has only been possible by drawing down on other funds and reserves and this is not a position that can continue indefinitely.

Over the next few years, if progress continues to be made in increasing the number of ordinands for training, the costs of the Council are expected to continue to increase at a time when dioceses will also need to fund the additional curacies which will ensue, possibly before the increase in clergy retirements anticipated in the 2020s occurs. In this context I believe that there is a need for a more strategic longer-term approach to the funding of central costs over the next five years or so beyond year-to-year tactical funding. Whilst there may be an opportunity to approach the Church Commissioners, their ability to assist over this period may well be constrained by lower returns and other calls on their resources, so we need to consider other sources of funding.



I have been reflecting on the process for parish giving in my own diocese of Southwark, which we introduced three years ago. This scheme, which has been incredibly successful, is a scheme based on generosity, whereby parishes make pledges to the dioceses on three biblically-based principles, proportionality, informed generosity and an aspiration and an encouragement towards becoming self-financing. Thus richer parishes continue to support poorer parishes but all strive to be generous according to their ability.

My question therefore, as we seek to re-equip the Church nationally with larger cohorts of new ordinands, is whether these principles could also be applied in a diocesan context. Might some dioceses with greater historical glebe and endowment assets be prepared to be generous in pledging additional contributions to help fund the Church's ministry, thus mitigating the financial challenge ahead for those dioceses with fewer historical reserves? I appreciate that this suggestion might cause total consternation in some quarters, particularly the quarters directly in front of me. However, may I ask what are these historical reserves for (which run into hundreds of millions of pounds) if not to support the future ministry of the Church in a context of informed generosity?

*Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool):* Valley person. We are in an unusual position in that we are looking at a budget of £43 million for the Council having just looked at the Accounts which show expenditure in 2017 of £139 million. The difference, of course, is the money paid as grants to dioceses from funds provided by the Church Commissioners.

I have three concerns and one specific question for Canon Spence. My first concern is I really feel that we need to have an integrated picture of all the spending planned to be undertaken by the Council. If the Council spending is, as I believe, about £140 million, we should see an analysis that adds up to £140 million. At the moment what we have is details of the £43 million in the budget and a note that says, "By the way, there is another £100 million somewhere else". I do not think that is really good enough.

If we saw that total picture we might ask some questions and I have one as my specific question. The Report we received on the Council's activities GS Misc 1191 includes the line that the Council agree to reduce the cash allocations for strategic development funding in 2019 from £25.6 million to £24 million. Why, please?

My second concern is that we need somewhere, and Canon Spence touched on this, an overview of the total finances of the NCIs. The flows are getting very complex. The Commissioners, the Archbishops' Council, the Corporation, Church House, the Archbishops' Council, the Church and Community Fund. I think we need to find a way of presenting plans that are integrated and give this Synod, and all those with a wider interest in these matters, a clear picture of the total position. That would be my second concern: how can we get a perspective on what is happening across the NCIs, not just looking at individual sets of accounts.

My third concern, and I return to something that I asked in Questions and hope that the Church Commissioners might also be listening, is a request to publish grants made to

dioceses, because we cannot see them in any papers I have seen, and also grants that have been firmly planned. If we were covered by the Freedom of Information Act and were asked for these figures, we would of course have to provide them. We should not take pride in being less open and transparent than is the norm for the public sector. I have confidence in our financial management, and especially in Canon Spence's inspirational mountaintop leadership, but I also think we need to get into some good habits of sharing information, particularly forward-planning information, and encouraging, not deterring, questions.

*The Chair:* I invite John Spence to respond. I know he wishes to. You have up to three minutes.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* You caught on to that quickly. Penny, thank you very much. I committed that we would do the work up to next year, February, around the cost of this work. In terms of your specific question, the utilities bill increase is not Lambeth Palace - that gets paid by the Church Commissioners - it is for Church House, reflecting the increased occupancy of the building due to the increases in the Safeguarding Team and those working on various Renewal and Reform investment programmes. We will do the work ahead of February and I understand the priority that Synod gives to these issues around environment and climate change.

I will come to Keith next and, Keith, you know I agree with you: we need to find a better way in order to show the whole piece on a joined-up basis. The reason that this debate is around the elements of the budget Votes 1 to 5 is because those are the elements on which Synod votes. I take fully on board the need to have a complete picture of the financial activities of the Archbishops' Council. It is not, I am afraid, for us also to report on all the other bodies involved. We need to give you a better joined-up picture. I committed on Friday that we would work on that and we will debate with Mary how best we can do it. We will make sure that you can see the totality of the giving and all the grants that are going out. I totally agree with you, Keith, on the need for that.

Now Carl, to misquote Mark Twain, "reports of your impending assassination are premature". I am not going to shoot you, Carl, but one or two Bishops might be a bit thoughtful. The serious point is that Carl makes absolutely clear to you all the challenge that we will be undertaking between now and, as the Bishop of Guildford called for earlier, early next year, when we need to be very clear about what the funding for 2020 to 2022 looks like, and to ensure that that is compatible with the 10-year goals of the Church as a whole and of individual dioceses. We need to deal with all the issues that Carl has mentioned, and, on the question of generosity of dioceses, no conversation can be off the table. We will discuss all of this in our drive to develop a consensus and a whole Church equitable solution.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* Point of order: would you accept a motion for closure on this item?

*The Chair:* Well, thank you for that. I have been mulling on a couple of options that we have. There seems to be quite a level of interest in people wishing to contribute in this debate so I am minded to move a variation in the order of business. I was going to propose that the rubric which is stated in our Order Paper that says “not later than 11 am” for the next item of business be amended to “not later than 11.30 am”, if that has the consent of Synod. I put that to you as an option.

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

*The Chair:* That is really clear, thank you. I do need a motion for closure, please.

*Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester):* Will you accept a motion for closure, please?

*The Chair:* Yes, absolutely. We will come to vote on the motion for closure.

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

*The Chair:* John Spence, would you like to add anything else in response to the debate, very briefly, two minutes maximum?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I shall indeed be very brief. First, may I thank every one of you for participating in this debate. It is very sustaining to understand the levels of interest. I hope you all know that you are very welcome to keep corresponding with us not just today but throughout the year.

Secondly, I think you understand the complexities of what we are dealing with, but it is an absolute certainty that we will come back next year with a proposition which makes sense in terms of the 2020s.

Thirdly, I would want to express my thanks to my Finance Committee, to the Archbishops’ Council, to the people behind me, William Nye and Gareth Mostyn, and there is one rock behind me here who is always too modest to say anything in public but who is absolutely with me on this financial journey every step of the way, and sometimes it is the unsung hero who is the greatest hero, and David White, you are in that category in my book. Thank you all very much.

Keith, I do not think you are a valley person. Come and climb the mountain with us. Let us get to the top together with a budget that makes sense and that ensures the resources are there for the things which are the greatest priorities of the Church and that enables us to walk boldly forwards, our hearts ablaze and to bring others to the joy of Christ. I move again on motions 15 to 22.

*The Chair:* We move to vote on Item 15 only at this stage, “to take note of this Report”.

*The motion*

*That the Synod do take note of this Report*

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

*The Chair:* Item 15 is carried. We will need to work together, everyone, to move swiftly through Items 16 to 20. I now invite John Spence to move Item 16, Training for Ministry.

## **ITEM 16**

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* If it would help, Chair, I could move them collectively so as I do not need to bob up and down.

*The Chair:* I am afraid that is not possible.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I knew she would get her own back in the end! I move Item 16, Chair.

*'That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £17,337,309 in respect of Training for Ministry.'*

*The Chair:* Thank you. Item 16 is now open for debate. Thank you. Let us move straight to voting as I see no one standing.

*The motion*

*That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £17,337,309 in respect of Training for Ministry.*

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

## **ITEM 17**

*The Chair:* Let us do a similar thing with Item 17, the National Church's responsibilities.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I move Item 17.

*'That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £18,793,759 in respect of National Church Responsibilities.'*

*The Chair:* Thank you. Any debate on Item 17? I do not see anyone standing so let us move straight to vote.

*The motion*

*That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £18,793,759 in respect of National Church Responsibilities.*

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

## **ITEM 18**

*The Chair:* Similarly let us move to Item 18, Grants and Provisions.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I move Item 18.

*'That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £1,252,816 in respect of Grants and provisions.'*

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. Let us move straight to the vote.

*The motion*

*That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £1,252,816 in respect of Grants and provisions.*

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

## **ITEM 19**

*The Chair:* That is carried. Item 19? In a similar way please, mission agency clergy pensions contributions. I see no one standing - Sorry, John Spence. I am ahead of myself.

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* That is great, I tried to hurry it up and then she leaves me out! I move Item 19.

*'That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £822,290 in respect of Mission Agency clergy pension contributions.'*

*The Chair:* Thank you. More haste, less speed. I see no one standing.

*The motion*

*That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £822,290 in respect of Mission Agency clergy pension contributions.*

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

*The Chair:* That is carried. Item 20, the CHARM Scheme. John Spence.

## **ITEM 20**

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I will say something here. This is a very important scheme where we are committed to 5% increases through to 2020. It will be another important element to take into the piece where I know the Pensions Board are concerned to make sure they meet the needs of clergy. The House of Clergy have met during this Synod and have asked for a review of stipend and pension arrangements. We understand that there may be a growing number of people coming up to retirement and thus the demands on this scheme. This will be another area of important study, but for now I move Item 20.

*'That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £5,046,284 in respect of the CHARM Scheme.'*

*The Chair:* Thank you. I see no one standing so let us move to vote.

*The motion*

*That the Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's expenditure for the year 2019, as shown in its budget, of £5,046,284 in respect of the CHARM Scheme.*

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

## **ITEM 21**

*The Chair:* That is carried. We need to be very swift, everyone, for Item 21, which is over the page on the Order Paper. John Spence would you like to move it, please?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I do move Item 21.

*'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2097) for the apportionment amongst the dioceses of the net sum to be provided by them to enable the Council to meet the expected expenditure shown in its budget for the year 2019.'*

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so let us move to vote.

*The motion*

*That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2097) for the apportionment amongst the dioceses of the net sum to be provided by them to enable the Council to meet the expected expenditure shown in its budget for the year 2019.*

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

*The Chair:* That is carried.

## **ITEM 22**

*The Chair:* The last item, Item 22?

*Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio):* I move Item 22.

*'That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2097) for the pooling adjustment for 2019 in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands.'*

*The Chair:* Thank you, John Spence. I see no one standing, let us move to vote then.

*The motion*

*That this Synod approve the Archbishops' Council's proposals (set out in the Table of Apportionment contained in GS 2097) for the pooling adjustment for 2019 in respect of additional maintenance grants for ordinands.*

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

*The Chair.* We have just about made it for the rubric. That concludes this item of business and we move to the next item. Thank you, everyone, for your contributions.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 11.02 am.

**ITEM 501**  
**SPECIAL AGENDA I**  
**LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS**  
**DRAFT ECUMENICAL RELATIONS MEASURE (GS 2046B)**  
**DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 30 (GS 2047B)**

*The Chair.* We now come to Item 501. The delay was because we were checking whether the House of Bishops was quorate, but it is. The Synod has reached Final Approval stage of the Ecumenical Relations Measure GS 2046B. As required by Standing Order 102, I declare on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect of the draft Ecumenical Relations Measure.

I now call upon the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 501, "That the Measure entitled 'Ecumenical Relations Measure' be finally approved". Archdeacon, you have up to 10 minutes and I understand you also want in your speech to cover Item 502.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* With your permission, your Grace, yes.

*The Chair:* Permission granted.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I beg to move

'That the Measure entitled "Ecumenical Relations Measure" be finally approved.'

The draft Ecumenical Relations Measure and Amending Canon were brought to the Synod as part of the programme of legislative reform proposed by the Simplification Task Group, itself one aspect of the wider Renewal and Reform programme. The legislation, as members will recall, began life as part of a much larger set of omnibus legislation, the draft Church Representation, Ecumenical Relations and Ministers Measure and an originally much longer Amending Canon No. 38. The Revision Committee decided to divide that Measure and Amending Canon so that the provisions concerned with ecumenical relations became a separate Measure and a separate Amending Canon. This assisted the Revision Committee, and we believe the Synod, in scrutinising and improving legislation concerned with different aspects of the Church's mission and ministry, perhaps providentially as I do not recall that this was among the arguments adduced for their separation. This has also increased the profile of this very important legislation in the field of ecumenical relations. Our thanks go particularly to legislative counsel and to the entire legal team of Church House for their careful drafting and redrafting as we have taken this work forward.

The Church of England existing legislation on ecumenical relations was passed in 1988. It created a framework within which a wide range of ecumenical co-operation with partner Churches has been successfully fostered. The activity covered by the 1988 legislation



has included invitations to and from ecumenical partners to participate in each other's worship, the holding of joint worship and the establishment of formal relations (local ecumenical partnerships) in which partner Churches and our Church worship together and pursue the Church's mission agenda together on what is, effectively, a permanent basis.

However, the ecumenical environment has developed in the 30 years since Synod last legislated for this area. Our legislation now needs to catch up with those developments so that it can continue successfully to foster a wide range of ecumenical co-operation.

One significant way in which things have changed is of course the growing number of Churches which are not set up on a national basis and which do not have a national structure or governing body. The 1988 legislation was designed principally to enable co-operation between the Church of England and Churches which were well established on the national ecumenical scene. The first Churches to be designated under the 1988 Measure were the Baptist Union, the Methodist Church, the Roman Catholic Church and the United Reformed Church, all designated in 1989. A number of other Churches have been designated since then, most recently the Church of Scotland in 2004. All but one of these Churches is a Church or body of Churches which has some sort of national structure through which it relates to its ecumenical partners. That reflects the current provisions of legislation which require the designation of partner Churches at that national level by our Archbishops.

Now we need to create similarly fruitful relationships with the large and growing number of other Churches, particularly Pentecostal Churches, including many black-led and black majority churches, with whom we share the Christian faith and the common mission. That means we need to ensure that our own legal structures have the necessary flexibility to enable us to create relationships with ecumenical partners who do not necessarily have the sorts of structures to which we have been used in the past. One of the central provisions, therefore, of the Ecumenical Relations Measure is a wholly new provision that will enable the bishop of a diocese to designate partner Churches at that local level, at diocesan level. Any Church which subscribes to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and administers the sacraments of baptism and Holy Communion can, in principle, be designated. It is for the bishop of the diocese to decide whether such a Church is a suitable ecumenical partner for the diocese, and the Measure provides the bishop for the framework within which to take that decision.

Once the bishop has designated a partner Church, so long as the designation remains in place, the partner Church is treated in that diocese under the same terms under our Canons, as any other of the Church's ecumenical partners. That will mean that the ministers and members of that Church can be invited to perform particular duties in Church of England services - reading the Scriptures, preaching and assisting in other ways. It will mean that Church of England clergy and lay ministers will be able to accept invitations to take part in services in the partner Church. Joint worship will be possible. The Church of England will be able to participate with Churches that are designated at

the diocesan level in local ecumenical co-operative schemes. As I endeavoured to explain earlier in this Synod, that is an umbrella legislative body for our legislative use under which a whole range of current and future local ecumenical initiatives can flourish with their own appropriate local terminology.

The legislation does not prescribe detailed rules as to how all this is to happen. The provision in the Measure, clause 2, is quite minimal. The new Canon B 43, which replaces the existing ecumenical Canons B 43 and B 44, provides a general framework and sets some boundaries. Much of how to go about making these arrangements work in practice is to be set out in guidance to be issued by the House of Bishops. Clause 3 of the Measure provides for the House to issue a code of practice on co-operation by the Church of England with other Churches. That code, and any subsequent revision of it, must be approved by the General Synod before it comes into force, so members will have sight of it. The Measure and the Amending Canon make various other improvements. Some uncompleted business from 1988 is being resolved, with provision now being made to enable a member of the Salvation Army to preach at a Church of England service. The Salvation Army is a longstanding partner of the Church of England, but, for various reasons, the 1988 legislation failed to make provision that covered them. The rules are also being relaxed in relation to non-designated Churches more generally so that a member of any Trinitarian Church can be invited to read the Scriptures or to lead prayers in a Church of England service.

The Amending Canon, as I have said, replaces the existing ecumenical Canons with a single Canon about ecumenical relations. It reflects the changes to the overall framework for ecumenical relations which are being made in the Measure and it also presents the canonical provisions in a way that is much easier to follow, removing the need to cross-refer between one Canon and another, and setting out the provisions in a much more straightforward and clear manner. The policy has been to include only as much detail as is really necessary and to leave other matters to the code of practice to be made by the House of Bishops. That should mean that the practical changes can be made in the future as they are needed without needing to revise the Canon. I hope therefore that Synod will support this enhanced legal inclusivity and flexibility in our ecumenical relations and I commend the draft Measure and the Amending Canon to Synod.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much. Item 501 is now open for debate. May I remind members that under Standing Order 64 motions for the closure, the speech limit or moving to next business are not in order in this debate.

*Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester):* Thank you for calling me because it allows me to really welcome this Measure and Amending Canon. I am holding in my hand this Petition to the Queen for something that has been in my heart for 50 years, which followed from reading John 17 and finding Jesus saying to his disciples and praying to God that we might be one, even as He and His father were one.

I have longed, and still long for a Trinitarian unity between the churches that proclaim his name. As the Church of England we love our land but we cannot re-evangelize England without those Christians in the denominations that are springing up around us. This gives us opportunity, and I hope it will give us opportunity and will prompt us and make us proactive in taking the opportunities to go to the Churches that are not currently designated as partners with us but which could be if only invited. I believe that all our bishops need to be asked to please look for Churches to designate as new partners. All our parishes need to be encouraged to make relationships, particularly with those that we are already close to, such as the Methodists in the working towards the Mission and Ministry in Covenant. I pray that God will give us a new enthusiasm for this work of ecumenical unity for the sake of the work of the Kingdom in our land.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* This is a very warm, welcome, and a completely unprepared speech because just over 40 years ago we moved into a new garden village. It was a struggle to build our church. When a local senior member of the Church of England came to visit us, he said to us, because we have a joint membership with URC, "As an LEP, I am afraid you are going to find that if you pay attention to all the rules, you will scarcely be able to operate, though we would encourage you to think flexibly, to look locally, to look ecumenically and to think about who you can work with".

We had only been there for a very short time - we were already in partnership with our, three miles away, URC - and we found ourselves being approached by other churches in our area to do a mission project within our community. Shortly after that, we found ourselves raising money for charity and we found ourselves in joint venture for that. Shortly after that, we were looking at training courses and we were thinking, can we use those ecumenically?

We are in a covenanting relationship now with nine other churches and I put my hand on my heart and say to you, I do not know how many rules we have broken. Please help us by passing this legislation and we will actually feel as if we are legal.

*The Chair:* Penny, you may be absolved, all right.

*Revd Canon Debbie Flach (Europe):* We in the Diocese in Europe warmly welcome the draft of this Measure on Ecumenical Relations. It clarifies and simplifies the legislation surrounding the work and worship with our ecumenical colleagues. It reminds us of the wide number of sister churches with whom we already share the proclamation of the Gospel.

It opens further opportunities for us to participate in acts of worship in other churches with whom we are not normally allowed to set foot in, of course, but we probably do, and to invite those members of those churches to participate in our acts of worship. This is a most welcome move in the context of the permanent work and contact with a broad range of Christian Churches with whom we live and work in the Diocese in Europe. I warmly commend this to Synod.

*Revd Beverley Hollins (Peterborough):* I declare an interest. I am a member of a domestic ecumenical partnership and have spent the whole of my life working not only in that domestic situation but in local, regional, national and international ecumenism. It is my life. I, therefore, welcome warmly this updating of the 1988 legislation. Canon Martin Reardon, who was involved in the 1988 work, was a personal mentor to me and I am glad we are able to honour and continue all that he did as we move forward.

I look forward to seeing the Code of Practice and look forward to it being a Code of Practice that enables ecumenism to be something not just for ecumaniacs and people like me who are involved in domestic ecumenical partnerships, but something that truly lives out the prayer of our Lord in John 17, that we may be one that the world might believe. It is a missional imperative that we work and go out in mission together with our brothers and sisters of all traditions. I pray that through this piece of work we will work together for that end, that the world may believe.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing and so I invite the Archdeacon to reply.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* Thank you, members of Synod, for such a warm and overwhelmingly generous welcome for this legislation. Yes, Lisa Battye, thank you, let us create a culture of invitation so that, among the churches that proclaim the name of Jesus, we may participate in the evangelization of England, newly enthusiastic for the work of the Kingdom.

Penny Allen, after his Grace's absolution, we will pass over any matter of ignoring the rules but, yes, let us think creatively, look locally and work ecumenically. Debbie Flach, thank you for the contribution from Europe and how important at this time that the churches, in particular, take a lead on widening good relationships and opportunities for good relationships and good working across European partner denominations.

Finally, Beverley Hollins, thank you very much indeed. I suspect you are not the only domestic LEP here and, yes, indeed, let us all be mindful of the mission imperative in all that we do. We do everything that the world may believe and know the transforming love of Christ as we do. Thank you, Synod and thank you, Chair.

*The Chair:* The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Ecumenical Relations Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses since this is Article 7 business.

The vote on Item 501: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 22, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 84 in favour, 2 against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 95 in favour, none against, with 4 recorded abstentions. The motion

*That the Measure entitled "Ecumenical Relations Measure" be finally approved.*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* The Ecumenical Relations Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee. Synod, that concludes this item of business.

## **ITEM 502**

*The Chair.* We now come to Item 502, that the Synod has reached the Final Approval stage of Draft Amending Canon No. 38. Members will need the Draft Amending Canon GS 2047B and the Petition for the Royal Assent and Licence GS 2047C. As required by Standing Order 102, I declare, on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect to draft Amending Canon No. 38. I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to formally move this particular item.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 38” be finally approved.’

*The Chair.* Debate? I see no one standing. The question is: “That the Canon entitled ‘Amending No. 38’ be finally approved”. In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 502: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 23, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, in favour 88, 2 against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 107 in favour, none against, with 3 recorded abstentions. The motion

*That the Canon entitled “Amending Canon No. 38” be finally approved.*

was carried in all three Houses.

## **ITEM 503**

*The Chair.* Therefore, I call the Archdeacon to move Item 503, “That the Petition for Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2047C) be adopted”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* Thank you, Chair. I do so move.

‘That the petition for Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2047C) be adopted.’

*The Chair.* Is there any debate? I put the motion to the vote. This is a simple majority that is required.

*The motion*

*That the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2047C) be adopted.*

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

## **ITEM 505**

*The Chair.* Members of Synod, we come to Item 505, that this Synod has reached the Final Approval stage of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure (GS 2064B). As required by Standing Order 102, I declare, on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity, that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect of the Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure.

I call on Ms Josile Munro to move Item 505, "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved". Ms Munro, you may speak up to ten minutes.

*Ms Josile Munro (London):* I move,

*'That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved.'*

This is the twelfth in a series of Miscellaneous Provisions dealing with uncontroversial matters that do not merit separate, freestanding legislation. The fact that the matters it deals with are not controversial does not mean that they are not important.

I am now going to summarise the main features of the Measure, which contain 16 clauses. The Church Commissioners currently have no power to apply their funds towards furthering the mission and work of the Church of England generally. The Commission's powers are currently confined to specific matters, such as a payment of bishop stipends, the payment of certain costs associated with cathedrals, the payment of certain pensions and the making of additional provision for the cure of souls in parishes where such assistance is required.

Clause 1 will enable the Church Commissioners to support the work and mission of the Church of England more generally. It does that by creating a new power for the Church Commissioners to make grants out of their general fund to the Archbishops' Council. The Archbishops' Council's objects are to co-ordinate, promote, aid and further the work of

the mission of the Church of England. A grant could be made to the Council under the new power for any purpose that came within these wide objects.

While this new power will not mean that there is more money available overall, it will mean that the Commissioners have greater flexibility over the way they make it available, enabling them to support aspects of the Church's mission that they have not previously been able to do within their funding powers.

The provisions in clause 4 should make it easier for bereaved families and funeral directors to find clergy and lay ministers who are willing and able to provide authorised Church of England funerals. As the law currently stands, a funeral service at a cemetery or crematorium may be provided by the minister of the parish where the deceased has died, resided or is on the Church electoral roll.

There is currently no provision which enables assistant or retired clergy or licensed lay persons to officiate at a funeral at a cemetery or crematorium, even if they are asked to do by the deceased's minister or by the family or friends of the deceased.

Clause 4 will provide authority for any member of the clergy, who has current authority to minister in the Church of England, to perform a funeral service at a cemetery, crematoria or other non-parochial setting, if asked to do so by the persons concerned. Before performing this funeral, he or she must, insofar as is practicable, inform the minister of the deceased's parish and seek his or her goodwill. This should ensure that the pastoral contact is made and followed up.

Clause 4 also widens existing statutory provision concerned with funerals and crematoria and cemeteries, so that an incumbent can arrange for someone else to perform the funeral of a parishioner if the incumbent cannot personally do so. The incumbent will be able to arrange for another member of the clergy or deaconess, reader or lay worker to perform the funeral on his or her behalf.

Clause 7 makes a decision of a provincial appeal court binding on lower ecclesiastical courts in both Provinces. This should help remove anomalies that have resulted from different approaches being taken by the appeal courts in the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

Clause 9 untangles the arrangements for varying or cancelling arrangements for groups of sessions of the General Synod. In its final form, the clause proceeds entirely logically. Where the provision for the Synod to meet has been made by the Synod, only the Synod, acting through its six officers, can vary this arrangement. When a provision for it to meet has been made by the Presidents, then it is they who have the power to vary the arrangements they have previously made.

Other elements of the Measure include the making of minor improvements to the terms of service legislation; the making of improvements to legislation concerned with

ecclesiastical fees and with ecclesiastical legal aid; simplifying the procedures for the execution of formal documents by PCCs, the Church Commissioners, the Pension Board and the Archbishops' Council; enabling the diocesan advisory committee and Church Buildings Council to delegate functions to officers; and making minor improvements to the procedures for pastoral schemes and orders, and a procedure for Bishops' Mission Orders.

The Steering Committee hopes that, despite the technical nature of much of this legislation, these Miscellaneous Provisions will, nonetheless, make a real difference to the mission and work of the Church of England. I do hope the Synod will be able to support the Final Approval of this Measure.

*The Chair.* Item 505 is open for debate. May I remind members that, under Standing Order 64, motions for the closure, the speech limits or next business are not in order in this debate.

The *Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Rt Worshipful Charles George (ex officio):* In respect of clause 7, in introducing the Measure there was a reference to such a decision being binding. The wording of the provision does not include the word "binding" and, in my submission, and as I explained when this matter was under consideration in London, it will be treated by the court as if made by the other court. The extent to which it is binding will depend upon the view taken by the appellate court in question.

*Mr Andrew Williams (Coventry):* I particularly want to welcome in this, which otherwise might be considered quite a dry Report, the excellent changes that are being made to the provisions on funerals. Funerals are a very important pastoral service that we as the Church of England provide. Simplifying this in such a way to allow a family's choice of clergy or other lay minister to take part in the funeral, to provide them the services they need to help them at this bad time for them, is I think excellent and a good use of a change of legislation to drive the mission of the Church.

*The Chair.* I see no one else standing and so may I invite Ms Josile Munro to reply to the debate.

*Ms Josile Munro (London):* Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Synod, for a generous welcome to this legislation. Thank you to the two people who spoke, Charles George in clarifying and making it clearer about the courts and what binds which court and, also, Andrew Williams for welcoming the issues around the clause around funerals.

*The Chair.* The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.



The vote on Item 505: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 23, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 105 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 124 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion

*That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved.*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* Therefore, the motion is carried, that the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee. Synod, that concludes this item of business. Thank you very much for your patience.

The CHAIR: *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 11.54 am.

## **ITEM 506**

### **DRAFT CHURCH PROPERTY MEASURE (GS 2083A)**

### **DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND PENSIONS MEASURE (GS 2084A)**

*The Chair.* We now come to Item 506 of the agenda. Synod, we will now take the Final Drafting and Final Approval stages of the Draft Church Property Measure and the Draft Church of England Pension Measure. Members will need draft Measures GS 2083A and GS 2084 and the Report of the Steering Committee GS 2083Y and GS 2084Y. I call upon the Vicar General of the Province of Canterbury, Chancellor Briden, to move Item 506, "That the Synod do take note of this Report". He has up to 10 minutes.

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* I beg to move

'That Synod do take note of this Report.'

These two draft Consolidation Measures which received First Consideration in February 2018 now come before Synod for Final Drafting and Final Approval. There is a single Steering Committee Report covering both Measures and members of Synod will also be helped by having the drafting notes of standing counsel.

The work of consolidation, although superficially not terribly exciting, is very important if the law of the Church is to be kept up-to-date and in a digestible form. Consolidation does not involve making substantive changes to the law. Instead, it brings together existing legislation on a given topic into one Measure, removing inconsistency or duplication and modernising terminology.

Of the Measures, the first, the Church Property Measure, contains provisions dealing with parsonages, glebe land, the acquisition of land and a variety of technical matters

concerning conveyancing and property rights. Although to the non-lawyer it does not make easy reading, the effect is to produce a single and practical body of legislation which will be a considerable help to those who deal with the property interests of the Church.

This Measure will replace something of a patchwork of property legislation which has accumulated over many years. A final trawl through the draft Measure has produced some extra drafting amendments which are annexed to the Steering Committee's Report. Most important among them is confirmation, if confirmation were required, that notices or notifications under the Measure may be given by electronic means, thus bringing the practice of Church property lawyers into line with the generality of their specialist colleagues in the property field.

Turning to the Church of England Pensions Measure, it has recently been estimated that more than 50% of ordained clergy are now in receipt of pensions. I can promise that the present members of the House of Bishops and the House of Clergy, however young, will find that they get an increasing concern about the content of this legislation as the years roll by.

The draft Measure is designed to bring into one Measure the provisions of the Clergy Pensions Measure 1961 - which now itself is approaching pensionable age - and numerous other Measures and regulations down to the Pensions (Pre-consolidation) Measure 2018. It also repeals and re-enacts section 11(3) of the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure 2018 dealing with the execution of documents.

Among the final drafting amendments annexed to the Steering Committee's Report are two items introduced by the Pensions (Pre-consolidation) Order 2018, made under section 8 of the Legislative Reform Measure 2018 and in receipt of the deemed approval of this Synod. An order was required because substantive changes to the law outside the scope of the consolidation procedure were required.

The first, now appearing in clause 15(5) of the draft Measure, gives retrospective effect to the payment of lump sums to clergy retiring up to 10 years before normal retirement age. This corrects what was probably an unnoticed error in the Church of England (Lump Sum Payments) Rules 1988.

The second, in paragraph 2(6) of Schedule 1, disqualifies from membership of the Pensions Board a person prohibited or suspended under sections 3 or 4 of the Pensions Act 1995. Obviously, it would be inappropriate for a person unfit to act under the secular regulatory regime to serve on the Pensions Board.

By their very nature, Measures of this kind do not give rise to questions of policy and so the principal burden of preparing these drafts for Synod has fallen not upon the Steering Committee - grateful as I am to the support of the members of that Committee - but upon standing counsel and the staff of the legal office.

The Committee is grateful for the resources allocated to the work of consolidation and especially to Mr Christopher Packer and the Revd Alexander McGregor for the time and effort expended upon their task. The resulting drafts may, indeed, be taken as a monument of their endless labour. We are very grateful to them.

I hope that the Synod will support this tidying up exercise and enable the legislation to go forward as a useful adjunct and help to those who administer the affairs of the Church in the property and pensions field. I, therefore, will invite Synod to take note of the Report.

*The Chair.* Item 506 is now open for debate. I call David Lamming. You have up to five minutes.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I think I will need just one. I just wanted to point out, in the light of an observation that was made earlier this morning as to where we are with simplification, how are we getting on with it.

What we have heard from Tim Briden just now is that we are making use of the Legislative Reform Measure within two months of its being given Royal Assent. That is because the Pensions (Pre-consolidation) Order, which is GS 2106 - which I think will come before us a little later for approval - is being made under the Legislative Reform Measure.

It does not actually require the Scrutiny Committee process because it is in a separate section of the Legislative Reform Act which enables pre-consolidation amendments to be made by a simplified process. There, members of Synod, is an illustration straight away of how this reform is being put into practice.

*The Chair.* I call Chancellor Briden to respond, should he wish to.

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* Thank you very much. I am very happy to respond to such a brief and well-focused debate.

*A Speaker.* Point of order: there was someone standing at the point that you called Chancellor Briden back to speak.

*The Chair.* I will call the next speaker and Chancellor Briden back to respond in that order. Apologies.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* It is all right, do not worry. I just wanted to warmly welcome this and just say to you as a member of the Glebe Committee for our diocese that the Church Property Measure, particularly in disposal of land, is critically important at the moment. The reason I am saying that is because I have just been on a set of visits with our land management agent and looking at HS2 arriving in our area and the disposal of redundant churches to be able to actually section a churchyard for sale with a house or not; to actually sell a piece of land for new housing development; to actually talk to the land agent and suddenly find that we have got in our area 6,000 properties that he has

now got to review as blighted with HS2 as being a surprise. I think in terms of disposing of some redundant churches and Church property, the Church Property Measure will be extremely helpful and I do not think I know anyone who will not welcome the electronic mail.

*The Chair:* As I see no one else standing, Chancellor Briden, would you like to respond?

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* Yes, I was going to express thanks for one speech but now I can express thanks for two. It is very good that these proposals have been received warmly in the way that they have. I think I need formally to move that the Synod take note of the Report.

*The Chair:* Thank you. We now put Item 506 to the vote.

*The motion*

*That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved.*

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

*The Chair:* Item 506 is carried.

## **ITEM 507**

*The Chair:* We now move to Item 507 on the agenda and I call on Chancellor Briden to move.

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* I move, "That the Measure entitled 'Church Property Measure' be finally approved".

*The Chair:* Although no one is standing, I am informed I need to remind Synod members that, under Standing Order 64, motions for closure, the speech limit or calling for the next item of business are not in order for this debate. The debate is now open. Because no one is standing, we now need to move to a vote. The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Church Property Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 507: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 25, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 104 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 126 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion

*That the Measure entitled 'Church Property Measure' be finally approved.*  
was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* The Church Property Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee.

## **ITEM 508**

*The Chair.* We now move to Item 508 and I call on Chancellor Briden to move Item 508.

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* Chair, I move, "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England Pensions Measure' be finally approved".

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I am also required to remind you, should you change your mind and wish to speak in this debate, that, under Standing Order 64, once again, motions for closure, the speech limit or calling for the next item of business are not in order for this debate. As I see no one standing, we put this item to the vote. The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England Pensions Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 508: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 24, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 106 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 129 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. *The motion*

*That the Measure entitled 'Church of England Pensions Measure' be finally approved.*

*was carried.*

*The Chair.* The Church of England Pensions Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee. That completes this item of business. We will now move to the next item on the Agenda.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 12.20 pm.

## **ITEM 509**

### **DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE (GS 2046AA)**

### **DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO.39 (GS 2047AA)**

*The Chair.* Good afternoon, Synod. We come to Item 509, the Report by the Revision Committee on the Draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure and Draft Amending Canon No. 39. Members will need the Report of the Revision Committee and 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 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, this second Report of the Revision Committee deals with what remains after the Committee divided the Measure and Amending Canon, namely the new Church Representation Rules, some provisions relating to ministers and provisions concerned with the holding of services.

We needed seven meetings to complete our work. That reflects, in part, the number of submissions the Committee received and had to consider, but it also reflects the sheer scale of the exercise. This is the first time the Church Representation Rules have been completely overhauled and doing so was a considerable undertaking. We believe that the result is a set of clear, comprehensible, workable rules that meet the current needs of the Church.

The new rules are a few hundred words longer - but only a few hundred - than the existing Church Representation Rules but we think that is justified; firstly, because they are much easier to read; secondly, because they try to avoid leaving questions unresolved; and, thirdly, because they provide for considerably more flexibility than the current rules, and we needed the space to say how that flexibility will operate.

A major issue the Committee had to address was compliance with the new Data Protection legislation. Do I hear a groan in Synod? Our policy has been to make it as easy as possible for parishes, deaneries and dioceses to operate the rules in a way that complies with those requirements. Having taken legal advice, we decided that we should not rely on consent as the lawful basis for the processing of personal data under the rules. That would have imposed an unacceptable burden on those who will operate the system. Instead, because the rules are statutory, we can rely on the ground that the processing of personal data required by the rules is “necessary for the compliance with the legal obligation”.

In relation to special category data, data that in this case reveals individuals’ religious beliefs, we can rely on the fact that the processing required by the rules is carried out in the course of the legitimate activities of the Church of England with appropriate safeguards and that the data is not disclosed outside the Church.

The Committee made amendments to accommodate electronic communication and electronic voting in elections. While we could have left this to the Elections Review Group to take forward at a later date, we decided that we should grasp the nettle now and, as far as possible, futureproof the rules. As a result, the new rules will treat email addresses, to all intents and purposes, as equivalent to a postal address and emails as equivalent to written paper documents.

It remains optional whether to provide an email address but, where an email address has been provided, it can be used for all purposes of the rules and passed on to others - for example, the secretary of the deanery synod - where the rules require that. We have left it to the General Synod to write its own election rules, as it currently does. No doubt when it does it will include provision for electronic voting in elections. It will then be open to diocesan synods to decide to have a system of electronic voting in their elections.

We have simplified the rules about church electoral rolls. I hope I hear a hooray here rather than a groan that I heard in relation to the Data Protection. Names will no longer need to be removed from the roll during the course of the year. That will be done only as part of the annual revision. We have included provision which should help avoid the situation where a person's name is wrongly removed from a roll because, for example, that person has been prevented from attending services by illness. We have removed the requirements for the annual publication of additions and removals from the roll. It will suffice simply to publish the revised roll. The PCC can decide the form in which the roll is published, whether on paper or on a website.

We were persuaded that there should be considerably better representation of mission initiatives in the synodical structures of the Church. We have strengthened existing provision for the representation of mission initiatives on deanery synods by making it mandatory for the diocesan synod to make a scheme for their representation where the bishop so directs.

We have also made those who worship in mission initiatives eligible for election to diocesan synods and the General Synod. If the leader of a mission initiative declares a person to be part of the worshipping community involved in the initiative, he or she is then qualified for election as a member of the diocesan synod and of the General Synod, subject, of course, to meeting the usual requirements as to age and being an actual communicant.

Other changes we made include enabling PCCs to conduct some business by correspondence, increasing the flexibility of the provision for joint councils and clarifying provisions concerned with disqualification on safeguarding grounds. As a result of a particular case having been drawn to our attention, we have also inserted provision to ensure that the lay members are always in the majority on a PCC.

As to the rest of the Measure, we left out a clause that would have abolished the rule that a person must have been in holy orders for six years to be eligible for appointment as a dean, archdeacon or residentiary canon. We could not see any adequate justification for changing that requirement.

We spent some time considering the provisions in the Amending Canon concerned with morning and evening prayer. One submission urged us to drop the requirements in relation to those services altogether, or at least to attenuate them significantly, but a

majority of the Committee were content with the form Canon B 11 will take once the Amending Canon comes into force.

It is not unreasonable to expect morning and evening prayer to be held daily somewhere in each benefice, particularly given that the clergy can call on the laity to assist by officiating at these services. We did not wish to see a fundamental change in what is supposed to be the normal pattern of worshipping life in the Church of England. There simply is not time in a ten minute speech for me to go into the detail of our work, but the detail is there in our Report. Even if members do not agree with all the decisions we took - and I do not suppose they will - I hope it will be apparent that we have taken our responsibilities seriously.

I wish, finally, to take this opportunity of publicly thanking the Legal Department for their outstanding support in this unusually large and involved piece of work. Their exemplary professionalism and, at the more personal level, their unfailingly constructive and co-operative approach at times when we must have taxed their patience deserves an acknowledgment before the whole of Synod. Chair, I move that Synod do take note of this Report.

*The Chair.* Thank you. Your tummies will be telling you - we are up north, so it is dinner up here - that dinner is awaiting us. I am going to adjourn this debate at this point, but it will be really helpful to me if you would just indicate if you were hoping to speak in the debate which will then resume at 2.30. Could you just indicate? Stand, wave or anything like that. Great. I am not taking a register. I adjourn this debate. We will see you at 2.30.

## **ITEM 39**

### **ADDRESS FROM THE MOST REVD MOON HING, BISHOP OF WEST MALAYSIA AND ARCHBISHOP AND PRIMATE OF THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH EAST ASIA**

*The Chair.* I promised you that we would resume the debate that we just began, but we have an extra special item. That is an address from the Most Revd Moon Hing, Archbishop and Primate of the Church of the Province of South East Asia and Bishop of West Malaysia. It is our pleasure, Archbishop, to invite you to address the Synod and thank you for being here.

*The Archbishop and Primate of the Province of South East Asia and Bishop of West Malaysia (Most Revd Ng Moon Hing):* Thank you very much. Good afternoon to all of you. When I was coming up this way to England, someone asked me, "Bishop, where are you going?" I said, "I am going to the UK". "Oh, good, you go for holiday?" I said, "No, no, no". "Then what for?" "I am going to the Church of England General Synod". "What sin have you made?" That is for my members.



I am very glad. This is the first time I have come here to see the mother Church, the Church of England. My province is a very big province. From one end of the province we fly 12 hours to the other end of the province. That is the scope of my province, from Kathmandu in Nepal to just beside Papua. We cover nine countries and speak many many different languages, but we want to thank God that the only common language that we can use is English. We could not use any other language because no one understood each other and so we have used English.

The population of that region is 500 million, but most of the countries are less than 1% Christian - it includes Catholics. It includes all others - a very small minority of Christians. In the south, that is Indonesia, we have the largest Muslim country. In the north, that is Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Myanmar, that area, they are majority Buddhists but with pockets of communists there, socialists. On the north-west, there are majority Hindus in Nepal.

We live in the midst of all this mixture of religion and we have to tread very carefully. Sometimes misinterpretation is so common. We do something with good intention but the other culture and religion thinks negatively. For example, if my right hand is holding something, I will usually hand with my left hand, but this is forbidden in some cultures because you cannot do anything with the left hand. You cannot give something with the left hand and you cannot receive. We have to work within these sort of parameters, which is typical.

Yet, the Church is growing very strongly. Though we have a lot of misunderstanding, we try to minimise it and try to work on it. Every year in the province, we add about 10,000 to 12,000 members every year. So, the provinces add together, this is where the growth is of the province. My diocese itself spans from 1,000 miles and 600 miles. It is probably the size of the whole of England, which is too big and too sparse. Nonetheless, we work very hard under very extreme pressure in the sense that because of the different cultures we have to tread carefully.

Of course, you realise that in our part of the world it is so difficult. Especially, there was a court case on the usage of the word "Allah". We lost. In a sense, those are some of the pressures we have. That actually sets us very good to keep us together. I backtrack a little bit how we began this way.

In 1988, my predecessor Bishop went to Lambeth and came back in 1989. He called all the clergy together. He said, "We come together because Lambeth told us that from 1991 to 2000 there will be the decade of evangelism". We asked the Bishop, "What is that?" He said, "I do not know. Let us put our heads together". So, we discussed for one year, the following year, in the year 1990 we discussed and we did not know what to do. I was a young clergy then.

Finally, the Bishop and all of us decided on three things, we do only three things. He said, "Go to all the PCCs and ask the PCCs to put in their agenda evangelism. If there is

none, put one and you will discuss it at every meeting. Secondly, appoint someone, not a clergy, a laity, to be the co-ordinator of evangelism. Do not worry whether he knows anything or not. If he does not, ask him to go for training, send him for training and equip him. And, number three, put a budget; even though £5 or £50 or £100, never mind, just put a budget, you begin”.

So, in the year 2003, the new Bishop, basically my predecessor, he asked me to do a survey what happened to the decade of evangelism. In the year 1991, I looked at the Synod reports right up to the 2000. I collected all the data. Even though it may be wrong, they may give false figures, but every year they are giving the false figures so we know the difference. You know that the difference will be the true one, not the number.

With that, for the 10 years from 1991 to 2000, suddenly everybody was shocked when I presented the figures and some people did not believe me. Then I said, “You can check the figures”. Without knowing what to do in evangelism, we grew 12,000 in those 10 years, which means that is 1,200 per year which means every month one church of 100. When we look back actually, from that year onwards until now, we have planted more than a hundred other churches only in my diocese.

When we look back, I think there is one good thing that we have learned which is to be intentional. We can talk about it but, finally, we have become intentional to appoint somebody, put a small budget and just discuss about it. Now, our diocese and our province is going into intentional discipleship. After all, we found that there are a lot of people but then not everybody. They are very skilful but sometimes you cannot use them. If you use them it causes more problems than not to use them.

Now we are intentional by doing discipleship that they will go down and understand very well what it means to be a disciple of Jesus. I am now appointed by Archbishop Justin Welby to be the Chair of the Intentional Discipleship Order of the Anglican Communion and I go around to encourage people. I do not do the job for you, but I encourage everybody how to do discipleship. It is not methodology. It is the whole ecclesiology. We must put it in the ecclesiology that the end product of the Church is not another church but it is a disciple.

I end by saying this though on one thing. I have a tree. It is a mango tree. A mango tree produces the best mango, very good mango, but when I take and consume this and I could not finish the mango because it is too many and so I give it to all my neighbours and friends and everybody and so they just consume. One day when my tree dies, no mangos will be going around. Why? Because no one planted a mango tree because everybody consumed that mango. In the mango there is a seed. It is a potential of another tree. Nobody plants. If I do not plant, I do not have.

At the end of the day, that mango tree will cease to operate, will cease to live. There will be no more mangoes. But if every one of us plants a seed, that seed that we eat, the mango after we enjoy, because we are consumers, but once we enjoy that will become a

tree. My question to always ask: What do you see in a mango tree? What is the fruit of the mango tree? You say mangoes, and I say let us look deeper. The fruit of the mango tree is another mango tree. We must see it that way. But, if you see further, the fruit of the mango tree is a plantation of mangoes or mango trees because every one potential mango seed can become a plantation.

I close by saying these things, which I shared in the Primates meeting. I thought because of misunderstanding, and sometimes it can be fun but it can be painful, we will learn from it and we can grow from it. I went to Korea. Many years ago, I took a team to learn about church growth and in Korea we learnt church growth and after a while we were learning.

In Korea everything you eat in Korea, everything they give you is kimchi. Nothing else, kimchi; morning kimchi; afternoon kimchi; night kimchi. At the end of the day, my parishioners were saying, we are called padre, "Padre, can we have something else without kimchi?" So we say, "Okay, we will have to pay for it. We will find another Korean brother and say can you take us out". The Korean brother says, "Yes, I can, but what do you want to eat?" Nobody knows what is there in Korea, so someone thought of it, "What about barbecue?" He said, "Good". Then he took us to a barbecue.

When we went there, we sat down and we said, "No kimchi only barbecue". When we start, the meat comes and they start to barbecue in front of us, Korean style we barbecue, and it was very nice. The fragrance is good, the taste is good, and halfway through somebody asked, "Brother, what meat is this?" He says, "Barbecued duck". Not the duck here, no, barbecued duck!

Then at halfway another person asked, "Brother, what is this? What meat is this?" "Barbecued duck". "Well, how come the duck bone is so big?" Nobody bothered. We had finished eating. Almost at the end, it dawned me, I said, "Brother, what do you say this meat is?" He says, "Barbecued duck". Then it dawned me and I say, "How do you spell duck?" He says, "D-O-G"! But we enjoy! Next time you are smarter.

My dear brothers and sisters and fellow workers in the Lord's habits, we need to learn from mistakes but must be intentional. God bless all of you. Thank you.

*The Chair.* Father, please take our love and best wishes and prayers back to your province and we look forward to coming and sharing a meal with you at some stage! I now call the Chair of the Business Committee - I am just waiting to see whether she is listening to me - who has something to say to us.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy's (Oxford):* Friends, thank you for your patience in listening to me yet again. I have to say I have been known to say that my definition of a successful group of sessions is that I do not have to do what I am about to do and so I apologise in advance. You will be aware that there are a number of really interesting debates coming up this afternoon and we have just had the wonderful additional item. Thank you so much, Archbishop.

We are minded to ask if you would consider moving the business, which is the Report from the Church Commissioners, Item 24, to 9.15 tomorrow morning. That will give the Chairs of the debates later this afternoon the opportunity to call more people who wish to speak and we think we have a little bit of flexibility in the programme tomorrow morning.

The effect is to give us more time this afternoon and to move the Report from the Church Commissioners to 9.15 tomorrow morning. I hope that the Chair will be able to ask your consent for that.

*The Chair:* Well, I will ask their consent now. Let us see.

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

## **ITEM 509 (CONTINUED)**

*The Chair:* Now, you remember before lunch we began a debate on Item 509, the Report by the Revision Committee on the Draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure and Drafting Amending Canon No. 39.

Professor Joyce Hill had presented that to us and, now, I open the debate on that Report. 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. We will begin with speeches of five minutes but, very quickly, I will be reducing that to three. If you wish to speak, would you stand, please.

*Ven. Luke Miller (London):* It fell to me to support our indefatigable Synodical Secretary to steer through the London Diocesan Synod the representation for those worshipping in our worshipping communities which had Bishops' Mission Orders under the current Regulations and rules. Therefore, I welcome very much that the revisions provide very much better for this aspect of our Church's life.

The process was immensely complicated and it is wonderful to have something that, I hope, will work a lot better. I have three things to ask the Steering Committee to consider and possibly find some route to deal with. The first is how the initial roll is drawn up. One of the problems with the establishment of new things is to create an electoral roll where there is no previous roll on which to build.

Our old rules allow for amalgamation but not for a proliferation of churches. We need more mangoes. The new rules state that the members of the new roll should be those who are declared to be so by the leader of the mission initiative. I think that is great in order to get us going, but I perceive difficulties of trust in the subsequent life of the mission initiative. It seems to me that to limit the minister's say-so to six months and then to have a roll which is drawn up in the usual way that we are used to, composed of habitual worshippers, would be a good thing to do.

Secondly, under the rules, 24(3), the diocesan synod makes the scheme and gives the mission initiative a scale of representation which it chooses, "Making due provision for the representation of the worshipping community". I have a question. Does this mean that it might have more or less representation than a parish or a guild church under the guidance of the same diocesan synod? I hope the principle must be, as a number of amendments are putting down for this, that all worshippers should benefit from the same scale of representation. Therefore, when it comes to it, I shall be supporting Clive Scowen's amendment.

Then, there is a further aspect which I think I have got and understood correctly, which I would very much like to welcome if I have, which is the abolition of the synodical bus stop. When we tried to put these things through before, we discovered that, because of our triennial structures and because the scales of representation to deanery synods are worked out on a triennial basis, it became impossible to start something up having representation except at exactly the right moment in the triennial cycle.

I think I read correctly that it is now possible for a diocesan synod to start something up at any point in the cycle. If I have got that right, I welcome it immensely. If I have got it wrong, please can we try and do something about it.

As you can probably see, I have been struggling with this. It all sometimes feels very dry, but I am absolutely clear that taking the opportunity to bring into our synodical structures properly those who are worshipping in forms of church which are increasingly normative for us and no longer strange things at the edges of what we do, but at the heart of our mission, must be the right thing to do to give voice to many in our churches who are active in mission in our deliberations, alongside those others active in mission in what have hitherto been more traditional shaped structures.

*The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent):* This is a good day for simplification. I feel like leading the Synod in a chorus of "simplification is coming home", but it does not quite scan. When we sat in Church House, quite a long time ago now, trying to rake through all the response from dioceses about what was and was not working, we identified a number of issues which were almost too hard to handle. One of those, of course, was the Church Rep Rules, which happily we have handled.

Today, we have actually got to the stage where we have dealt with Ecumenical Relations, where we are hopefully going to deal today with the Church Rep Rules and also with people being ordained to posts other than normal title posts. That is quite an achievement and came out of a lot of deliberation at Simplification Group. I am very grateful to Jane Steen and Joyce Hill and all those involved in bringing this to the floor of Synod.

As a warning, last time we did Church Representation Rules in this Synod, it was an absolute disaster. It was a debacle not to be repeated. We were in London. I remember Archbishop Justin, it was probably one of his first Synods as Archbishop and he came out

of the session saying, "Is it always like that?" Because we got to the stage where we were nit-picking over various amendments because we did not think it suited our particular understanding of PCCs and how they should be conducted, et cetera.

I hope we will obdure that way of doing revision this afternoon. It is a great new Measure because it comes from an idea that we have two principles being established. One is flexibility, that we try to provide Church Rep Rules which do not do universally the same thing in every part of the country but will suit the conditions of PCCs and others throughout the country according to their pastoral need. That is a really important principle. Please do not go moving your amendment on the basis that it is going to work in my place without thinking will it work in somebody else's place.

The second thing is that the Church Representation Rules and all this stuff are actually to be made use of, not for them to make use of you. I think what I welcome from this new approach, and plaudits to Timothy Briden who came along with the idea in the first place that we ought to try and do some flexible thinking about this, that actually it is important that they are able to be used well.

Now, there is a little mention in the Report that sometimes they are used because PCCs are not all that they might be. The two culprits who are not named in the Report but who are behind the question of whether you can pack a PCC with clergy in order to try and get a parish on the move are both speaking in this debate and have already done so.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that if a PCC is dead on its feet and a church has been stuck for 20 years, no amount of tinkering with the Church Rep Rules will solve that problem if you. I do not regret that we did although I understand why you are closing the loophole.

*The Chair:* After this speech, I will be reducing it to three minutes.

*Mr Michael Stallybrass (York):* I very much welcome most of the revisions which have gone into the Church Representation Rules and I believe they are going to free us up in many ways. However, I have very recently become aware of one situation where I think we need to make a small modification to the Church Representation Rules as proposed, which is going to help and protect people in PCCs.

It actually starts with, how shall I put it, a rather late amendment which General Synod passed last year to the Ecclesiastical Offices (Age Limit) Measure, in which it is now a requirement of the PCC to give consent to the issuing of a direction to extend the term of an incumbent's appointment. It is quite clear that, in those sorts of discussions, the incumbent should not - and, indeed, the Archbishops' Council's guidelines say that he must not - be present when the item is discussed.

If you then look at the draft model rules for PCCs, it also makes it clear that there are times when PCC minutes should be regarded as confidential. We had a situation where

our incumbent, reaching the age of 70, the PCC received a letter asking for us to agree to a directive for an unspecified period of time.

The PCC felt that an unspecified period of time was not actually in accordance with the requirements of the Measure, that there should be a specified period of time. The then chair who was elected for that particular meeting got the agreement of the PCC that all the discussions should actually be, first of all, under Chatham House Rules and, secondly, that any vote which was taken should be done by secret ballot.

Now, we are talking about a personnel issue here and I am firmly of the opinion that the fact that a secret ballot was held has actually protected a number of people within the PCC subsequently. It was not a clear-cut decision and the PCC, there are a few people who were prepared to say, "Well, it is up to five years, let us agree for five years". There was a majority who felt that it should be a shorter period of time in line with the mind of General Synod when that extra provision was actually put in.

However, the Church Representation Rules also have two clauses, M26(3), which is that any member can require the minutes to show how they voted, and M26(2), which is that one-fifth of the members present and voting can require the minutes to record the names of each person voting for or against the resolution.

I have spoken with our diocesan registrar and she agrees with me that there are circumstances, especially around personnel issues, where it is inadvisable to have a person-by-person outcome recorded. It is much better simply to be able to say, "Yes, there was a majority for outcome A rather than B". I am asking that even at this late stage the Revision Committee should consider as to whether it is possible to put something into the Church Representation Rules to allow, in special circumstances, if the chairman feels that it is appropriate and maybe two-thirds of the members there feel that it is appropriate, a secret ballot can take place.

*The Chair* imposed a three-minute speech limit.

*Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson (Chelmsford)*: Particularly in rural areas, churches these days are often being encouraged to work closely with one another and to collaborate together, and I want to welcome the provisions in this draft legislation, especially in section C on joint councils, which contain the possibility of opening up whole new futures in this area, because PCC members and congregations can often feel torn about collaboration with their neighbour: torn on the one hand between their acceptance of the need for change, and their understanding of the value of collaboration in God's mission and ministry and, on the other hand, their loyalty to their particular church, their own village. Of course, new relationships have potential but they also contain a considerable element of the unknown. How, they ask, will the wider community react to some kind of pastoral reorganisation, and how do we hold on to our identity as God's people in this place, entrusted for a season with the building of a place of worship where people have sung God's praise for hundreds and hundreds of years?

The provisions before us this afternoon, I dare to suggest, could enable rural parishes, among others, to have their cake and eat it, because specified property and rights and liabilities and functions can be taken on by a joint council while local sensitivities can be heeded in what is not transferred in what remains with the PCC. The incumbent's diary can then be full of something other than endless PCC meetings and yet he or she can still take a lead in ensuring effective governance.

These provisions would make a difference to a group of 10 villages with whom I am currently working: seven PCCs, one covering four villages; two benefices each containing three parochial church councils. These arrangements will make a real difference because it opens up a range of future possibilities to them; structures that will support them in their desire to work together, yes, in mission and ministry, but without losing the distinctiveness of each church and community.

I urge Synod to support this legislation which will serve us well as we move into a changing future.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I declare that I am the lay Chair of Southwark Diocesan Synod and the lay Chair of Bermondsey Deanery Synod. I have recently been chairing the Bishop of Southwark's Advisory Group on breathing new life into deaneries and I convene the group of diocesan lay Chairs which met this morning and has given rise to this intervention. I want to thank the Revision Committee and the Steering Committee for their amazing resilience, I think is the word, in pursuing this task, and in coming up with such great improvement.

I want to speak about the status of diocesan lay chairs and deanery lay chairs at the end of the triennium because if the guillotine falls and they are pushed out of office, there is no one there to perform that very valuable task. It is the convention in most dioceses, as far as I can gather from speaking to my colleagues, that the diocesan lay chair and the deanery lay chair in their respective positions continue in office, whether or not they have been re-elected, until their successor is appointed, which means that they are on hand to give advice to the bishop, the archdeacon or whatever during the time until the new person is appointed or they are re-elected.

That is not clearly stated in the Church Representation Rules and it is not clearly stated in all the Standing Orders up and down the country. What I am hoping for is, first, a clear statement from the platform if possible, or followed up in writing in due course, that this convention that they continue in post until they are replaced or re-elected is the correct convention and should apply, and that we make that clear either in the Church Representation Rules via subsequent further amendment or in guidance to the dioceses on the issuing of Standing Orders for diocesan synods and deanery synods.

*Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor):* I am Auditor in this Province and Dean of the Arches and also a member of the Legislative Committee. I



congratulate the Revision Committee on the thorough job they have done in the spirit of reform outlined by Bishop Pete. I particularly welcome the new and constitutionally important rule M13(2), ensuring that the laity on a PCC must outnumber the clergy. Indeed, in the light of recent events in one well-known parish, to which Bishop Pete referred, I am doubtful that without such provision the Measure would obtain the approval of the Ecclesiastical Committee. Let me explain why. As stated in paragraph 56 of the Revision Committee's Report, it has previously been understood that a lay majority on a PCC would always be the case. The Revision Committee go on rather coyly to refer to the current position as being "open to abuse since a bishop could license a large number of curates to a parish who would then be able to outvote the lay members".

As will be known to readers of the *Church Times* and/or *Private Eye* or both, this is precisely what happened at St Mary-le-Bow where, on 18 July 2017, no fewer than eight additional curates were licensed without the PCC's knowledge, thereby outnumbering the lay members of the PCC. I accept that there were difficult pastoral and mission considerations in play, and I am not alleging bad faith in anyone, but what happened does indicate the urgent need for the provision of such as is now proposed in the new rule M13(2).

*Mr Clive Scowen (London):* Just before I say what I was going to say, with great diffidence to correct the Dean of the Arches, it is actually St Mary-le- Strand. I think St Mary-le-Bow would be a little alarmed to hear what you just said!

Chair, I stand as Chair of the Elections Review Group to thank the Revision Committee for taking heed of our request to get on with making provisions in these rules for the conduct of electronic elections and particularly for the harvesting, if that is the right word, of email addresses and giving power to do that as soon as possible. This is really important for the programme we have to conduct the 2020 elections electronically, and I am really grateful for their willingness to take that on board.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: would you accept a motion for closure after the next speaker?

*The Chair:* If anyone dare stand after this speaker, I will need you, but we will see where we are.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* Following on from the Dean of Arches, it is all very well having a rule that ensures the House of Laity has ascendancy over the clergy at the time of election; it is another thing entirely when the meeting takes place. If we are going to have this rule, it would be also good to consider whether or not the House of Laity is still in the majority at the time of the meeting.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing. Mr Lamming is standing. I might want a motion for closure. It is nothing personal, David.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* As a member of the Revision Committee - and I declare that interest - I think the concern that has just been expressed is an unnecessary one. What we have done in these rules is to ensure that there will be a lay majority. You will have looked at the second rule, I think it is, which is if, as happened at St Mary-le-Strand, there are a number of clergy all licensed on the same day to a particular parish, and the result would be that they would outnumber the lay members on the PCC, none of them would become members of that PCC, not just a sufficient number to make sure that the laity remain in the majority. I think the phrase used in the *Church Times* report was "gerrymandering". Whether that is the right phrase or not, what happened in St Mary-le-Strand could not happen again with the provisions that we have put into the rules. We have also provided, as you may have seen, that they are entrenched provisions and therefore cannot be amended under a scheme to vary the model rules.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: would you accept a motion for closure on this item?

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so I probably do not need it, but thank you very much indeed. I call on Professor Hill to respond to the debate. Joyce, you have five minutes to do so.

*Canon Professor Joyce Hill:* Thank you very much. I am very pleased indeed with the broadly positive response to our proposals here. I did say, I think, in my speech that it is not likely that everybody will agree with everything. It is not possible in legislation of this scale and scope. The fact that questions are asked and we know later we will be dealing with amendments is no big surprise, but I take great heart from the fact that there is a good deal of support in the air for what we are doing.

If I may briefly address each particular point made. Luke Miller, thank you for supporting our approach to the Bishop's Mission Order context. We were trying to find a way forward there. I will ask the Steering Committee if it will double-check that we think we have got things right there, but we were finding a way forward. We will check, I hope, through the Steering Committee that we have got all the loose ends tied up.

Thank you to the Bishop of Willesden for so kindly supporting what we have tried to do and recognising the flexibility that we have tried to build in, a point that was also taken up by Jenny Tomlinson in relation specifically to the rural context.

As far as Michael Stallybrass is concerned, I will ask the Steering Committee to give further thought to the question of, effectively, reserved business when there are particularly difficult personnel issues in hand.

As far as Adrian Greenwood is concerned, on the question of what happens with diocesan deanery lay chairs at the end of the triennium, one possible way would be for guidance to be given to dioceses regarding their Standing Orders, and, indeed, one thing the

dioceses and deaneries will have to do in the light of these rules, if they are all passed and accepted is that they will have to revisit their own Standing Orders anyway so it would be quite simple to address the issue of diocesan and deanery lay chairs through that route. I will ask the Steering Committee to have a look at that.

As far as the Dean of the Arches' intervention is concerned, we were indeed readers of the *Church Times*, which was why the clause that he was grateful to us for including was indeed included.

I think Tim Hind's question was answered satisfactorily from a legal point of view by David Lamming, who has been working as a member of the Revision Committee.

I would simply like to say that for the loose ends that have been identified here I will ask the Steering Committee to attend to them, check them out, look at them carefully, but I thank Synod for the very positive general response to the flexibility that we have tried to build into these rules. We recognise that we live in a very, very, very mixed economy in the Church of England and we need rules that will work in all kinds of different situations, so that is what we were trying to do, as well as bringing ourselves up-to-date as far as electronic matters and data protection matters and so on are concerned. Thank you for your support. Do I have to move at this point, Chair, that you accept my Report? I did say that at the beginning.

*The Chair:* You did. It is all okay. I now put the motion at Item 509, "that the Synod do take note of this Report" to you, Synod.

*The motion*

*That the Synod do take note of this Report*

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried.

*The Chair:* We come now to the Revision Stage for the draft Measure. 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.

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 - and we have decided these “some other means” is if you hold up your gold Order Paper then I will be able to spot it - that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken.

## **ITEM 512**

*The Chair:* 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 therefore call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 512, “That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure.’

*The Chair:* Does anyone wish to speak? I see no one standing. I therefore put Item 512 to the vote, “that clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure”.

*The motion*

*That clauses 1 to 3 stand part of the Measure*

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried.

## **ITEM 513**

*The Chair:* We now come to Schedule 1 to the draft Measure and I invite Mr Clive Scowen to move his amendment, Item 513. Mr Scowen, you may speak for not more than five minutes.

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

‘Schedule 1, Rule 12, page 9, line 29, at end insert—

“(ba) Rule M13(1)(e) and (f) (PCC: churchwardens and persons to be admitted as such to be members);”.’

As the Bishop of Willesden has already pointed out, one of the great strengths of these new rules is the introduction of model rules for parish governance which parishes can adapt to their own needs, subject to the consent of the Bishop’s Council. It is right, as the Bishop of Willesden has said, to move away from a one-size-fits-all approach of the old rules. I want to suggest that it is also important to ensure that we do not swing from

one extreme to the other and finish up with more flexibility than is consistent with the principles of synodical government.

These first four amendments are all concerned with that issue. The first amendment, which I am now moving at 513 would ensure that a parish scheme to vary the model rules could not remove churchwardens *as ex officio* members of their PCC. In view of the key role of lay leadership that churchwardens have, and which is inherent in their office, it is surely unthinkable that they should be excluded from PCC membership. This amendment would ensure that a parish scheme to vary the model rules could not exclude churchwardens from the membership of their PCC. That is all there is to say about it and, as I say, I beg to move.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to speak in response for not more than five minutes.

*Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle):* The Steering Committee does not support Mr Scowen's amendments. The items in the list in rule 12(2) are concerned with matters of overriding principle rather than practice, for example that some people are disqualified for legal and safeguarding reasons. In discussing this, the Committee could envisage situations in which there might be reasons for some variations in rules M13(1)(e) and (f). One of the parishes in my diocese, for example, has 10 churches, 20 churchwardens, and so you can imagine the size of the PCC that would result if all those 20 churchwardens were on the PCC and if you were to have a sufficient number of lay representatives to balance them. We would not wish to place such a restriction on the face of primary legislation. If a scheme is made under these rules then rules 13(3) and 13(4) require it to be approved by the Bishop's Council and Standing Committee, which the Steering Committee believes provides more than adequate scrutiny for the specific scheme, so we do not support Mr Scowen's amendment.

*The Chair:* Thank you. With the Steering Committee not supporting this amendment, if you wish there to be debate on the amendment, I need to see 40 members standing. There are not 40 members standing, therefore this amendment lapses.

## **ITEMS 514 AND 515**

*The Chair:* We now come to the amendments at Items 514 and 515. These amendments form a group and I understand Mr Scowen will speak to them together in moving Item 514. Once again you may speak for not more than five minutes.

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

'Schedule 1, Rule 12, page 9, line 29, at end insert—

“(bb) Rule M13(1)(j) (PCC: elected representatives of laity to be members), subject to paragraph (3);”

These amendments seek to preserve the integrity of the synodical government system. Fundamental to that system is the connection and relationship between its different levels. The principle is that members of the Synod are also members of all other synods more local than it. As we all know, members of the General Synod are on their diocesan synod, deanery synod and PCC. At present, members of the diocesan synod are also on their deanery synod and PCC. Yet, as drafted, the rules would allow a parish scheme to exclude all Synod members, even the parish reps on deanery synod, from *ex officio* membership of the PCC. I suggest that would undermine a fundamental principle of synodical government and further inhibit the flow of information and knowledge between the different levels, which, as we already know, can be quite challenging as things are.

However, I am aware that some larger parishes have a lot of deanery synod members, as, as I am sure is going to be pointed out to us, would joint councils. Amendment 515 would allow a parish scheme to provide that where there are more than three deanery synod members, the APCM could choose at least three to serve on the PCC. This will preserve the link and communication between the PCC and the deanery synod without unbalancing the PCC.

Amendment 514 establishes the principle that Synod members should continue to be *ex officio* on the PCC and, if it passes, I will then move 515 to introduce the qualification that would allow the APCM to choose not fewer than three deanery synod members to serve on the PCC. I therefore move 514.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have not more than five minutes.

*Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle):* The Steering Committee does not support Mr Scowen's amendments, for largely the reasons we outlined for the previous amendment. It significantly reduces flexibility and the safeguard of rules 13(3) and 13(4) is there.

*The Chair:* As the Steering Committee has not accepted the amendment, we can only continue the debate if 40 members are standing. There are 40 members, and more, standing, therefore this item is open for debate. Would those wishing to speak please stand. I see no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 514 to the Synod.

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

*The Chair:* That is lost, which means that 515 also falls. I therefore call Mr Scowen to move Item 516.

## **ITEM 516**

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

'Schedule 1, Rule 13, page 10, line 15, *leave out* "ensures" and *insert* "is necessary to ensure".'

The result of the last two or three amendments makes this one even more important, because, as I mentioned before, and as the Steering Committee has also reminded us, schemes to vary the model rules require the consent of the Bishop's Council. The Revision Committee very helpfully introduced some criteria for a Bishop's Council reply in deciding whether to give consent, because in its initial draft there was none. One of those criteria is that the scheme has to ensure efficient governance of the parish, and that is clearly right. I suggest that there should be a requirement for the bishop's council to be satisfied that the provisions of the scheme are necessary to ensure efficient governance, in other words, that applying the model rules would create a problem and not ensure efficient governance for that parish.

There is much wisdom in the model rules. I suggest that this rule ought to provide that they should departed from only where it is truly necessary in a parish's particular context, and particularly given that the Steering Committee has invited us to rely on this rule to ensure that schemes that do abuse the system do not go through, I suggest it is doubly necessary to add in these words that it should be necessary to ensure effective governance for those changes to be made. I move.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I invite a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Revd Alyson Buxton (Lincoln):* We reject this amendment. While this amendment changes very few words, it would completely undermine a major principle of the new rules. The Simplification Task Group made a clear recommendation that the rules should contain model rules for parish governance. These are the M rules in Part 9. These apply by default unless a parish makes different provision by way of a scheme under rule 12. It was a central principle of these new Church Representation Rules that parishes should, subject to certain safeguards, be free to amend, supplement or replace the model rules as the annual meeting of the parish thought fit.

Rule 13(4)(b) is one of the safeguards. It says that the Bishop's Council may approve a scheme for different local arrangements only if it is satisfied that the scheme ensures effective governance of the parish. That is an entirely sensible safeguard. This amendment would impose a wholly different restriction. If his amendment were passed, no schemes for local arrangements could be made at all unless the Bishop's Council was satisfied that the proposed scheme was necessary to ensure the effective governance of the parish.

It would mean that, in order to get approval for their scheme by the Bishop's Council, a parish would have to be able to persuade it that the model rules in Part 9 did not meet their governance needs in some significant way so that it was necessary to make alternative provision by scheme. That would be a reversal of the policy that the rules in

Part 9 are intended only to be model rules which a parish follows by default if it does not wish to make different arrangements.

The Steering Committee wishes to uphold the intention and the much greater level of flexibility for parish governance - arrangements that would result from this. The amendment would completely undermine that and the Steering Committee must, therefore, oppose it.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee does not accept this amendment, therefore, the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members? There are not 40 members. Therefore, that amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 517**

*The Chair:* I call Mr Scowen to move Item 517. I am asked to say that the Revd Prebendary Simon Cawdell has given notice of an amendment in the same terms.

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

‘Schedule 1, Rule 19, page 13, line 23, *leave out* paragraph (3) and *insert*—  
“(3) A diocesan synod must, for the purpose of securing that the number of persons elected by each parish is, as nearly as possible, proportionate to the number of names on its roll, calculate the number of persons to be elected by—  
(a) determining a number for the purposes of this paragraph (“N”), and  
(b) providing for each parish to elect one person for every N names on its roll and, where the number of names on the roll is not divisible by N without remainder, for the remainder.”’

As some will know, I favoured a different electoral base for the House of Laity of this Synod, but in the informal ballot that we conducted this time last year it was clear that Synod wanted to stick to the deanery synod lay members as the electoral college for electing the laity to this Synod. So be it.

One thing I hope we can all agree is that it is essential that the House of Laity of this Synod should be credibly representative of the laity of the Church of England. Since deanery synod laity are to continue to be charged with the role of electing General Synod lay members, it is equally vital that they, the electors, should be credibly representative of the lay members of the parishes who elect them and that every electoral roll member should count the same, whether their parish is large or small.

For that to happen, it is essential that the diocesan scheme determining the number of deanery synod members should ensure that those numbers are directly proportionate to the numbers on the electoral rolls in the diocese. The current rules permit but do not require that. In London, we have chosen to adopt a proportionate scale and it is working well.



Across the country, there is a whole range of different systems which often result in larger parishes - that is, the members of electoral rolls of larger parishes - being grossly underrepresented, vaguely reminiscent of the inequalities in representation which existed in Parliament prior to the Great Reform Act. Since this is about the credibility of the House of Laity of this Synod, it is right that this should not be a matter of diocesan discretion.

We, as General Synod, should be able to insist that every diocesan scheme is directly proportionate because it affects the legitimacy of this body. Of course, it will continue to be for each diocese to determine the numbers that work in their context, provided they observe the principle of direct proportionality. It is for that reason that I move Item 517.

*The Chair.* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle):* The Steering Committee does not support Mr Scowen's and the Revd Prebendary Cawdell's amendments. The Committee understood that some dioceses, such as London, do not wish to calculate the number of representatives but they do wish to calculate the number of representatives on a strictly proportional basis, and the rules as drafted allow that.

We see no reason why the wishes of some dioceses in this respect should be forced on all other dioceses. We strongly wish to retain this flexibility in the rules as drafted rather than becoming more prescriptive. The flexibility is in keeping with the wish to reduce the level of detailed prescription on the face of primary legislation. Let us leave it to the wise counsels of diocesan synods to determine.

*The Chair.* The Steering Committee is obviously resisting this amendment and so the 40 member rule applies. Yes, there are 40 members standing and so the debate now takes place on this item. Would those wishing to stand please indicate?

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* This amendment, to which Mr Scowen has already lucidly spoken, is simply about a fundamental democratic principle. As a Synod, we have indicated that we wish to maintain the House of Laity of the deanery synods as the electoral college for diocesan bodies and the House of Laity of this body.

It creates an important principle that deanery synod membership should, therefore, be proportionate to the size of churches who are electing them in order to maintain that proportionality throughout the synodical bodies of the Church. As presently drafted, the rules do not achieve this and would allow an unreasonably wide range of variation and, in effect, privilege the votes of some church members over others simple because they attend a church of a size privileged in the diocesan scheme, wherever it is, by a particular banding.

Compare in the secular, national world, the next elections will be taking place in new constituencies taking account of the work of the Boundary Commission, seeking to equalise, as far as possible, the number of electors in each constituency. This is the result of concern at long running disparities, not least the so-called West Lothian question, which meant that constituencies north of the border typically had fewer electors than those in England. This is even without entering into the passionate arguments that could be had about proportional representation.

Internationally, we can see the puzzlement of many that the current President of the United States was elected despite gaining some three million votes less than the defeated candidate, as the result of that country's electoral college system which locks disproportionality into their voting.

This amendment is carefully drawn in order to supersede these difficulties. Without it, we will be opening ourselves to the worst practices of secular electoral gerrymandering and ignoring, in effect, the principle that we are all made equal in the sight of God and, therefore, presumably in His Church we all ought to have a proportionately equal vote.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* I too would like to support this amendment. I speak as the chairman of one of the possibly strangest deaneries in the country, the Oxford Deanery, the lay Chairman, which is in some ways a microcosm of the differences of the Church of England and also has several large churches within it.

Clearly, the differing ways in which deanery representation is calculated could have quite a dramatic difference on the membership of our deanery synod, but it is hard to imagine that that is going to have a very substantial effect on the actual operation of the deanery synod. What it will have a substantial effect on is the elections to this Synod.

If dioceses had only the membership of deanery synods and their internal functions and workings in mind, they may well come to different conclusions as to how best those should be composed in terms of representation from parishes. As has been said, that body, the deanery synod/the House of Laity, is also the electoral college for elections to this body and it makes no sense for dioceses to decide that on a disparate basis.

When various different forms of election were being considered, I initially felt that using the deanery synod as an electoral college was not the best way of doing it. I came to the conclusion that, in fact, it was the worst system until you had considered all the others. What that means is that there is going to have to be an element of compromise within the system. I think part of that compromise needs to be that the freedom of dioceses to determine their electoral systems needs to be more restricted than would have been the case if it did not have that dual role.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Speaking first as Chair of the House of Clergy, one of the problems we have with a disproportionate system is that we get lots of deanery representatives on diocesan synod from tiny churches which

are struggling and not doing very well and our larger successful churches are underrepresented and we only have a few of them because they do not get as many reps and so it screws the feeling of our diocesan synod.

The more substantial point, and the reason why I stand here, is about the credibility of this House. Time and time again, I meet political commentators who say, "Whenever the General Synod takes a decision, it is the Synod that has taken the decision not the Church". If there is any question mark over the fairness of the election to the Laity, and I speak as a member of the House of Clergy, if there is any question mark over the fairness of the election of the laity to this body it reduces our authority in the decisions that we take.

We need to hear the whole council of the Church in this place from every sort of church fairly represented. That is why I support this amendment.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* The presence of minority groups in the Church of England has often been sub-proportionate and tokenistic. Here is an opportunity to make provision for and hopefully to encourage wider representation on diocesan synods that reflects its constituents. This amendment is a simple issue of justice to which we are called, for God does not show favouritism. Look around, Synod. I am afraid to say that wise counsel has not done this thus far. I do hope we will accept this amendment.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Well, it is all seeming a bit sort of univocal at the moment, so let me offer another model of democracy. In the absence of his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, on royal business, I am reminded of the *West Wing* and all that I have learnt about American politics. Much of that can be easily forgotten, but anyone who knows how Congress works will know that there are two ways of ensuring representation.

One is the way that Congress does it, which is to elect a proportional system on the size of the population. The other is the way the Senate does it, which is to have two elected representatives per state. This is to inject a sense of checks and balances into the government of the United States. This is to ensure that minorities are heard and have a careful input into the deliberations.

My concern with this amendment is that it does not actually do what it says on the tin. In fact, some might claim it offers a way of larger churches dominating this Synod and does not allow the voices of smaller churches to be represented as effectively. It is for this Synod to decide how it wants to do that, but it seems to me that we must not just rush into this as a sort of blind way of saying there is only one way to be democratic, that there is only one way to hear minority voices.

There are many ways to hear minority voices in this Synod. We do that through ensuring that the larger churches, important though they are, do not overwhelm the large majority of our churches in this country which are small or medium sized. I would be concerned

that, by taking this amendment and accepting it, we would actually be silencing a large number of members of our Church who would not have the democratic power in order to elect members. That might privilege the larger churches and it might privilege certain traditions over others.

*Revd Paul Hutchinson (York):* Why might a diocese want to do something other than a strictly numerical system? Well, that diocese might have a substantial number of relatively small rural parishes that the diocese is wanting to encourage to simplify their administration in by amalgamating and coming together in various ways.

If you have a strictly numerical system according to the number of electors in a parish, then what that will do, say, to ten benefices being brought together into one PCC is reduce their representation from, say, 10 or 20, down to one or two, or perhaps a few more depending on the electoral roll.

Obviously, the numbers can vary but it will very substantially reduce the number of electors from small rural parishes. Sometimes, the question of amalgamating is about persuading those small parishes that they are not going to lose a voice in the life of the Church if they come together. This amendment does exactly that.

*Christina Baron (Bath & Wells):* I must tell Synod something it evidently does not know. We are not exactly democratic according to numbers. Have you not read the provision for the representation of the Northern Province which, until the Northern Province, by the grace of God, enormously increases the numbers of members of the Church of England, is overrepresented and we have written that into the way we operate?

I am not saying that is wrong but, just remember, Synod, we are not operating exactly evenly now, nor may I point out are there actually in the Church of England equal numbers of clergy and laity. Do not tell anyone but there are actually more laity. Yet, the structure of this Synod assumes that we should have equal representation. I am not entering into that argument. I am just pointing out that that is not how we structure Synod at the moment.

Furthermore, of course, the previous speaker was exactly right, in the diocese from which I have the privilege to come we have got one or two large churches with over 200 on the roll and we have got quite a few small churches with 10 or 20 on the roll. We do not want them to cease to exist and we do not want them not to be represented. We want that interest, if you like, the rural interest, which I understand that some dioceses do not have quite so strongly but it is important that it should be represented.

Let us be under no illusion. We are not running on one member one vote entirely fairly throughout the Church of England. There are very good reasons why that is so and we should not enforce it. Reject the amendment.

*A Speaker:* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 517.

*The Chair:* You were reading my mind, thank you.

*Revd Canon Gary Jenkins (Southwark):* It seems to me that deanery synod members do not represent parishes or churches but they are elected by individuals, elected by electoral roll members. I am concerned if we have a system where some electoral roll members have greater representation than others. I am a lifelong supporter of proportional representation. I believe in proportional systems.

I take the point from the Revision Committee about giving dioceses freedom, but do we want to institutionalise a freedom to have a system which is unfair and disproportionate? Let us have something that is proportionate that reflects the value of every single member of every electoral roll, a person made in the image of God, they ought to have fair representation, equal representation, irrespective of which parish they happen to worship in.

*A Speaker:* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 517.

*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 therefore put Item 517 to the vote.

*The amendment*

*Schedule 1, Rule 19, page 13, line 23, leave out paragraph (3) and insert—  
“(3) A diocesan synod must, for the purpose of securing that the number of persons elected by each parish is, as nearly as possible, proportionate to the number of names on its roll, calculate the number of persons to be elected by—  
(a) determining a number for the purposes of this paragraph (“N”), and  
(b) providing for each parish to elect one person for every N names on its roll and, where the number of names on the roll is not divisible by N without remainder, for the remainder.”*

*was put and lost on a show of hands*

## **ITEM 518**

*The Chair:* I call Mr Adrian Greenwood to move Item 518.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I beg to move

‘Schedule 1, Rule 25, page 15, line 34, leave out “23 or 24” and insert “or 23”.’

This is the shortest of all the amendments - hooray - and, I hope, the sweetest. The issue that I am addressing has already been addressed very positively by Professor Hill and by Luke Miller in his speech. It does touch on the issue of representation. It is the representation of the congregations who operate under Bishops' Mission Orders, BMOs.

We know from the Report of the Revision Committee and from the new guidance - the new code of practice from the House of Bishops on Bishops' Mission Orders - that the intention is that we give representation - they do not have it at all at the moment - in the synodical structures to the congregations of Bishops' Mission Orders. That is common ground.

In new rule 24, we have an interesting situation because the bishop directs that the diocesan synod must approve a scheme in which Bishops' Mission Orders are represented. Great. But, as currently drafted, in 25(2) that resolution to approve the scheme to do what we all want must have what is called a special majority, which is two-thirds in the House of Clergy and the House of Bishops.

That seems to me to be a bit of a nonsense. If we want it and the bishop is directing it, why not just require that the Synod approve it by an ordinary majority and not by a special majority? My very simple amendment simply removes the fact that a special majority would be needed to pass this scheme to get BMOs represented on our deanery synods. Thank you very much. I hope you will support it. It is very short, it is very sweet and it is very simple and it is easy to vote for it.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* The Steering Committee does, indeed, support this short and sweet amendment. As Mr Greenwood has explained, his amendment and the motives behind it are primarily that the requirement we have stipulated is otiose. If the diocesan synod must, should the bishop or bishops who made the BMO so direct, make a scheme to provide for representation of the Bishops' Mission Orders at deanery level, then specifying the majority to be a special majority is somewhat, if I may say so, overegging the pudding.

Even were that not so, since the diocesan synod must pass the scheme if it is to be made, certainly the special two-thirds majority makes their task harder and that has not been our intent throughout this Measure. If the Synod passes this amendment, Mr Greenwood's amendment will, in fact, require further amendments and further redrafting. For consequential and logical reasons, the Steering Committee is willing to look at those and, as I said, support the amendment.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: can I tempt you, Chairman, with a motion for closure on Item 518?

*The Chair.* I cannot be tempted at the moment because I would like to see if anybody - I open the debate on this item - would like to speak? I see no one standing. Therefore, I put to the Synod Item 518.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule 25, page 15, line 34, leave out "23 or 24" and insert "or 23".*

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

## **ITEM 519**

*The Chair.* I call Mr David Lamming to move Item 519.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I beg to move

‘Schedule 1, Rule 33, page 19, line 19, at end *insert*—

“(1A) In exercising the power under paragraph (1), the bishop must have regard to the principle that the number of members of the house of clergy of the diocesan synod and the number of members of the house of laity of the diocesan synod should be approximately equal.”

I am a member of the Revision Committee for this Measure. Might I invite members of Synod to turn to page 19 of the Measure where rule 33 is set out. May I start then by saying that this is a proposed amendment that does not relate to PCCs and so, therefore, does not relate to anything which could be modified under the provisions to enable a PCC to replace the model rules with some other rules.

This is a proposal that relates to the membership of the diocesan synod. Under rule 33(1), it is provided, as indeed the current rules provide, that the bishop of a diocese may nominate up to 10 additional members of the diocesan synod and they may be clergy or may be laity. Now, there is no guidance at the moment in either these rules or the existing Church Representation Rules as to how that power should be exercised.

The purpose of having rules is partly as a backstop and as a protection. Under the rule, as it stands, a bishop could, if he wished, nominate 10 members of the clergy to add to the diocesan synod or, alternatively, of course, 10 members of the laity. The amendment that you will see that I am proposing is that, in exercising that power, the bishop must have regard to the principle that the number of members of the House of Clergy and the House of Laity should be approximately equal. It is not prescriptive. It is to have regard to the principle. It is not laying down a hard and fast rule. What it is is consistent with the subsequent rule that provides how the diocesan synod is to determine the number of elected members of each House.

If you turn over to page 21 in rule 37, rule 37 is the rule that prescribes that the diocesan synod must, once every three years and before 31 December, decide on the number of members to be elected the following year in the elections - in fact, in the elections that, for our current diocesan synods, have been taking place over the last month or two.

At rule 37(5)(b) we read that: "When exercising its functions under this rule, a diocesan synod must act so as to ensure... (b) that the number of members of the house of clergy and the number of members of the house of laity are approximately equal".

If that is a rule which the diocesan synod must comply with when it is setting the number of elected members for each House, it seems rather odd if we have not got an equivalent provision in relation to the nominated members, at least in terms of establishing a general principle that the bishop should have regard to. I think that is really all that needs to be said about it. I would ask, Synod, that you support this particular amendment.

*The Chair.* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester):* I stand here to oppose the amendment on behalf of the Steering Committee. This amendment from David Lamming relates to the power of a bishop under rule 33 to nominate up to 10 additional members of the diocesan synod. The amendments will require the bishop to have regard to the principle that the number of members of the Houses of Clergy and Laity should be approximately equal.

Points to take. This is really not necessary. The bishop can only appoint a maximum of 10 members to the diocesan synod. Even if a bishop appointed all 10 to the same House, that will not create much of a discrepancy between the numbers in the Houses of Clergy and Laity, given that a diocesan synod will normally have at least a hundred members and probably considerably more than that. The amendment is, therefore, unduly prescriptive. Bishops should simply be trusted to get the balance right.

*The Chair.* The Steering Committee has not accepted this amendment. Therefore, the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members wishing to debate this? There are not. Therefore, this amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 520**

*The Chair.* I call Mr Lamming to move Item 520.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I beg to move

'Schedule 1, Rule 33, page 19, line 22, *leave out* "who is nominated under this Rule" and *insert* "may not be nominated under this Rule unless he or she is an actual communicant aged 16 or over; and a lay person who is so nominated".'



Might I preface what I want to say in support of this proposed amendment by reading from a press notice issued by the Church of England last Wednesday. Some of you may have seen it. "We are aware of a blog entitled 'Church of England Synod may abolish Holy Trinity to include Muslims'." Apparently, some commentators appear not to have realised that the author intended it to be a joke.

For the avoidance of doubt, this article is entirely without basis of fact and is published marked as satire. "The agenda for the July 2018 General Synod can be found here, including details of all Private Members' Motions listed for debate". Finally, this: "The Church of England remains fully committed to the doctrine of the Trinity". I think that was perhaps demonstrated initially by our opening worship on Friday.

Turning now to rule 33 and the amendment I propose, you will see that at present the only provision about a member of the laity is in rule 33(3): "A lay person who is nominated under this rule becomes a member of the house of laity of the diocesan synod".

As it stands, and it may only be theory, it could be that you could have a bishop who wanted to see a representative of another faith on the Synod who could appoint a 15-year-old Muslim and nominate that lay person to the Synod. Now you may say that is unlikely, but if we then look at equivalent provisions in the rules they are all there to ensure that someone who is a member of an elected body, be it the diocesan synod or this Synod, is over 16 and an actual communicant.

Can I invite your attention, Synod, to another rule where this is clearly specified and what the Revision Committee have said about it? If you turn to page 35 - sorry, I have got the wrong page. It is rule 47(1), "House of Laity of the General Synod". You will see in rule 47, "*Ex officio* members", "Each of the following, if not in holy orders, is an *ex officio* member of the House of Laity..." And paragraph (f), "Each member of the Archbishops' Council who is an actual communicant". So, to be a member of the Archbishops' Council and thereby to become a member of this Synod, it is not sufficient just to be a member of the Archbishops' Council, you also have to be an actual communicant.

If you then turn to page 35 of the Report of the Revision Committee, we received some representations about that. You will see at paragraph 308 of the Report, "The Committee was advised that rule 45(2) was concerned only with elected members of the House of Laity while rule 42(1)..." and these are the old rule numbers not the current rule numbers. "... was concerned with *ex officio* members. The words 'who is an actual communicant' in what is now rule 47(1)(f) were therefore required".

Now if those words were required to ensure that a lay member of this Synod is an actual communicant, why are they not also required in rule 33 to ensure that someone nominated for the diocesan synod is an actual communicant? For those reasons, in particular, members of Synod, I invite you to support this amendment. That is all I think I need to say.

*The Chair:* I, therefore, call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Revd Alyson Buxton (Lincoln):* On behalf of the Steering Committee, I oppose this amendment. This second amendment from David Lamming also relates to the power of the bishop under rule 33 to nominate up to 10 additional members of the diocesan Synod.

This amendment would mean that the bishop could not use the rule 33 power to appoint a person to the House of Laity unless that person was an actual communicant and aged over 16. In order to qualify as an actual communicant, a person's name has to be on the roll of a parish and the person must have received Holy Communion, according to the use of the Church of England, at least three times during the previous 12 months.

The amendment could, therefore, prevent a suitable representative of an ecumenical partner being appointed by the bishop as a member of the diocesan synod. We need to rely on bishops' judgments not to make unsuitable appointments.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee does not accept this amendment. Therefore, the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are 40 members standing. This item is now open for debate. Would those wishing to speak please stand?

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* I want to oppose this amendment. The reason is that Mr Lamming's logic is flawed. He has been appealing to rule 47, which quite clearly has a list of people who are going to become members of the House of Laity and it is only required that the Archbishops' Council members are actual communicants. Secondly, if we want to be consistent and simple within our rules, we should also make sure that his amendment does not include the restriction on being over 16 because, apparently, we could also choose Archbishops' Council members who are under 16.

*Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford):* The Steering Committee have already indicated that the reason why they are opposing this amendment is to allow those who are not communicant members of the Church of England to be appointed as members of diocesan synod; for example, ecumenical representatives. The question then arises, do we want people who are not communicant members of the Church of England and over 16 to be full voting members of the diocesan synod? In this Synod, we have ecumenical representatives and they are non-voting observers. They are not full voting members. Just out of consistency, it would seem to me that it would make sense to apply similar arrangements in the diocesan synod.

*Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford):* Chair, I often regret that in this debating chamber we are not allowed to intervene, as elsewhere. Of course, if we were allowed to intervene, I would have intervened on the proposal to say does not my honourable friend feel that his motion for an episcopally led Church shows scant confidence in the collective and individual judgment of our bishops?

*Ven. Malcolm Chamberlain (Sheffield):* I welcome any provision that gives possibility for representation on our synodical structures for young people, particularly as we are a Church seeking to grow younger. I think this amendment would preclude anybody under 16 being invited to serve on diocesan synods. Therefore, I oppose the amendment, welcoming the opportunity for under 16-year-olds to be elected or nominated by the diocesan bishop.

*Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich):* I oppose the amendment, but in the reply of the Steering Committee an issue came up which occurred to me that I need to draw to their attention. It was said that to be regarded as a communicant for the purposes of this, that you had to both have received Communion three times in the last year and be on the roll of a parish. This would seem to have consequences for the communicant members from the Bishops' Mission Orders and mission initiatives because they will not be on the roll of a parish.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: Chairman, after the next speaker, can I tempt you with a motion for closure?

*The Chair:* You certainly can, thank you.

*Mrs Corinne Aldis (Gloucester):* Just a clarification following on from the speaker before Sally. Yes, it is great to have young people on diocesan synod. If the bishop were to appoint someone under the age of 16 to diocesan synod, I may have missed it in the rules but are they then *ex officio* on the deanery synod and PCC and do we not have a rule that they have to be over 16 to be on those bodies? Is there a contradiction or am I just missing something in the rules?

*The Chair:* You are asking the wrong person, I am afraid.

*A Speaker:* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 520.

*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, therefore, put Item 520 to Synod.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule 33, page 19, line 22, leave out "who is nominated under this Rule" and insert "may not be nominated under this Rule unless he or she is an actual communicant aged 16 or over; and a lay person who is so nominated".*

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

## ITEM 521

*The Chair.* I call Mr Scowen to move Item 521.

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

‘Schedule 1, Rule 75, page 47, line 22, leave out paragraph (b) and insert—  
“(b) the election proceeds with the number of seats to be filled being reduced by the required given number, and  
(c) any vacancy which arises because the number of candidates in that category is less than the required given number is to be filled in accordance with Rule 73 (casual vacancies).”

Amendment 521 is about constrained elections and I can see already that even those who were formerly quite interested are beginning to glaze over. What do I mean? An example, though actually not one that would be governed by these rules, is the election of the four representatives to this Synod of the universities and TEs.

In that particular constituency, there is a constraint that at least one must come from the Northern Province and at least one must come from the Southern Province. Imagine - and this is not wholly incredible - that four candidates are nominated all from the Province of Canterbury. If the rules as they are currently proposed were to apply to that election, the consequence would be that, because no one had been nominated from the Province of York, all four seats would go to the nominated Canterbury candidates.

My proposal, by contrast, would result in an election of three members from those four candidates and the Northern Province place being left vacant to be filled in short order in a by-election, thus securing Northern Province representation. Now, this is just an example but I hope the point is clear.

Constraints are introduced to secure breadth of representation and, where they exist, a failure to get a candidate to fill the reserved place nominated first time around should not result in that place and that reservation being lost but should, instead, result in a by-election. We all know that when it comes to by-elections, when there are vacancies after the first round of elections, it does concentrate the mind and people then find candidates who had not even thought of standing the first time.

The point is, Chair, that if we want to have constraints in elections - and sometimes it is appropriate - they should have full effect and not be capable of being overridden simply because on the first attempt no candidate appears to fill that seat and it, thus, results in more members from the rest of the body serving on the body to which is being elected than was intended.

It is a simple minor change but one that I think is important if we want to follow through with the rules that we make. I move.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I am afraid this time the Steering Committee is not minded to accept this amendment. I would not want to be a one trick pony. As the Revision Committee Report, which members will have available, explains at paragraph 382, we did consider an amendment to this effect at an earlier stage in our proceedings.

However, we believed then and believe now that the overriding principle-based purpose of this Measure is to enable flexibility for governance, which is locally appropriate. The preservation of vacancies, rather than their reallocation if they cannot be filled by members of a particular category, seems to us actually to reduce the likelihood of as much local engagement as possible. If the vacancies cannot be filled in one category, we would prefer them to be filled by candidates who are otherwise eligible rather than be left empty.

We hope that this will concentrate minds at an early stage in the proceedings. Should this Measure finally receive the approval of Synod, we hope that dioceses will encourage that mental concentration. We, therefore, prefer the approach as drafted in the Measure currently and resist Mr Scowen's amendment.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee has resisted this amendment, which means that the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are not 40 members. This then lapses.

## **ITEM 522**

*The Chair:* I call Mr Scowen to move Item 522.

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

'Schedule 1, Rule M6, page 56, line 32, *leave out* paragraphs (5) and (6).'

And, finally! You might just like to think about whether you might like to get one through. Paragraphs 5 and 6 of rule M6 were added by the Revision Committee. These appear to seek to establish a norm that parochial representatives on deanery synods should only serve two terms. That is two terms of three years each. Even by modern notions of governance, that is a surprisingly short time.

While an APCM will be able to resolve that the rules should not apply to that particular parish, the clear intention is for the two-term limit to become the norm. I suggest, if that were to happen, it would lead to several presumably unintended negative consequences.

First, I suggest it is going to be rare for a new lay member of a deanery synod, at his or her first meeting, to be willing to volunteer to serve on the Standing Committee. In most people's experience, it is quite difficult to persuade people to do that after they have been on for many years.

In reality, I suggest the result of that would be that most people would be unable to serve more than one term on the Standing Committee. Even more rare would be the new member willing to stand to be lay chair at their first meeting. Unless Synods were to rely on *ex officio* members like ourselves, those of us who are in the House of Laity, lay chairs would be able to serve only one term of three years in reality and would come into that role probably never having served on a Standing Committee.

Now, in many charities we know there are term limits. Quite often, there is a rule that ordinary trustees can serve three lots of three years. Usually, there is a different rule for officers, so that a trustee who has served two or three terms can still be eligible then to serve more terms as chair or as some other officer. However, a lay chair of deanery synods, whose membership of Synod depends on her or his having been elected by their parish, would have no ability to remain on Synod as chair after her or his two terms had elapsed.

A third problem is that it would mean that the deanery synod members would only get to vote in one or, at most, two General Synod elections. It would be a constantly new and inexperienced electorate. I doubt whether that is in the best interests of stability and continuity.

It looks to me, Chair, with the greatest of respect to the Revision Committee - who in so many ways have done such a magnificent job - that the full implications of paragraphs 5 and 6 of M6 have not been fully thought through and I invite Synod to conclude that it is unwise to proceed with them. I move 522, which would result in the deletion of those two paragraphs.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond and they have up to five minutes.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I am sorry, the Steering Committee does, indeed, oppose this amendment. As Mr Scowen has explained, his proposal would - but listen up because this is, in a sense, the worst effect - remove the provisions. Having removed the provisions which require a person to stand down after having two consecutive terms of office as an elected member of deanery synod, Mr Scowen's amendment would also remove the provision which allows a parish to disapply that rule.

The purpose of the Measure, as drafted, is to mirror the provision under the Churchwardens Measure which allows precisely that disapplication should a parish wish to do so. Members of Synod will be very aware of the correlation mapped in the Church

growth research between Church growth and such factors as vacancies for new leadership to come forward.

I would, therefore, encourage the Synod to reject this amendment both on the basis of the flexibility which the Measure, as drafted, contains and on our wider desire within this Church for new membership, new life and new Christians in all our structures at all levels.

*The Chair.* The Steering Committee is resisting this amendment, which means that the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are 40 members standing. I, therefore, open the debate on this item. Would those wishing to speak please stand? Gentleman up there followed by - I have forgotten your name - lovely shirt.

*Dr Michael Todd (Truro):* I certainly support Mr Scowen's amendment with the experience that he identifies, particularly in relation to deanery synods. The situation he described is all too frequently going to occur. In other contexts, it is not as bad in terms of its effect because those elected to these posts are supported by long-term staff, but certainly in the context of deanery synods that is not the case; it is those elected to posts such as lay chair who provide that support. In my experience, particularly in rural areas, the need for long-term continuity and experience is quite critical to good governance. If you have too rapid a turnover, then there is no continuity and continuity is often very very important.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby):* Thank you, Chair, for your sartorial comments. You are a man of fine taste. I need to confess my interest as an area dean and I stand to resist the amendment. Lord Harries, formerly a member of this Synod, once described a deanery synod as a group of Anglicans waiting to go home. Many of us who are rural deans and area deans will work really very hard to ensure that deanery synods do not match that definition, but one of the things that does increase the level of tedium is the same old people saying the same old things.

We are a Church that is in need of new blood. We are a Church that needs to give the chance and the air and the opportunity for new people to make an impact and not to find that they cannot even get on to the deanery synod because the same people have been doing it for ever.

My very first encounter with a PCC was when I was elected as deanery synod member to a parish in Oxford Diocese where Lord Harries was the Bishop at the time. It was through that that my exposure to the governance of the Church of England began, but I would not have been able to do that had there been people who had always done that job and wanted to continue doing it. There is scope for this to be amended in areas where that cannot happen given the congregation and the parish that is there, so I urge the Synod to resist the amendment.

*Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark):* If this policy were to be adopted, logically it would be adopted for all levels of Church representation including this Synod. The logical conclusion is that one should serve no more than two five-year sessions on General

Synod. I do not believe that that would be beneficial for the Church, therefore, I would resist it in all cases.

*The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I think the remedying clause is 6 which Mr Scowen also wants to do away with. First of all, 5 says the person may not stand for more than two terms and then in paragraph 6 - and this is an important paragraph - "the annual parochial meeting may by resolution decide that paragraph 5 does not apply to the parish and a resolution to that effect may be brought by subsequent annual special meeting". So, friends, it is flexibility. It says 5, but if the PCC says, "This does not apply to us", they have the right to pass a resolution. This is already catered for. I would rather go with the flexibility than simply taking out the two clauses.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* I am aware time is moving on, Chair, and I wonder if you might accept a motion of closure?

*The Chair:* I might very well do that after I have had heard the next speaker.

*Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury):* I support this amendment. I am a deanery lay chair and what we are trying very hard to do is to change the culture. That takes time. We have a good group of people who work together but it takes time to build that team, and change of this kind needs to be managed, otherwise we find ourselves susceptible to doing things in the same old way instead of different ways. When you have worked together for a while, you can be much bolder.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Point of order: would you accept a motion of closure on this item?

*The Chair:* I would accept that. Would Synod accept such a motion?

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

*The Chair:* That is clearly carried. I therefore put Item 522 to the Synod.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule M6, page 56, line 32, leave out paragraphs (5) and (6).*

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

*The Chair:* The amendment is lost. I call the Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford to move Item 523.



## ITEM 523

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I beg to move

'Schedule 1, Rule M21, page 65, line 27, at end *insert-*

"(1A) For the purposes of paragraph (1), a "sufficient number" of meetings is at least three in addition to any meeting that is held only for the purpose of appointing or electing officers of the PCC or members of the standing committee; and the meetings required by paragraph (1) must, so far as practicable, be held at regular intervals."

It does feel a little bit like the Charge of the Light Brigade at the moment and this is the next regiment going in. We hope that our less-coloured shirts might mean we do not get shot down.

Here we go. I want to remind Synod of the last time we did it and when we looked at this particular piece of legislation in 2014 you agreed that we should have a minimum number of PPCs per year, and the present wording says, basically, "as required". It leaves a PCC to decide how many meetings it wants in any given year.

What has changed? Well, the legislation then was profoundly flawed and that is why the Synod quite rightly kicked it out. What we did was a bit bloody. We were like terriers chasing rats and, as the chief terrier, I do not apologise for doing that. Perhaps we have learned better manners since then. The new legislation we have here is excellent; it is wise and it is flexible. That is why it is good that it is all changing.

The other thing that has changed is that, generally speaking, PCCs have much more to do now. They are supposed to have meetings on mission, on safeguarding, on statistics collection and delivery, on governance, on financial security and all the other things that PCCs do. Why then do we need to make sure there are a minimum number of meetings per annum? The answer is that often small churches, both in the urban areas and in the countryside, are dominated by a few, their family and their friends. Sometimes their PCC meetings take place around the kitchen table. Some of them take great pride in the fact that they can get all their business done in one meeting - and they will tell you so.

The Church of England is sustained by a lot of Christian goodwill, but that Christian goodwill is fuelled by robust pragmatism. The trouble with robust pragmatism is that it often gives birth to expediency and expediency always gives birth to minor corruption. Minor corruption leads to slovenliness and sometimes deceit, and deceit gives birth to a whole list of things which can be deemed to be diabolical. I do mean that. One of the reasons why I am moving this is because I know what happens when safeguarding is not done properly in country parishes because they will not have a meeting about it. Joking apart, this is serious.

I know that no rules can prevent wickedness. However, we can help rural deans, country vicars and archdeacons to see the warning signs. We have already heard earlier on in this debate from Jenny Tomlinson about the way you can organise country parishes around a single PCC with DCCs. There is no reason at all why the vicar has to go to every PCC. You can do things another way which means local clergy are not bogged down by meetings. But I do know one thing and that is the cunning of the average Suffolk peasant. I know because I am one - and we can drive a coach and horses through this wording as it stands: how many meetings do you want? Have as many as you like or as few as you like. That is what it says and that is why we need a rule just to keep an eye on my fellow county members and others like us. The thing is if we do not do this we will be back here in 10 years' time to change this rule, but this time with a list of disasters in our memories, a list of disasters that will be financial and, in some cases, abusive.

This new legislation is great. It seeks to give us a new security system which protects the Church and encourages growth, and I am all for it. We just have to be a little bit careful in our enthusiasm to be as flexible as possible because there is always somebody, particularly in Suffolk, who knows better than we do.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio):* The proposed amendment persuasively argued by Canon Alderton-Ford was also put by him to the Revision Committee. It was rejected then and it is opposed now. Like Canon Alderton-Ford, I started life as an ignorant Suffolk peasant and looking back to those days I seem to remember a popular song which had as its refrain, "It ain't what you do, it's the way that you do it; that's what gets results". It is that thinking which underpins the version of rule M21(1) supported by the Steering Committee. What we are proposing is a test not of the number of meetings that you hold as a PCC per annum but the effectiveness of what you do. Canon Alderton-Ford has rightly said that there is range of tasks imposed upon the PCC of today, and it seems appropriate that the test of whether it is doing its job or not is whether it is effective in what it is doing and not the number of meetings which it physically holds.

Yes, there are issues about safeguarding and there are issues about a range of other important matters, but surely the test of that is whether safeguarding requirements, and all those other important requirements are adhered to, and not the number of meetings that the PCC manages to hold every year.

The amendment the Steering Committee considers is, in any event, really unenforceable, as it is only the chair that can convene the meeting under rule M21(2), and the other members of the committee are not empowered to take any action. Thus the scenario that he puts forward of the local Suffolk magnate being able to manipulate things remains unchanged, just as it remains unchanged that the magnate can organise token meetings around his kitchen table, numbering three, or however many other a year he wishes to sort out, but it causes particular problems in relation to joint councils established under a

scheme under rule M34, where PCCs are effectively put in abeyance in whole or in part while their functions are transferred to the joint council. It is perfectly unworkable to expect these residual PCCs to proceed to hold token meetings in order to comply with a rule which really has no bearing anymore because their business has been transferred elsewhere. I would therefore urge Synod not to re-impose the sort of mechanical approach which bedevilled previous debates on this subject, and to which Bishop Pete also alluded. Let us make a fresh start and direct the test - the litmus test - to the effective transaction of business rather than some sort of mechanical approach which can be easily circumvented.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee is resisting this amendment, therefore, the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are not 40 members standing, so this amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 524**

*The Chair:* We now come to the amendments at Items 524 to 526. These amendments form a group and I understand that Prebendary Cawdell will speak to them together in moving Item 524. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move

‘Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 39, after “members” insert “, unless paragraph (1A) applies”.’

The whole piece of work done by the Steering Group in GS 2046 is a remarkable piece of legislation on which I congratulate them. My amendment is simply intended as one of those areas where a light tweak is required to make it work in practice. When the previous legislation came before Synod in the last quinquennium as GS 1924, the draft contained a provision that a standing committee should have a minimum of three members. At Revision an amendment was put in in February 2014, and the debate can be found on the Report of Proceedings, Volume 45, part 1 from page 178, if you have a particularly sleepless night. As the record shows, the amendment wished to substitute in the minimum number of five members for a standing committee on the grounds of good governance and the need to prevent the capture of the PCC by a small group.

Along with Canon Martin Wood of Chelmsford, I opposed the amendment, telling Synod about one of my parishes which has a total population of 60, a Sunday congregation of nine once a month, together with the occasional stray bird, a few bats and a considerable number of deathwatch beetle holding hands to keep the floor up, and, coincidentally, a PCC of nine. Three, as I said then, is a perfectly sensible standing committee for the rare occasions when urgent matters need to be decided or a matter agreed in principle like a building project needs to be expedited in detail. Canon Wood further pointed out the difficulty that in small churches you often do not manage to fill both posts of churchwarden. Synod, at that point, you kindly agreed with me and the motion to raise

the minimum number for a standing committee to five was defeated, and the number remained at three.

I was somewhat surprised when the legislation came back to us this time around a different form and, contrary to Synod's previous decision, that it contained a minimum number of five for a standing committee in the new model arrangements for parish governance. Nor was the point on the likelihood of some smaller parishes failing to elect two churchwardens addressed.

I was further surprised on reading the Revision Committee Report at paragraph 508 to find that, in considering my submission, they felt that, even if a PCC consisted of only five members they could all be on the standing committee, a point I never raised in my submission but in fact is a *reductio ad absurdum*. Clearly, the view has been that for good governance a minimum number of five is required as a safeguard and this has lost all sight of proportionality and practicality in the context of small parishes.

My group of amendments is a compromise which seeks to enable our smallest parishes to have a normative governance structure that is appropriate to their size by a modest revision of rule M26. If passed, for most parishes the minimum number would indeed remain at five, but for those which are smallest, with the smallest PCCs as defined in rule M13(7), the appropriate number would be three.

The amendments also seek to deal with the issue of vacancies in the role of churchwarden by enabling a PCC to determine the appropriate two PCC members to join the incumbent on the standing committee. With good rural pragmatism, they will almost certainly elect the churchwardens where in post and happy to serve, but they will have the flexibility they require to ensure that governance is effective and proportionate. The steering committee may argue that this could be done by an application under the mechanism of rule 13 to the Bishop's Council. Frankly, that is unrealistic. In truth, most PCC members in a rural parish have probably never heard of the Bishop's Council and will simply ignore regulations that seem inconvenient and which would be the opposite of the good governance these regulations seek to enact.

These rules are normative and my amendments will not prevent small churches adopting a larger standing committee should they wish and will not alter the requirement for larger churches to have a greater minimum number of five that their size would merit. They will, however, bring smaller churches within the regulations at a level which is appropriate and, more importantly, operable because they will be willing to follow them.

I move my amendments.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. They have up to five minutes.

*Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle):* The Steering Committee does not wish to support these amendments and believes that weakening the provisions in the draft rules would be unwise. It clearly makes sense for the minister and churchwardens to be members of the standing committee given their level of involvement in the day-to-day affairs of the church and their leadership role. However, the Steering Committee is strongly of the view that the PCC must have the ability to appoint other members on to the committee to provide an essential level of oversight and safeguarding the interests of the wider PCC. These amendments would serve to remove this important protection.

If the standing committee were reduced to three members it would be a rather hole-in-the-corner arrangement for a body that is empowered to transact the business of the PCC between meetings. It could easily mean that the only members of this standing committee would be the minister and churchwardens without any other lay involvement on the committee. This is not good for transparency and accountability. Where there are no more than 50 people on the electoral roll, the PCC should have six elected members of the laity. The PCC could therefore have 10 or so members, including the minister, churchwardens and deanery synod members. It is not unreasonable for the standing committee to have five members and, indeed, if the PCC is only five members strong, why not let that constitute the standing committee to do that work outside of PCC meetings if necessary. We do not wish to support this amendment.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Point of order: I am not a legal expert and I have listened very carefully to the reply, but you have completely misunderstood what this man has just said. You really have.

*The Chair:* Sorry, that is not a point of order.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I know but it has to be said.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee has resisted these amendments, therefore the 40-member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are 40 members standing. We need to debate each of those amendments one-by-one so I open the debate on Item 524. Would those wishing to speak to that amendment please stand? I see no one standing. Therefore, I put item 524 to the vote.

*The Chair:* That is too close to call so we are going to have to use our little machines.

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* Point of order: can you just clarify, if Item 524 falls the two amendments fall as well?

*The Chair:* You are correct. Those other two amendments will not be moved.

I order a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 524.

The vote on Item 524: those in favour 114; against 89, with 20 recorded abstentions. The motion was carried.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 39, after “members” insert “, unless paragraph (1A) applies”.*

*was carried on a counted vote.*

## **ITEM 525**

*The Chair:* I now invite Prebendary Cawdell formally to move Item 525.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I do so move.

‘Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 39, at end *insert*—  
“(1A) If there are no more than 50 names on the roll of the parish on the date on which the annual meeting is held, the standing committee is to consist of at least three members until the conclusion of the next annual meeting.”’

*The Chair:* This matter is now open for debate. Those wishing to speak please indicate.

*The Bishop of Lynn (Rt Revd Jonathan Meyrick):* The Lynn area of the Diocese of Norwich has dozens of parishes with fewer than two churchwardens and I am quite sure that there would be huge despondency at the insistence that the standing committee had to consist of five people every time. I find it odd that the Steering Committee that has so far this afternoon done a wonderful job of standing up for small parishes appears not to get the point that this is needed this time round. I do hope that we vote for this amendment.

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* I wish to make an even simpler point endorsing what the Bishop and my brother of Hereford have said. You have voted for an amendment to make a reference to paragraph 1(a). If you do not support this amendment, there will be no paragraph 1(a) for the previous clause to refer to! I urge you to support the amendment.

*Revd Canon Sally Gaze (Norwich):* I am a member of the Revision Committee. I was formerly a team rector and one of my PCCs had four members, a churchwarden who was already also secretary, a treasurer, who did not go to church, and two other members, one of whom was in hospital. If you stick to five members of the standing committee, what would we have done in terms of making decisions? The Archdeacon at the time whose advice was sought did not want the PCC to close. So, I urge you vote for the amendment.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: after the next speaker, would you be minded to accept a motion of closure?

*The Chair:* That would be lovely, thank you.

*Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* Just one small point, if we pass this, that the Steering Committee may need to consider on final drafting. This assumes, I think, that the parish is going to hold a PCC meeting immediately after the annual meeting in order to elect the officers and standing committee, and there is provision for such a meeting in the rules, which does not of course require an agenda to be distributed but it requires the 10-day notice. If the PCC is not held immediately after the annual parochial church meeting, how does this affect the continuity of the standing committee? If we do pass this, I would invite the Steering Committee to look at that when it comes to consequential drafting amendments.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: would you accept a motion of closure?

*The Chair:* I do not see anybody standing - only you! I therefore put Item 525 to the vote.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 39, at end insert—*

*“(1A) If there are no more than 50 names on the roll of the parish on the date on which the annual meeting is held, the standing committee is to consist of at least three members until the conclusion of the next annual meeting.”*

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

*The Chair:* I now invite Prebendary Cawdell to move Item 526.

## **ITEM 526**

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I do so move.

*‘Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 42, before “each” insert “unless paragraph (1A) applies,”*

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate.

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* Point of order: motion for closure on this item.

*The Chair:* I think I would like to hear one view and Tim is standing.

*Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells):* Just to clarify a point of confusion that I think occurred earlier when one of the amendments was being resisted, the idea that there would be no

churchwardens as a result of this. This amendment suggests that we do not automatically appoint a churchwarden but then we appoint two other people and one of those could well be a churchwarden. Therefore, there is a good opportunity that the three people would be the incumbent churchwarden and one other lay member and so, therefore, there would be additional lay membership.

*The Chair.* I see no one standing. I, therefore, put Item 526 to the Synod.

*The motion*

*Schedule 1, Rule M29, page 69, line 42, before “each” insert “unless paragraph (1A) applies,”*

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

## **ITEM 527**

*The Chair.* I now invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 527, “That Schedule 1 [as amended] stand part of the Measure”.

*Canon Dr Addy Lazz-Onyenobi (Manchester):* I do so move.

‘That Schedule 1 [as amended] stand part of the Measure’.

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put Item 527, “That Schedule 1 [as amended] stand part of the Measure”, to the Synod.

*The motion*

*That Schedule 1 [as amended] stand part of the Measure.*

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

## **Item 528**

*The Chair.* No notice has been given of amendments to the remaining Schedules and no member has given notice of an intention to speak against either of them. I, therefore, invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 528, “That Schedules 2 and 3 stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That Schedules 2 and 3 stand part of the Measure’.



*The Chair.* This is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put to the Synod Item 528, “That Schedules 2 and 3 stand part of the Measure”.

*The motion*

*That Schedules 2 and 3 stand part of the Measure.*

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

## **ITEM 529**

*The Chair.* I, therefore, invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 529, “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* This is the exciting bit. I do so move.

‘That the Long Title stand part of the Measure’

*The Chair.* Anyone want to talk about that?

*Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark):* This moment should not pass, I do not think - because we have had a long afternoon - without paying tribute to those who do this work for us and particularly to those who do the due diligence of reading all this stuff and bringing matters to our attention for our consideration. Whilst we should be grateful to Prebendary Cawdell and David Lamming and Adrian Greenwood and Jonathan Alderton-Ford, I think we should be particularly grateful to Clive Scowen for his diligence and I would like to pay tribute to him from this bench.

*The Chair.* I see no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 529 to the Synod, “That the Long Title stand 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 Church Representation and Ministers Measure. The Measure now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its Final Drafting.

## ITEM 530

*The Chair.* We now take the Revision Stage for Draft Amending Canon No. 39. I invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 530, “That paragraphs 1 and 2 stand part of the Canon”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That paragraphs 1 and 2 stand part of the Canon’

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put to the Synod Item 530, “That paragraphs 1 and 2 stand part of the Canon”.

*The motion*

*That paragraphs 1 and 2 stand part of the Canon*

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

## ITEM 531

*The Chair.* I call the Revd Prebendary Simon Cawdell to move his amendment, Item 531.

*Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford):* I beg to move

‘Paragraph 3, after sub-paragraph (3) *insert—*

“(3A) After paragraph 1, insert—

“1A. The reading of Morning and Evening Prayer as required by Canon B 11 may be dispensed with on a general basis for a diocese if the bishop has made such alternative provision for daily prayer as may best serve to sustain the corporate spiritual life of the benefices in the diocese and the pattern of life enjoined upon ministers by Canon C 26. In making alternative provision as mentioned in this paragraph, the bishop must be satisfied that there is good reason for doing so and shall ensure that no church ceases altogether to be used for public worship.”

Chair, in their Report (GS 2046YY/2047YY) at paragraph 602 the Steering Committee has actually given us a very wonderful gift. In the midst of this day of somewhat mind numbing if important legislative business, they have suggested this amendment, in fact, and that we talk about how we pray as a Church together. How splendid.

Before I introduce the spiritual and practical reasons for considering this amendment which they offered, I need to emphasise what it is not. This amendment, despite its use

of the phrase “dispense with”, is not about the abolition of daily prayer in benefices around England.

Any attempt to caricature this motion as a diminution of the duty upon the parish priest to foster and encourage the corporate life of prayer in parishes simply could not be further from the truth. It is, in the spirit of the rest of this legislation, about enabling creative conversations to take place across the Church so that churches may develop appropriately nurturing patterns of prayer that are both robust in their intent and engaging to their community in congregation.

It has long been the canonical provision that morning and evening prayer should be said in each parish on a daily basis. This has been moved to a benefice basis. I love the Daily Office, which is set corporately in the civic church of the benefice of which I am team rector by the staff and where we may be joined by parishioners.

The present benefice consists of a market town and eight other villages, but in my previous more rural benefice of two churches I have to say I spent years saying morning prayer in church after ringing the bell - “we do like to hear you ringing the bell, vicar” - and can report that I was only joined in the activity by a parishioner on less occasions in 12 years than I have fingers.

I do not wish to imply that the parishioners avoided prayer, but that this was a form which did not suit and that the attempt to maintain it could have become deeply dispiriting as a result. There will be many here who will wish to affirm that they find the discipline of the office greatly nurturing, but anecdotal conversations also suggest that the present provision is more honoured in the breach than in the observance, particularly as regards evening prayer.

The necessities of ministry all too often render the timetables for public worship unworkable for the regularity of formal public prayer at both ends of the day and herein lie the difficulties. First, while this is a canonical provision, it is a possibility that parishioners who wish to complain about their minister may find an easy target in pointing out a lack of diligence in saying evening prayer in particular.

Indeed, it would be a failure in the obligations of office with the possibility of significant penalties which might be levied against clergy who are otherwise, in fact, hardworking and missionally active. Indeed, the fact that clergy were probably overworking in other ways helpful to the Church might be the actual problem in failing to achieve the standard. In short, it is a grenade in the hand of a vexatious complainant.

Secondly - and here I speak both as a chair of clergy and as a member of the Wellbeing Working Party - there is a possibility that the failure to meet a standard, which is best achieved perhaps in other ways in your context as regards promoting corporate prayer in the parish is simply another demoralising weight to the conscientious cleric.

This amendment is framed to allow a bishop to have a creative conversation with clergy and parishioners as to how the expectation of the Canon as to how the daily corporate life of prayer in our communities is best achieved. The Canons already allow the dispensation provision upon application by a parish or benefice and this simply widens the conversation.

The amendment is clear that the bishop must be satisfied that the provisions for daily prayer will remain in place and, further, that no church will cease to be a place where worship takes place regularly. If it were to pass, I would hope and even expect the House of Bishops would produce some guidelines that gave creative assistance. This would be a significant encouragement to Church members throughout the country in each diocese where the provision was exercised and a mechanism where and why best practice could be achieved.

Even if Synod chooses not to pass this amendment at the present moment, I hope that we may have a debate now which begins a conversation to be followed up by the House further, encouraging our daily corporate worship in intersession together, as we seek to sing the praise of our Lord and our God in our diverse communities in the 21st century in ways which are nurturing, creative and sustainable. I beg to move the amendment in my name.

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to respond. You have up to five minutes.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I am afraid that the Steering Committee does not support this amendment. Members will find our reasoning set out in paragraphs 598 following of the Revision Committee Report and I summarise them now.

First, we do not consider that the saying or singing of morning and evening prayer in one church in every benefice daily to be unduly onerous. If no one, lay or ordained, can be found to pray, application for dispensation can already be made to the bishop under Canon B 14A.

Further, the Steering Committee feels, as the Revision Committee Report sets out, that to relax the requirement for daily morning and evening prayer further than already provided for in the Amending Canon would amount to a fundamental change in what is supposed to be the normal worshipping pattern of the prayer life of the Church of England and we remain of the view that we have no mandate to make such a change.

Since the Revision Committee last met and our Report was drafted, questions at Synod have also, as members will be aware, moved matters on. I remind members of the Bishop of Willesden's answer to question 50, in which he says that the saying of morning and evening prayer in at least one church in each benefice should be achievable. He went on to say, "I very much hope that bishops will actively encourage their clergy and laity to promote this ministry of daily public prayer and to share responsibility for it. Where

appropriate, this could include the bishop authorising lay people to officiate at these services, a very helpful way of growing the corporate spiritual life of our parishes”.

Very often, where the daily offices are said, people come. Not always but often. We are a Church concerned for growth. We are a Church concerned for people for whom Sunday mornings are not easy: families, shift workers and so on. So, seize the opportunity to diversify the offering of worship. Have morning and evening prayers at times when people can come. If there are none, pray - as Canon Cawdell has evidently faithfully done - in the church anyway.

It may be that one of the reasons our cathedrals are so successful is that they are houses of prayer, topped up, if you like, almost like a spiritual battery, regularly two, three times a day. If it is really impossible, ask the bishop for a dispensation and ask the bishop to pray for you more hard.

In the meantime, if I am honest, it is quite hard to see how Canon Cawdell's amendment is not exactly what he says it is not, an attempt to move away from twice daily patterns of morning and evening prayer in our parish churches, at least in every church in the benefice.

Common Worship is immensely flexible. I urge people to make the most of that flexibility. If our ministerial timetables make twice daily prayer impossible, as I say to myself not infrequently, it is the timetable and not the prayer which needs reconsideration.

Accordingly, while we were, not least because of the very impassioned views of one of our members, willing to see Mr Cawdell's proposed amendment suggested through the Revision Committee as a way to test the mind of Synod, the Steering Committee does not think this is an appropriate move and we urge Synod to resist the amendment.

*The Chair:* The Steering Committee is resisting this amendment. Therefore, the 40 member rule applies. Are there 40 members standing? There are not 40 members standing. Therefore, this amendment lapses.

## **ITEM 532**

*The Chair:* I call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 532, “That paragraph 3 stand part of the Canon”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That paragraph 3 [as amended] stand part of the Canon’.

*The Chair:* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. Therefore, I put this item to the Synod, “That paragraph 3 stands part of the Canon”.

*The motion*

*That paragraph 3 [as amended] stand part of the Canon.*

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

## **ITEM 533**

*The Chair.* I call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 533, “That paragraphs 4 to 9 stand part of the Canon”.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘That paragraphs 4 to 9 stand part of the Canon’.

*The Chair.* This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I, therefore, put Item 533 to the Synod, “That paragraphs 4 to 9 stand part of the Canon”.

*The motion*

*That paragraphs 4 to 9 stand part of the Canon.*

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

*The Chair.* That completes the Revision Stage of Draft Amending Canon No. 39. The Canon now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its Final Drafting. As is now our way, I have the joy of announcing for myself and for you a comfort break of 10 minutes. A bell will be rung one minute before you are expected back in this chamber, so go and enjoy every minute. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 5.30 pm.

*The Chair.* Member of Synod, before we move to our next item of business, it may help if I explain how the Synod’s business will unfold after we have completed the legislative business. Following this item, we shall move to Item 23, the Carlisle Diocesan Synod Motion on the NHS. Thereafter, there is no timed business but Synod has already agreed to move Item 24, the Presentation from the Church Commissioners, to tomorrow. Item 25, a Report from the Archbishop’s Evangelism Task Group, will only be taken if time permits.

## ITEM 511

### **DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) (NO. 2) MEASURE (GS 2104)**

*The Chair.* We move now to Item 511, the snappily titled, “Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure”, which is before the Synod for First Consideration. Members will need the draft Measure (GS 2104) and the Explanatory Memorandum (GS 2104X). The Eighth Notice Paper contains a financial statement relating to this item on page 4.

I hope that members will agree with me that it is a special treat to have before us the second Miscellaneous Provisions Measure of the day and that there is absolutely no truth in the suggestion that to have one Miscellaneous Provisions Measure on the agenda in one day may be regarded as a misfortune, to have two looks like carelessness. Fortunately, the Chair of the Steering Committee was not Lady Bracknell!

I now invite the Archdeacon of Moseley and Sefton, the Venerable Pete Spiers, to move Item 511, “That the Measure entitled ‘Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure’ be considered for revision in committee”. Archdeacon, you have up to 10 minutes.

*Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* I beg to move

‘That the Measure entitled “Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure” be considered for revision in committee’.

Just when you thought it was safe, another Miscellaneous Provisions comes along. This is the thirteenth in a series and we are amending specific provisions and various Measures that do not merit separate freestanding legislation. As has already been explained, there is an Explanatory Memorandum (GS 2104X) which gives more detail about the proposed amendments and I wish to go through it now for you clause by clause.

Just to remind you, clause 1 would permit bishops to ordain a member of a religious community without providing that person with a parochial office and, two, to grant a licence to an ordained member of a religious community to exercise ministry in the diocese in connection with the work of that religious community, provided that any such licence does not include the solemnising of marriage, which is a parochial duty.

Clause 2 provides for the creation of a national clergy register. One of the recommendations made in the Report of the Independent Peter Ball Review was that the Church should introduce arrangements for a national register of clergy with permission to officiate.

Following careful consideration, it was decided that a register of only those clergy whose authority to exercise ministry took the form of permission to officiate would be of limited practical utility. Accordingly, this draft Measure proposes the creation of a national clergy register which includes all clergy with the authority to exercise ministry.

The draft Measure provides for the Archbishops' Council to make regulations with the approval of the General Synod, specifying what information must be provided to the Archbishops' Council, such as names, addresses, the form of authority to exercise ministry, the area, place or activity to which the authority relates and any limitation on the authority's time. The Archbishops' Council would be required to use this information to compile and maintain the register.

The regulations may extend the register to include lay people with authority to exercise ministry. The Archbishops' Council would also have a duty to publish sufficient information to enable a member of the public to discover whether any individual has authority to exercise ministry. However, the personal details of clergy would not be made public.

Clause 3 would enable an ecclesiastical court to exempt a party to proceedings from or to reduce court fees to ensure that access to the ecclesiastical courts is not dependent on an individual's financial circumstances. It would bring ecclesiastical courts in line with the temporal courts where there are statutory provisions providing exemptions from or reductions in court fees for persons of limited means.

Clause 4 would confer a power on the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England or on a cathedral's own fabric advisory committee to vary or revoke, one, approvals for cathedral building works or, two, conditions on which such approval was given, including where it becomes apparent that an approval was given in error. This new power is needed as, at present, neither approval body has the power to vary or revoke an approval or a condition attached to an approval once it has been granted.

If a chapter wishes to alter a proposal once it has been approved, the statutory approval process must be repeated in its entirety. This can be disproportionate and onerous, particularly where the alterations requested differ little in substance from what was previously approved. In addition, if a condition attached to an approval is no longer capable of being met on its original terms, neither of the approval bodies can amend or remove the condition once the approval to which it is attached has been issued.

Clause 5 provides a mechanism for cathedrals to build on disused burial grounds. The Disused Burial Grounds Act 1884 - I am sure you are familiar with it - makes it unlawful to erect any building on a burial ground no longer used for internments, except for the purpose of enlarging a church. As a result, some cathedrals are unable to use land in their precincts in a way that best furthers their mission. A faculty could now be granted for parochial burial grounds to authorise building that would otherwise be prohibited by the 1884 Act, provided certain conditions are met.



The draft Measure would enable cathedrals to overcome this prohibition by conferring power on the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England to approve the erection of freestanding buildings on disused cathedral burial grounds, subject to one of the two following alternative conditions which are similar to those applying to parochial burial grounds. First, that no internments have taken place in the land on which the building is to stand within the past 50 years; or, two, if there have been any internments within the past 50 years no personal representative or relative of any person who has been buried in the land during that period has objected or any such objection has been withdrawn.

Clause 6 provides that, instead of the diocesan synod making a scheme to appoint persons approved by the diocesan advisory committee to inspect churches in the diocese, the diocesan scheme provides for the PCC of each parish to be able to appoint their own inspector. The PCC would need to consult the DAC before appointing an inspector who would have to have the necessary qualifications and experience recommended at any guidance issued by the Church Buildings Council.

Clause 7 amends the Parochial Registers and Records Measure 1978 to permit but not require a service register to be maintained in electronic form or in any form approved by General Synod.

Clause 8 amends the definition of “records” and “records in parochial custody”. The existing definition has led some diocesan record offices to consider that framed photographs displayed in a church had to be deposited in the record office if they were over a hundred years old. The new definition of “records” expressly excludes anything which is or has been fixed to the fabric of a church.

Clause 9 would facilitate the delegation of statutory functions by both the Church Commissioners and the Cathedrals Fabric Commission for England to one of their respective offices.

Clause 10 would limit the terms of office of the chair and members of a diocesan advisory committee to a maximum of two successive terms. As terms of office last six years, the new provisions would prevent a person from holding office continuously for more than 12 years. A person who has held two successive terms of office becomes eligible for reappointment after not having held office for one complete term of six years. The Church Buildings Council will have power in a particular case to authorise the reappointment of a person who has held two successive terms of office and who would otherwise not be eligible for reappointment.

Finally, clause 11 amends the Constitution of the General Synod so that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity are no longer officially styled “Prolocutor” and “Pro-Prolocutor”. We are sure that there will be improvements and refinements which members of Synod would wish to propose and to suggest to us and, assuming that you are content that this should proceed to revision, we would encourage you to submit

proposals to the clerks so that they can be considered in due course by the Revision Committee. I am delighted to be able to move Item 511.

*The Chair:* The motion at Item 511 is now open for debate. I remind members that, under Standing Order 51, speeches must be directed to the general purport of the Measure rather than to points of detail, though I have to say given the nature of the draft Measure I intend on this occasion to interpret the Standing Order generously. I know you will not get used to that.

*Rt Worshipful Charles George (ex officio):* I welcome, unlike perhaps other members of Synod, the luxury of this second Miscellaneous Provision and I congratulate the Legal Department on the acuity with which they have discovered so many more loopholes that need to be filled by appropriate legislation.

I must declare a financial interest in respect of clause 3 concerning remission of statutory fees because this will include the fees payable in the two appellate courts in which I preside. Whilst it is plainly desirable that there should be a power to grant exemption from, reduction to and remission of fees in whole or in part, the question arises as to who should bear the cost of fees foregone as a result of such orders. It does not seem fair that ecclesiastical judges and registrars should have to make up the shortfall which should surely be made up rather by the relevant diocesan board of finance.

Since this provision is said to be modelled and derived from what happens in the secular courts, their, of course, central funds make up the consequences of any remission of fees. If this is to be the case, then should not there be a provision for it in the primary legislation, it being doubtful whether suitable provision could be made under a fees order, nor would it be appropriate that the matter be simply left to the discretion/generosity of DBFs? There needs to be a specific statutory provision.

The second matter I would want to address very briefly is clause 8. I confess, rather ashamedly, that I only recently became aware that there was such a thing as the Parochial Registers and Records Measure 1978, but when this very issue, which is the subject of the provision in clause 8, came up at a recent meeting of the Legal Advisory Commission of General Synod, the various, I think, quite distinguished lawyers present were unable to reach a consensus as to the meaning of the present legislation, which shows precisely how necessary it is to have the revision and the clarification which is proposed by clause 8 as presently worded.

*Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford):* Chair, I just want to make some very brief comments on this Measure in my capacity as Chair of the Church Buildings Council and I want to say very brief words about clauses 6 and 10. Clause 6, which deals with quinquennial inspection, the main point about this change is to allow other suitably accredited and experienced professionals to do QI work for two reasons. First, it opens and will open up the field for more professionals to do this work. There is a dearth in some areas and many experienced inspectors will soon retire.

Actually, also, an important reason is that if we do not make the change as proposed in the Measure we will almost certainly be sued and taken to judicial review because the present arrangements clearly violate existing competition law and there is a real threat from the Chartered Institute of Architectural Technicians and they have the backing of others. The changes that are proposed in this clause are evolutionary but we do need to make the system modern and judicial review proof, protecting both dioceses and the national Church.

Clause 10, on limiting the term of service on diocesan advisory committees of the care of churches, provides me with the opportunity, first, to say on behalf of the Church Buildings Council, and I am sure the whole Church, a huge thank you to those people who do serve on diocesan advisory committees and the expertise that they offer.

I think we have got to find a kind of balance here between ensuring that diocesan advisory committees have the expertise that they need and require to carry out their work on the one hand, but that they do not become a sort of secret garden on the other which sort of becomes kind of impenetrable. By trying to ensure that there is a reasonable turnover of membership, one is trying to seek to get that balance right.

Can I just explain to Synod, as these changes will only apply to new appointments the first time it will actually affect a DAC's appointments process will be 2032 and so it is hardly revolutionary. I am hoping that between now and then we will certainly see England in the finals of a lot more World Cup appointments.

This is real touch on the tiller stuff of trying to encourage DACs to find people to come forward to fill vacancies on DACs and that the norm should be that people do not serve for longer than 12 years on a DAC. As a fall-back and as a failsafe, if a DAC or a diocese says, "Look, we really cannot find a person, this person needs to stay for more than 12 years", well, then there is a provision for them to apply to the CBC to give them that freedom.

I hope that, when it comes to it, Synod will see the wisdom and value of these two kind of modest reforms, which I hope will help with the work of looking after the care and maintenance of our churches.

*Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln):* The contents of the draft Measure look entirely sensible, but there are some areas which I think we should take the opportunity to strengthen and go a bit further. In Saturday's safeguarding debate, I argued that readers - and, yes, I am still a reader - and others who hold the bishop's licence or PTO should be held to the same high standards as clergy.

Clause 2 of the draft Measure allows the proposed national register of clergy to be extended by the Archbishops' Council to include others in authorised ministry. I would

like to see that strengthened so that all lay persons, who are licensed or hold PTO for what would otherwise be a licensed position, must be included in that register.

As we have been reminded, clause 7 provides for the use of an electronic service register in our churches - good - but part of what has to be recorded in it continues to be, in the words of Canon F 12, the alms and other collections. Now, in my own parish church, the open plate collections represent something like 5% of the regular and planned giving. The other 95% comes through stewardship envelopes, which have to be carefully processed separately from the open plate and separately recorded, or by bank standing order which cannot be assigned to a single service.

Rather than requiring alms and other collections to be recorded in the service book, the electronic service book in future, would it not be better to require that they be recorded in some auditable manner within the PCC accounts and to rely solely on that?

Then clause 10 introduces a limitation on the number of successive terms a person may serve as DAC chair, as DAC member, as Tony Baldry has just reminded us. I suspect that there are other aspects in the structure and operation of DACs that would bear attention, such as perhaps having a proportion of the members that need to be appointed to that committee to be appointed each year rather than all being appointed at once every six years. I would ask dioceses to be actively consulted in the changes they would like to see in this part of the legislation.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I speak as a member of the Southwark DAC and of the Legislative Committee of this Synod. My comments relate to clause 10 of the draft Measure and I have one request covering both clauses 6 and 10. The proposals, as we have heard, limit the length of service for DAC members after 2032. There are good reasons for this.

It is usual charity practice and, as I have argued elsewhere, a turnover in membership allows for new talent to come on board. However, a DAC is not a governance body and, more importantly, as far as I am aware, there has been no consultation leading to these provisions. The archdeacons on General Synod have had a canter around this Measure and I think it is fair to say - and others may get the opportunity to tell you this - we are not of one mind. The same doubtless applies to bishops and DAC chairs and secretaries across the country. Consultation which could be conducted electronically need not be onerous or costly.

The draft Measure before us is unlikely, I think, to be the last Miscellaneous Provisions Measure into which provisions could be inserted. It is not clear to me that the mischief to be corrected by these proposals will burden the Church greatly if time is taken for consultation. Do you know, I really think we can get this done before 2032.

My request, therefore, is, I hope, simple. Could the provisions at clauses 6 and 10, which would affect DACs, be removed from this draft Measure to allow for wider consultation

after which Synod may again consider their purpose and perhaps other matters pertinent to the good running and effective exercise of the powers of our DACs?

*The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker):* Speaking to clause 1 of the Measure on religious communities, simply to remind Synod - particularly anybody who was not here on Friday evening when we discussed the Amending Canon No. 40 - it is very common to have a Measure and an Amending Canon going hand-in-hand with each other.

We did not feel it necessary to have a completely separate Measure for the bits of the religious communities that need to go into a Measure rather than a Canon, so clause 1 of this Miscellaneous Provisions Measure does those things that need to be done by Measure rather than by Canon. This needs to walk hand-in-hand with the Canon on the religious communities that is working its way through, to which you kindly gave strong support at First Consideration on Friday evening. So, please, do support this equally strongly.

*Ms Alison Fisher (Leeds):* Just a very quick observation on clause 11. I am delighted to see that the term "chairman" is deemed an outdated term. I just want to say that, I hope, whenever we have an opportunity to look at anything that we do write or say, that we consider language and outdated terms.

*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* I am grateful for two alignments into modernity or even post-modernity; clause 2, and you will not be surprised that Liz and I will just reflect on clause 11. Clause 2, of course, is something that I have spoken about in this Synod in relation to a national clergy register on a number of occasions. The real push to bring this idea and concept in has been the wonderful Report by Dame Moira Gibb.

I speak as a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group. This would align with my other role in general practice where, as a general practitioner, I am both required to register with the General Medical Council but also to be on the National Performers List, in my case the Medical Performers List - which I recently left but I did so voluntarily to do other work.

To be a general practitioner, certainly in England, you need to be on the Performers List, which guarantees that you do safeguarding training, that you are in good standing in your practice, that there are no complaints of note against you and that you are trying your best to keep up-to-date. It stabilises the system. It makes clear to others who can look you up online at any minute of any day to show that you are truly who you claim to be.

I am with Nigel Bacon. I am very content for the need to be some similar register for licensed laity. I do encourage that and I am sure, as we go through the revision, we may need to come back to that with some of the technical concerns about how you keep such a register up-to-date and who is responsible and how it is accessed. That is clause 2, a serious point.

At clause 11, perhaps the last speaker makes a clear point about “chair”, “chairman” and so on. This again brings us up-to-date to where we should be. This goes back, I believe, to the Synodical Government Measure of 1969 - which I am sure again you are all familiar with - which brought into birth the General Synod in 1970.

Of course, that is where this terminology comes from, where it was stated that there would be a Chairman and that there would be a Vice-chairman and they would be called the Prolocutor and the Pro-Prolocutor of the House of Laity. Well, of course, it is great to have Prolocutors next to us here as we sit in the corner, but I think we are delighted to be called whatever we are going to be called, Chair and Vice-Chair.

*Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans):* Point of order: Chairman, after the next speaker can I tempt you with a motion for closure on Item 511?

*The Chair:* I think I might be tempted.

*Revd Tim Goode (Southwark):* I join Jane Steen in expressing a personal interest as a member of the Southwark DAC. I wish to speak to clause 6. My reading of clause 6 is that the PCC will have ultimate responsibility, in the end, for choosing their inspecting architect.

Well, each PCC in the Church of England is unique in make-up and may have a wide range of motivations regarding the choice of a quinquennial inspector. DACs are that one step removed from the internal politics of any particular parish and may, therefore, provide unbiased advice and continuity of vision.

Need I state that the quinquennial inspection and report, whilst they are primarily to benefit parishes - and, of course, are paid by them - is a requirement of Canon law overseen by the diocese to ensure that churches are passed on from generation to generation in good physical order. Surely this responsibility of oversight should rest with the diocese ensuring reasonable governance measures are in place while maintaining and ensuring consistent standards of inspecting and reporting.

*Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans):* Point of order: motion of closure on this item.

*The Chair:* That has my consent. I put the motion of closure on Item 511 to the Synod.

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

*The Chair:* I invite the Chair of the Steering Committee to respond to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

*Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* Thank you all very much for your contributions. That has clearly begun to sketch out the ground for our work. It was good to hear appreciation for

the work of the Legal Department of General Synod, because they do a fantastic job. Thank you very much, Charles, for highlighting that. On your particular point about legal fees and if they were remitted, who would bear the cost of that, that is something the Fees Advisory Commission could take into account and certainly we could discuss whether to put it on the face of the Measure.

On the quinquennial inspection for a PCC, it is the responsibility of the PCC and not the diocese to appoint an architect. We need to try to think through carefully about PCC responsibility and diocesan responsibility and how they fit together. I am responding to Tim Goode's last point.

Yes, we are trying to get that balance, as Tony Baldry pointed out, between expertise on the one hand and turnover and fresh blood on the other hand. We do not need to wait until 2032. It is quite simple: if after a term of six years a bishop decides not to renew someone's appointment, they can simply say, "I am not going to renew", so it could be a lot less than 12 years.

Nigel Bacon, thank you for your comments on the clergy register. The issue with that is that we would need to get dioceses to tell us who has been authorised for lay ministry, and that might take a little bit longer for us to get around to. We could perhaps start off with clergy and move on to lay people. That is certainly something we would discuss. The idea of recording giving separately and not straight into the service register was an intriguing one.

Thank you to the Bishop of Manchester for your comments on religious community and to Alison Fisher for reminding us about outdated terms. We have already seen that earlier on this afternoon where some members of Synod thought Bishops were "he" when they are "she" as well. It is important that we get our use of language right on this one and get into reality.

Thank you, Jamie Harrison, for welcoming your new title. We will hope that you will enjoy that for many years to come.

Please write into it us if you have any other comments to make and the Steering Committee behind me would welcome reading them and perhaps hearing you at the Revision Committee stage if you vote for it.

*The Chair:* We now move to vote on Item 511.

*The motion*

*That the Measure entitled "Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure" be considered for revision in committee.*

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

*The Chair:* That is very clearly carried. The draft Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the Agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than Friday 10 August. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Stockport (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 6.04 pm.

**ITEM 23**  
**SPECIAL AGENDA IV**  
**DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTION**  
**LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE**  
**(GS 2089A AND GS 2089B)**

*The Chair:* Synod, now for something completely different. We come to Item 23, Special Agenda IV, Diocesan Synod Motion, Long-Term Sustainability of the National Health Service. Synod will want paper GS 2089A and may want the background note GS 2089B and Order Paper V for sight of the amendments.

I call James Newcome, Bishop of Carlisle, to move this item. You may speak for up to 10 minutes, but I would be grateful if you did not need them all.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* I beg to move

'That this Synod:

- a) welcome and commend the report The Long-Term Sustainability of the NHS and Adult Social Care published in April 2017 by the House of Lords Select Committee on the Long-term Sustainability of the NHS; and
- b) call upon Her Majesty's Government to implement the recommendations made by the Select Committee, giving particular consideration to:
  - (i) the problems arising from the use of urban models of strategic care in the rural context;
  - (ii) whether social care is being adequately funded in the context of an ageing population; and
  - (iii) whether sufficient resources are being given to the recruitment, outside larger urban centres, of experienced and highly qualified health professionals.'

I am very grateful indeed for this opportunity to introduce a Carlisle Diocesan Synod Motion on the long-term sustainability of the NHS and social care, not least because I had the privilege of being a member of the ad hoc Lords Select Committee which produced the report that we will be debating.



The Government has now issued a response. It had not in February when this was contingency business, but it is not a response with which we are entirely happy, and members of the Select Committee, including me, were able to make that clear in a recent House of Lords debate on this subject.

If you have been able to read the report, you will know that it reflects an absolute commitment to the NHS, which, as you know, has just celebrated its 70th anniversary. It also reflects our admiration for those who work in it. The NHS is rated as one of the best health services in the world. It also reflects our desire to see the principles which led to its foundation being maintained and strengthened. As you probably know, it represented Beveridge's attack on the five great evils of physical want, disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness, and we might now add loneliness as a contemporary scourge. It was to be free at the point of need for every citizen and was rooted in a passion for social justice, not least in the north of England.

The report also expresses the very clear impression we gained that very few people were looking ahead any further than the next election, apart perhaps from Simon Stevens, Chief Executive of NHS England with his Five-Year Forward View. Health, like education and housing, has become something of a political football, with major decisions determined by electoral considerations. We were concerned with where the NHS will be in 10, 15 or even 20 years' time, when, in my case, I will be one of the rapidly growing number of elderly (if I last that long) and my grandchildren will be grown up.

Having heard and read a huge amount of evidence, we were all very conscious of the fact that to every complex question - and you cannot get much more complex than the NHS - there is one simple answer, which is usually wrong!

I suppose the simple answers that have been offered in the past include more money, less or better management, technological innovation and emphasising prevention rather than cure so that the NHS becomes a wellness service rather than a sickness service. On their own, none of those will ensure the long-term sustainability of the NHS but, taken together, they are all necessary and valuable and will make a very important contribution to healthcare in this country in the future.

In Cumbria, where I live, our GPs were recently voted the best in the country so we have much to be thankful for but, like everybody else, we have our own particular healthcare issues such as maternity provision, and although this motion was to some extent prompted by our local concerns, it is not specifically about them despite the somewhat oblique references in section 2. Rather, we have deliberately focused on long-term sustainability, which affects everyone.

Returning to the Select Committee report, we explored a whole series of topics which were not exhaustive but which we felt were most significant in the long term. They included service transformation. Everybody agrees, and they have agreed for years, on the pressing need for a more coherent integration of services across the board, especially

between health and social care. Thousands of (usually) elderly patients block hospital beds because there is no adequate social care provision for them, and that puts a huge pressure on the NHS. We looked at some of the 44 sustainability and transformation plans (STPs as they are known) in the country, especially in Greater Manchester whose STP has been outstandingly successful. We also analysed the small business model of general practice which, in our view, needs to be scrapped. In the process it was hard to find anyone with a good word to say about the so-called Lansley reforms which re-organised the NHS with clinical commissioning groups and so on. In a further Lords debate on integration only last Thursday, I was able to emphasise the importance of integrating public health and spirituality as well as mental health and social care.

We looked at workforce as well. There is a clear need for the evolution of roles, not least for pharmacists and others along the lines of nurse practitioners, and for close attention to morale in the NHS.

Funding - I really do not want to make this into a debate about Brexit, but I guess we are all aware that even after we have left the EU, an extra £350 million per week will not be pouring into the NHS coffers. The key question is how best to fund the growing needs of an ageing population with multiple morbidities and high expectations. The Prime Minister has now announced an extra tranche of money for the NHS, which is good news, even if as yet it is not altogether clear where that money will come from. That extra money over the next five years will simply keep the show on the road. It will not touch innovation or, crucially, social care.

That leads on to innovation, including technology, artificial intelligence and robotic surgery, productivity and the effectiveness use of data. I have to confess this would probably not be my chosen *Mastermind* subject, but I did grasp enough to realise that in the end a lot of that boils down to good management.

Then there is public health, notably the issues of prevention and patient responsibility, including on obesity whose global cost is now measured in trillions of dollars, and combatting the culture of short-termism.

As a result of all this, we made 34 specific recommendations which you, Madam Chair, will be glad to know I will not rehearse in detail now, but let me briefly remind you of some of our main conclusions, one of which was to establish a new office for health and care sustainability which would be non-party political and would be set up deliberately to look ahead and advise the Government of the day, rather like the Office for Budget Responsibility. Thus far the Government has declined to consider this as a serious option, even though in speeches I have emphasised it more than once and in conversations, too.

We want to integrate health and social care into a new department. That has now happened, though quite how far integration is actually taking place remains to be seen, as does the question of who is responsible for making it happen. Continuing to fund the NHS free at the point of use for everyone through taxation will involve an increase in tax,

whether or not hypothesised, or a different set of priorities. It could also mean introducing the so-called Dilnot proposals and possibly an insurance-based scheme for social care.

There are several other important recommendations: reforming the training regime for an integrated health and social care workforce; emphasising technological innovation; restoring funding for public health; and educating the public about lifestyle choices, particularly on exercise, alcohol, smoking, obesity and so on; and one or two others as well.

I have not mentioned the theological dimension of this Report basically because it does not have one, but it easily could have, and I would like to pay tribute to the other members of the Committee who were happy to have a representative of the Church among their number and were attentive to what was, I hope, a Christian perspective on the many issues we discussed.

When William Temple, who was a friend of Beveridge, saw the Act of Parliament for the setting up of the NHS, he said that he had never seen the Christian ethic expressed in an Act of Parliament before. The Report reflects a commitment to social justice, care and love for one's neighbour, especially those most in need, a belief in the importance and value of healing as wholeness and an absolute commitment to the value of each person regardless of circumstance or background, and, as we would say, made in the image of God.

I have run out of time. There are lots of people in Synod who are much better qualified than me to speak about this, and I look forward very much indeed to hearing what you have to say.

*The Chair:* Synod, as there are four amendments tabled, it may be helpful for me to outline to you how I intend to navigate this debate. I will open up the floor for some initial debate before calling Alison Coulter to move her amendment. When we have completed that, I will ask both Gavin Oldham and Carl Hughes to speak to their amendments, as they relate to matters that somewhat overlap, before asking them to move their items separately.

When we have dealt with those two amendments, I will call Jane Patterson to move her amendment and then we will return to the main motion, amended or otherwise. Given all that we have to navigate and the time that we have available, I am going to limit speeches in the debate to three minutes from the start. The floor is now open for initial debate on the motion as it stands.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Dr Nick Land (York):* Until April I was medical director for one of the largest mental health providers in the country. I am profoundly committed still to the NHS which I see theologically as a means of common grace to the people of this nation. Each year for the

last eight years I have sat down with my executive team and we have had to look to find a £10 million reduction out of a £300 million budget. We have done that time and time again. It was a good team. We used lean production methods and, if demand had remained steady, I think we could have done this without putting undo pressure on our services, our service users and our staff. However, during that same period of time demand for our NHS mental health services has gone up not by 10%, 20% but in my area over 100%, and still rising rapidly. Many of our staff have been under significant pressure. Many of them have freely given of their discretionary time, often working unpaid hours to ensure that service users' needs are met. A further exacerbation of pressure on services is even if we had the money we could not recruit the staff. I spend much of my time trying to recruit and retain high-quality professional clinical staff and outside the golden triangle of London, Oxford and Cambridge, in many areas, medical staff are very difficult to get and even in those areas nursing staff are even more difficult to get.

I very much support this motion. I think we really have to look at the issue of recruitment, of how we train staff; we have to do it differently. As a Church though, we also need to think about what we can do. We probably have 40,000 NHS staff within our churches and, thinking about *Setting God's People Free*, what are we doing to equip them to be the relational and positional leaders who could really make a difference in the NHS? How do we give them the resilience to continue that leadership when the NHS flips from being angelic to demonic on a year-by-year basis? These are really important things.

The final thing quickly, social care: think of Joanne, she goes into hospital, she is slightly confused; somebody sees she is slightly confused and there is then a huge delay in getting a social care assessment. She could have gone out after three or four days with a little bit of social care help but now she is going to need residential care.

Here is a theological principle in terms of getting social care to the people who need it, Proverbs 3:27: "Do not withhold good from those to whom it is due when it is in your power to act". Thank you very much.

*The Bishop of London (Rt Revd Dame Sarah Mullally):* I must declare an interest. I have worked for over 30 years in the National Health Service. My children were born within it, I am very grateful for the care that my parents received when they were dying and I am a user.

Synod will not be surprised that I am a great supporter of the National Health Service and, despite its challenges, I have seen some of the best care in the world. In this year when we celebrate the 70th anniversary, I would like to pay tribute to those who had courage to establish it but also to those who continue to work within it. Those who provide care today in the NHS add the tenderness to a £116 billion organisation.

The NHS for me reflects our compassion as a society, caring for people regardless of their ability to pay, at some of the most vulnerable moments in their life. It reflects society's belief in the common good. Over the coming years the NHS will continue to be

under more pressure. We grow older. Our population increases. Our expectations rise and research and technology will give us very hard decisions. I believe that it is only sustainable if the belief in that common good remains at the core heart of our society. It is only sustainable if we - if you and I - commit to a sense of solidarity of action: communities nationally but also churches acting together. Churches, I believe, hold the potential to work alongside social care and health to promote health and wellbeing. I would commend to you the work of the Cinnamon Network which in May of this year produced a report into the Church's impact on health and care, some 3,500 churches and 200,000 volunteers contributing to health and social care. They identified that initiatives could provide a sustainable solution to the key health needs. This is not about providing healthcare or social care; it is about offering life in all its fullness, creating communities of compassion at the heart of the Gospel. General health and wellbeing, loneliness and isolation, mental health and services, such as carers in A&E departments and parish nurses.

I would urge Synod to support this motion and amendments 40 and 43. Only as a common act of solidarity will we be able to pass on to our children and grandchildren an NHS which is an inspiring act of empathy and not a despondent act of inhumanity.

*The Chair:* I now invite Alison Coulter to speak to and move her amendment. Alison, you have up to five minutes.

## **ITEM 40**

*Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester):* I beg to move

'After paragraph (a) *insert:*

"( ) express its heartfelt gratitude for the dedication of NHS and social care staff, and call on local churches to support those working in the NHS and social care, and to pray for them regularly publicly and privately."

I declare an interest. I spent most of my working life in the NHS as a physio, as a manager, as a public health specialist. I remain a member of the Faculty of Public Health of the Royal College of Physicians. More recently, I have worked as a freelance consultant and associate of the King's Fund at my local NHS leadership academy, encouraging and supporting leaders within the NHS and, of course, like all of you, and Bishop Sarah, I am a user, but I am going to spare you the finer details of my medical history. I also want to recognise that in this chamber there are many people who work for the NHS.

Synod, we have an opportunity before us - and I am very grateful to Bishop James and to Carlisle Diocesan Synod - to express our gratitude and to remember the people who work in the NHS, and to remember, too, our call under God to care for those with compassion who care for us and our families.

I want to share with you some figures from Professor Michael West's research. He was a colleague of mine at the King's Fund and you can Google him: Michael West; collaborative and compassionate leadership. He says 35% to 40% of NHS staff report feeling unwell due to the level of stress in the workplace. This is 50% higher than in other workplaces. Only 40% of staff feel happy with the quality of care that they are able to deliver.

Nick has already talked about the stress that people are under and it is because of complex and multiple causes. I just want to offer three reflections on this stress to you. First, I think it is because of the nature of work, and we only have to think of the Novichok poisoning and the staff in Salisbury District Hospital and what has happened this weekend to understand that stress.

Secondly, I think it is also caused in some places by the culture of the NHS, and I would like Synod to know and recognise that there are times when proper performance and quality management by national bodies, a holding of people and organisations to account, slips into bullying, which cascades down through organisations on to staff. This pressure, which I am sure that the Department of Health does not intend to be harmful, is harmful and stressful.

Finally, it is stressful because we are making unreasonable demands of our healthcare staff. I have a new daughter-in-law. It is a thrill to get to know her. She is in her final year of GP training. I texted her this morning to ask her what her day was like. She started before 8 am. She will not get home until after 8.30 pm. She will see 23 patients as well as visits and admin, and this is typical. Most GPs see more than 30 patients a day plus visits and admin.

I have been remembering back to the hot summer of 1976, as I am sure some of you are as well (but that shows my age) and lying awake in a tent unable to sleep at night as a child listening to my father, a surgeon, talking to his friend, a director of public health in the West Midlands, about the long-term sustainability of the NHS. I am sad to say, Bishop James, that this is not a new football that is being kicked around; it has been going on for a long time. I am very glad for this report from the House of Lords. It really is excellent and I urge Synod to support this motion.

There are things that we can do, too. Thank you to everyone who held services to pray for 70 years of the NHS, but please do not wait until it is 80 to start praying again. Let us keep praying, all of us, in our services and individually. We should be supporting and lobbying our MPs, doing what we can locally to support. We can make a difference each of us, by being grateful and by encouraging the staff that we meet day-to-day.

Synod, please take this opportunity to accept my amendment and to show our appreciation for the dedication of the staff of the NHS and social care. We are truly grateful for their work and skill. Let us commit to encourage and pray for them as well as

asking the Government for a long-term solution for the NHS and social care. I move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I call Bishop James to comment. You have up to three minutes, though I hope you will not use it.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* I am very grateful indeed to Alison Coulter for this very helpful amendment, which I accept wholeheartedly and very warmly. There is an organisation called We Love the NHS, with which I have been involved and which lays on parties for NHS staff. Interestingly, in Cumbria we started five years ago NHS stress days for staff working in the NHS. We thought we would run them for a year, we ran four, they were completely booked out; we have been running them now four a year for five years, and they are always absolutely booked out.

This is also an opportunity to thank and call for support for hospital and hospice chaplains, who care for staff, frontline and management, as well as patients and clients. I was going to mention them in my initial speech and ran out of time, but thank you, Alison, for giving me an opportunity to mention them and their wonderful work now.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 40.

*The Chair:* I am inclined to test the mind of Synod, given that this amendment is supported by those proposing the main motion, and so I will move to a vote on the motion for closure on Item 40 immediately by a show of hands.

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

*The Chair:* That is passed and so we will go straight to the vote on Item 40.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (a) insert:*

*“( ) express its heartfelt gratitude for the dedication of NHS and social care staff, and call on local churches to support those working in the NHS and social care, and to pray for them regularly publicly and privately.”*

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

*The Chair:* I now call both Gavin Oldham and Carl Hughes to speak to but not move the amendment standing in their names, Items 41 and 42 respectively. They each have up to five minutes. We begin with Gavin Oldham.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* The original three core principles of the NHS are as follows: that it meets the needs of everyone, that it be free at the point of delivery, and that it be based on clinical need not ability to pay. I do not take issue with any of these three

principles and we should all applaud the dedication and amazing service provided to over one million patients every 36 hours. That is equivalent to each citizen being an NHS patient on average 3.7 times each year.

As my amendment says, universal participation lies at the heart of the NHS and is its great strength. However, there is nothing in these principles which stipulates the funding of the National Health Service. The assumption has just been for the past 70 years that it all has to come from general taxation and, at £125 billion per annum, 100% funding from general taxation has become its greatest weakness.

The interesting aspect of the House of Lords Select Committee Report is the contrast it makes between recommendations for funding health - that is recommendation 15 in paragraph 170 of the Report - and for funding social care - and that is recommendation 23 in paragraph 239. It says that health should continue to be tax funded whereas social care should be underpinned by a means tested system of insurance.

What is the logic for this dual approach? I would suggest none. It is just that we have become addicted to the mantra of paying from the public purse for our state driven health system, whereas for social care means testing has become accepted as the norm. However, the need risk profile is very similar.

In fact, for health there is arguably more prospect of people taking action to restrain their need for service by keeping fit, not becoming obese and not taking unnecessary risks. Social care for the elderly is much more involuntary than health as old age limits the scope for mind and body to take measures to avoid the need. On this basis, health would be a much stronger candidate for payment by an element of mandatory individual insurance.

The question is, therefore, should both health and social care only be paid out of general taxation for those who cannot afford the cost of that mandatory insurance, leaving higher rate and top rate taxpayers - I would suggest on a progressive basis - to pay their own premiums? In case anyone says, "What about National Insurance?", it is important to remember that unless an insurance premium bears some relevance to the cost of claims it is not really insurance, just part of the taxation system.

The Bible teaches us that our Christian focus should be on the poor and most disadvantaged, not those well able to pay for themselves, but the use of general taxation to pay for universal services has become the enemy of supporting the poor as the huge cuts in support for Child Tax Credit families shows and as I explained in my question 36 on Friday evening.

I am, therefore, asking you to recognise the fundamental inconsistency in the House of Lords Select Committee funding recommendations and support my amendment asking the Government to introduce mandatory insurance for higher rate and top rate taxpayers to pay for their use of the Health Service.



*The Chair.* Carl, I invite you, please, to speak to your amendment.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* Caring for the sick, the elderly and the infirm lie at the heart of our Christian calling and mission. As Archbishop Justin has said, the NHS is a powerful visible expression of our Christian heritage because it sprang out of a concern that the poor should be able to be treated as well as the rich. However, as the House of Lords Select Committee Report sets out in the clearest of terms, the challenges facing our health and social care systems 70 years after the NHS' foundation are both complex and significant.

The research, incisiveness and thoughtfulness of their Lordships' Report should actually be a wake-up call to Government and nation alike. However, there is a serious risk of inaction with this Report potentially being left to gather dust. I fully support the motion before us and thank the Bishop of Carlisle for all his work on this subject. However, to avoid the risk of inaction by the Government, I believe that we should be calling upon the Government to establish a Royal Commission to consider in-depth how our country's health and social care needs might best be delivered and financed over the period to 2040.

Health and social care have been the subject of Royal Commissions in the past, most recently in 1975 into the NHS and in 1998 into long-term care for the elderly, so there is precedent. A Royal Commission would enable this vital subject to be considered out with normal partisan politics. It would also enable all voices to be heard and for proper modelling to be undertaken of what I believe is a significant crisis just over the horizon. Notwithstanding current annual public expenditure on health and social care of just under £150 billion, the NHS is creaking at the seams.

Social care is yet to be fully integrated with healthcare. More could be done to promote wellness rather than just treat illness. Also, there remains much that we can learn from other healthcare systems in other countries. We need a Royal Commission to take time to reflect on where we are, the good and the bad, and where we need to get to in order to address the expected changes in life expectancy, demography and medical technology, all of which will continue to add significant further stress to our health and social care systems.

The Institute of Fiscal Studies suggests that health and social care spending will need to increase from 7% of GDP today to nearly 13% of GDP over the next 50 years, a truly enormous adjustment. No single government or political party is able to address these vital issues and I, therefore, ask you to support this amendment.

## **ITEM 41**

*The Chair.* Can I invite Gavin Oldham to move Item 41, the amendment standing in his name.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I do so move.

*'After paragraph (b) insert:*

*"( ) welcome the call for a mandatory insurance system for funding social care in Recommendation 23 of the Report, but as a supplement to Recommendation 15, ask the Government to explore a progressive application of mandatory insurance for higher rate and top rate taxpayers in funding their universal participation in the National Health Service."*

*The Chair.* Bishop James, you have up to three minutes to comment, if you wish.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* On Gavin's?

*The Chair.* On Gavin's.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* It is good to be clear about these things. I am hugely grateful to Gavin for the amendment that he has brought. All the thought and compassion that goes behind his commitment to a flourishing NHS and social care is absolute. When he and I were discussing this before, I did say to him that from a personal point of view I would have no objection to that kind of way forward.

However, I think I would want to reject it as an amendment to this motion for various reasons. One is because it is a fairly specific and slightly contentious recommendation which goes in the face of the kind of recommendations both that the Select Committee Report was making and that are contained in our Carlisle Diocesan Motion.

Part of the point of any kind of further commission or any kind of further pressure on the Government would be precisely to ask them to look at suggestions of that kind without forcing their hand in advance. I think I would rather say could a suggestion of this kind be fed into the ongoing debate as others have fed it in the past, rather than making it a sort of hard and fast concrete amendment at this stage to the debate.

*The Chair.* For the debate on the amendments, I am going to have a two-minute speech limit and request that people do speak to the substance of the particular amendment. The floor is now open for debate on the amendment in Gavin Oldham's name. I see no one standing and so we move to a vote on Item 41 by a show of hands.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (b) insert:*

*"( ) welcome the call for a mandatory insurance system for funding social care in Recommendation 23 of the Report, but as a supplement to Recommendation 15, ask the Government to explore a progressive application of mandatory insurance for higher rate and top rate taxpayers in funding their universal participation in the National Health Service."*

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

*The Chair.* I ask Carl Hughes to move Item 42, the amendment standing in his name.

## **ITEM 42**

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* I do so move.

‘After paragraph (b) insert:

“( ) call upon Her Majesty’s Government to establish a Royal Commission to consider how the United Kingdom’s health and social care needs might best be delivered and financed in the period to 2040, taking into account expected changes in life expectancy, demography and medical technology.”

*The Chair.* Bishop James, you have up to three minutes, if you really need them, to comment.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* Carl, thank you very much indeed for this very interesting amendment. A number of people have asked for a Royal Commission. It has to be said the Government is not at all keen on Royal Commissions. Even asking for it means that it is highly unlikely that it would come into being.

Nonetheless, it would be another means of putting pressure on the Government to take seriously some of the recommendations that have been made in the House of Lords’ Report. It could have the interesting effect of leading to an all-party parliamentary commission which has been suggested by Sarah Wollaston, who is the Chair of the House of Commons Select Committee on Health, and which I have discussed with her.

I would be happy to accept this proposal for an amendment. Of course, Royal Commission reports take a long time. They can be ignored by the Government. We will need to be keeping up pressure on the Government right the way through, but I have no objection to this amendment.

*A Speaker.* Point of order: as the amendment has been accepted, may I move a motion for closure?

*The Chair.* That would have my agreement. Can I test the mind of Synod?

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

*The Chair.* We move to a vote on Item 42 by show of hands.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (b) insert:*

*“( ) call upon Her Majesty’s Government to establish a Royal Commission to consider how the United Kingdom’s health and social care needs might best be delivered and financed in the period to 2040, taking into account expected changes in life expectancy, demography and medical technology.”*

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

## **ITEM 43**

*The Chair:* I ask Jane Patterson to speak to and move Item 43, the amendment standing in her name. Jane, you have up to five minutes.

*Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield):* I beg to move

*After paragraph (b) insert:*

*“( ) call upon local churches to lead by example in showing Christian compassion and care to the elderly and vulnerable in our local communities, as we have done historically and is now especially needed, given the shortfall in the funding of social care.”*

I have worked in the NHS for 33 years, including 20 as a consultant surgeon. I work in a district general hospital in a deprived area in North Nottinghamshire. I can stand here now because a consultant colleague of mine is covering my on-call commitment for the moment. The House of Lords’ Report is the best analysis of the issues that health and social care faces that I have ever read. It names the numerous serious, immediate and long-term challenges facing health and social care.

Synod should be grateful to the Diocese of Carlisle and particularly to Bishop James for taking the lead in this area and so I fully support the motion. Last winter, my neighbour, Claire - a supposedly part-time GP in inner city Sheffield - and I debriefed one another each evening. We shared the stresses of our day’s work in hospital and the community. Claire and I, and many, many others who work in this sector, feel that as the funding, and, therefore, the provision of health and social care fail, we are standing on the edge of an abyss into which the elderly and vulnerable are falling.

Consultation about implementation of any changes will take time during which some in our communities will suffer. In this now 71st year of the NHS, let us celebrate God’s people with a much longer history of caring for the elderly, poor and vulnerable and let us unashamedly reclaim the initiative. Many local churches are already playing their part.

In my local church, much of the pastoral care, including social care, happens through our network of small Bible study groups to which the majority of adults belong. We run a weekly club for the elderly. We employ a pastoral care co-ordinator. We are about to

employ a counsellor both to help people address the issues they need to confront in their lives and to train others to help others. I could go on but I will not.

I do appreciate that not every local church is blessed with such human or financial resources but, surely, the 16,000 parishes in the Church of England can do what the state will never be able to do. Historically, the Church has sought to live the Commandments. Let us again seek to honour our fathers and mothers and to love our neighbours, caring for them in their hour of need for the common good. I urge you to support this amendment.

*The Chair:* Bishop James, I invite you to comment. You could have three minutes. Please do not use them.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* I will be very brief. I am hugely grateful to Jane for this very helpful amendment which I am more than happy to accept. I think one of the things it does is to remind us of the Church's crucial role in actually creating hospitals and hospices in the first place. Were it not for the Church, we probably would not have hospitals and hospices.

There are a number of organisations that are already trying to bring together some of the kind of work that is referred to here in this amendment. There is something called Linking Lives with which I am very closely involved. That is now working closely with the Red Cross and particularly with church-based groups to care for the vulnerable and needy in their communities. We are hoping to set up something called Caring for the Carers, which is to look after those who are very hard pressed as they care for relatives and friends in their homes.

Of course, not very long ago in Synod we had a debate on valuing people with Down's syndrome. We will be bringing back parish resources to be used by parishes in the fairly near future for that purpose. All in all, I think this is an excellent amendment. It is entirely in keeping with both the Report and with our motion and I am very happy to accept it.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 43.

*The Chair:* I am content to test the mind of Synod on that.

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

*The Chair:* We will move to a vote on Item 43.

*The motion*

*After paragraph (b) insert:*

*"( ) call upon local churches to lead by example in showing Christian compassion and care to the elderly and vulnerable in our local communities, as we have done*

*historically and is now especially needed, given the shortfall in the funding of social care.”*

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

*The Chair.* We move to the amended motion, Item 23. Our three-minute speech limit remains in place.

*Revd Dr Jason Roach (London):* I speak as someone who has worked in the NHS as a hospital doctor and had the chance to reflect on these things as an editor of the *British Medical Journal* for several years. I am a supporter of the motion. I just want to point out that the way that we fund healthcare services and social care, of course, needs review, but the problem is not simply not enough cash but also not enough community and not enough community that cares for the common good.

The World Health Organization says this: “To a large extent, factors like where we live, the state of our environment and”, hear this, “how many family, friends and community we have has considerable impact on our health, more so than access to healthcare”. Is that not extraordinary? The bottom line: community matters.

Synod, therefore, let me ask you, where would you find a community that cares about where you live? How about one where the founder says, “Seek the prosperity of the city”. Where would you find a community that cares about your environment? How about one where the founder says, “He does not forget even a single sparrow”. Where would you find a community that cares about investing in relationships with every person in every place? How about one whose founder says, “Love even your enemies and pray for those who persecute you”.

Why? Because this is love. Not that we love God but that He loved us and sent His son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins. This is us. This is the community. This is the Church. I share the sentiment that Giles Goddard made yesterday. Where we can, our motions should not just be calls to the Government but calls to us, the Church, to do what we do best: to be salt and light, to be good Samaritans, to be the sorts of neighbours that people say, “I may not agree with your Jesus but if you were not here this would be a worse place”, and we pray that some might even ask us about the reason for the hope that we have.

I think this amendment, as it is now configured, not only asks us to call the Government to act but asks us to do what we do best and, as we follow God’s Commandments and care for people, as a bonus says to the world, as we do, that we also care for people as the health trends of our day demand. Can I just support this motion?

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: Madam Chair, a motion for closure after the next speaker on this item.

*The Chair:* Thank you. I would be interested in that. You have up to three minutes.

*Mr Edward Cox (Church of England Youth Council Representative):* Education, housing, Brexit, job opportunities, pay scales and pensions. I mention these words not to complete my Synod Bingo but these are things that are steadily being taken away from young people. The NHS is what gives us hope. Many people may think that it might be artisan coffee and avocados, but the NHS embodies egalitarian morals. The NHS is not just vital for us as consumers, but it is vital for the people who use that space to live out their God given vocation.

As young people, we look to the NHS as hope. It provides us safety and security for years to come. I want to look beyond celebrating 70 years. I would love to be able to stand here in 70 years and say, "Let us celebrate 140". We need to sustain the NHS not just for ourselves but for the people who work in it, the people who get their pay, their income to support themselves and their families.

I say this because probably about 90% of my extended family work for the NHS. I do not know if I need to declare an interest by saying that, but if it were not for them and their ability to live out their morals, their values and their ethics in their work, they would not have made the mark and the impression that they have made upon me today.

The NHS is a mark of our character. It is a mark of our morals. It is also a space to be salt and light. Chaplains are eagerly encouraged to be in that space, living out the love of God to each person. I eagerly encourage you, Synod, to vote this motion through.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 23.

*The Chair:* I am minded to test the mind of Synod on that.

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

*The Chair:* That is passed. Given the time and how close we are to 7 o'clock, I would like to request Synod to extend our sitting by up to five minutes to give Bishop James a chance to respond, but I would like to take a counted vote because I think this is a motion of major public interest and that will take an extra couple of minutes. May I have your permission to extend the sitting up to five minutes, if necessary?

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much for that consideration. Bishop James, if you would like to respond to the debate, as briefly as possible.

*The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome):* I will be extremely brief. The Select Committee on which I sat had a year to consider all these various issues. We have had 50 minutes and so it has been a little condensed. I would like to say thank you for such

an informed, intelligent, compassionate and fruitful debate. I am really grateful for all the contributions that people have made. I am sorry there was not time for many others who would have liked to speak to have a chance to do so.

I think this whole session has provided a very good example of the remarkable range of expertise and experience that is available to us in this Synod. I was going to take a look at the various themes that people have raised but I will not do that given the time constraints.

What I will do is just pick out one thing which I think emerged from almost all the contributions and was emphasised particularly by Jason Roach and, of course, by Jane Patterson in her amendment. That is our personal responsibility, not just for our own health - we are not expecting the NHS to do everything for us - but also our responsibility as members of our churches and as Christians for caring for those around us.

Members of Synod, I have personally found this debate both illuminating and inspiring. I think I speak on behalf of the whole of the Carlisle Diocesan Synod in thanking all of you for making the time to consider our motion, which I hope very much you will feel able to support in its amended form. I beg to move Item 23.

*The Chair.* This will be a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The vote on Item 23: 267 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion

*That this Synod:*

- a) *welcome and commend the report The Long-term Sustainability of the NHS and Adult Social Care published in April 2017 by the House of Lords Select Committee on the Long-term Sustainability of the NHS;*
- b) *express its heartfelt gratitude for the dedication of NHS and social care staff, and call on local churches to support those working in the NHS and social care, and to pray for them regularly publicly and privately;*
- c) *call upon Her Majesty's Government to implement the recommendations made by the Select Committee, giving particular consideration to:*
  - (i) *the problems arising from the use of urban models of strategic care in the rural context;*



- (ii) whether social care is being adequately funded in the context of an ageing population; and*
- (iii) whether sufficient resources are being given to the recruitment, outside larger urban centres, of experienced and highly qualified health professionals;*
- d) call upon Her Majesty's Government to establish a Royal Commission to consider how the United Kingdom's health and social care needs might best be delivered and financed in the period to 2040, taking into account expected changes in life expectancy, demography and medical technology; and*
- e) call upon local churches to lead by example in showing Christian compassion and care to the elderly and vulnerable in our local communities, as we have done historically and is now especially needed, given the shortfall in the funding of social care.*

was carried in all three Houses.

*The Chair.* Thank you, Synod, for your co-operation and participation. That completes this item of business and today's business. We now move to worship.

*Revd Simon Talbott* led the Synod in an act of worship.

**Full Synod: Fifth Day  
Tuesday 10 July 2018**

**MORNING WORSHIP**

*Dean of Manchester (Very Revd Rogers Govender)* led the Synod in an act of worship.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 9.15 am.

*The Chair:* Good morning, members of Synod. Well done for making it this far. We are on the last lap. Before introducing the next section, I have been asked to let you know that this is Jarvis's last Synod. He will be retiring and will become part of the family. Well done, good and faithful servant, Jarvis, who is up there, so, if you want to give him applause please do.

**ITEM 24**

**PRESENTATION FROM THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS**

*The Chair:* Now we come to Item 24 which is a presentation from the Church Commissioners. I am going to invite Loretta Minghella, the First Church Estates Commissioner, to come and do a presentation. There will then be an opportunity for questions afterwards.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* Good morning. I am grateful for the opportunity to address Synod. I will try to be brief in order to make plenty of space for your questions which the Third Church Estates Commissioner will help me answer. She will take all the difficult ones and I will take any easy ones that are left over!

It does not feel like it but I have now been in the role for eight months and it has absolutely zipped by, which is a really good sign, I hope. The first thing I want to say is thank you to my fellow Trustees, to staff and others for their welcome and guidance. At our AGM just 10 days ago I was able to thank my predecessor Sir Andreas Whittam Smith for his tremendous legacy, but we also recalled that in recent years he stood here and predicted a slow-down in investment returns which did not in fact come straightaway, but it is here now. There is a new mood in the markets and I think of 2017 as a return to reality: uncertainty over Brexit, geopolitical developments, fervour in the US about tariffs and market confidence levels blowing hot and cold. There is not a great crash but there is a sort of new norm of more muted returns in the markets and greater volatility.

In this context, our 7.1% return in 2017 was a good outcome even though it lagged our RPI +5% target. If we did not hit our target, why do I consider that a good result? First, it is a deliberately demanding target. We could never expect to hit it every year. This performance reflected our strategy of investing in a highly diversified portfolio and holding

a larger than usual amount of cash. This is dry powder, if you like, to deploy when the markets become more favourable.

Markets had mixed fortunes in 2017. UK and global equities, commercial property and strategic land were all good performers for us. Sterling strength, liquidity reserves and timberland depressed our performance. We would have done a little better if we had been less diversified but diversification is the right approach for the longer term. The difficult start to this year underlines this with the Commissioners losing less than comparable investors, so the diversification which cost us last year repays us now, and we are still ahead of our target over five, 10, 20 and 30 years.

We are not complacent and some changes are currently under consideration. These include shifting away from UK equities to a more geographically diverse portfolio, revisiting our hedging strategy, looking harder for win-win investments, especially in the renewable markets, and building up our venture capital portfolio. In short, we will continue to be unfashionable in favouring active strategies over following the herd.

Meanwhile, we recognise our calling to good stewardship. We have an important obligation to invest ethically and to drive positive change in corporate behaviour. On day three in post I spoke at the launch of our new policy on extractives at Lambeth Palace, attended by some of the CEOs of the world's major mining companies, testament to the convening power of the Church. Many of you will have been here on Sunday when we explained that engagement within coalitions has put pressure on Exxon, on Shell and others and is helping to hasten the big shift that is required if we are to cap global warming below 2 degrees in accordance with the Paris Agreement. At the same time divestment is another tool which we are very willing to deploy where necessary. We are changing the way business does business. I will not say much more about this because we covered it in depth earlier in Synod, but I will repeat this, and I make no apologies for doing so: we have some of the best people in the world working for us on this, demonstrating thought leadership which is driving practical action for the common good.

Investment returns are only a means to an end for us. They count for absolutely nothing if funds are not used effectively. The Report sets out how we spent £226 million last year and you will recognise the recurring spend on supporting the mission and ministry of our bishops, our provision for deans and residentiary canons. We also allocated £24 million funding for lowest-income communities, crucial funding, as we heard at our fringe yesterday, in very many parts of the country.

I am excited about the strategic development funding of £72.3 million allocated to the Archbishops' Council Strategic Investment Board during this triennium. We want this money to make a difference. That is what motivates the Commissioners. We want it to support projects addressing need and opportunity in diverse settings; north and south, urban and rural and from right across the spectrum of Church tradition. Bids for these funds were initially slow and not always very ambitious, but, as you heard yesterday morning from Mary Chapman and Matthew Frost, there is a real head of steam now.

Resource churches in city centres, yes, Fresh Expressions in market towns, Champing in rural areas, Pioneer Ministry on outer estates. The list goes on. It is early days in terms of outcomes but there is a growing portfolio of increasingly diversified mission projects and I find that really inspiring. These are not the only bids coming in.

On my arrival I found an in-tray overflowing with funding requests. That is understandable. John Spence spoke compellingly about that yesterday, but I want to manage expectations a little with two sobering thoughts. First, while the fund's value grew to £8.3 billion last year, it is worth remembering that were the Commissioners alone to fund all the Church's running costs for a while, we could do so only for about how many years? Four years before the fund was completely exhausted. We rely on expert actuarial advice on deciding what is in fact sustainable and the actuary tells us - and here is the second sobering thought - that even without our recent outperformance, we have only a 55% chance of meeting our planned distributions in future years. Discipline is important. It is what I call "prudent joy".

I have been reading a lot about the Commissioners' major financial difficulties in the early 1990s in balancing the books, the first seeds of which were actually planted in the 1940s and 1950s with various well-meant and very reasonable over-commitments. I am determined that we will not repeat that mistake on my watch. But we must also avoid making new and opposite mistakes. Of course, I do not want to short-change tomorrow's Church but, here's the thing: neither do I want to short-change today's Church. So, finding the right level and choosing the right priorities are extraordinary challenges on which we will be working closely with our actuaries, the Archbishops' Council and others over the coming year.

There is so much more to our work than I have covered here. The first tranche of legislative changes arising from simplification come into effect this summer, including proposals for simplifying and speeding up pastoral reorganisation and for giving statutory recognition to deanery plans. We have been working with dioceses to promote the range of innovative options for local church structures to support mission and ministry in areas of need and opportunity.

Our Annual Report, if you have time to take a look at it, includes a case study of a closed Church building recently transformed into a state-of-the-art primary care facility and medical centre. In settling the future of closed Church buildings, the Commissioners have to balance the various missional, financial, heritage and other considerations in play. This can result in a wide variety of outcomes with diverse uses, ranging from church planting or worship by other Christian bodies, to other community, commercial or residential uses, raising significant sums to support the Church's mission and to fund the Churches Conservation Trust.

The Commissioners have also set up a Cathedral Sustainability Fund in response to concerns regarding the financial health of a number of cathedrals. This can pump-prime fund-raising and revenue-generating activities, so grants provided to date have focused

on new development capability projects to realise commercial potential and the creation of new visitor amenities. There are several more applications already in the pipeline. The Third Church Estates Commissioner - who is fabulous by the way - is preparing to oversee the implementation of proposals arising from the Cathedrals Working Group which we will be discussing later and is very much looking forward to working with the deans on this.

The Second Church Estates Commissioner is working extremely hard as our conduit to Parliament, every year answering more Parliamentary Questions than the year before on an ever-widening range of subjects. She has also engaged with government for us on education, apprenticeships, counter-extremism, wi-fi, church repairs, metal theft and so much more. There is a great opportunity there for faith to contribute to the public square and the common good and she is taking it.

We are also thinking about our own governance, including looking at our own diversity profile. We have taken some steps and are considering what more we can do to improve ourselves. The three Church Estates Commissioners are all women now, but the overall profile is still some way from where we would like it to be. You can play a part. The Board agreed earlier this year that we should try to encourage a diverse range of people to stand for election as we try harder to reach skilled individuals whom we may not have reached in the past. It is about reflecting the society that we claim to serve. Anyone interested in finding out more should speak to our fantastic Chief Executive, Andrew Brown, who is behind me, or to Eve or me.

So, the ambition of this relative newcomer? I want the Commissioners to make great returns well-earned. I want us to be a great example of faith and ethics in action. I want our resources to be utilised strategically and imaginatively. I want us to be part of the wider movement towards maintaining what is flourishing in our Church, halting decline and stimulating growth and renewal right across the country. I want us to invest not just in shares and buildings but to invest in the future of the Church at the heart of nation, to play our part in building the Kingdom, and in this I look forward to engaging with all of you. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Synod, we now have a short time for questions. In a moment I will invite those of you who would like to ask a question to stand in your places. I will call you in batches of three. Can I remind you once again, Synod, about the art of asking a question? The longer you take in asking a question, the more difficult it is for the people answering the question to answer, so please keep it short. You will also, by having longer questions, prevent other people from asking theirs and you will also make them more grumpy! Please keep your questions brief and to the point. If you would like to ask a question please stand in your place.

*Ms Jay Greene (Winchester):* Thank you, Loretta. I have read the Report, or most of, it and you have substantial investment in commercial forestry like UK timber and Jahr tree timber. Can you tell us how you ensure there is best environmental practice in those places?

*Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury):* Loretta, thank you so much for your presentation. Could I ask: do you expect there to be a financial crash? How well positioned are we if a crash is to take place because of the Brexit exit?

*Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark):* At the end of the 19th century, Octavia Hill convinced the Commissioners to use their capital creatively for the provision of affordable housing. Is there any consideration at the moment to looking at ways in which we might unlock provision of affordable housing using our capital, perhaps in coalition with other people? Was that short enough?

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* First of all, Jay, thank you very much for your question. I have had to learn so much in my job and finding out a lot about trees has been one of the joys. Very recently, I found myself deep in the woods with the Bishop of Dudley, as you do. We were up in Lockerbie and we were looking at the Commissioners' forests there. I was alongside all the people who were working. We saw the trees at very early stages of growing, the trees mid stage and the trees fully grown, and the Bishop himself got in the great big extraordinary vehicle that fells the trees and he helped fell a tree. We followed the trees to the saw mill and saw them being sawn beautifully into pallets to help in the construction of properties. The important thing about that work is that it is not only profitable but we are doing it in a very deliberately sustainable way in accordance with very best practice, and that is in the interests of the environment and in the interests of great, sustainable financial return.

Coming to Peter's second question, in the last financial crash I was running the Financial Services Compensation Scheme. That cost me £21 billion, which was quite a lot at the time. I have lived through a financial crisis more than once. Do I expect another one? If I knew the answer to that, I probably would not be standing here. The important thing, because none of us knows about that, is to be very well positioned for a range of eventualities. That is why the portfolio is very highly diversified but because of the growing volatility in the markets, that is one of the reasons why we are looking again at our hedging policy, to see whether we can protect ourselves in more ranges of shocks to the financial system over the coming period. That includes any impact that there may be from the toings and froings over Brexit.

Coming to your question, Giles, about affordable housing, we have a strategic land portfolio which involves bringing land forward for residential development. Whenever we bring property forward for residential development, of course there is always an element there of affordable housing and that is, as you know, subject often to negotiation between planners and developers. We are often finding ourselves a middle person in that negotiation and what we are trying to do is make sure that the best possible ratio can be agreed so as to maximise the potential there. What I hear from colleagues in similar endowments is that we push harder than a lot of people to make sure that is unlocked. I shall be keeping a very close eye on that, so thank you.

*Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford):* Thank you for the Report. I would like to draw Synod's attention to and ask a question about the short paragraph on page 29 about impact investment. I know that there is a lot in the Report about climate investment, but what future plans do the Commissioners have to increase impact investment and in what areas?

*Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford):* Huge thanks to Loretta for that inspiring presentation and to all the Church Commissioners for their excellent Report and work on our behalf. I worked with Richard Harries in the early 1990s when he felt he had to take the Church Commissioners to court to get them even to consider an ethical investment policy and now to be world leaders in that is quite remarkable. I also wanted to ask about impact investment. Sue just beat me to it. I would like to add to that. We heard in the climate debate about remarkable work in Carlisle Diocese with renewable energy initiatives. In Oxford we have solar panels on many vicarages, a ground source heat pump and one zero carbon-neutral church.

*The Chair:* And your question?

*Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford):* Here is the question: is there any way your impact investments could actually connect with the extensive estate of the whole Church of England and actually benefit church communities as well as bringing return, particularly in the area of renewable energy?

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* It is great, and, following up on Giles Goddard's question about the legacy of Octavia Hill, I declare an interest: I spent my entire career in the affordable housing sector working for a housing association. It is great to hear the answer about positive engagement. The problem is that the current definitions ---

*The Chair:* Adrian, can we have your question, please?

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* --- are not affordable. Could I encourage the Church Commissioners to think about investing in social rent or genuinely affordable rent and holding on to the ownership but delegating the management? I think that would be a great way forward and would show a way in which we can get the rents to genuine affordable levels.

*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* Thank you, Synod, for those great questions. Sue and Martin, on your questions about impact investment, first, thank you for the encouragement. I would draw everybody's attention to pages 28 and 29 of the Annual Report where we spell out some of our specific investments in renewables, including £6 million in a wastewater opportunities fund, £34 million in an Impax Environmental Markets Fund and then £256 million in our sustainably certified forestry portfolio. Do we have plans to increase this? Yes, we do.

One of the difficulties is finding the opportunities that also deliver the kind of financial returns that you are dependent on but at the same time address the specific social needs that we know are out there. To do that we are going to need more support and because we want to do that, we are recruiting more help to make sure that we can find the opportunities that there are. They will be of varying types. Of course, we already have solar and windfarms on our land. I draw your attention to the Palatine Private Equity investment we have. That is based in Manchester, investing mainly in small and medium-sized enterprises in the English North West. Do watch this space and I hope when I come back next year, if you will still hear from me next year, I will be able to tell you that we have been able to achieve a lot more.

Picking up the point that Adrian made about the extent to which we can join things up, or was that Martin, I have lost my thread on that, I think it is really interesting to ask whether some of our work around renewables could be joined up with churches and dioceses directly. That is something I will take back to the team and look into.

Coming to the points that have been made around Octavia Hill, first, I recognise the continuing pain that memories of Octavia Hill cause so many people. We heard from the priest at St Peter's Woolworth about the continuing impact on the local community. I think we are acutely aware of that. We have fiduciary duties which direct us to obtaining the financial returns that we are expected to obtain by the Charity Commission. This is challenging territory for us. I am sensitive to it and, as I say, we want to make sure that where we are bringing land forward for development, there is the best possible allocation within our fiduciary requirements to affordable housing.

*The Chair:* We have got time to squeeze in three more questions. Please keep them brief.

*Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich):* My question is about actuarial projections for clergy retirements. As I understand it, there is a bit more doubt about them because there is no fixed requirement age. How are we set to cope with the burden that will place on the Commissioners for pensions? On the good side the stipend bill for dioceses will be reduced and so what preparations are being made to deal with that and the uncertainty?

*Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford):* Could I ask the Church Commissioners to consider investment not so much in affordable housing but in benefiting the elderly communities and sheltered housing in the line of the *beguinage* which happened in Holland and Flanders, which keeps elderly people in the community with a role to do. That would be really good.

*Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield):* Could I ask for a further comment, please? I am looking at "Climate change strategy" on page 27, the first sentence: "The principal risk for the Commissioners is that our asset allocation, our asset managers or individual investment assets will be poorly positioned for the investment risks and opportunities associated with the transition to a low-carbon economy".



*Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio):* Patrick, thank you for the question. We have a part of the portfolio allocated in our minds to provision for clergy retirement for which we ourselves are responsible, and that is in relation to service pre 1 January 1998. Provision for service after that date is a matter for the Pensions Board. That provision is about £2 billion of the £8.3 billion portfolio, so that is well secured insofar as we have responsibilities in that element. The clergy stipends are not covered by us.

Coming on to Mary's question, we already invest in senior living provision. We have some investment in that area.

Coming to Penny's question, yes, of course we have to look out for the investment we have in our businesses: are they ready for the transition to a low-carbon economy. On the macro scale that is what the TPI Initiative that you heard about on Sunday was about. Whenever we are looking at any individual manager - and our investments are almost entirely through investment managers - we always look at their approach to the mandate we give them to make sure that every investment they take us into has that climate risk in mind as one of the entire spectrum of environmental, social and governance risks that they are expected to manage.

*The Chair:* Synod, that concludes Item 24 other than for me to say thank you very much to Loretta for her presentation, and the way she has answered the questions, and to assure her on your behalf of our prayers for the next year. Please stay in the chamber for Item 26.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 9.45 am

## **ITEM 26 REAPPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE PENSIONS BOARD (GS 2099)**

*The Chair:* We come now to two formal items of business, we move first to Item 26, the reappointment of Dr Jonathan Spencer as the Chair of the Pensions Board. Members will need the paper from the Secretary General, GS 2099. I invite the Archbishop of York to speak to this item.

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

'That the reappointment of Dr Jonathan Spencer as Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board from 1 January 2019 to 31 July 2019 be approved.'

Chair, thank you very much. The Church of England Pensions Regulations 1997 provide for the Archbishop of Canterbury and I to appoint a Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board with the approval of the General Synod.

Dr Jonathan Spencer was appointed to the Chair of the Pensions Board from 1 January 2009 for an initial five-year term. This was extended for a period to the end of this year and if you remember I moved a motion for that extension. This time last year, Jonathan would not have been anticipating his term to be extended by a further short period, indeed he would have anticipated that his name would have been featuring in those we are saying farewell to later this morning.

Sadly, though, the untimely and sudden death of the Board's Chief Executive Officer, Bernadette Kenny last October caused us to examine other options. The Archbishop of Canterbury and I were consulted and agreed that if Jonathan was willing to stay on for a short period that the Board would fill the Chief Executive's post first and then commence the search for his successor. The first part of this has been done and they will be embarking on the second part in the autumn. It is intended the General Synod will approve the appointment of Jonathan's successor at the February 2019 group of sessions. A short extension of Jonathan's term to the end of July 2019 will enable time for a proper search to be carried out for a successor to be found for this important position.

So, we are very grateful to Jonathan for his service to the Pensions Board over the past 10 years and that he has indicated his willingness to stay on for a short period. We are also grateful to him and the Executive Team for leading the Board's staff following Bernadette's death until the new Chief Executive John Ball took up the post very recently. The Archbishop of Canterbury and I commend this appointment to the Synod. Chair, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Thank you, your Grace. Item 26 is open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* On behalf of the Archbishops' Council Finance Committee, particularly on behalf of Canon John Spence in his absence today, I would like to take this opportunity to support this motion for the reappointment of Dr Jonathan Spence for an additional seven months as Chairman of the Pensions Board. Synod, we all owe Jonathan an enormous debt of gratitude for his long service to the Pensions Board and particularly for his leadership following the untimely death of Bernadette Kenny. Can I ask that we acknowledge our appreciation of Jonathan's willingness to serve for an additional seven months whilst John Ball continues to assume the reins as Chief Executive and whilst the new Chair of the Board is selected by supporting this motion unanimously. Thank you.

*Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich):* I am also very pleased to hear about the extension of this appointment but I rise to just make one point. A few years ago, the Pensions Board took the decision to link the clergy pension to SERPS, SERPS has been withdrawn and the effective result of this is the clergy pension is half the minimum national stipend not two-thirds. I would like to register that point and

I hope that in this interim period work will be made to restore the two-thirds proportion for our pensions.

*Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark):* I think I am the one person in the room at present who has worked most closely with Jonathan, having been a member of the Pensions Board for seven years, coming off last 31 December, and I would like to pay tribute to the work that he has done. He is an excellent Chairman and I fully support the fact that he is being asked to stay on for a further short period.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so I invite His Grace to respond to the debate.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* For those who paid great tribute I just want to thank you, you are in mind with the Archbishop of Canterbury and myself on the wonderful job and what he has done. Only one question to Mr Alderton-Ford. This was actually in many ways discussed by the House of Clergy on Saturday. The Pensions Board does not make this benefit under the scheme, this is not them who do it but the employer, so direct the question to the right person. With all those things, I just want to thank you all for supporting somebody who has done an incredible amount of work for the Pensions Board and we want to salute you, sir.

*The Chair:* We move now to a vote on the motion at Item 26.

*This motion*

*That the reappointment of Dr Jonathan Spencer as Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board from 1 January 2019 to 31 July 2019 be approved.*

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

## **ITEM 27**

### **REAPPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE TO THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2100)**

*The Chair:* We move now seamlessly to Item 27, though I feel I should point out that in order to be appointed to senior roles in the church it is not necessary to have a christian name beginning with J or the consecutive letters S-P-E-N-C-E in your surname. Item 27 is the reappointment of Canon John Spence as a member of the Archbishops' Council, GS 2100 has the details. I now invite His Grace the Archbishop of York to speak to the item.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* I beg to move that the appointment of Canon John Spence as a member of the Archbishops' Council from 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2021 be approved.

Chair, members of Synod, what can I say about John? Today the answer could be absolutely anything I wish to say. Unfortunately, he cannot be with us to hear what I want to say so I will leave that for another opportunity. John is a man who wears many hats as well as having many talents. Soon after he finished presenting the Archbishops' Council budget yesterday morning, he had to travel back home to Chelmsford for County Council business. Knowing John, doubtless by now he has also clocked up one or two engagements in his newest role as Mayor's Consort. His wife Yvonne, who has often been with him during the group of sessions at York, was recently appointed the Mayor of Chelmsford. I trust members of Synod will join me in congratulating her and wishing them both well in their new roles.

Back to the business in hand. John has served the Archbishops' Council and the wider Church in so many ways and with distinction. Since appointment five years ago he has consistently asked the question how can the Council use its resources to serve our dioceses and parishes most effectively in carrying out the missional commandment of Jesus Christ? It was largely as a result of John's endeavours that last year the Council radically changed the way in which grants are made to dioceses. The key factors now are a desire to use our money more effectively, to have greater visibility of its impact and to facilitate wider learning among the Church's family. John is now Chair of the Council's Strategic Investment Board, which oversees the award of diocesan grants, as well as working with our partner National Church Institutions by chairing the Joint Employment and Common Services Board.

One example of John's desire for Christ to be at the heart of this nation is through his advocacy of the work of the Church's National Digital Team. Through their various initiatives, they are reaching new people currently outside the church in imaginative and creative ways. They are also increasing their engagement with our local parishes to equip and enable them to share both through the web and social media the message of salvation we proclaim. We are grateful to John for his work with the Council's partners, such as the Corporation of Church House, the All Churches Trust and the Church Commissioners to attract additional funds. This has enabled the Council to support and welcome and continue an increase in vocations that we have sought without all the financial burden falling on our dioceses.

As John outlined yesterday, funding the increase of workload the Council has to do on behalf of the Church is going to be a challenge over the next few years, but a challenge that he and other members of the Council actually very much are looking forward to.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and I are grateful that John is willing to serve as a member of the Archbishops' Council and the Chair of its Finance Committee for a further three years. Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

*The Chair:* Item 27 is now open for debate.

*Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark):* I am the newest member of the Archbishops' Council where I sit in awe of the abilities of Canon John Spence. I am sitting in the chamber next to Mark Russell and it is possible I am going to make the same speech, I do not know.

As Chair of Finance Committee, as we have all heard, he brings an amazing attention to detail combined with a very clear vision of the big picture. You are aware, members of Synod, of his brilliant oratory and his effective skills of persuasion, and, to quote St Luke, we might also “note his words of wisdom that no one will be able to withstand or contradict.” His vision for the risen and living Christ being at the centre of every community in our country is something that drives him and drives his work as the Chair of our Finance Committee. It is very clear to me that among all the things that hit his desk, there is a very clear priority and focus on evangelism as the first and, in my view, pre-eminent Mark of Mission. Archbishop Justin made evangelism one of his three priorities and established the Evangelism Task Group, but it was John Spence who found the money to make it happen.

We would have been receiving a Report and debating a Report about the work of the Evangelism Task Group at this group of sessions, but, unfortunately, the important legislative business that we had to do has meant that it will not be heard today. I do want to commend GS 2098 and as you go home please reread it and join me in committing yourself to doing whatever you can towards implementing Items (a), (b) and (c) before we debate this again in February.

*Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield):* Chair, thank you for calling me. This is not a million miles away from Adrian’s speech. I have served on the General Synod for just over 10 years in two different mandates and I have served under four different Chairs of the Finance Committee. John Spence is unbelievably remarkable, talented, gifted, visionary, committed and unbelievably able, and I just wanted to pay tribute to him on the floor of this Synod today. I want to pay tribute to his capacity, his brain, he has got more intelligence in his finger than I have in my head; he can remember everything; he stands up there with no notes and remembers numbers from his head; his commitment to evangelism and particularly with younger people; his understanding of the world of social media and our need to communicate digitally; his commitment to the poorest communities in our land. Someone told me once that budgets are theology in numbers, and John has worked tirelessly to ensure that our budgets align with our vision and that we put our money where our theology is and where our mouth is.

Synod, we are remarkably well served by this incredible individual and I hope that Synod will not only just support this motion but will do so with immense enthusiasm and pay tribute to a remarkable man who serves and will continue to serve the Church of England with distinction and I am thrilled he is going to be on our Council for three more years.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* It is well known to the Synod that many, many good things come from the Chelmsford Diocese, I hardly need to say this. I felt this was a good opportunity to underline the point that the new Chief Executive of the

Pensions Board was, until a few days ago, the diocesan secretary of the Chelmsford diocese. Our Chairman is the registrar of the Chelmsford Diocese. I first met John Spence when he was Chair of the Board of Finance of the Chelmsford Diocese and we were appointing the new diocesan secretary. John persuaded me - he is a persuasive man you know - to get one of these headhunting companies to help us. They did lots of tests and extra interviews with the people. We came to the short-listing meeting, all of us, with piles of papers like this, and of course, as usual, John came into the room without any paper at all and yet he was the person who had the greatest command of the paperwork.

He is an extraordinary man, but the reason I wanted to stand chiefly is because I am his Bishop and I know him well in his context back home in the diocese. I see another side to him which you do not see. The one thing I do not think anybody else knows, which is worth knowing because it helps you understand what motivates him, is that John and Yvonne worship at the cathedral and run the Catering Committee for the cathedral, so whenever there is a cathedral event - next week we will be installing John Perumbalath in the cathedral as new Bishop of Bradwell - the people in the kitchen getting all the food ready will be John and Yvonne. Yvonne usually makes the food and John is in the kitchen up to his elbows in soapy water doing the washing up.

John has many, many gifts, but right at the heart he is a servant and he uses the gifts he has in the service of the Gospel. We were very, very sorry to lose him to the national Church, but, goodness me, what a blessing he has been, and as his Bishop it is a great joy to be able to stand here and thank him for what he has done for our church in east London and Essex and what he is doing for all of us.

*The Chair:* I see no one standing so I invite His Grace to respond to the debate.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* With such words there is nothing anybody can say other than:

“To God be the glory, great things He hath done,  
So loved he the world that He gave us his Son;  
Who yielded His life our redemption to win,  
And opened the life-gate that all may go in.  
Praise the Lord, praise the Lord, Let the earth hear His voice, Praise the Lord, praise the Lord,  
Let the people rejoice;  
Oh come to the Father through Jesus the Son, And give Him the glory;  
great things He hath done”.

Chair, that is my response to the speeches”.

*The Chair:* As usual, Your Grace, Standing Orders cannot contain you. We move to the vote now on the motion at Item 27.

*The motion*

*That the reappointment of Canon John Spence as a member of the Archbishops' Council from 1 October 2018 to 30 September 2021 be approved.*

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

*The Chair:* That is very clearly carried, and that concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 10.06 am.

## **ITEM 28**

### **REPORT OF THE CATHEDRALS WORKING GROUP (GS 2101A AND GS 2101B)**

*The Chair:* Good morning, everyone. As Pete said, we are nearly there and, as you will see from the Agenda, we now come to the report of the Cathedrals Working Group. This covers both Items 28 and 29 on the Agenda. For these items members will need GS 2101A and GS 2101B. Please also refer to the financial comments on the Eighth Notice Paper.

Synod's consideration of the Report takes the form of a presentation by the Bishop of Bristol followed by brief questions and then a debate on the motion set out on the Order Paper moved by the Bishop of Worcester. First of all, we come to Item 28, which is a presentation under Standing Order 107. I invite the Bishop of Bristol, Vivienne Faull, to make the presentation and I would like to draw to your attention that this is the first time Vivienne is addressing Synod as a Bishop. You have 15 minutes. Thank you.

*The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Vivienne Faull):* Good morning, Synod. My thanks to the Business Committee for this space in a lengthy and busy agenda. I am glad we have opportunity both for this presentation and for questions prior to the debate. When the Archbishops asked me more than 18 months ago to be Vice-Chair of the Cathedrals Working Group, I had no inkling that the group would be the backdrop to my last months in cathedral world or that I would be addressing Synod having ceased to be Dean of York and having become Bishop of Bristol which, of course, gives me a new perspective on the Report, though I have viewed a range of cathedrals from a range of viewpoints over the years.

Colin Buchanan, then Principal of St John's, Nottingham, once labelled me as a relic because I admitted that at my village primary school we learnt both our times tables and the shorter catechism. Those were the days. I feel something of a relic from cathedral world this morning because I started as Chaplain at Gloucester Cathedral in 1990 in the

days even before the Howe Report, the Care of Cathedrals Measure and the Cathedrals Measure. And over the last 28 years I have seen cathedrals change profoundly.

First, there was the definition of common purpose, honed by the Dean's Conference, which for the first time gave an ecclesiological framework for the task of all cathedrals as the seat of the Bishop and a centre of worship and mission. Secondly, there was legislative process via the Care of Cathedrals Measure and the Cathedrals Measure, creating a framework of accountability for chapters, for deans and canons and lay members, that accountability being to the wider Church, to their own communities of interest and to national bodies ecclesiastical and parliamentary.

In the 1990s this accountability was regarded with a mixture of fear and disdain, particularly, I suspect, by grand deans of grand cathedrals. At the time the universities were going through a similar transformation and vice-chancellors quipped that the process turned all polytechnics into universities and all universities into polytechnics. Grand deans - these days an endangered species - felt similarly that all provosts would become deans and all deans, provosts.

I say this by way of introduction because many of the issues raised during the Working Party's group were to me somewhat familiar. Alongside the fundamental questions of ecclesiology - and Bishop Adrian and I were determined to start there rather than with particular apparent hard cases in particular cathedrals - were practical questions about the details of management and the great variety of cathedral contexts.

We had to cover a great deal of ground, but we did not rush. At one point we were given more time to complete the task properly, but intensive work was done by colleagues and by staff, so my thanks particularly to the staff of Church House for producing briefing and drafting papers of the highest order. I would like to thank colleagues on the Group who wrestled with hard questions with great integrity. No solution was simply taken off the shelf or copied across from other sorts of organisations.

Beyond the Working Group itself, we were grateful to the Association of English Cathedrals, to its Chair, Adrian Dorber, Dean of Lichfield, to its executive and especially to Sarah King, its Executive Director, a Baptist who like so many across the great variety of churches, loves cathedrals in full knowledge of their failings and fragilities and is dedicated to their development.

Above all I would like thank the Chair of the working group, the Bishop of Stepney, the Rt Revd Adrian Newman, whose consultative style, evidenced, for instance, by his commitment to an hour's conversation with every diocesan bishop and every cathedral dean, set the tone for our work. What you have before us today is the product of an extensive listening process.

The report of the Cathedrals Working Group is now complete as you will see from the very substantial paper before you as GS 2101A. However, I would like to emphasise that



we are now at the start of the next stage of what I hope will continue to be a collaborative process between Synod and the cathedrals constituency. Cathedrals themselves have already begun this journey under the leadership of the AEC. Many of the non-legislative recommendations have already been adopted and are being taken forward.

At national level, I am grateful indeed to Dr Eve Poole, the new Third Church Estates Commissioner, who has with great passion and enthusiasm started a new national level cathedral support group made up of NCI staff and other representatives. This group, the first which has brought together all those whose work in the NCIs affects cathedrals, will drive forward the legislative and operational action points which the report recommends for the National Church Institutions.

So now to the Report itself. The Cathedrals Working Group was set up in early 2017 in response to a request made by the Bishop of Peterborough in his January 2017 visitation charge for Peterborough Cathedral. The Bishop asked the Archbishops' Council to look carefully at how the current legislation governing cathedrals is operating and whether any improvements could be made. The Archbishops established the Cathedrals Working Group in response to this charge. The list of members of the Working Group is set out on page 109 of the Report and brought together a combination of skills and perspectives drawn from across the Church, the charity sector, the heritage sector, the political world and the corporate and financial sectors. Their varying insight and rigorous questioning have been invaluable in completing our task.

In preparing the Report our focus has necessarily been on the terms of reference we were set but we were from the start aware of the particular nature and ecclesiology of cathedrals. The Report therefore begins with a lengthy chapter on this, drawing on some of the current academic writing on this subject. We have attempted to frame our comments in the context of theology and ecclesiology. We have specifically recommended that further work be done on this important area as part of the implementation stage.

In terms of our own thinking, our biggest challenge has been to strike a balance in the Report between those who contend that cathedrals are too separate from the bishop and the diocese and those who argue that the cathedrals should have an arm's length status with regard to the bishop and the rest of the diocese.

We hope our proposals take account of these widely divergent viewpoints, whilst favouring a model of co-operation and emphasising scrutiny, good governance and oversight for all cathedrals, albeit within the historic framework of the cathedral chapter and its operations.

In making our recommendations, the Working Group was acutely aware that not all the recent problems with cathedrals have been due to unsuitable legislation. We have identified complex issues around relationship breakdown, confusions over accountability and responsibility, and the frustration of some stakeholders who wanted to intervene and

help with problems. For this reason, we have made a number of recommendations about non-legislative improvements to processes and people management.

Many cathedrals have already put such arrangements in place, but not all of them have yet done so and we urge them to do so. We are aware that some smaller cathedrals may view the recommendations as daunting and expensive and arrangements for this will require further thought, not least on how to fund key posts and not least in parish church cathedrals with their particular legislative framework. However, we still take the view that many recommendations can be implemented fairly quickly.

As requested in our terms of reference, we devoted most of our time to considering how cathedrals are governed. It is clear from recent visitation reports, as well as from our own experience and the feedback we received in the course of our work, that there is currently a confusion in cathedral governance between different functions of governance and management.

In secular charitable institutions and in many companies and academic organisations, these functions are clearly split between a governing body, a board, and some kind of executive committee which leads to day-to-day management. We were aware that, in ecclesiological terms, it is impossible to split these two functions of governance and management into two separate bodies if chapter were to retain its historic role as governing body with, at the same time, those responsible for the day-to-day, the dean as chair and the residentiary canons as members of that governing body.

What we have suggested is a kind of hybrid model where this historic ecclesiological structure is retained but with the majority of members of chapter being non-executive members. These members will bring some additional external scrutiny and specialist professional skills to the governance and oversight of the cathedral. In the meantime, the senior executive team, which may also be chaired by the dean, will do the operational work. We are suggesting a vice-chair drawn from outside the cathedral to support the work of the dean.

Secondly, we have recommended that all cathedrals should come under Charity Commission regulation. We do not expect this to solve every problem. The road to registration may not be straightforward, but, if achievable, we do think it will act as an incentive to cathedrals to encourage good governance. Charity Commission regulation will also give assurance to donors and funders and show that cathedrals are in line with best practice elsewhere in the third sector.

All members of chapter will have trustee responsibilities to support the mission and purpose of the cathedral over and above their own individual interests. This accountability will be further strengthened when cathedrals are regulated by the Charity Commission. No one member of chapter will be able to subvert this, not even, as has been suggested, the vice-chair.

To support the scrutiny and oversight of the new style chapter, we are proposing a new system of quinquennial assurance review commissioned by the bishop. We are not proposing to abolish tradition episcopal visitations, but we do see these as rather heavy-handed processes for the more routine improvement discussions which should be taking place between the bishop and the dean and with the chapter on a regular basis.

We have also strengthened the requirements for the management of audit and risk. We are calling for a finance audit and risk committee to be established which reports directly to the chapter. The finance audit and risk committee, or committees, should take a much stronger role than a purely advisory role.

After consultation with council chairs, we have proposed the abolition of cathedral councils, freeing some members of councils to become non-executive members of chapter and enabling cathedrals to pursue the stakeholder engagement strategy which is most suitable for their missional needs.

The Working Group paid great attention to the role of the cathedral as the seat of the bishop. We urge cathedral and bishop to work closely together to support the overall mission of the diocese, as well as to ensure a consistent approach to areas such as safeguarding. At national level, we believe that Charity Commission regulation will also make the role of the Church Commissioners much clearer, leaving them free to inhabit their appropriate role as a funder of cathedrals rather than being drawn further into a regulatory role.

Aware that many cathedrals, particularly in areas of multiple social need, struggle financially - and have not yet found a king under a car park - we would like to see national Church funding for cathedrals increase, and we would also like the NCIs working with cathedrals to open a dialogue with Government on the possibility of making a national contribution to a Cathedral Fabric Fund.

The Cathedral Working Group published a draft of its Report in mid-January 2018 for an eight-week period of consultation. A detailed breakdown of the consultation responses is set out in GS 2101B. We received nearly 300 responses, and we are grateful for them, the majority of respondees supporting the majority of the recommendations. However, the responses did usefully crystallise some issues and concerns.

Accordingly, following the consultation, we rewrote the chapters on “governance” and “leadership”, “management” and “people” to make our recommendations clearer and take account of the points raised. In the final version, we have set out more clearly our recommendations on the composition of the chapter and the role of the vice-chair. We have agreed that further work needs doing on the role and status of parish church cathedrals. We have corrected some infelicitous language in the “people” section and done more work on the role of residentiary canons.

In preparing the Report, we were acutely aware of the previous work done by the Howe Commission on Cathedrals in the mid-1990s. Reading the Howe Report today, it is notable that their recommendations still read as relevant, sensible and nuanced. It was our belief that if more of these recommendations had been implemented, as recommended by Lady Howe at the time, then there would probably have been no need for a further Report and a number of subsequent high-profile issues within cathedral world would have been avoided, hence our perhaps ill-advised plea that the recommendations be taken as a whole and to avoid cherry picking.

Synod, of course, has the freedom to pick, choose and amend the cherries, but we were concerned that any follow-up proposal will need to have coherence. Cathedrals sit at the nexus of a web of connections. As the local authority leaders reflected to us, they carry symbolic and spiritual weight far beyond the immediate community of their clergy and congregation. They create and sustain a sense of place and identity in a context of increasing diversity, fragmentation and rootlessness.

As the Rt Hon Jack Straw, a member of the Working Group, noted recently in the *Church Times*, William Temple knew what he was doing in making Blackburn the See City of a new diocese. Blackburn was one of more than a dozen new cathedrals planted around the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries as centres of mission. A century on, those cathedrals, along with others of great venerability, have themselves developed as complex organisations. With the old and new foundation cathedrals, they face the constant scrutiny that social and mainstream media now gives to all public institutions, as well as the statutory requirements for security, safety and safeguarding compliance.

As Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa, author of the novel, *The Leopard*, wrote about his state and his estates at a time of profound change, "If we want things to stay as they are, they will have to change". The context for cathedrals has changed irrevocably since the earliest days of cathedrals and significantly even in the last 28 years. The world which the Howe Report worked for in the 1990s has moved on. The role of cathedrals continues to be relevant.

Jack Straw reminded us how cathedrals appeal to all members of the community, whether Christian, of other faith or of no faith at all. They attract all sorts, giving identity to the surrounding area. They are often the focal point of civic life and culture. Not only do they attract worshippers, they fascinate visitors seeking an experience of living faith in a secular world. On behalf of the bishop, they gather in the name of Christ and send in the name of Christ. The Report aims to support that missionary work and I am proud to be presenting it to you today.

*The Chair*. It is now the opportunity for members to ask brief questions. As we have already done this morning, we will hear your questions in groups of three. Is there anyone wishing to ask a question?

*Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester):* Having read the Report with interest, I was excited to read in the conclusions in paragraph 14, and it was alluded to in the speech, "Cutting across our Report at various points is the question of state funding", and that in the final sentence it says, "A dialogue with Government should be opened up". My question is twofold. When and how will this dialogue take place and, if and when it does, will our other ancient churches and buildings be brought into the dialogue as they too attract visitors?

*Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester):* My question relates to the accountability of residentiary canons outlined on page 61 through the dean and the chapter and how that would sit with them being fellow trustees alongside the dean and other chapter members. It feels a little muddled, and I am wondering what measures are anticipated to make this workable, especially if conflict arises?

*Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester):* What is it about Rochester this morning? This is not coordinated, incidentally. Overnight, I received an email on these subjects - and this is not my subject, obviously - but I would ask, is there any evidence that the Charity Commission has the willingness as well as the capacity to undertake the responsibility? Has there been the actual consultation? Has it happened yet or is that an aspiration?

*The Chair:* Vivienne, would you like to respond, please?

*The Bishop of Bristol (Very Revd Viv Faull):* Angela, thank you for your question about the possibility of national funding. There has been dialogue ongoing, actually, over some years which resulted a few years ago in the World War I Memorial Grants, which were enormously helpful to cathedrals. That dialogue has continued, not least through the good offices of Lord Cormack, and deans have been meeting with parliamentarians on an informal basis. Conversations have begun, including some months ago a conversation with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Those will continue. I hope now they can be put on a more formal basis.

Secondly, the question about residentiary canons also being trustees. I do not see a complete stress in the relationship there. The whole of the body of the chapter has to have trustee responsibility. Within the chapter, there will, of course, be different responsibilities and those different responsibilities have to be held accountable to the work of the chapter chaired by the dean. I think that is a separate question from the issue of conflict when it arises. In any Working Group that is operating in the public eye with a degree of pressure in terms of resources and time, there will, from time to time, be conflicts.

I am glad that, in many cathedrals, there is now deliberate work being undertaken to work with external facilitators to ensure that, as conflicts arise, as differences of opinion arise, they do not become extreme conflicts without some process of conciliation taking place. I know that that is always going to be a potential fault line in cathedrals, but it is something that I think we are getting a little more skilled at working to ameliorate.

Finally, Charity Commission. I think nearly 10 years ago I led the first meeting of cathedrals with the AEC and the senior staff at the Charity Commission. The senior staff arrived looking wary. The first question to me was, "Are your foundation documents [in other words, our Constitution and statutes] in English?" Because the Oxford and Cambridge colleges had recently gone through the process of coming under Charity Commission regulation and, believe it or not, some of their con and stats were not written in English at that point. I assured them that that was not a major problem, but I know that this will require considerable negotiation with the Charity Commission in order to enable them to say yes to this proposal.

*The Chair.* I can see we are warming up now.

*The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell):* Thank you very much for the work that has been done on this, which I think is taking us a long way forward and it is good that it has started with ecclesiology. I just need to confess that I still do not get why some of our cathedrals are cathedral and some of our cathedrals are parish church cathedrals. I think this creates ecclesiological problems and difficulties. Unless I have just missed that bit of the Report, I just wonder why there is not more being done on trying to make sense of that.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I am a Church Commissioner. In all other areas of the Church, parishes, deaneries, dioceses, we see mutual support taking place, although I must confess I do think there is a need for a teaching document on mutual support from the House of Bishops. Why does this not apply to cathedrals? Why can we not have mutual support so that the richer cathedrals can support the weaker cathedrals?

*Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield):* Thank you, Group, for your hard work. I have read this Report twice through Archbishops' Council. I have one question, which is why are in many dioceses and many cathedrals residentiary canons paid more than incumbents and what does that say to other incumbents about the status that they are seen in the wider Church against residentiary canonries?

*The Chair.* Vivienne, would you like to respond to those questions, please?

*The Bishop of Bristol (Very Revd Viv Faull):* Bishop Stephen, thank you. Parish church cathedrals. Yes, having been provost and dean of a parish church cathedral, I asked that question frequently, and that cathedral would have wanted to have become an extra parochial place in order to have become more like other cathedrals. But other parish church cathedrals - Southwell, for instance, has parochial responsibilities and Southwark - are somewhat resistant to that proposal. More work needs to be done both on the merits of the case and on getting agreement to a proposal. There is a proposal to do more work, but what the outcome will be I do not know.

Gavin Oldham, mutual support between cathedrals, those who are more well-endowed and those who are less endowed. Well, that is happening partly on an informal basis and

partly formally, because the richest I think five cathedrals receive no additional funding from the Church Commissioners except the funding from the dean and two Commissioners' canons. There is some, if you like, pooling of funding at that point. I am glad that there is that sense of mutual resource and mutual support that goes across the cathedral constituency. Removing endowments from richer cathedrals to give to poorer cathedrals would be a long and cumbersome way of resolving issues and so maybe informal support needs to be developed further.

Mark Russell's question on residentiary canons, actually, I do not really know the answer. I am sure there is a committee that considers remuneration and perhaps does need to set out the arguments for that, particularly in a world where, alongside the considerable responsibility for governance and the considerable specific skills that residentiary canons bring, there are now, across dioceses, incumbents carrying very significant responsibility and bringing very significant skill to their tasks. I think there does need to be a renewed setting out of the rationale for the differential there.

*The Chair.* We will take, Chris, your question, as the last one.

*Revd Chris Newlands (Blackburn):* I declare an interest as I am the acting Chair of the Greater Churches Network at the moment. Many of the greater churches are actually physically larger than some cathedrals and have the potential to be a great resource to dioceses working with the cathedrals in hosting many things and being a source of mission. Many of the points made in the Report, I could actually read cathedrals and greater churches in terms of what they are able to offer. Is there a way in which we can work more closely together between the greater churches and the cathedrals in providing resource more widely?

*The Chair.* Thanks, Vivienne. I can see you are coming along to respond to Chris's question.

*The Bishop of Bristol (Very Revd Viv Faull):* The answer to Chris, is, yes, the Project Panel is, indeed, looking at extending its remit to major churches, knowing that in many dioceses there is already some work going on between cathedrals and, for instance, minsters and other greater churches and so I think there is work beginning already.

*The Chair.* Thank you very much, everyone, for those contributions and for Vivienne's responses. That brings to an end Item 28.

## **ITEM 29**

*The Chair.* We turn over, in terms of the Order Paper, to Item 29. I invite the Bishop of Worcester, the Rt Revd Dr John Inge, to speak to and move on behalf of the House of Bishops Item 29. You have up to 10 minutes.

*The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Dr John Inge):* I beg to move

'That this Synod:

- a) welcome the recommendations in the Report of the Cathedrals Working Group (GS 2101A);
- b) request the Archbishops' Council to bring forward a draft Measure for the First Consideration at the February 2019 group of sessions to give effect to the recommendations that involve legislative change;
- c) call on all concerned, including bishops, cathedrals and the National Church Institutions, to give effect to the recommendations that do not involve legislative change as soon as practically possible.'

Good morning, Synod. As Lead Bishop for Churches and Cathedrals, I am delighted to propose this motion on behalf of the House of Bishops.

I want to begin by thanking Bishop Viv for her excellent presentation. Like her, I want to express my appreciation to the Bishop of Stepney and all the members of the Cathedrals Working Group. They worked very hard under great pressure of time to produce what I think is an excellent Report.

I echo Bishop Viv's view that this Report is highly significant. It seems to me that it is finishing business which was not properly dealt with 25 years ago following the publication of the Howe Report and its rather half-hearted implementation which followed.

Had all the recommendations of that Report been accepted, as Viv has intimated, it is quite possible that some of the recent problems at cathedrals would have been avoided. Maybe we owe it to Elspeth Howe and her group, as much as we do to Bishops Adrian and Viv and their group, to ensure that we do not lose this second opportunity properly to protect and enable the current and future mission of these wonderful places.

Enabling and growing mission is what this Report is about. As required by the remit of the group, it covers a range of crucial practical matters, finance, governance, people management, audit and safeguarding. These are sometimes wrongly categorised as secular matters, whereas, in fact, it is essential to get them right in order better to enable the prayer and worship, service and outreach to the community which are core to the ecclesial identity of cathedrals. Only then can these buildings continue to flourish and benefit the rapidly changing community context in which they have such an important symbolic, spiritual and physical presence.



The motion you have before you today is what is known in Synod parlance as a “paving motion”. What is being asked is that Synod should take stock of the current situation, look back at the Report of the Working Group, encourage ongoing activity and endorse the plan to bring legislation back to Synod. I should say at this stage that I am very happy to accept the amendment that will be proposed.

In proposing the motion, I should like to speak briefly to the recommendations which are referred to in clause A. These begin, rightly, with ecclesiological considerations. Perhaps you would expect me to say this, but I agree very strongly with the Working Group that a good working relationship between bishop and dean is absolutely crucial to ensuring the mission of each cathedral and its diocese.

I disagree with those who have suggested that the recommendations of the Report might jeopardise that, neither do I agree with those who have suggested that it will result in a destructive power grab by either deans or bishops. Chapters corporately, rather than deans or bishops, will continue to formulate the cathedral policy and have complete responsibility for its implementation. Collegiality will remain essential to the life and health of cathedrals.

The Working Group has, I believe, done an excellent job in reconciling best practice of governance in the secular world with the unique historical and ecclesiological status of cathedrals. Let us be frank, there was considerable pressure to dispense with the Christian tradition for the governance of cathedrals which goes back hundreds of years. Extending chapters, as is proposed is, rather, evolution, not revolution.

I remember people being very exercised about the introduction of lay members of chapter following the Howe report. I was a residentiary canon at the time. It has turned out, in my view, to be an unreservedly good thing. This Report recommends extending this principle in order that the non-executive majority on chapters will be able to play an enhanced role in offering external expertise and scrutiny while allowing the historic status of dean and canons in collegiate and prayerful leadership to continue.

I am aware that there is some ongoing interest in the role of vice-chair as set out in the Report. I want to emphasise what should already be clear; that this individual will have the same trustee obligations as every other member of chapter, namely he or she will be required to operate for the wider good of the cathedral and not to lobby for any particular interest, whether that of the bishop, the dean or any other body. The vice-chair will not be the bishop’s mole on chapter but will perform a vital role as supporter and critical friend of the dean and other members of the chapter.

The point is that the dean will continue to lead the praying heart of a cathedral and the lead in communication between it and the bishop will continue to be the dean, but the vice-chair will be able to support. Concern has been expressed by some about the proposals to abolish councils. It is true that councils will no longer be a part of the body corporate as proposed in the Report, but cathedrals will be welcome and, depending on

the consultation over implementation, they will be encouraged to have a sort of critical friend or stakeholder group. Our council at Worcester operates pretty much like that, and very effectively, at present.

The intention with this, as much else, is that implementation should leave as much individual flexibility as possible for cathedrals to express, wherever appropriate, their different personalities and ways of working.

There are a number of recommendations in the Report which concern the relationship between cathedrals and the national Church. I welcome the fact that, perhaps for the first time, the national Church institutions are making a concerted effort to co-ordinate their support for cathedrals which previously has been rather limited to buildings matters and grant-funding. They will be able to track the delivery of this existing support as well as to look at options for further support in the future. To this end, I commend to you the work of the newly established national Cathedrals Support Group chaired by Dr Eve Poole, the Third Church Estates Commissioner. This group will bring together staff from the different departments of the national Church institutions which are supporting cathedrals and oversee the delivery of the various national-level actions requested by the Working Group.

In due course, Synod will be able to debate in detail each of the proposals in a report which require legislation, including how cathedral chapters are composed, their constitution and statutes, et cetera. The bulk of the recommendations set out in the Working Group's report however will be achieved through non-legislative actions taken by cathedral clergy and staff, the Association of English Cathedrals and the staff of the National Church Institutions. Work has already begun in a number of cathedrals, including at Worcester by our own excellent dean and chapter, on this. The chapter sees it as a substantial but not unmanageable task.

It remains for me to repeat my thanks to all those who have worked so hard to get us to this point. I hope very much that you will feel able to give your full endorsement to the motion and I now have great pleasure in moving the motion which stands in my name.

*The Chair:* As we come to debate Item 29 I would like to remind members about what the Chair of the Business Committee drew to our attention in the debate on the Report of the Business Committee about the need for members to declare any relevant interests if called to speak. Item 29 is now open for debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

*Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln):* Thank you for calling me for my maiden speech on this important matter. I need to declare an interest. I am a lay canon of Lincoln Cathedral, a member of the Cathedral Council and Chair of Lincoln Cathedral Community Association executive committee. I am also a regular member of the worshipping community and a volunteer steward. It is that experience of being part of the praying

community that I want to focus on today in the context of my overall support for this Report.

The Report rightly identifies omissions. We have not been able to cast more than a glance at some fundamental aspects of the cathedral's life. I think one of these aspects which has not yet had sufficient attention is the wider praying community which is, for me, the beating heart of a cathedral.

Let me offer a glance of my own lived experience of Lincoln, which I am sure will resonate with many others who are part of a cathedral community. On any day in Lincoln Cathedral there are at least four public acts of worship, more on Sundays, and many of these are during times when visitors will see and/or hear the worship even if they do not join it. Staff, regulars, volunteers and visitors alike light candles and leave prayer requests. Duty chaplains (all volunteers) are on hand to pray with visitors and to offer short public moments of silence and prayer. Much of our public prayer is sung and, as St Augustine reminded us, singing well is praying twice, and our choir do sing well.

The building itself scaffolds this prayer. From the minute you walk in it strikes you as a place of prayer and holiness. The dean and chapter set and shape that rhythm but it is the regulars and the visitors who help keep the heart of prayer beating strongly. When I sit in my canon's stall or pray my allocated daily psalms, I am part of not just a present wave of prayer but of past and future, in a place that prayer has indeed made valid; what you might think of as a thin place. Alongside those visitors with little formal experience of prayer, there are times when I too can be in that space and allow the Holy Spirit to intercede with sighs too deep for words.

Why am I telling you this? I think this sense of a praying community as being the heart of a cathedral, which is acknowledged in the Report, needs to be examined much more fully and the governance, management and leadership recommendations as they are developed need to be located much more firmly in that framework of a rich and diverse community of prayer if they are to offer not just a sensible model for improvement but a radical reframing of the missional potential of our cathedrals.

Please do support the motion and the amendment but please also encourage those who are drafting the Measure to look still more deeply at all our cathedral communities of prayer and to bring together their valuable work on ecclesiology, and governance, leadership and management in that context.

*Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd Dr David Ison):* I declare quite a bit of interest in this debate. I am speaking on behalf of Deans in Synod. Like the Bishop of Bristol, I have worked in three very different cathedrals over the last three decades. We know that different circumstances mean that this Report will be heard differently by local cathedrals, bishops and dioceses. Please do not forget how different cathedrals are from your own. Many deans have long wanted a review of the 1999 Cathedrals Measure and were grateful to the Cathedrals Working Group, and especially to Adrian Newman, for their careful

listening, consulting and writing which has made the Report rather more of a review than a narrow response to particular problems.

As Deans, we would ask you to support this motion hopefully as amended by Neil Patterson. The Report sets out good practice, much of which is already happening in many cathedrals but needs to be consistently worked through all of them. It recognises the difficulties that cathedrals have in recruiting skilled volunteers to assist with governance and finance, affording enough skilled staff and working under the pressure of immense regulatory and repair liabilities, and also security nowadays, with insufficient resources. The Report helpfully looks for ways for cathedrals to be helped with those. We do, however, have some concerns and the Deans in Synod ask you to bear in mind five things as you consider this Report, two of them about content and two about process.

First, we welcome the stress in the Report about greater accountability for deans and canons and we hope that bishops and parish clergy will in due course also welcome increased accountability for their ministries. We do, however, have a concern about the role of the independent vice-chair which John has already referred to. Having this person chairing the chapter in the absence of the dean will conflict with the role of the vice-dean in many cathedrals and will muddle the distinction between an executive dean and a non-executive vice-chair. There has been occasional experience of a chair of council or a lay chapter member wanting to muscle in on the running of chapter or decide with a dean, or some canons against others; experiences which suggest the danger of conflict which this role could engender. We also note that it is the dean who should represent the cathedral to the bishop with the assistance of a vice-chair and not the other way round, as the Report implies. We would ask for further consideration of this proposal.

Secondly, we welcome chapters having regulatory oversight over them, but we note the unwillingness of the Church Commissioners to do it and the reluctance of the Charity Commission. We hope it is not because nobody wants us but because it is a difficult task. We need to be transparent and to be regulated. We urge closer working together with cathedrals by NCIs and others to achieve an agreed outcome on this.

Thirdly, the legislation and regulation which emerges from the Report must be as flexible as possible within the principles and constraints of the Report in order to accommodate our 42 very different institutions. We are not trying to evade any responsibilities but to have flexibility for appropriate adaptation in different places.

Fourthly, what concerns us most is what comes after this debate. The motion calls for draft legislation and, as you have heard, Eve Poole is working with the Association of English Cathedrals on setting up a good process and deans would welcome being included in this alongside canons and other cathedral representatives. We believe that Synod will need draft legislation which commands a strong consensus from cathedrals, Archbishops' Council and the NCIs. So, we need enough time for a strong process of consultation and working together.

Finally, the fifth point I want to raise is that raised by Muriel Robinson. Stephen Oliver, on page 26 of the Report says that the cathedral is an organism, its praying heart is also its governing heart, the chapter. In the process of ensuring better governance and accountability, good though all that is, we need to keep hold of this essence of chapters and cathedrals being praying communities with spiritual heart. So, we urge you to vote for this, hopefully as amended, and we ask all of you to work with us and your own cathedral and chapter to be that praying community, resourcing bishop and diocese as a focus for the mission of our Lord Jesus Christ.

*Dr Eve Poole (ex officio):* No longer my maiden speech. I am delighted to welcome this important and historic Report. Recommendation 4 of the Working Group's Report says, "There should be greater clarity about and development of the remit of the Third Church Estates Commissioner to provide oversight of the link between Church Commissioners and cathedrals, including the work of the AEC and CAFA".

I welcome this recommendation and am already taking up the challenge it lays down in overseeing the activity to ensure that the recommendations in this Report are taken forward. I will be keeping in close contact with deans, the AEC and CAFA as this work progresses and seeking their views and input at every stage. I will be chairing an internal staff group of those NCI officers charged with implementing the national level workstream set out in the Report so that we can track progress and ensure good communication. I will report back regularly to the cathedrals and the Church's governance bodies. Each of our workstreams will have either a sponsoring dean or another appropriate member of the cathedral community to make sure we are absolutely marching in step. I will be in regular contact with that group throughout this process to share progress and to resolve any issues that may arise. Please do feed your thoughts on this process to me.

The Cathedrals Working Group spoke of the findings of the seminal Theos report *Spiritual Capital*. I commissioned this Report as a trustee of the Foundation for Church Leadership because we knew then that there was an untold story about the extraordinary mission that our cathedrals provide to the nation; their occupation of what the Report calls "liminal space" allows them to function as places of spiritual possibility for those on the fringes by providing a spiritual bridge.

While the Working Group explored the ecclesiology of cathedrals we would like to extend that into a theological exploration of what we really mean by governance and risk in a cathedral context. This work is vital to ensure that any transfer of formal oversight to the Charity Commission does not replace the equivalent and appropriate ecclesiastical oversight that is proper for the Church.

We are minded to progress this as a symposium with deans, bishops and theologians perhaps via a St George's House consultation in the spring and we will report back to Synod on what we discover. For this reason, I support the amendment as it will allow us to undertake this consultation before we return to Synod with the legislation.

I would like to close in thanking the Bishops of Stepney and Bristol and the members of the Working Group for such a useful Report and I look forward to playing my part in its implementation. In the meantime, I invite you to support this motion and the amendment and I ask for your prayers for all of our cathedrals and for all those who work in them.

## ITEM 45

*The Chair:* We come to the amendment. That is what we are going to deal with now. It is listed on Order Paper VI. As we come to Item 45, I invite the Revd Neil Patterson to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to three minutes.

*Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford):* I beg to move

‘In paragraph (b) *leave out* “February” and *insert* “July”.’

Chair, members of Synod, I start by declaring the interest that I am a member of the Cathedral Council in Hereford and an occasional worshipper there, particularly on week days, and I have taught and advanced this debate to various parts of the cathedral and its officers. I have to say that they have responded rather as you might expect from their different perspectives within the cathedral ecology. We will hear from a lot of people from different angles in this debate and so I shall stick to the amendment, which has, as you realise, the effect of just slowing down the pace of action a little and allowing, as we have just heard, more work on the ecclesiology to be done before we have draft legislation.

I did intend in tabling an amendment to offer Synod, in the context of a debate, an opportunity to calibrate, to measure among ourselves what has felt to me like a degree of disquiet about, as Dean Ison said, method and proposals in the Report. I slightly wonder if I should have made the amendment stronger because Dr Inge (with the suave efficiency that gives him such a high reputation as a diocesan Bishop) and his team have accepted it, and so it is perhaps less exciting than one might hope, and you are probably all going to support it anyway.

But I will just add a bit as to why perhaps that adds a sense that things are being managed through Synod and we need to think through and debate through because we all come from different places and have different things to say on this.

In part, this is because, as we know and the Report itself acknowledges, it began in the crises at Exeter and Peterborough. We have all read sources on them and probably talked to different friends and, ergo, worked out who are the martyrs and who are the villains, and which of them are sitting among us. We are also aware of the underlying financial precariousness that cathedrals have and share with many parts of the Church today. That too is a reason to slow the pace and not respond to particular circumstances.

My deeper disquiet has already in part been voiced by the Dean of St Paul’s and I will abbreviate it a little. It comes from paragraph 32 of the Report setting out the thesis that

the governing heart of the cathedral is the same thing as its praying heart. That has a long and a noble history in the life of our Church, and, indeed, of many other Churches. I wonder perhaps when new praying communities are being called into existence at Lambeth and elsewhere, it is being rediscovered.

The Report sets before us a proposal that the chapter becomes a group for whom the majority by definition are asked not to be at that praying heart, to come in externally. Of course, outside voices and outside expertise bring all sorts of things but the distinction is important.

It seems to me that the paradoxical glory of cathedrals is that, to an unusually high degree, their life is mixed up with the secular world. I suggest by uniting the praying and the governing heart that is how they have kept their souls in the face of the pressures that brings, and we should with great caution abandon that principle. I move the amendment standing in my name.

*The Chair:* I invite the Bishop to comment, please. You have up to three minutes.

*The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Dr John Inge):* I am immensely grateful for this amendment because it enabled the proposer to refer to me as being “suavely efficient”. I have never thought myself as either but I shall meditate upon that. In the meantime, I am really sorry to disappoint him by articulating again that I am very happy to accept the amendment.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: would you be prepared to accept a motion of closure?

*The Chair:* I would be interested to see if anyone would like to make a speech at the moment, first of all, and then I will bear that in mind. Item 45 is now open for debate. Please remember to address your comments to the amendment. The speech limit is three minutes.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn):* I too have a strong interest which I declare, and I am grateful to Neil for putting through this amendment. Yes, it was a very interesting consultative process that we went through and I was very grateful to the Bishop of Stepney for telephoning me and listening to me for an hour - that was very good - but it was not a fantastic consultative process, because there was a very significant group of people who were left out of it, and that is residentiary canons. That caused a huge amount of upset. I support this amendment because I want a better process following on from this debate.

I need to be perfectly honest with you. When we received the draft Report we were asked not to cherry-pick, so it was kind of all or nothing, and Southwark decided “nothing”. We

were one of the few chapters and councils together where we had a consultative process within the cathedral and, along with only one other cathedral, we decided that we did not want it, thank you very much, for quite strong reasons, and those have been rehearsed already to some degree, particularly around the governance issues and the vice-chair, and losing something of what I believe is a very creative distance that there has always been between the cathedrals and the bishops.

The Archbishop of Canterbury famously said that cathedrals are safe places for doing risky things. I really believe that and I am a dean who enjoys doing risky things. I was at Pride in London on Saturday afternoon because our chapter had decided that we wanted to march in the Pride parade and we did so flying the flag literally from the tower of the cathedral. If our Bishop had been present in the chapter meeting, I am sure we would not have been able to make that decision, not that Bishop Christopher is not supportive of us, but I know that it causes upset within the rest of the diocese among a few people. At the moment he is able to say, "That is nothing to do with me. That was a decision of the chapter". Not just on that issue but on many other things as well cathedrals are able to push forward on some of the things that we all need to address. I want to see that creative gap allowing the risky to take place in very, very special places within the whole our community to be maintained.

I am going to be voting for this amendment, supporting it and, reluctantly, I will be voting in favour of the motion as amended. I look forward to seeing what comes through the process ahead of us.

*Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury):* I too want to speak in support of this amendment. I am a lay minister in the Diocese of Salisbury and I have the great privilege to be one of those day chaplains or visitor chaplains at the cathedral, most recently on the occasion of the Royal Wedding. There were about 3,500 people gathered outside to watch the wedding and who came flooding into the cathedral after that, but it is a long way from my first experience of an Anglican cathedral which happened to be in Regina, Saskatchewan, where I was married to a man I met at the first ever insolvency conference in 1983. It sets your heart racing, does it not? I was practising in the province of Alberta at the time as an insolvency lawyer.

There was a famous Englishman called Bill Mackie, who said that there were some classic signs of insolvency. The first was flagpoles in the courtyard and the second was tropical fish in the aquarium in the reception and the third was a helicopter for the chairman. The most important thing he said is, "Perhaps you don't see or recognise these things unless you look for them or you hear them". One of the things this Report contained is anxiety on the part of, I forget how many, but certainly a very large proportion of the cathedrals about the financial situation.

I would like to see in the year that will pass between now and when some legislation comes before us a timeline prepared that deals with the legislative and non-legislative changes. I cannot tell you the burden that such situations impose on organisations when



there is too much change, too rapidly, which does not become embedded, when they are required to do things without taking the time to reflect and actually choose the right people. Of course, there needs to be someone at the centre who is asked and expects answers to difficult questions. Whether a lay vice-chair is the right route or not, I do not know, but a lot of thought needs to be given to how the relationships are going to be organised and how people are going to be able to bear the simple sheer workload.

The *Daily Mail* picked all of this up. It said there were 150 recommendations in 125 pages, including some detail like no cathedral should borrow more than £1 million. I am sorry, but I do not understand where things like that come from when the budgets of cathedrals are so disparate.

The final thing I would ask you to do is to watch the communication carefully, especially the communication to the nation and to the local area. If I can find it, I would like to read you what the *Daily Mail*, the source of all great wisdom and knowledge, said about this.

*The Chair:* We have run out of time, Debrah, thank you. Please may I remind people that if you are wishing to speak on the amendment, make sure your comments are focused on the amendment. Mary Durlacher followed by Jane Steen and then I will be looking for a motion for closure.

*Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford):* I wish to support the amendment. It does not matter how much extra time is sought in order to make sure the cherries in the bunch are all fit for eating. I would like to support this because I think more thought needs to be given to the role of theology and the place of theology in the cathedrals. They are the seat of the bishop in the cathedrals, or the cathedra (which is the seat of teaching and learning) and that is what we need in our country where there is so much ignorance of what Christianity is about. So, please could we encourage the Bishops to take up that role of teaching and what a place there is for that? Thank you.

*Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark):* I welcome this amendment and I think it is essential. I was a canon residentiary of Southwark Cathedral for eight years. Southwark Cathedral sits in my archdeaconry, although I may remind the Dean that it is a parish church more often than the Dean might like to be reminded.

The Report's emphasis on accountability is fantastic. If the cathedral as the mother church modelled transparent accountability to the parishes, what a mother it would be. I rejoiced at the connection between governance and prayer and at the appreciation of the quality of relationship, particularly between dean and bishop. I too was therefore puzzled that the majority of the governing body will be those who are not integrally required to be part of that praying community. I too was puzzled by elements in the role of the vice-chair, particularly chairing the meetings in the dean's absence in which the chapter assesses the dean's leadership. This, says the Report, will have the effect of giving the bishop a more direct and positive relationship with the chapter. Really? The bishop already appoints the dean and cathedral canons in almost all cases, in almost all

cathedrals. If he or she cannot establish a direct and positive relationship with those appointees, will one more appointment like that make a difference? I doubt it. Dare one recommend something for bishops?

So, it is the more important that we support this amendment as we move forward to legislation, which I hope we do. Legislation, as we know from yesterday, requires detailed drafting and careful scrutiny and re-scrutiny. If it is brought forward, and I hope it is, it must not be hasty and it must pay careful attention to the interdependent, relational and praying nature of cathedrals in their dioceses and with and for their bishops so that legislation does not undermine what it tries to achieve as in some ways this Report, in many ways excellent, otherwise sadly does. Thank you. Please vote for the amendment.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 45.

*The Chair:* Thank you, John. 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 vote on the amendment, Item 45.

*The motion*

*In paragraph (b) leave out "February" and insert "July".*

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

*The Chair:* We are able now to resume debate on Item 29, as amended by Item 45, the Report of the Cathedrals Working Group.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Dr Pete Wilcox):* For the past 12 months I have been the statutory visitor to Sheffield Cathedral, but before that I served for 11 years as the member of a cathedral chapter, for five years as Dean of Liverpool and for six years before that as a residentiary canon at Lichfield Cathedral.

The two situations were very different. Lichfield Cathedral is one of the oldest in the country; Liverpool Cathedral one of the newest. Lichfield Cathedral one of the smallest in the country; Liverpool Cathedral, by a distance, the biggest. Lichfield Cathedral, the mother church of one of the most geographically extensive dioceses in the country; Liverpool Cathedral of one of the more compact. Lichfield itself, though a city, feels to a visitor like a quintessentially English medieval market town; Liverpool, a modern and increasingly multicultural metropolis, a European city break destination.

One thing was constant. When I look back on those 11 years and call to mind the moments when those two cathedral chapters were most fruitful evangelistically in bearing lively witness to Jesus, when we were most aware of the grace and power of God's spirit, when we were most effective as heralds of God's coming Kingdom, I can see that it was when we demonstrated a healthy appetite for risk. Of course, a healthy appetite for risk is not an excuse for recklessness but it is a real readiness to experiment, to do a new thing and to push boundaries.

In my experience, that has been as true in relation to worship as to enterprise, as true in relation to the way visitors are received, as to the planting of new congregations. I am heartened to see on page 22 of the Report, the now well-known mission statement of Liverpool Cathedral generally applied and even described as a "mantra".

As part quoted by the Dean of Southwark a moment ago, all cathedrals really can be safe places to do risky things in Christ's service. I make this point because, although I do not think the recommendations in the Report are risk averse, I fear the mere fact of the Report, following on from the crises in Exeter and Peterborough, may have the unintended consequence of inhibiting cathedral chapters and of making them more risk averse.

That is not what the mission of God requires, least of all now. I hope the Synod will give chapters every encouragement, as the recommendations in the Report are implemented over the coming years, not to lose their sense of adventure in the Lord. With that caveat, I will be supporting the motion as amended.

*Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark):* I am coming to speak to this motion as one of the members of the Cathedrals Working Group. I became involved with some of the challenges which our cathedrals are facing when I was asked to undertake an initial review of the financial condition of Peterborough Cathedral in 2016. Thereafter, I led a small team which worked with Bishop Donald on his formal visitation at the Cathedral.

Over the past two years, I have become more and more passionate about the work and mission of our cathedrals and, indeed, the opportunity that they provide for proclaiming the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Their survival and flourishing are vital, not just for the health of the Church but for the spiritual health of our nation.

To ensure that flourishing, cathedrals do need good governance, good management, good people, strong safeguarding procedures and - my own favourite subject - strong financial management control. Cathedral chapters are stewards of this heritage for future generations. However, to do this, cathedrals do need the right operational and financial skills and knowledge. They do need good governance and management frameworks with appropriate checks and balances in which people can place their trust and have confidence, whether as worshippers, funders or visitors.

Ultimately, this is the reason why we have recommended that cathedrals come under the regulatory remit of the Charity Commission. However, all the regulation and Cathedral Measures in the world can never ensure that you have the right people in the right place with the right responsibilities doing the right roles. Besides being particularly engaged in our recommendations concerning refreshing cathedral governance and distinguishing it from management, I particularly focused on the need for strong financial management and controls, including ensuring that chapters receive timely, up-to-date and robust financial information.

We are recommending the introduction of quinquennial assurance reviews to provide assurance that appropriate governance, management, financial and operational controls are in place and operating effectively. Chapters need to know the risks that they are facing, the scale of the financial commitments they are taking on and the impact of the investment decisions they are making.

We have recommended that the new finance risk and audit committee must report into chapter and that the chair of the committee must sit on chapter and play a part in the governance of the cathedral. We are also calling for clear budgets, good financial reporting and robust external audits.

Returning to what Debrah McIsaac was saying before, I would like to say that, notwithstanding the piece in the *Daily Mail* last Friday, we have not said that the Church of England may be forced to sell one or more of its ancient cathedrals because of their overwhelming debts. However, we have made a number of recommendations concerning how the national Church funds cathedrals.

We also think that the Church at a national level should start talking more boldly to Government about seeking state funding to preserve these amazing institutions whose duties of care and cultural importance go far beyond their congregations and members of the Church of England. These are national assets and part of our national heritage.

*Revd Canon Paul Rattigan (Liverpool):* I have to declare more than a passing interest in that I am a residentiary canon at Liverpool Cathedral and this is my maiden speech. Cathedrals were not part of my background and so I surprised myself when I applied for my current role and was even more amazed when I was appointed.

In the last five years, I have developed a real passion for cathedrals and their place in the wider Church, especially in mission. In a study leave last year, I looked at cathedral growth and why it seemed to be bucking the general trend. One thing I found from visits and reading was something that one report called "adjacency". This, I connected with my reading of the Gospels where I observed that Jesus does not often speak directly to the crowd; instead, he allows them to overhear his chats with the disciples. Cathedrals are able to do this overhearing or adjacency through many different ways but two especially, heritage and choral tradition.

The downside is that both of these come with interesting price tags, which is part of the reason we find ourselves here today discussing this Report. I support the Working Group's Report and ask you to vote in favour of it. Yes, we can all find details we may not like. For me, this is particularly around the role of vice-chair. I understand the desire for a clear bishop's representative that can aid the communication between chapter and bishop through the dean, but do not see the need for that person to be vice-chair and especially to chair in the absence of the dean.

I have other questions but they can wait until more details come out in the legislation. Overall, the direction is very workable and much needed. I have two requests going forward. My first request is that any groups or panels that pursue this matter beyond today have a generous representation from all aspects and people of cathedrals. That is why I am glad that we have passed the amendment as it will allow more time to achieve this.

My second request is around the comments on recruitment, appointment and training. This is stressed for lay chapter members, but I would ask that it is stressed for lay members, canons and deans. Good personnel can thrive even within bad legislation but no legislation can make up for poor personnel. All it can do is provide an early warning system. My plea going forward is for generous representation and resource to recruitment, appointment and training.

*Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham):* I declare an interest as an honorary canon of Birmingham Cathedral. The strapline in our cathedral is the church that became a cathedral in the town that became a city. St Philip's Cathedral is a parish church cathedral - not a rich foundation in comparison with some - in a diocese with limited financial resources.

I would like to make three very quick points in response to the Report but would very much encourage us all to support the motion as amended. Every cathedral has its own unique identity and special pleading for special cases may break the unifying approach that the Report may be trying to put forward. We must take account of the truism that one size does not fit all.

Parish church cathedrals have a distinctive nature. It is welcome that the Report, as revised, offers the possibility that parish church cathedrals can opt to retain that status. Please do not let this get lost. Please enable cathedrals to develop their unique offering within their unique context for their unique mission. Our strapline reflects our history and our current reality and is part of our core identity.

Secondly, the good governance and management of cathedrals is of paramount importance. Please consider the costs of this. Where new arrangements and requirements place a financial burden on poorer cathedrals, give some regard to helping with funding extra posts, perhaps such as chief financial officer. As in every area of

Church life, finances are stretched and new significant expenditure will be a real challenge in Birmingham.

Another last very small point - maybe. Relationships between bishops and cathedrals are vitally important. When they are good, all is well. As people change and complex situations develop, those relationships can be compromised. The balance of power and vulnerability needs to be carefully considered. Please continue to look carefully at the weight of balance in governance between cathedral and bishop and pay attention to ways of keeping the relationships collaborative and not adversarial.

Bishops and cathedrals need to be singing from the same hymn sheet or chant sheet, but the harmonies brought together by the relationships enhancing the life and mission of diocese and cathedral. Dissonance causes problems. Let each line of the tune contribute to the anthem that calls people into faith and makes cathedrals centres of mission and worship.

*His Honour Judge Peter Collier (ex officio):* I declare my interest, which is that I am Chair of the cathedral council for York Minster and also a lay canon. The proposal in the Working Party's Report is that the cathedral councils will cease to exist when the newly enhanced chapters will have amongst their number several of those who might previously have served as lay members of cathedral councils.

The justification seems to be that there is much confusion about what the role of a council is. The role of the council is sometimes described as that of a critical friend to chapter. That is the limited but real role that we have always adopted in York. We are able to speak to chapter, asking questions, giving advice, but also to speak on behalf of chapter to the wider community.

Those are important roles and I would say that the loss of each would be significant. Once those experienced and skilled lay persons have joined the newly formed chapter, including the vice-chair, they will become insiders and, although able to impart their experience and wisdom to the decision-making process, they are then part of the inner circle and could well be party to unwise decisions or proposals.

If there was still a critical friend, the cathedral council, they could ask the hard questions. They could offer the external advice and could do so if they were a necessary rather than an optional stakeholder group. The role of speaking for chapter would also be lost.

Last night at York Minster I chaired a meeting at which the parents of schoolchildren met with chapter. Explanations were given. Questions were asked. It is not the first time, as Chair of council, that I have played such a role. It is a role that was significant but made possible because of the position of the council. I want to question, as the work goes forward, the assumption that any new form of chapter means there is no need for a council with a formal role and part of the corporate body.

*Mr Timothy Fleming (St Albans):* I have the privilege, Synod, of working as the head of finance and development at St Albans Cathedral and have previously supported PRCs in their governance and financial control. So, a conflict, I guess; an interest, call it what you will; you will have to be the judge as to whether what I say is relevant.

I absolutely welcome this Report but we do need to implement it with care, be pragmatic and work with cathedrals. It is excellent that we have heard from Eve Poole today that it sounds like that will be the case and I warmly welcome that. Yesterday, we supported flexibility in individual contexts. Today, let us not inadvertently undermine all the good work of our cathedrals in what I might call each of their individual DNAs. For one moment, I might ask you just to hold up a mirror to your own cathedral and ask you what do you see in it and hold that thought.

A lot is made in the Report of differentiating between executive and non-executive roles and this is good. Let us remember a good chapter is one with the right people at the right time with the right breadth of skills, balancing support and challenge and, critically, with the right level of personal engagement with the cathedral's growth and mission.

A tick box approach, if that is how we implement this Report, really will not work. For many cathedrals, including St Albans, this means congregational representation. For others, I might suggest it could be different: stakeholders. Lose this connection and we run the risk of damaging not only financial growth but missional growth as well. I would say this, would I not, but for many cathedral contexts I would commend going even further than the Report suggests and commend a lay majority on chapters as we have in St Albans.

Some specific pointers too on the recommendations for the new Cathedrals Support Group. The conversations that we will have on cathedral funding need to be accelerated. It is great to hear they are starting but let us not delay. A watch-out on regional appointment lists. These can so often become the preserve of like-minded people.

I would encourage us to think about discernment rather than such a case, particularly discernment with young people. Whilst there is a lot in relation to financial process and a lot of good stuff, perhaps we need to make sure that we also leave finance teams the space and judgment to be able to concentrate on financial growth and sustainability. Synod, in implementing this Report, let us not unnecessarily constrain our deans.

Let us continue to do the risky things. Let us not constrain staff and let us keep any legislative change as light as touch as possible. When we look in that mirror that I asked you to do, let us make sure that what we see in the reflection is something that inspires us.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: Madam Chair, can I tempt you with a motion for closure after the next speaker?

*The Chair.* Not just at the moment, thank you.

*Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry (Leeds):* I have been associated with cathedrals as an honorary canon and as a member of a bishop's staff meeting where deans have been close colleagues for the last 12 years, first in Manchester, then in Wakefield and, more recently, in the cathedrals of the Diocese of Leeds.

I have consulted with the Deans of Bradford and Ripon in preparing this speech. Overall, in my view, the proposals in this Report are a quantum leap forward. I am not only content with it but enthusiastic about much of it. The Report gives much needed clarity on a number of issues.

There is a good section on the ecclesiology of cathedrals, including Rowan Williams' comment on cathedrals supporting the bishop in his or her role of representing the gathering Christ. Some real practical issues are addressed, such as the relationship between deans and residentiary canons and the responsibilities of all members of chapter as trustees. However, there are also, for me, two concerns.

This Report is rightly aimed at taking cathedrals to the next level but, as some of our cathedrals juggle with finding the capacity to deal with what they are already doing, this plan will not succeed unless there is also investment to help them make it happen. At Synod, we heard at the fringe meeting from Eve about the Cathedrals Support Group which will be offered as a support, but I also worry about whether cathedrals themselves will have the capacity to do all that they need to do internally to make this work.

Many of our smaller cathedrals do not currently have even full-time directors of operations or chief finance officers. The senior executive team proposed will need investment. Our smaller cathedrals want to reach out to the aspirations of this Report, but without proper resource there is a fear that it may not happen as quickly or as effectively as hoped.

Secondly, I have a concern about the respective roles of the dean and vice-chair. The latter role is presumably an attempt, in the light of dioceses where things have gone wrong, to hold the dean to account. That is understandable, but, in my view, the dean must continue to be, whilst also being accountable, both the chief executive officer and the chair of chapter. A cathedral is a praying church community led by a dean. Nothing else looks or feels right in my view.

As for the appointment of a vice-chair, yes, if people of the highest calibre can be found to serve. Both the deans I have talked with would welcome working with an able person in this position, but not if he or she becomes a barrier to direct and effective communication between the dean and the bishop, which is crucial. The essential problem in those dioceses where things went wrong was that that relationship was not there. I hope that we can maintain a good relationship with the bishop all the time.



*Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham):* I am a lay canon of Durham Cathedral. Being a lay canon and going to cathedral morning worship and evening worship most weeks with the wonderful Canon Professor Simon Oliver, I have learnt a lot about ecclesiology and about the nature of cathedrals.

On page 25 of the Report, he is quoted in this way. He says, "The people of God invite the bishop's oversight in the gift of the cathedral". I want to think about the people of God and the wonderful gift of cathedrals. Of course, the people of God are all of us, ordained and lay. People of the diocese wish the cathedral well, as we all do, and want it to flourish wherever we are. The laity see the cathedral as a gift but also want to engage with it, to be challenged by it, a place to pray, a place to celebrate, a place to grow and a place to be taught.

That has been my experience at many cathedrals across England. Yet, when I look back to when we debated the Cathedrals Measure in 1998 and 1999, I was struck at the difficulty we had as lay people of getting through the door to be involved in the cathedrals' governance and leadership. It was touch and go whether we would have lay people on cathedral chapters.

I am not quite sure how well-received cathedral councils were universally. Now, of course, we celebrate those councils, even though they seem a little bit under threat. It was a delight to hear Peter Collier's speech, pointing out the value that he and his council bring in this context of York.

I do want to say to those who wonder about this Report, let us celebrate it but also challenge it and question it - as we have heard already from others in the debate, not least the Dean of St Pauls. I want the governance to be the very best, the leadership to be the very best, and lay people can be involved in that.

I note also questions around the vice-chair role, which, of course, can be lay or ordained but it needs to be right. Laity on chapters have proved to be very helpful. I know in Durham that has been the case. There needs to be the right sort of balance and understanding, going back to Simon Oliver's view of ecclesiology. I trust we can work together on this, that we can learn to trust one another as we develop with this extra time helpfully brought in the amendment and that particularly laity can be supportive and prayerful, not least in this chamber.

I know the great Ruth Etchells, who was my mentor in so many things, also so often said her place in the Synod as a lay person was to pray in the Synod debates. I think we can learn from that.

*The Bishop of Lynn (Rt Revd Jonathan Meyrick):* Synod, I have been connected with three cathedrals since 1998 as a canon residentiary for six and a half years, as a dean for six years and for the last seven a member of the college of canons in Norwich. You may remember that succinct quote from E.M. Forster, "Only connect". Many people have

told us, quite rightly, that ministry and life is largely about making or helping to enable connections with others. I have found this particularly true in cathedral ministry where making unexpected connections was always a delight, so often enabled by saying “yes” when I was expected to say “no”.

There was a moment in Exeter when the cathedral's relationship with a section of the city's life - which we had largely ignored before - was opened up simply by saying “yes” to a funeral request even though the undertaker told me I ought to say “no”. I do not think I will ever forget the sight of a council litter collector's coffin arriving at the west door escorted by 300 Harley Davidsons, nor my administrator's face when we squeezed 1,350 people into a space that seats 800.

Connections of that kind are enabled by flexibility and the willingness to be open, to embrace new possibilities of relationships. Synod, just as we are now called to embrace the possibilities inherent in these proposals, so I urge those responsible for implementing them either on the ground or in the framing of legislation not to lose sight of two things: the need for flexibility and openness. Getting governance structures, accountability and financial oversight right, of course, are important to do; but they only will be right if they allow and encourage all those who deliver a cathedral's ministry of enabling connections to retain flexibility and openness.

Secondly, they really must prioritise connectedness of relationships, direct relationships between dean and bishop; dean and residentiaries; bishop and chapter; dean and cathedral council chairman or vice-chair of chapter - if that is the route we go down; chapter and the cathedral community, which, of course, is itself a collection of many different communities: city, county, diocese.

It is only as these range of peoples connect with each other and, of course, pray together - as we have been urged many times - that proper life enhancing and, therefore, missional community can flourish. Fellow Bishops, perhaps we should ask ourselves do I pray with the cathedral often enough? Everybody needs to feel connected with each other. Governance structures should help that process. Please make sure that what we put in place for cathedrals over the next year helps and enhances the whole range of cathedral relationships.

*Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby):* I declare my interest as canon chancellor at Derby Cathedral, a residentiary canon, a member of a chapter and the diocesan canon working in and around the diocese bringing cathedral to the diocese and diocese to the cathedral.

I would like to pay tribute to the Cathedrals Working Group for a comprehensive and really well thought through piece of work. Thank you. The chapter at Derby Cathedral have talked about this Report extensively. We welcome it broadly and it has occasioned some very good conversations amongst ourselves.

At the heart of the Report is that clarity around governance and management. In other discussions over this group of sessions we have been concerned about how we hold those in authority to account, both individuals, roles and corporate bodies. There is a danger that we as a Church prioritise leadership at the expense of governance. Good governance does not come from the gifts of any one individual. It comes from having a systematic approach that enables accountability and good practice to become embedded in a culture.

The clarity at the heart of this Report could and should enable cathedrals to be models for the whole Church of how to hold those in authority to account without disabling them as leaders and managers of the Church. Perhaps, as others have suggested, a bishop's working group could be something that the Bishop of Bristol's new perspective brings to the House.

Going forward, I would, first, like to echo Paul Rattigan's request for using the talents and insights of all roles within a cathedral as we take this forward. I hope that the Third Church Estates Commissioner will include this in the various workstreams that she has in mind.

I would also ask that attention is given outside the legislative process to helping chapters embody a collegial approach to life, mission and ministry. It is a challenge to move from being the vicar of a parish to being a member of a chapter. I found this and I know my colleagues have found this also. Offering support in this transition would be helpful. I think too that this would also be a gift to the wider Church where collegiality can be something that we find difficult to embody in the way that we live and work. Thank you to the Cathedrals Working Group and I urge you to support this motion.

*The Chair.* After Bishop Donald has spoken, I will be looking and hoping for a motion of closure on Item 29.

*The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister):* I have a certain interest in this matter, which I think is fairly obvious to many. I was, for over seven years, a member of the college of canons of Chester as archdeacon there and for the last eight and a bit years I have been in Peterborough closely involved with the cathedral, a place I love very much.

I attend the early morning office and Eucharist every day that I am in Peterborough and that is a very important part of my life. I know other Bishops, not all are privileged to live next to the cathedral but I know many who can do so. The praying community of the cathedral, the daily praying community, is absolutely vital. It is the heart of the cathedral's life. It is not just made up of the chapter though. It is the chapter, sometimes the bishop, and others as well. It is wonderful and a privilege to be part of that.

I am glad to be able to build slightly on what others have said in quashing the rumour not just in the *Daily Mail* but also from Jeremy Vine on Radio 2 last Friday that the Archbishop had Peterborough Cathedral up for sale. Not true. He may have wished to but I do not think he did. This rumour arose because of a great misunderstanding and difficulty for

the general public to understand the ways we work. What is ownership? What is authority? Where is leadership? How does it all fit together?

People just do not get and understand cathedrals. That is a shame. We all need to do more of an educational job to make cathedrals better known in all aspects of their life. I encourage and support the relative independence of cathedrals from the bishop, as I do the relative independence of parishes. We are not a franchised Church. We do not want every parish to look the same, every church or every cathedral. For the mission of Christ, it is best that we are different and that we can be different.

I want to pay very great thanks and tribute to the Working Group, particularly Bishop Adrian, for very good consultation and listening, I am most grateful, but also to people I was able to turn to in the national Church and in the Commissioners when things went a bit wrong at Peterborough. In particular, I want to mention William Nye, Andrew Brown and David White for huge support given and continuing to me and to Peterborough Cathedral. The Commissioners and the Secretary General, the National Church Institutions do serve us at the local diocesan level and at the parish level.

I am glad we have got the extra time from the amendment. Some of the work does need to be looked at carefully. The legislation needs to be right. I simply end by saying, if something like the Working Group proposals had been in place the problems at Peterborough would not have arisen.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 29.

*The Chair:* Yes, that is great timing now. Thank you, John. 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 invite the Bishop of Worcester to respond to the debate. You have up to eight minutes.

*The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Dr John Inge):* Thank you very much indeed, Madam Chair, and thanks to all members of Synod who have spoken in this debate. It has been very encouraging to hear so many speeches, all of which have been broadly supportive of the motion. I am sure that some of the points that have been made, which need to be considered during the next stage of implementation, will be by all those who are responsible for that implementation.

If I can make reference to some of the speeches. I would like to thank particularly Muriel Robinson for her maiden speech, in which she drew our attention to prayer being the beating heart of the life of every cathedral. It is perhaps worth drawing your attention to paragraph 21 in the Report where the authors wrote, "We are acutely aware of the omissions in this Report. We have not been able to cast more than a glance at some

fundamental aspects of a cathedral's life and witness". Of course, prayer would be one of those.

They go on to say, "Our focus has been on the narrow areas of governance and management and our hope is that, by enhancing these basic structures in a cathedral, we can strengthen their ability to deliver their mission".

I am grateful for the Dean of St Pauls' support. He drew attention to some important things which will need to be considered during the implementation phase. I am grateful to Eve Poole, not only for the work that she has undertaken to do and has already done but also for being responsible for the sponsoring of that wonderful Spiritual Capital Report.

I would like to draw attention, in referring to the Dean of Southwark's speech for which I offer thanks, that a full apology was offered by Bishop Adrian for the omission of consultation with residentiary canons in the initial stage. There was then, following that and that full apology, a consultation with residentiary canons during the course of the next phase. It is good to have heard residentiary canons speaking in favour of the motion this morning.

Debrah McIsaac issued a sensible warning. Mary Durlacher talked about the teaching role of the bishops, something which I think we all want to take very seriously. Jane Steen drew attention to the fact that the bishop already appoints members of chapter in most cathedrals. In fact, for some of us, if all the recommendations of this Report are implemented, we shall have less influence rather than more.

The Bishop of Sheffield drew attention again to the notion of cathedrals being safe places to do risky things. They should be, absolutely, laboratories, not centres of excellence, in my view - I dislike the notion of excellence in Christian witness - but certainly exemplary to us and they should be places in which risk is enabled to be taken.

Carl Hughes, thank you for his membership of the group and his right to emphasise the importance of proper regulation, whilst reminding us that no regulation can ever absolutely ensure that we have the right people in the right place in the right roles at the right time.

Thank you to Paul Rattigan for his maiden speech and for the valuable work that he did during his sabbatical on the role of cathedrals and for drawing our attention to the concept of adjacency which is central to the work that Dee Dias has been doing here at York, with which some of you will be familiar.

Thank you to Priscilla White for reminding us that we cannot go to a one size fits all approach and the importance of work which has been acknowledged, the importance of necessity of further work on parish church cathedrals, that smaller cathedrals will need help and reminding us once again that relationships must be collaborative and not adversarial.

I am grateful to Peter Collier for his speech highlighting the important work that councils have done, despite the fact that their powers were watered down in the implementation of the Howe Report. It seems to me that the pool of people from which members of chapter will be drawn will be slightly different from the pool of people from which, generally, members of council have been drawn, in that members of council are only expected, generally, to be present at two meetings a year, whereas chapter involves much more responsibility. As has already been said, the sort of stakeholder group which already is very supportive in many cathedrals, it is possible for that to carry on, though it will not have a legislative role.

I am grateful to Tim Fleming for his reminder to us that we must implement with care. I am grateful to Anne Dawtry for her enthusiastic acceptance of this Report, once again drawing our attention to the importance of help for smaller cathedrals.

Jamie Harrison, thank you for drawing our attention to Professor Simon Oliver's wonderful work and the notion of the cathedral being a wonderful gift. I am grateful to Bishop Jonathan for his emphasis on the importance of relationships which are core to our discipleship as Christians and our ministry relationship. Good relationship must be at the heart of everything. There must, of course, be flexibility and openness in the implementation of the Report.

Simon Taylor, thank you for drawing our attention to the importance of including all sorts of people who are concerned with and have an interest in cathedrals in implementing the Report.

Thank you to Bishop Donald for drawing attention to the appropriate distance between bishop and cathedral which, it seems to me, will not be threatened by this particular Report, if it is implemented, because chapters, as I emphasised in my initial remarks, will be responsible for the setting of cathedral policy and carrying it out. It will not be the role of a bishop but it would be good, I think, for some bishops who would like to be able to take more of an interest in cathedrals to be able to do so by having a place in chapter now and then. The point with which Bishop Donald concluded was a very powerful one, that had this Report been implemented before the troubles at Peterborough, the recent troubles, they might well not have happened.

I would like, in closing and moving the motion, to refer you to heritage and renewal and something which appears at paragraph 22 right at the end. They drew attention in that Report to some words about English cathedrals, "They are monuments on a vast scale, very well preserved, rather austere, with huge fantastic spaces, full of history, mystery and piety, veritable ships of the spirit where matter has not only a use but a meaning".

Those words were written by Giovanni Battista Montini, the future Paul VI, as he visited nine English cathedrals in 1934. He continued, "They are places where glorious and sorrowful memories of the past are brought into living contact with the present".

Wonderful words which only touch the surface of all the huge symbolic spiritual, cultural, educational and heritage importance of cathedrals. This Report will serve to enhance the role of cathedrals and I beg to move.

*The Chair:* We move to vote on Item 29, as amended.

*The motion*

*That this Synod:*

- a) *welcome the recommendations in the Report of the Cathedrals Working Group (GS 2101A);*
- b) *request the Archbishops' Council to bring forward a draft Measure for the First Consideration at the July 2019 group of sessions to give effect to the recommendations that involve legislative change;*
- c) *call on all concerned, including bishops, cathedrals and the National Church Institutions, to give effect to the recommendations that do not involve legislative change as soon as practically possible.*

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

*The Chair:* Thank you very much, everyone, for your contributions. That concludes this item of business. We now move to the next item on the agenda.

THE CHAIR: *The Bishop of Stockport (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 12.04 pm.

## **53rd REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (GS 2102)**

*The Chair:* Synod, we come to consideration of the 53rd Report of the Standing Orders Committee to which the First Notice Paper refers. You will need GS 2102 on the First Notice Paper. As indicated in Notice Paper XV under Standing Order 40(5), the amendments to the Standing Orders contained in Items 32 to 33 and 37 to 41 of the First Notice Paper are deemed to have been approved. We are debating Items 34 to 36 of the First Notice Paper this afternoon.

### **ITEM 34**

*The Chair:* I, therefore, invite Geoffrey Tattersall to move Item 34. Geoffrey, you have up to five minutes.

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

'In Standing Order 29, after paragraph (1) *insert—*

“(1A) Where an amendment to the main motion has been moved, the mover of the main motion may speak in reply.

(1B) If the mover of the main motion indicates that he or she supports an amendment, the debate on the amendment continues.

(1C) If the mover of the main motion indicates that he or she does not support an amendment, the Chair must declare the amendment to have lapsed unless at least 25 members indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue; and where at least 25 members stand in their place or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue, debate on the amendment is resumed.

(1D) Paragraphs (1A) to (1C) do not apply to an amendment which, in the opinion of the Chair, is consequential on an amendment already carried; and the Chair must inform the Synod of his or her ruling.

(1E) Paragraphs (1A) to (1C) do not apply in relation to—

(a) a debate on a draft Measure or Canon or other draft instrument,

(b) a debate on an amendment to these Standing Orders, or

(c) a debate on liturgical business.”

I know this is what you have all been waiting for! As the Chairman says, you are going to see, I think by a miracle, soon, Item 34, which of course is on the First Notice Paper, which I am sure you have all lost by now.

Before I deal with that, I need to remind Synod that Standing Order 127(5) of our Standing Orders requires that the Standing Orders Committee shall, "Keep under review the procedure and Standing Orders of the Synod and shall submit to the Synod such proposals for amendment to the Standing Orders as the Committee shall deem fit".

It is our job to propose to you what we think will help to improve the working of the Synod. It is equally important for us to realise that it is for you to decide - you as a Synod as a whole - whether you like it or not. I turn to Item 34. You will see the context from paragraph 12 of our Report, which I hope you have not lost.

Following the July 2017 group of sessions - which I did not attend because I was in bed, which was dreadful - the Business Committee received a lot of representations which questioned the current adequacy of the current arrangements for the moving of and debating of amendments. This was in the context, as you can see, of the debate, "After the General Election, a still, small voice of calm".

You can see at paragraph 13 of our Report the various options for the amendment of the Standing Orders which the Business Committee considered. The Business Committee concluded that if an amendment was not accepted by the mover of the motion, 25 members should be required to stand, or at least signify their support, for a debate on the



amendment to continue. They believed that that was a more orderly way to structure our business.

The issue was separately considered by the Standing Orders Committee which reached the same conclusion. In particular, it did not favour the possibility of revisiting the number of members who were required to support an amendment from the current two. Synod had clearly rejected that 10 years before when it was raised with Synod. Members should note that this proposal will not prevent the would-be mover of an amendment from speaking about his or her amendment, although, of course, the chair of the debate has a discretion as to the length of such speech which could be utilised in an appropriate case.

Members should also note that this proposal will only apply to the general business of the Synod. It will not apply to legislative business nor to liturgical business; nor will it apply to amendments to the Standing Orders themselves where, thus far, the same problem does not exist; nor will it apply to amendments which are consequential to an amendment which has already been carried, as you can see. Hence, paragraph 18 of our Report summarises the overall effect of the proposed amendment. Madam Chairman, I beg to move Item 34 standing in my name.

*The Chair.* Item 34 is now open to debate.

*The Chair* imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

*Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford):* I declare an interest, having actually fielded an amendment last night which was opposed from the mover and which would undoubtedly under this rule have ceased then. It did actually effectively cease then because there was no time to hear any speeches on anything last night at all, much to the regret I think of that debate because I think we could have heard a lot more.

I am just concerned under this that what it is going to do is rather stifle opinions coming out. I was well aware that my amendment last night was unlikely to get through, but I would have loved to hear just a speech or two just to hear people's reasons as opposed to basically having a situation where the mover does not feel it fits the shape of the motion and so that is the end of the matter there and then.

While I understand where this is going, I would like to see some sort of exceptionality written into it so it were possible to hear a little bit more on the floor. That is what we are here for, really. We are here to hear people's opinions and to gather debate, not just literally to sort of set things through on the nod.

*Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool):* I totally support this item. I think it is a great improvement. When I came on Synod in the year 2000, a group of us were just fed up of people putting amendments in so that they could guarantee themselves a speech. I do not think that is what we are here to do.

I welcome the fact that, where the mover of the main motion accepts the amendment, debate can continue. It is almost as if to say we should not even be debating it, but the person who has made the amendment could have their speech and have their day. It is really frustrating when we spend most of our time in a debate debating the amendments when we should be debating the main motion. My only worry is about 25 people standing, because 25 people sometimes stand or 40 people sometimes stand just for the sake of hearing a bit more about it and then it goes down by a large majority.

Synod, we need to be clear that we are here to do good business. We can have all sorts of discussions and they can all be jolly interesting over tea, coffee and over meal times, but the floor of the Synod is the place where people can bring their views on the main motion. If we can improve them then great, and often they are improved by when the movers of the main motion simply accept the amendment. Please accept this and give it your wholehearted support.

The final thing I would say is it was me who years ago said for an amendment to be debated it had to have the support of 10 people and, after a series of amendments by Tom Sutcliffe, we got it down to two. That has palpably not worked. We are going to give this a try. We can change it if it does not work but let us give it a good go and let us vote for it overwhelmingly and wholeheartedly.

*The Chair:* I see no one else standing. Geoffrey, you have up to three minutes to reply, if you need them.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* To Mr Spiers, I simply say I was the responder to those very many motions which got it down to two. That is why we are not revisiting it, absolutely. As to Mr Oldham, I say this. The mover of the motion is perfectly entitled to explain why they want to move this amendment. Really, if 25 people cannot be persuaded to stand in the absence of the mover of the main motion accepting the amendment, then we should not be debating it. We have to be a bit grown up and we have to say to ourselves that we have to order our debates in a sensible way and this is one way of doing it.

*The Chair:* We now move to vote on Item 34 of the First Notice Paper.

*The motion*

*In Standing Order 29, after paragraph (1) insert—*

*“(1A) Where an amendment to the main motion has been moved, the mover of the main motion may speak in reply.*

*(1B) If the mover of the main motion indicates that he or she supports an amendment, the debate on the amendment continues.*

*(1C) If the mover of the main motion indicates that he or she does not support an amendment, the Chair must declare the amendment to have lapsed unless at least 25 members indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue;*

*and where at least 25 members stand in their place or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue, debate on the amendment is resumed.*

*(1D) Paragraphs (1A) to (1C) do not apply to an amendment which, in the opinion of the Chair, is consequential on an amendment already carried; and the Chair must inform the Synod of his or her ruling.*

*(1E) Paragraphs (1A) to (1C) do not apply in relation to—*

- (a) a debate on a draft Measure or Canon or other draft instrument,*
- (b) a debate on an amendment to these Standing Orders, or*
- (c) a debate on liturgical business.”*

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

## **ITEM 35 AND ITEM 36**

*The Chair:* That is carried. With my permission, I now invite Geoffrey to move Items 35 and 36 together. Geoffrey, again you have up to five minutes.

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

‘In Standing Order 30, in paragraph (4), after “motion” insert “moved by a member other than the Chair”’

and

‘In Standing Order 31, in paragraph (1)(a), after “the Chair” insert “or by the Chair acting on his or her own initiative”.’

If I look first of all at Item 36 (because Item 35 is merely consequential to Item 36), it simply gives the chair the power to himself bring about the closure with the consent of Synod. You can see what we have said about this in our Report at paragraphs 19 to 22. The Business Committee trialled for a period of time Synod being told by the chair of the debate, how long the debate would last and how it was going to be structured. The natural consequence of this is really that the Business Committee believes, as does the Standing Orders Committee, that the Standing Orders should be amended to allow the chair himself or herself to move to closure.

This is not stopping anybody moving to closure. If, for example, the chair were to be slow in the minds of Synod to move to closure, up can pop any member of this Synod, and we know who it will be, and they can move to closure. If that finds favour with the Synod, so be it. Equally, on the other hand, if it is thought by the members of Synod that the chair is being premature in moving the closure of a debate, then he still has the consent of Synod, and Synod is of course within its right to say, "No, we want to hear more". This is purely to give a right to the chair to avoid the necessity on occasions to rely on the usual suspects, but, as I say, whether or not the closure is carried is down to Synod. That is Item 36. Item 35 is a consequential amendment and I beg to move both those Items.

*The Chair:* The floor is now open for debate. I call John Freeman.

*Mr John Freeman (Chester):* The "usual suspect" is here. I wholeheartedly support this change in Standing Orders. It will enable those in your chair to be able to use their infinite wisdom if the rest of us have fallen asleep. I also extend my thanks to all those who have assisted me over the years. Please support it, folks. Thank you.

*Revd Paul Hutchinson (York):* Point of order: as Mr Freeman has spoken in this debate he cannot call for a motion of closure. I wonder whether you would accept a motion of closure on this item?

*The Chair:* That has my permission. I am willing to test the mind of Synod.

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

*The Chair:* That is carried. We move to a response from Geoffrey. You have up to three minutes if you need it.

*Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester):* I just need to tell Mr Freeman that there is no redundancy payment!

*The Chair:* So we move to a vote on that motion covering both Items 35 and 36 of the First Notice Paper.

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

*The Chair:* That is carried, Synod, thank you. We move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn)* took the Chair at 12.19 pm.

*The Chair:* I am very used to running pilgrimages and when you leave the hotel and you are on the coach, I have to grab the microphone and say, "Have you paid your bar bill and have you had handed in your room key?" so it is a moment like this, not the bar bill, but if you have not handed in your room key could you please do so at the appropriate lodge. Thank you very much. That is the end of that notice.

## **ITEM 30 FAREWELLS**

*The Chair:* Now we are into Item 30 Farewells, and I call on the Clerk to the Synod to make a brief farewell before we move on to other farewells.

*Clerk to the Synod (Dr Jacqui Phillips):* Thank you, Chair. Our first farewell this afternoon is to a member of staff and a great colleague of mine Sion Hughes-Carew. Sion has been

Administrative Secretary to the Synod Team in the Legal Office since July 2013. In that role his duties in relation to Synod involve compiling the business done, which I am sure you all read very carefully, projecting motions and amendments and, of course, operating the electronic voting system. In all these respects Sion has performed his duties not just with professionalism but with panache. The platform will be less colourful and stylish without him.

We lose Sion for the best of reasons, as I am delighted to say that he has been recommended for training for the ordained ministry, which he will begin at Westcott House in October. We send him on his way with both our thanks for all he has done in supporting the work of Synod and our very best wishes for this exciting new departure in his life. Thank you, Sion.

*The Chair:* I now call upon His Grace, the Archbishop of York to say farewell to the Chair of the Dioceses Commission, Professor Michael Clarke.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* While it is indeed traditional to mark the retirement of diocesan bishops - which we shall do in a few minutes - we only do so sparingly in respect of other Synod members. But I am in no doubt that this Synod should honour the long service of one of its most distinguished lay members, Professor Michael Clarke, as he stands down from his role as Chair of the Dioceses Commission.

Michael has served this Synod for 28 years (with the exception of a short two-year break from 1993-95). In this time he has played a very active part. He was for many years a much-valued member of its Panel of Chairs, bringing his calm professionalism to bear on many tricky debates. Most notably, back in July 2010 during the debate on the Revision stage of the draft Women in the Episcopate Measure when the Order Paper ran to 37 pages. Surely that is a record.

The bewildering kaleidoscope of the amendments made it quite unclear what the outcome would be. Michael chaired the debate with consummate skill, articulating succinctly the effect that each amendment was intended to achieve, so that members could vote with understanding and confidence.

Many working parties, such as *Talent & Calling* (the review of Senior Appointments chaired by Sir Joseph Pilling) also benefited from his wise counsel.

Latterly, he is best known for his work for the Dioceses Commission, where he was able to bring his deep experience of local government to the service of the Church. He served as a member of the Commission from 2008 and as its Chair since 2011. In this time he played a major part in the creation of the new Diocese of Leeds - the most radical restructuring of our dioceses since the 1920s. Only in February he helped to put the finishing touches to this work with the renaming of the See of Richmond as Kirkstall.

Michael has been an active member of the Diocese of Worcester, where he has been a Canon Emeritus since 2010 and the Chair of the Cathedral Council. It was in recognition of all he has done for the Church that Michael was awarded the Canterbury Cross by the Archbishop of Canterbury earlier this year.

In addition to his contribution to the national Church, Michael is a former Vice-Principal of the University of Birmingham and was Deputy Chair of the Local Government Commission and a member of the Local Government Boundary Committee.

Michael will be a very hard act to follow, but I wish him well in his well-earned respite from national Church responsibilities. Our prayers go with you. I should like Synod to express its appreciation to him in our usual way.

*The Chair:* I now invite the Archbishop of York to express our thanks and farewells to the Rt Revd Alastair Redfern, Bishop of Derby.

*The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu):* Before I do that, Professor, I have got two copies of what I have said about you here.

Now then, Bishop Alastair, I suspect you are feeling a little uncomfortable waiting for this farewell. Not because there are some dark secrets that Caroline, who is sitting over there, might have shared with me but rather because you are a very private person and will not relish me talking about you and for all of us wanting to say a very big thank you for all you have given. There is a bit about you which does not really like that kind of stuff. Sorry, mate, you are going to get it.

I think it is quite right that we are given the opportunity to say thank you to a very faithful disciple, a committed learner and teacher and a thoughtful and caring Bishop who has given of himself to others throughout his ministry.

There are many stories to tell from your ministry in various places and anyone who has been a tutor at theological college must be in fear and trembling of all the nuggets of information your previous students might want to share about you. But do not worry, we are not going to do that or anything like it at all.

Now, there are those who suggest you may not be the most modern of people but, as this photograph shows, this is simply not true, pictured here clearly enjoying a game of *Angry Birds* or was it *Candy Crush*, with your episcopal colleague. It might be worth pondering who is teaching whom in this enterprise! But, on a more serious note, this picture captures something of the teacher, pastor and bishop you are Alastair.

One of your area deans commented that you encourage and support clergy “quietly and without fuss”.

You have encouraged the clergy and laity to continue in their learning with regular quiet days, study days, an annual summer school and an annual clergy conference, all of which I know have been hugely appreciated.

Alastair, you have overseen the development of new “super deaneries” in the diocese where the area deans are paid half-time in that role (with the other half of the stipend for their parish ministry). I understand it has been a joy to see the eight area deans grow into their leadership roles and plan mission and ministry locally and contextually. Is this perhaps a new model for the Church of England?

You are a passionate supporter of Church schools and in September the new Derby Cathedral School will open - the first Church secondary school in the Diocese. Again that is not a small achievement. You have spoken time and time again of the mission opportunities our Church schools afford and have built up a first-rate team under an outstanding Director of Education.

Of course, Alastair, we are all impressed with the work you have done to highlight the horror that is modern slavery and the huge amount of effort you have given to leading on this area, not only for the Church of England but for all denominations and others to ensure this matter is taken seriously.

You founded the Clewer Initiative, a national project linked to the Church of England, working with dioceses to tackle modern slavery. You speak regularly at conferences about slavery and have produced related theological resources including a Lent course, and a book, *The Clewer Initiative: T.T. Carter and The Fight Against Modern Slavery*.

As a member of the House of Lords, Alastair, you were on the Select Committee that scrutinised the draft Modern Slavery Bill and worked exceptionally hard to take it through Parliament for enactment in 2015. This was only the second piece of anti-slavery legislation in British history since 1807 and the first in Europe.

In addition, you represent the Church of England, alongside colleagues from the Vatican, on the Global Sustainability Network. This is a network of key philanthropists and global leaders who work towards fulfilling Global Sustainability Goal 8 - the eradication of slavery.

Alastair, you have also found time to be the:

- Chair of the Independent Anti-Slavery Commissioner’s Advisory Panel (which is not a small task);
- A founding member of the Derby and Derbyshire Modern Slavery Partnership;
- The Church of England’s representative on the Santa Marta group;
- Vice-Chair of the Anglican Alliance (again time-consuming stuff; and
- Co-chair of the Multi-Faith Centre in Derby.

Sitting there and seeing your wife, Caroline, over there, we all know of her work and commitment to the life of the Church. She has been a very great support to you or, rather, I had better put it this way to say you have both supported each other, because I have seen you both at very close quarters. It is mutual support in one being for the other.

Alastair, we know that you will not really retire. But we want to thank you for all you have done over the years. Your vast wisdom and deep spiritual leadership will be greatly missed both in the Diocese and in the life of the Church of England.

I certainly will miss your words of encouragement where you have always come to me and just encouraged me. It is a very exceptional gift and quality.

My dear brother in Christ, thank you and God bless you and may you and Caroline continue to mutually support each other. Thank you. You too will not escape without getting copies of what I have just said.

*The Chair:* Thank you. That concludes this item of business. We now move to the final item, prorogation of this group of sessions.

## **ITEM 31 PROROGATION**

*The Archbishop of York prorogued the Synod.*