

Report of Proceedings 2019

**General Synod
February Group of Sessions**

Volume 50, No. 1

Officers of the General Synod

Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

Canterbury

The Revd Canon Simon Butler

York

The Ven. Cherry Vann

The House of Laity

Chair

Canon Dr James Harrison

Vice-Chair

Canon Elizabeth Paver

Secretary General

Mr William Nye LVO

Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

Chief Legal Adviser & Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Secretary to the House of Bishops

Mr William Nye LVO

Legislative Counsel

Mr Christopher Packer

Secretary to the House of Clergy

Mr Jonathan Neil-Smith

Deputy Legal Adviser

The Revd Alexander McGregor

Secretary to the House of Laity

Mr Andrew Brown

Officers of the Convocations

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of Canterbury

Revd Stephen Trott

Registrar

Mr Stephen Slack

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of York

The Revd Paul Benfield

Registrar

Ms Caroline Mockford

AUSCRIPT LIMITED

Central Court, Suite 303, 25 Southampton Buildings, London WC2A 1AL Tel No:
0330 100 5223 Email: uk.transcripts@auscript.com

Contents

INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES	1
REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2112).....	4
PATTERN OF MEETINGS (GS 2113)	17
PRESENTATION ON EVANGELISM AND DISCIPLESHIP BY ANGLICAN COMMUNION GUESTS	44
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS	60
APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE PENSONS BOARD (GS 2114)	68
APPOINTMENT OF ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL MEMBERS (GS 2115)	70
QUESTIONS	75
AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047D)	213
DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE (GS 2046BB) AND DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 39 (GS 2047BB)	216
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103A)	272
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) (NO. 2) MEASURE (GS 2104A) AND DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2105A)	287
DRAFT PAROCHIAL FEES AND SCHEDULED MATTERS AMENDING ORDER 2019 (GS 2116)	319
CODE OF PRACTICE ON CO-OPERATION BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH OTHER CHURCHES (GS 2117)	338
HOMELESS TASK FORCE (GS 2110A and GS 2110B)	351
PRESENTATION ON "LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH" AND PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP (GS MISC 1200)	372
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMMES (GS 2094A and GS 2094B)	408
EVANGELISM AND DISCIPLESHIP (GS 2118 and ANNEX A)	439
STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT (GS 2119 and GS 2120)	486
GROWING FAITH (GS 2121)	526
FAREWELLS.....	570
ESTATES EVANGELISM (GS 2122)	580
MINISTRY AMONGST GYPSY, ROMA AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITIES (GS 2123)	617
ENCOURAGING YOUTH EVANGELISM (GS 2124A and GS 2124B)	650
ADVERTISING AND GAMBLING (GS 2125)	685
THE STATE OF THE NATION	714
FAREWELLS.....	758
PROROGATION.....	763

Full Synod: First Day
Wednesday 20 February 2019

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

WORSHIP

The Chair. Good afternoon, General Synod. Thank you very much for the time you have spent in travelling, for your presence and doubtless for your prayers for this time. In a moment I will ask Canon Michael Gisbourne to lead our opening worship. First, if I could draw your attention to the Community of St Anselm - please would they stand - who are leading the continuous praying presence through the group of sessions. They will be up there and around during the whole of the sessions. Please speak to them too about their experience of being in the community. I would guess from my experience of them this year they will tell you the absolute and unvarnished truth. Canon Michael, would you like to lead us in worship, please?

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 out the names of the new members of the Synod. Please would they make themselves known so that we can greet them all with applause at the end? The new members are: the Rt Revd Libby Lane, in her new role as Bishop of Derby, replacing the Rt Revd Dr Alastair Redfern; the Rt Revd Philip Mounstephen, Bishop of Truro, replacing the Rt Revd Tim Thornton; the Rt Revd Philip North, Bishop of Burnley, replacing the Rt Revd Richard Blackburn; the Rt Revd Mark Tanner, replacing the Rt Revd Libby Lane; the Revd Josias de Souza Jr, Diocese of Canterbury, replacing the Revd Canon Clare Edwards; the Revd Brunel James, Diocese of Leeds, replacing the Revd Bob Cooper; the Revd Canon Leah Vasey-Saunders, Diocese of Leeds, replacing the Revd Canon Maggie McLean; the Revd Canon John McGinley, Diocese of Leicester, replacing the Ven. Dr Tim Stratford; the Revd Simon Fisher, Diocese of Liverpool, replacing the Revd Canon Paul Rattigan; the Revd Dr Jeremy Sheehy, Diocese of Manchester, replacing the Revd Nick McKee; the Revd Canon Heather Butcher, Diocese of Norwich, replacing the Revd Canon Sally Gaze; the Revd Andrew Lightbown, Diocese of Oxford, replacing the Revd Jonathan Beswick; the Revd Chris McQuillen-Wright, Diocese of Truro, replacing the Revd Canon Alan Bashforth; Dr Paul Buckingham, Diocese of Peterborough, replacing Canon Liz Holdsworth; Mrs Marian Nicholson, Diocese of Canterbury, replacing Miss Judith Rigby; Michael Thomas, Diocese of Chichester, replacing Dr Graham Parr; Mrs Sarah Beach, Diocese of Salisbury, replacing Miss Fenella Cannings-Jurd; Miss Sarah Maxfield-

Phillips, Diocese of Worcester, replacing Mrs Sue Adeney; the Revd Canon Peter Moger, Diocese of York, replacing the Revd Dr Rowan Williams; the Ven. John Ellis, Armed Forces, replacing the Ven. John Chaffey; Air Commodore Polly Perkins, Armed Forces, replacing Malcolm Brecht; Emily McDonald, Church of England Youth Council Reps, replacing Miss Sarah Maxfield-Phillips; Sophie Mitchell, Church of England Youth Council Reps, replacing Ed Cox. May we greet and welcome them all.

Thank you. I would now like to welcome the guests from the Anglican Communion. The Communion guests are listed in Notice Paper VII. Since the production of this Notice Paper, regrettably, the Most Reverend Zacharie Masimango Katanda, Archbishop of Congo and Bishop of Kindu, cannot now attend the Synod - we will be inviting him again on a future occasion - and therefore I welcome most warmly, and with much gratitude for long journeys: the Most Reverend Dr Prem Chand Singh, Moderator of the Church of North India and Bishop of Jabalpur and the Rt Reverend Paul Korir, Bishop of Kapsabet, Anglican Church of Kenya. Please may we greet them. That concludes our introductions and welcome and I accordingly now hand over to the Chair of our first debate.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 2.46 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. Synod, the Convocations and House of Laity have met to consider Article 7 business as set out in draft Amending Canon 39 and have decided not to claim a reference on this item of business. This means that I am happy to

advise you that we will meet tomorrow after Holy Communion, the Eucharist, the Mass, whatever it is that you are going to, at 10.30 for legislative business.

We now move to Item 2, which is the Report of the Business Committee and I invite Canon Sue Booyes, the Chair of the Business Committee, to come and speak to Synod. Sue, you have up to ten minutes.

ITEM 2 REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2112)

Revd Canon Sue Booyes (Oxford): Happy birthday, Synod. I bet that is a surprise. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Church Assembly when the Convocations were combined with the new House of Laity. You will see there is a photographic exhibition in various parts of Church House. To celebrate, the Business Committee would love to stand you all a drink, but we have gone one better: we have focused our agenda on the future by giving prominence to debates on various aspects and expressions of mission and evangelism, which I know are close to your hearts. If you are as old as I am, you will recall the Decade of Evangelism, and you may understand why I had mixed feelings when somebody described this as the Synod of Evangelism. It is my prayer that this group of sessions will not be a talking shop but a springboard for mission and evangelism, however you interpret those words and wherever God has placed you.

Shortly, we shall hear about the context in which our brothers and sisters from other parts of the Anglican Communion share the Gospel. During Synod we turn to our own experience to debate evangelism with and amongst children and young people and evangelism amongst some of our most deprived communities. Saturday offers a rare opportunity to hear the experience of Christians from Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, and to reflect on our own role; not only in helping and supporting these communities but in opening our understanding to the gifts and perspectives they offer.

Our final debate on Saturday is perhaps the most ambitious of all: looking at how the church can play a role in healing and reconciliation in our own turbulent and complex times. I am sure that you are grateful to the Presidents for requesting this timely debate and I should like to thank my colleagues on the Business Committee, in Church House and at Lambeth and Bishopthorpe for the careful thought and renegotiation of the timetable that took place to accommodate this. It offers a welcome opportunity to reflect on and speak into our current political context. This does mean that some parts of the agenda are more tightly squeezed than they might have been. Please be helpful, especially on Saturday morning, by supporting our excellent and hard-working Chairs, whose business it is to ensure that we work together and dispatch all our business.

Of course, some business looks more appealing than others. I expect to be surprised by apparently ordinary business that turns out to be controversial. It is important to remember that apparently ordinary omnibus items can be absolutely essential to ensure that we keep our promises. A good example of this is the draft Representation Measure

which considers, amongst other things, the provision essential for the much longed-for electronic elections in 2020.

The Synod app probably wins the prize for the biggest contribution to my email inbox. You were disappointed that the old app (with all its imperfections) was gone; you were desperate for its return; frustrated by its lack of appearance. And now, slightly earlier than flagged in the Notice Paper, the new Synod app is here. Fanfare! And you are 'appy with the app, you are in love with the app, and we are grateful to the digital team for giving us the app. It is much improved and a real step change in the gradual but steady process of our modernisation. If you have not found it yet, it is available on both Android and iOS; just search "General Synod". The app is built on a more stable platform and has the capacity to be improved and updated. Indeed, an early user requested the Standing Orders and, behold, they are on the app.

If you have any technical issues or questions, members of the digital team will be available for help at the information desk. If you have any technical questions about Synod, can I do a quick advert for the Business Committee's Fringe meeting on Friday evening. It is mostly for new members in this quinquennium but anyone who still has questions about the way Synod works is most welcome.

Another very important aspect in improving Synod is constant attention to accessibility. A new Accessibility Statement has been published in GS Misc. 1201 and at this group of sessions we are delighted to welcome a team of three accessibility auditors.

The aim of this exercise is to identify barriers to both physical access and participation, paying particular attention to the building, its use, our processes and culture and the experience of members, visitors and staff. Fiona MacMillan, Anne Mehmet and Alice Kemp will be based in the Hoare Memorial Hall. They will attend main Synod sessions and Fringe meetings and they will be glad to hear from you what is working well, what is not and what else can be done.

I would like to draw your attention to two other GS Misc papers. GS Misc 1210 lists all those who spoke in July and the number and frequency of their interventions. This information exists in the Record of Proceedings but, following a number of questions, the Business Committee thought it might be useful to have this available in a condensed form.

It is important to remember that speaking in debates is not the only way to participate in Synod. Many of you play an important role through your membership of committees, boards, councils and the different groups that meet and organise Fringe meetings. Listening, learning and voting are amongst the many ways that we can all take part in the life of Synod. GS Misc 1211 presents the collated feedback from the survey following last July's Synod. The Business Committee will review this at our March meeting alongside the review of this Synod. That will be issued next week, and I would urge you to send us all your bouquets and rotten tomatoes and cabbages so that we can enjoy reflecting upon them at our meeting in March.

As always, I need to thank my colleagues on the Business Committee and the amazing staff who support us. We were very sorry to bid farewell to Polly Dunn at our last meeting and to welcome Claudette Brown to this Synod who has taken her place. This is also the last Synod for the amazing Andrew J Brown who will be organising logistics for the last time. We wish him all the best as he moves to a new role at Bishophthorpe.

Finally, members of the Synod should be aware that we have given permission to Acme Films, an independent film production company, to film the Living in Love and Faith discussions on Thursday. They will be filming from the gallery for a documentary commissioned by the BBC. I am sharing this information now so that you can be aware in advance of tomorrow's session. If members of Synod do not wish to be filmed, Acme will only be filming the floor of the chamber and not the public gallery. Thank you very much. I beg to move the Report standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Sue. This Report is now open for debate. Can I remind members that there will be an initial speech limit of five minutes, that amendments to the motion are not in order in this debate and that it needs to be a debate on the agenda itself and not what you would like to be debating at this particular moment. Those wishing to speak, would they stand, please?

Rt Worshipful Charles George (ex officio): I speak as Chair of the Rule Committee, whose principal role is to bring to Synod for its approval rules designed to facilitate the day-to-day working of the faculty system and, wherever possible, to reduce complexity and help

parishes. Following prolonged public consultation by the CBC, the Rule Committee has now held a number of meetings and we were hoping to bring to Synod this July amendments to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules. However, if one turns to page 13 of GS 2112, which we are debating, the Business Committee's forecast for the programme for July 2019 makes no mention of amendment to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules. Would the Chair of the Business Committee confirm that time will be made available for this benignly intended, and I would hope not wildly controversial, item of legislative business?

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Chair, I want to thank the Business Committee for their commitment to ensuring Synod is a safe and courteous place for members to do business. We have seen this in their work to introduce a Code of Conduct for all Synod members which we accepted in a similar debate to this one last July, but which we have yet, I fear, to understand how they are best implemented and upheld. Members I am sure will be more than aware of the extraordinary number of questions submitted this evening on the issue relating to a decision that this Synod overwhelmingly took back in July 2017 relating to welcoming members of the transgender community. If you are unsure, please refer to questions 44 to 79 in your Synod question booklet.

Chair, I have to say that the tone of some of these questions leaves much to be desired as does the accuracy of many of their supposed claims. There is much fake news purported as fact in these questions and many should, I believe, have been ruled out of order either because of their ability to cause deep hurt, and in some cases harm to the trans community, or because of their inaccuracy or their blatant, I am afraid I have to call

it transphobia or homophobia. They fly in the face of our agreed Code of Conduct, which is particularly poignant in the light of the proposed Pastoral Principles recently put forward by the Pastoral Advisory group, which we will discuss tomorrow.

Could I therefore ask the Chair of the Business Committee what the process is of assessing the appropriateness not of the legal content but the accuracy and tone of Synod questions, please. This is, I believe, an unfair call for our Legal Advisers to make, but might perhaps be more appropriate for an appointed Synod Chair, as set out in the proposed changes to our Standing Orders as referred to in sections 24 to 26 of the Report of the Business Committee. I would be grateful if the Chair of the Business Committee could look to clarify whether the Code extends to written questions and how it will be implemented in future, please.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): I would like to ask the Business Committee if safeguarding could be a standing agenda item for the General Synod, just as it is for every PCC and cathedral chapter in the Church of England. Last time we met as Synod we rightly applauded Jo Kind for being the first survivor to address the General Synod in that capacity, but before we have had a chance to meet again many of us will have seen her on Channel 4 News speaking about being the subject of a non-disclosure agreement. I am grateful for GS Misc 1213 and for Sir Roger Singleton's email this morning, but these are not a substitute for the light and transparency that a regular agenda slot would bring to this issue. Safeguarding should be, and is, rightly, a priority for us as a Church and as a Synod. It is good that this is outward-facing evangelism-focused Synod, however

welcome and good these debates are, they threaten to be undermined by the way in which we as a Church approach safeguarding. Please can we follow the example of PCCs and of cathedral chapters and have a dedicated slot on each agenda devoted to safeguarding? I hope the Business Committee can arrange this and I would urge members of Synod to support this call by writing to the Committee and including it in their feedback.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I would like to congratulate the Business Committee on its report of who spoke when and the wonderful colour scheme it used to break it down in a pie chart but, on the other hand, whoever produced the one that had all sorts of numbers and used red and green, for the disabled, like me, who cannot tell the difference, please do not use those two colours side-by-side because I did not know which was the best or the worst. Thank you.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Members of Synod, first, I would like to welcome the Seventh Notice Paper. It was prompted by an email I sent to Sue Booy last November. It means that we have in front of us the names of the new members of this Synod rather than have to wait for the Record of Proceedings. I would also like to express thanks to the Business Committee for the work on the app. However, might I put in a request that one of the other items it would be helpful to have on it, and was on the old app, is a list of the members of the Synod with their photographs. I know we have got to know each other over the last three years, but I think that would be a helpful addition.

Members will have seen that we have 120 questions on the Questions paper to try to get through, with supplementaries, in a minimum of 75 minutes this evening. Could I put in a plea to the Business Committee to implement Standing Order 117, which gives provision for questions to be asked between sessions of Synod? Quite a number of the questions which simply ask for factual information perhaps could have been answered between July and the sitting of this Synod. I have yet to see any operation of Standing Order 117 during the time that I have been on this Synod.

May I endorse the plea by Simon Taylor that safeguarding should be a standing item on our Synod agenda? All parochial church councils are encouraged to have it as a standing item and it would be good if we set an example in the Synod. I accept the wisdom of Sue Booy in July when she resisted my plea to have a session of Synod in November, and it has proved correct that we have not yet got the report from IICSA on the Diocese of Chichester and Peter Ball case studies last year. Indeed, I see from one of the papers we have before this Synod that the time for publication of that Report has slipped again and is now said to be early in the second quarter of this year. One hopes that is going to be in time for it to be the subject of a debate in July at York. I am disappointed to see on the forecast of future business that there is no reference to IICSA or to the Carlisle Report or to the Gibb Report, matters which I suggest we should be debating in this Synod.

The last matter that I wish to make reference to at this stage is legislative business and how, as a Synod, we deal with it and the time we give to it. Members of Synod will have seen that there are a number of questions relating to three sub-paragraphs of the rule

relating to how many terms someone should serve on a deanery synod. I think one of the problems was when that was debated in July, the debate on an amendment that was proposed to delete those particular provisions was truncated, and I do feel sometimes that we do not give legislative business the proper attention it deserves, bearing in mind this is one of the core functions of this Synod. Might I invite the Business Committee to take that into account when fixing the agenda and maybe to introduce an element of flexibility, because sometimes we get through the legislative business quickly and at other times we perhaps need more time for its consideration. Thank you.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I do not know whether it was Mark Twain or Bismarck who said that there were two things people should not see being made - laws and sausages - but my reflection is one that the Business Committee has identified in paragraph 15, as to the fewer people who are engaging in Synod with legislative business. This picks up the point Mr Lamming has been making. It has been reflected by some of us who are involved in legislation outside of this chamber that it is becoming increasingly difficult to get members of Synod to serve on legislative committees and in the important work of law-making that we do. It may be that there are reasons for that, but I think it is worth flagging up - and I had a conversation with the Bishop of Willesden about this the other day - the importance of Synod's engagement with legislative business.

I chair the Legislative Reform Committee and we will be laying our first Order before Synod after this group of sessions. But there is another group that is beginning to look further into the future about the shape of legislation as it might be in the coming years, in

the next ten years and what sort of law we want the Church to have in order to focus on our mission. It is being driven by the agenda we are experiencing out of feedback from Renewal and Reform and other elements of our work. That legislative reform scoping group is beginning to dream dreams about that. What matters in that is that this Synod recognises, Chair, that it is the one contribution to Renewal and Reform that this Synod and only this Synod can make, which is the forming of legislation. As we look forward, can I encourage the Business Committee to think even more imaginatively as to how Synod members can be engaged in this vital work for which they are sent here to perform?

Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield): Thank you to the Business Committee for its Report. Referring to GS Misc 1210, the basic summary of statistics relating to speakers at the July 2018 sessions, league tables attract attention. As with any league table, there will be some expected rankings, some surprises, even some disappointments, and there may be lessons that can usefully be learned. Those of us with experience as to statistical method know that the outcome of a study depends, amongst other things, on its inclusion and exclusion criteria.

As one of a number of movers of amendments at that group of sessions, I would be interested to learn why the Business Committee considered it appropriate to exclude us from the statistics, especially given the potential of amendments to influence the tone, the content of debates and even their eventual conclusion, hopefully for the good of the Church and the nation. The explanation may be simple but, please, what is it?

The Chair: I see no one standing so I now call on the Chair of the Business Committee Sue Booy's to respond to debate. Sue, you have up to five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy's (Oxford): Thank you very much for your contributions and, Chair, for your generosity. Mr George, thank you. I look forward to discussing faculty jurisdiction. The list of forthcoming items is not exhaustive and it had not come across our radar at the time of going to print.

Jayne, thank you very much for your questions about questions. We do not have a means of looking at appropriateness and, as you point out, that is a high expectation to put to lawyers. All I can say is that we will look at your question when the Business Committee meets for its residential in March.

Simon Taylor, you ask if we can have safeguarding as a standing item. I can see the value of this as an example but I can also see difficulties. We always respond positively when asked to have safeguarding on an agenda, but scheduling any item is quite a challenge, and my instinct is that I would prefer to say that we will always respond when asked, but do push back and send us some letters if you would like to.

Mr Freeman, thank you for your congratulations. The kind of reflection that you offered us about the colours is just the kind of thing that those conducting the disability audit need to hear from us.

Mr Lamming, Standing Order 117, again this is something the Business Committee can look at our meeting in March. If it is in the Standing Orders, you may ask the questions, but we will not necessarily ask you to ask the questions. You asked for a safeguarding debate in July. As those of you who follow these things know, there is likely to be a difficulty about this, besides the one for the Business Committee that it has to be asked, as it looks to me as if the dates of IICSA are parallel to those of General Synod and that might put an unreasonable stretch on some people. If we are asked, we will schedule.

You and Simon Butler both raised something that we had pointed to in the Business Committee Report about engagement with legislative business. It is a serious point and in some correspondence with the lay Chair of my own diocese this last week, I have suggested that when things are coming before Synod, the people to consult about them in the dioceses and the deaneries are the members of Synod. In relation to deanery synods and lay people on deanery synods, I would have hoped and expected that lay members of this Synod would have consulted, as they now have. We all need to remember our responsibilities and, Simon, I will do my best to stretch my imagination and see how we might proceed. Prizes? You stretch your imagination as well.

Jane Patterson, thank you for commenting on GS Misc 1210 and for your exposition of it. I found I had spoken myself many more times than I would have wished to, quite honestly, but I am sad to hear that it looks as if we might have slipped up on movers of amendments

and I will make sure that we check this when we publish this next time. Thank you all very much indeed.

The Chair: Thank you Synod, that concludes that item of business. I now put to you that this Synod accepts the report of the Business Committee.

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

ITEM 3 PATTERN OF MEETINGS OF GENERAL SYNOD (GS 2113)

The Chair: That is clearly carried. We move to Item 3 on the agenda, for which you will need GS 2113, Pattern of Meetings of General Synod. we can never hear enough of her, so I call Canon Sue Booy back to speak to us and you have up to ten minutes.

Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you. I suppose I could don a wig and look like somebody different but I think I will stick with myself. It is hard to believe that there is a mere 18 months until this quinquennium ends and the Business Committee wishes to present to you our proposals for meeting dates from 2020 to 2023. In considering these dates, we were mindful of the continuing need to make Synod as accessible as possible for those who are occupied during the week at work and caring for their families and our hope to encourage new and younger members alongside the current wisdom of this Synod.

In proposing these dates, the Business Committee has done a great deal of very careful thinking, consulting twice with existing members of Synod. The detailed analysis of the results of our most recent consultation, as many of you know, is set out in GS 2113. One of our difficulties is that although this survey looks conclusive in suggesting a weekday meeting, a more detailed look at the figures shows that more than 50% of the laity voted for one of the weekend options.

The Business Committee is well aware that preparing for and attending General Synod requires a huge commitment. We leave behind busy parishes or dioceses, work and family commitments and community engagement and we ask a lot of our family, friends and co-workers who cover for us whilst we are away. I, for one, am grateful for their sacrifice, for the work it allows us to do together and for the enjoyment I have in your company.

So which is better, the weekend meeting or the weekday meeting? The truth is, Synod, that we do not know what we do not know, and surveying a group of current Synod members does not necessarily tell us a huge amount about the folk who have not arrived yet. The Business Committee had hoped to test your minds, your imaginations and your generosity with a pattern of meetings that included more weekends, York-style, in London. I am aware that not all of you have warmed to our suggestions and you will have seen from the Order Paper that there are opportunities to test the mind of Synod on variations to the dates proposed in the agenda.

I would like to encourage you to be generous towards those who might genuinely find it easier to be here if we do not prove too attached to our habits. For these reasons I should make it clear now that we argue it is right to plan for at least one York-style Synod in London in the forthcoming quinquennium, and so you will understand that I will not be able to welcome all the amendments that appear on the Notice Paper.

The second issue that exercises you, my friends, is the timing of the February Synod. I want to begin by giving you some background and I rather wish I had the talent of the great Dave Walker and could offer you a cartoon on the screen for what happens in the process of planning. I am afraid I am not, so here is a list. We consult the diaries of the Presidents. We take into account the amount of time required for the preparation and distribution of Synod papers. We allow time for the meetings of the House of Bishops, the Archbishops' Council, the Business Committee and probably those of a certain Tom Copley and his mates. We then take into account the dates of Lent and Easter and any other festivals that might require clergy to be in their parishes and, when we have done that, we wonder about the dates of half-term.

After some extensive and exhausting research, I can promise that the dates proposed for the February General Synod between 2020 and 2023 do not clash with half-term if you live in Wigan. A friend! If you live in Kent, I cannot even make that promise about 2021 because those dates are still out for consultation in that county. I can promise that we know you mostly do not want to meet in half-term, and also that we have done our best

to ensure this, but I cannot promise that we will not meet in your half-term. It is frankly beyond my prophetic capability to foresee the dates which some 48 counties and 32 London boroughs will determine for their February half-terms.

So we have listened, we have done our best, but I fear no promises from me. Synod, I invite you not to like these arrangements but to pass them in optimistic hope that for most people, at least, half-term has been avoided, and I am actually reasonably confident about that being true for most people, and that by offering some different possibilities for the timing of Synod meetings, we will offer the best possible encouragement to a new generation in our church to stand for membership of Synod with an enthusiasm to lead us into the next hundred years. I beg to move Item 3 standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, this item is therefore open for debate. What I propose to do is take a couple of speeches first of all on the main motion and then to look at the amendments. It is obviously a very, very complicated business.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I want to speak in favour of the month of November, not only because it is great for birthdays, bonfires, mists and mellow fruitfulness, but because of what those dates signify for extra time for Synod. I notice that the Chair of the Business Committee said that this Synod meet on the following dates,

that is the motion, it will meet three times in the year, there is no qualification or different criteria for the November sessions.

I also speak for the value and purpose, the place and purpose of those November Synods, that is giving Synod extra time. Extra time in which we may listen, communicate and decide better. Without extra time we can do no better than we are already doing.

I think the qualification should have been on the paper that those November dates are really for contingency business. They were introduced, if I am honest, I think, to save money. General Synod used to meet three times a year, but now the issues are so serious, by which I mean possibly so complex or so emotional, that we seem constantly to run out of time. It seems to me that the two times a year experiment is not working. Indeed, some would say that Synod itself is not working unless it is given extra time or adequate time for the issues before it. We are asked to confirm these dates, and we will faithfully reserve them, for November, with the other two, 2021, 2022, 2023, as we did for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019, but none of them in this quinquennium have been used despite many calls.

They were last used in the women bishops legislation debate once or twice, particularly to resolve the issue when the sky fell in on what was later described as bad legislation, but the sky did fall in in 2012. However, we did not call for the November Synod, when the unprecedented refusal to take note of the House of Bishops' Report on matters to do with sexuality earlier in this quinquennium, despite even more calls, urgent calls, that we

should do theology, we should do Bible. We are ready, we do trust each other, we do seem to be kind to one another, although we may still need more ground there, but we want to do business.

The Shared Conversations were aborted just when we were ready to engage with the issues. So the plug was pulled in 2016 and 2017 despite that House of Bishops' Report not being taken note of. They were not used in 2018 after, in my opinion, shallow, irresponsible debate with too little time for the professional, scientific and medical evidence that was available but was not called and not used and left us with dangerously ill-defined concepts of abuse.

In 2019, this year, we have again been told we will not be meeting, despite the shemozzle, even the fiasco some would say, over the issuing, the presentation of the House of Bishops' Guidance. Some say theology has been done and no more needs to be done. Others would say that 15 years have been wasted in which theology has not been done, that was called for in 2003. This is despite mentioning the potential train crash in the Sheffield Sea three years ago, was it now, which caused the Independent Reviewer's Report and now the implementation of the Dialogue Group, which is, believe it or not, due to report by the end of this year. It is not in future business. I have not even mentioned Safeguarding, although it has been mentioned for more time, twice, already in this session.

General Synod, we need more time, else we may that the can has been kicked down the road until we reach the end of the road. We may feel that the ball has been kicked into the long grass on some of these issues, squeezed or lost in what Parliament calls the wash-up season at the end of a quinquennium. We will faithfully put these dates in our diary, but will they be used? What criteria decides and who decides? Synod wants to listen, communicate and decide or vote better. We need extra time and I plead that November Synod dates are booked and used.

The Chair: Mark Russell, three minutes Mark, and then I am going to call the movers of the amendments.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): Never in my wildest imagination did I imagine I would get excited in a debate about Synod dates, something very odd has happened to me, but I want to say something which I nearly said in the last debate. The Chair of the Business Committee and the role of the Business Committee is probably one of the most thankless tasks in this General Synod. And I have to tell you, as somebody who has served on the Business Committee for the last two years, they do a fantastic job. They listen carefully, they think carefully, they pray carefully and they have brought recommendations to this Synod for the dates for these next years and I think we should back them. Not least because, when you look at the amendments that are about to come after this which I hope we will totally reject, this Synod suits people who are retired and who come from professional backgrounds, who can take time off for this Synod.

Later in this group of sessions we are going to be asked to vote on a motion about Estates Evangelism, which says clearly in that motion that we must work hard to ensure that the voices of those from estates and marginalised communities are heeded and heard in the Church of England, and I can tell you that people on estates cannot take seven days holiday a year to join this Synod. If we want their voices in this room, then we need to change when we meet and how we meet and what the Business Committee are proposing today is a simple and a quite straightforward and small step forward. Please, Synod, can we reject these amendments and back this motion wholeheartedly and continue to reform this Synod so more people who are younger and from different backgrounds can join us because we need their voices to discern the voice of God for this Church in this time. Thank you.

The Chair: I now call on David Lamming to speak to but not move the two amendments that are in his name and you have up to five minutes.

Mr David Lamming (St. Edmundsbury & Ipswich): May I begin by firstly endorsing David Banting's speech and putting in a plea that we do use the November meeting dates this year. We have important business which we have not got on the agenda at this Synod. We have just been told by Sue Booyes that there may be a difficulty in talking about safeguarding in July because the July Synod coincides with a two-week session at IICSA focusing on the Church of England, so is it not ideal, therefore, to use the November dates for the safeguarding debate and all the issues around the various reports that I mentioned earlier in my speech?

Let me come to the amendments that stand in my name. When I read the motion as it is in the Order Paper, unfortunately the dates which are set out on page one of the agenda do not actually give the day of the week for these particular sessions, so I had to dig out a 2021, 2022 and 2023 diary to find out which of the February sessions were being arranged for weekends. As you will see, 2021 is from Friday to Tuesday, 2022 is Monday to Friday and 2023, again, is from Friday to Tuesday.

I reflected on the fact that if the motion was put to Synod as it stood and Synod failed to approve it, we would be left with no approved dates for Synods for these three years. The first purpose of my proposed amendments is to give Synod the choice of whether you wish to meet in 2021 over a weekend or from Monday to Friday. I say from Monday to Friday, it is a bracket of dates, traditionally, of course, we do not meet over the five days, it depends how much business there is whether we meet over three or four days, and similarly for 2023.

By voting on the amendment first, if the amendment is carried it will show that the will of Synod is to meet Monday to Friday rather than over the weekend. If the amendment is lost, then the main motion stands and the corollary, presumably, is that Synod will then approve dates which will involve meeting over a weekend in 2021 and/or 2023.

Dealing with the substance of it and in meeting the speech, in anticipation, as it were, of the amendment from the last speaker, might I invite Synod's attention to paper GS 2113.

Very helpfully, that paper sets out on pages 4, 5 and following, the comments which have come in from those members of Synod who responded to the consultation last autumn. Might I just draw attention to one in particular which I think really highlights the issue that we have got to consider when voting today.

One of the comments is it could be varied during the five years, thus giving all a chance to have their preferred option, that effectively is what the main motion is putting before us. Another is, though, that it is an impossible job to find a solution that everyone is happy with. Having two Synods that meet on a Sunday seem to make no sense at all since you would hope we would all have obligations elsewhere on the Lord's day. But, more specifically, as the father of a young family I would not appreciate losing a second entire weekend. And then this comment, on page 9, "Retaining the current general pattern, core weekend in July and core midweek in February would seem preferable". For those lay people who are in employment, July already requires usually three working days off. A four-day February group of sessions will also require two, possibly three, depending on the agenda load.

In answer to Mark's point, it is not as if we are asking lay people in employment to give up either a weekend or five days of their leave, it is a choice between possibly four days' leave if we meet midweek, as we do at the moment, or two or three days' leave. So it is not quite the contrast that might appear from one or two of the comments that have been made. In moving the amendment, and I have been asked not to formally move it just yet, the purpose of putting it forward is to give Synod that choice today. Thank you.

The Chair: Simon Cawdell, would you speak to your amendment but not yet move it please?

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Indeed. Last summer, Synod suspended its time together to watch a football match - you may fondly remember it. For many it appeared a rather popular move and the crowd atmosphere in the chamber probably reached a pitch of verbal excitement not seen in a Synod of church assembly any time in the last 100 years.

I feel on safe ground then, to describe a goalkeeper facing a penalty. Do they dive left or right or stay put? The answer may determine whether they make the save or not, but if they move too soon, they will certainly enable the penalty taker to shoot the other way. The key to a good goalkeeper is to leave the decision as late as possible so that all the information of striker's eye contact, body shape, run-up, et cetera, can be taken into account.

Well, the same is actually true in a rather different way for our decision now. We should avoid the risk of taking unnecessary decisions too soon. Synod should always be on a journey and, as such, we always need to be open to the possibilities of what the future might bring, and the people. One of the responsibilities of any group of people elected on behalf of others is we have to be careful both in providing for those who are not

members and, indeed, in particular in binding as little as necessary the hands of those who will be our successors.

If Synod is truly open to the gifts and talents of all God's children and truly *Setting God's People Free*, then we need to be willing to experiment and adapt our processes to enable the gifts of all God's Church to be represented in this chamber. To that end, it seems to me appropriate to make a provision now to allow our successors to make a decision. Firstly, we are trusting them, and that cannot be a bad thing. Secondly, we are genuinely opening the possibility to them that they can choose to meet in ways which might not have suited us so well, even if we are no longer a part of it, and thereby enabling the participation of people whose life and work demands may prevent them from serving now.

I believe we should resist David Lamming's amendments as they represent a continuation of the status quo without thought to the needs of those who might serve in the next Synod. They are binding to an extent which is unnecessary and unhelpful, and could prevent Synod from seeking new members whose present commitments currently prevent them from serving.

My amendment allows for an expanded window of nine days in 2023. Those who know me well may, at this point, think I am carrying my love of General Synod a little far by offering you the possibility of nine full days of deliberations - I hear David Banting - and may even now be calling for my doctor to make appropriate arrangements for my future care. I need to relieve your concern for my wellbeing. This amendment is offered to allow

the intent of the original motion to have a February weekend Synod in 2021, but then to give the Business Committee the possibility of consulting the new membership on whether they prefer a weekend or weekday pattern in London. We can then enable Synod to promote the widest possible candidature at the next election with the promise that they will clearly be able to influence their own times and patterns of sitting at the earliest possible stage, which would be 2023. It is intended to allow the most flexible possible provision and the greatest encouragement for the next quinquennium's membership.

The Chair: I therefore ask Mr Lamming to formally move the motion standing in his name, number 39.

ITEM 39

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I formally move Item 39 which relates to the dates in February 2021.

The Chair: Thank you. I call on Canon Sue Booy to respond.

Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I think Synod will not be surprised to hear that I would like us to resist this amendment. You have heard both Prebendary Cawdell and my friend Mark explain why we think it is important at least once to have a York-style weekend in London and explain why it would be best to do this at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Chair: Well, now this is exciting because there is a new Standing Order rule which we have not used before - neither have I. Because it is being resisted, if there are 25 members standing or indicating then the debate will continue. Are there 25 members standing or indicating they wish to debate this amendment and vote on? There are, this amendment therefore is open to debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Miss Emma Forward (Exeter): I speak in favour of these amendments. I am a lay person in full-time secular employment. In fact, I work in a boarding school so I actually have a unique set of circumstances in that I am a teacher, but I am working on Saturday mornings. I teach five lessons on a Saturday morning and then on Saturday afternoons I am umpiring netball matches. I have, as I said, a unique set of circumstances, which, by the way, means I love meeting in half-term, it is brilliant as it means I do not have to take any time off work. I think my point is I have a unique set of circumstances but so does everyone else.

The laity is varied, and the working experience of lay people is increasingly varied. People that work in all sorts of different spheres may or may not need to work on Saturdays. We should not just assume that it is easier for lay people to be able to be free on Saturdays. If we look at what the Business Committee is proposing - and I totally understand this is

a very well-meaning attempt on their part to make this fairer for the laity - actually it is only an additional two Saturdays per quinquennium that we are being faced with.

That, actually, will not make a substantial difference, at least not one that will balance out the inconvenience caused by having Saturdays in February that was so clearly expressed in GS 2113 and among those I have spoken to. I get that the intention is to attract more lay people, but I perhaps will not say it is naive but perhaps say it is very optimistic to think that we are going to get rafts of new lay people just on the grounds of having a couple more Saturdays every few years.

We do actually have an existing compromise, as David Lamming told us, which is July. July meets at weekends. February meets in the working week. That seems to work as well as anything could, in my opinion. I would ask you to vote for the Lamming amendments, or the Cawdell amendment if not, and if neither of those to go through to consider voting down the dates that we have in front of us and, thereby, ask the Business Committee to look at this again.

Canon Zahida Mallard (Leeds): I want you to vote for these amendments. I am from the north, lay, BAME, woman, who started on Synod in her 30s with an under three-year-old. I am one of those marginalised people that Mark mentioned or put in a box. Saturdays are important to me. They are my only day off. I work Saturdays as well in both my previous role and in my current role, so, therefore, two Saturdays feels a bit difficult. Yes, we are wanting to include people not exclude people, but, when I stood for Synod, as a

family we decided this was a sacrifice worth making to transform the Church and so those dates that go into the diary go in for all three of the sessions that we hold.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Another few words in favour of the amendment and against more weekends. I cannot claim to be in the disadvantaged categories, rather the opposite, and, in a way that perhaps feels dangerous to admit here, I do not know where I shall go to church on Sunday because I am now one of that class of whom there are quite a lot in this chamber: people who do a job for the diocese. I am director of ordinands, and also now rural Dean of Hereford and I shall decide which parish in my deanery to pop up in on Sunday, no doubt to the consternation of the incumbent as usual.

When I was elected, I was an ordinary parish priest in a rural benefice of six parishes. I could get Sundays covered by others. I was fortunate. I had retired clergy, lay ministers; it could be done and I did it for the Julys when I was here, but if I had thought that I had two Sundays a year when it was necessary for me to arrange for other people to lead in my parishes and to maintain all the pastoral relationships that were involved perhaps it would be one reason to think again.

Within the House of Clergy, I think, sadly, people like me, archdeacons, CMD officers, DDOs, we are probably, let us be honest, overrepresented. If the House of Clergy is to be more representative of the majority of the clergy of the Church of England, we need to try and make sure they can be in their parishes on Sundays, as indeed can as many of

the faithful lay people here whose roles are vital, no doubt, to their thriving and growing and flourishing there as well.

A Speaker. Point of order: after the next speaker, Chair, will you accept a motion for closure?

The Chair. I would be very interested in testing that, yes, thank you.

Miss Lucy Gorman (York): Apologies for the unrehearsed speech and I fear that the Archbishop of York might not be my friend at the end of this. Whether we decide to meet on Saturdays every time, whether we decide to stick as we are, if we want younger people in - myself being one of those mysterious under-30s - then can we please advertise that again some, maybe all, dioceses do reimburse loss of earnings.

I have a full-time job. I work Monday to Friday 9.00 till 5.00. I do not want to spend my annual leave in this chamber, sorry. I want to spend it on a beach somewhere. What I do is I take unpaid leave, which again I understand that not every workplace will allow. The Diocese of York reimburses my loss of earnings for that which means I can be here. I did not know that until, when I stood for this quinquennium, a friend in Synod said to me, "Have you thought about standing?" I said, "No, I am not spending my annual leave doing this." And they said, "I think we can reimburse loss of earnings." That really stumped me and, unfortunately, or fortunately, here I am. Please, can we advertise this when we are looking to elect younger people because it really does make a massive difference.

A Speaker: Point of order: a motion for closure on the amendment.

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

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

The Chair: I put to Synod Item 39, the amendment standing in the name of David Lamming. We are going to have to have an electronic count of votes - so early and so exciting. I order a counted vote of the whole Synod.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of order: can we clarify on which amendment we are actually voting?

The Chair: We are voting at the moment on Item 39, which is the first of the three amendments alone. That is the only one that has been moved.

The motion was put and lost, 129 voting in favour, 186 against, with 23 recorded abstentions.

ITEM 40

The Chair. I now call on David Lamming to move Item 40, the amendment standing in his name.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I move Item 40, the amendment in relation to the Synod dates in February 2023.

The Chair. Thank you. I call on Canon Sue Booyes to respond. You have up to five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booyes (Oxford): That is extraordinarily generous of you, Chair. I shall be, once again, resisting Mr Lamming's amendment. There are all sorts of things I could say, but I have to say that Lucy Gorman and Mark Russell spoke much more effectively as members of the House than I could possibly hope to do. I urge you to resist this amendment in the hope of speaking in a moment to the one proposed by Prebendary Cawdell.

The Chair. That amendment is resisted. Therefore, are there 25 members standing or indicating that they would like a debate to take place? There are not 25 members standing, therefore, this amendment falls.

ITEM 41

The Chair. I call on Prebendary Cawdell now to move Item 41, the amendment standing in his name.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I do so move.

The Chair. Canon Booyes, if you would like to respond. You still have five minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booyes (Oxford): All this generosity. I would simply like to urge you to accept this amendment of Mr Cawdell's which does exactly what the Business Committee is aspiring to do, which is to give Synod the opportunity to experience what it has not yet experienced, a York-style length Synod in London.

The reason for that is because of the window of dates we set. We have only so far in London had Synods which, for many people unsatisfactorily, have ended on Saturday evening. This will give us a proper opportunity to experiment earlier in the quinquennium and for Synod to decide for itself in the longer window, which Prebendary Cawdell's amendment gives us, about the Synod that would happen in February 2023.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): Simon Cawdell's amendment is very clever stuff but, Synod, what is going on here is a little battle for the soul of the Synod. We, many of us who will not be here after 2020, are trying to say something about what it should be like for those who will be here. In particular, we are thinking about younger people and people from backgrounds who would not normally try and find the time or the funding to get to Synod.

I think we have got to decide what we think Synod is for. If I may put it this way, we have had two current arguments running in this debate. One has been to say we need more Synod; there is more to talk about; we are not doing it properly; we need more time, we need more time. Then, the other one is saying, well, actually, we need a more active Synod with many younger people and it probably needs to be more streamlined. I would really love to know what the good folk of the Anselm Community and the CEYC, who potentially are the kind of people who might be members after 2020, think about this.

The actual dating thing seems to me it does not matter terribly, but Synod has got to decide does it want to be a big body of old people who sit and talk forever or does it want to be a younger, slimmer body. This debate for me has raised that issue rather sharply.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: a motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: I am very tempted. I will come back to you.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Relevantly, for this purpose, I am a member of the Business Committee. I am sorry to dissent a little from my Chairman's view about this particular amendment. The reality is that if the Business Committee had wanted to impose on Synod its own view, we would have gone for weekend Synods for every February. We chose not to because we wanted to, in a very Anglican way, bring a compromise to Synod that would, we hoped, tempt a few more younger people and working people and marginalised people to stand whilst not making such an enormous change that Synod would not accept it.

My fear about Prebendary Cawdell's amendment is that, in leaving the matter open, it does not do what we were seeking to do, which was to give some assurance to those considering whether to stand in 2020 that there would be at least two Februaries in a quinquennium when Synod would meet over a weekend. Just keeping the option open does not give that assurance and it seems to me we are likely to be in the same position as if David Lamming's second amendment had been carried in terms of the effect it will have on potential candidates in 2020.

I would invite Synod to stick with the Business Committee's proposal, which is already a compromise, in the hope that we will have some effect in rejuvenating and renewing the membership of this Synod in the direction that most of us, I think, are agreed we want to achieve.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: a motion for closure on Item 41.

The Chair. That has my agreement. Does it have the agreement of Synod, please?

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

The Chair. That is clearly carried. Therefore, I put Item 41 to Synod. All those in favour of the amendment would you please show. Thank you, those against please show. Sorry, it is very close from up here and so I am going to call for another count of the Synod. I am ordering a counted vote on Item 41 of the whole Synod.

The motion was put and carried, 177 voting in favour, 130 against, with 30 recorded abstentions.

The Chair. We now move back to the debate on the motion as amended by Item 41, Item 3 on the agenda. Those wishing to speak to the amended motion.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Diane Kutar (Chichester): I find myself in agreement with Canon Mark Russell that we need to find ways to change the demographic of this chamber. However, I would suggest a discussion on dates is not actually the way to do this. In my experience, the younger people in my parish and my congregation will give their time and their effort and

sometimes their money to things that actually make a difference and seem to change things.

There are 600-plus people involved in this enterprise and those of you who have tried to arrange a meeting between three people and co-ordinate their diaries will testify to the difficulties of this, let alone 600-plus people. No set of dates will suit everybody. If we want to attract a different demographic to this chamber, we need to demonstrate that we are in this business to make a difference, not to waste the last 30 minutes talking about dates.

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

The Chair: I have just indicated to another person, but then can you do it. Thank you.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I apologise if I am wasting yet more of Synod's valuable time. I have lost the plot now whether the point I wish to make is for or against whatever it is we are debating, but I would very much like to draw Synod's attention to the fact that one of the Diocese of Southwark members, this being half-term, has brought his three daughters to Synod. Anastasia, Joy and Zoe are in the public gallery. They are, without doubt, the youngest members of Synod and we are very glad to see you. Welcome.

Revd Jenny Gillies (Chester): I agree with the speaker who said that we should not be discussing dates if we want to change the demographic here. I just want to add that I think that it is not just about what we do here, it is also about the whole process in the way that people get as far as being elected to General Synod and engaged in the synodical process.

I have two daughters of 26 and 22. Neither of them would ever really have been eligible for PCC or diocesan or deanery synod by the very virtue of the fact that from 18 onwards they have been moving around the country for education and employment. This makes it extremely difficult to go through the normal trajectory where you get known in a parish and then selected to be on a deanery synod if it happens to be in a year in which you are living in that general area and then you move on.

Although there are other ways in which bishops and other people can do things, I really do believe that we need to look at how you become elected to this House and how we can look at making it possible for young people to engage more easily in the Church of England and its governance when, actually, they are shifting and moving continuously and not able to stabilise and, therefore, be known and elected in one place.

I think, therefore, that I really do not mind. I would be very delighted now to support the motion. I do not mind, but I do think that we actually need to go elsewhere and spend some serious time looking at how we get young people here and the process that leads up to it.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: can I tempt you, Chairman, with a motion for closure on Item 3?

The Chair: That has my support. Does it have the support of Synod, please?

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

The Chair: I call on Canon Sue Booy to respond to this debate. Do you think you can do with less than five minutes?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Oh, I think so, thank you. You may not have remembered, but Mr Banting will be pleased that I have, that he spoke earlier in this debate about November groups of sessions. It is for the Business Committee to bring these envelopes of dates to you but, as a result of legislation we passed in July, the decision for which parts of which envelopes of time will be used is a decision for the Presidents, the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.

Write to me as much as you like, and I might pass your letters on, but I am not the person to write to. I am really sad, Synod, to have wasted so much of your time talking about dates, but I cannot tell you how delighted I am with the last few speeches of these last five minutes because, in some ways, if we can turn our attention to looking at the serious

questions about encouraging a younger and a different demographic to sit in this chamber after my time, this will have been time well spent. Thank you for those interventions.

The Chair. I now put Item 3, as amended by Item 41, to the vote.

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

The Chair. That concludes Item 3. We now move to the next item of business.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Point of order: what I say may not please a lot of people but we have been sitting for quite some time and we have got a presentation from the Anglican Communion. What will be so sad in the next item is if people decide to go for a comfort break, have a cup of tea and the chamber is not as full it is. I do not know what the Standing Order is but could you order an adjournment for five minutes?

The Chair. I can certainly order an adjournment for the better of something or other of the Synod's business, I am told. I think it is the Church of England way of saying you can go to the toilet. This Synod is now adjourned for five minutes.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 4.15 pm.

ITEM 4 EVANGELISM AND DISCIPLESHIP: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE WIDER ANGLICAN COMMUNION

The Chair: Synod, we have just enjoyed what the Director of Mission and Public Affairs insists I must refer to as a “bio break”, so there is a bit of terminology you may never have had before. We have discussed a lot of how we order our business so far this afternoon and we are now coming on, I guess, to discuss what is our real business: evangelism and discipleship. It is important when we meet to discuss such matters that we have the benefit of the wisdom of the wider Anglican Communion of which we are one part. I am delighted that today we have the Most Revd Prem Chand Singh, Moderator of the Church North India and Bishop of Jabalpur, and the Rt Reverend Paul Korir, the Bishop of Kapsabet in the Anglican Church of Kenya. We were originally hoping to have three speakers but we have just two. We have allotted each of them 15 minutes to address us, so colleagues would you please listen to our distinguished guests.

Moderator of the Church of North India and Bishop of Jabalpur (The Most Reverend Pram Chong Singh: Let us pray, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Amen.

Your Graces, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Revd. Justin Welby, and the Archbishop of York, the Most Revd John Sentamu, dear colleagues, Primates, bishops, clergy and all other distinguished members and guests of the Synod, I greet you in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I bring greetings from the Church of North India Synod as the Primate and Moderator of the Church of North India and President of

the National Council of Churches in India and also the President of the Bible Society of India.

I am indeed privileged and honored to be invited to this Synod meeting. I thank the Archbishops and all others who invited me to this unique occasion. I am sure that most of you know about the Church of North India. We too belong in the family of the Anglican Communion. We are always indebted to the missionaries who brought the light of the Gospel to our country. We faithfully continue the ministries you have initiated.

The Church of North India was born on 29 November 1970 when the six major churches joined together. The CNI's jurisdiction covers all the states of the Indian Union, with the exception of five states in South India (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Telangana). The Church of North India has approximately 1,500,000 members in 27 dioceses and about 3,000 pastorates.

The following is in our constitution: "The Church of North India, as united and uniting together, is committed to announce the good news of the reign of God inaugurated through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in proclamation, and to demonstrate in actions to restore the integrity of God's creation through continuous struggle against the demonic powers by breaking down the barriers of caste, creed, class, gender, economic inequality and exploitation of the nature".

I am thankful to God for the witness of the Church of England. I am fascinated to see the wonderful work you are doing. Your network of parishes covers the country, bringing a vital Christian dimension to the nation and strengthening community life in numerous urban, suburban and rural settings.

We thank God that at this time you have asked me to precis what evangelism and discipleship are in the Indian context. It is understood that you would like me to present this theme from my own context because it is intimately related to specific contexts. Before I say anything about the Asian, especially the Indian context, I will try and make an equation relating evangelism and discipleship.

The risen Christ, before his ascension into heaven, gave us his great Commission - "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen".
Matthew 28: 18-20.

Peter preached the Gospel on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4) and 3,000 people were saved. This is the context when the Church is a discipleship and also evangelizing.

The Indian Situation. In the past two decades, Indian minority communities like Christians and other minority communities are facing a lot of violence, attacks, killings and betrayal. Christianity is India's third most followed religion according to the census of

2011. Now Christianity has been looked upon with suspicion and threat. India is now ruled by the Bharathiya Janata Party (BJP), which is a right-wing Hindu party supported by the ideology of the Rashtriya Swayam Sevaks (which we call RSS). The hidden agenda is to make India a Hindu nation.

The Hindutva groups have well-organised strategies. One of them is to encourage various Hindu extremist groups like the Bajrang Dal to go in large groups and attack churches and worship places. They do this especially on Christian festival times. They also engage in mass lynching of the minorities. This trend started with the burning alive of the missionary Graham Steins and his two sons, Philip and Timothy, while they were sleeping in their Jeep in Baripada, Odisha. This happened on 22 January 1999 after the missionary family had served the lepers and marginalised of that area for 35 years.

The Khandhamal carnage also came in 2008 and more than 100 people were killed and 300 churches were burnt, and 6,000 homes destroyed and 50,000 people were displaced in Khandhamal. We face this kind of situation and we thank God that even in this kind of situation the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ continues to be preached. In the month of November, there was a big gathering and all together 250,000 people listened to the Word of God, and that preaching and evangelism continues.

Revision of the constitution in various states to prohibit religious conversion is another strategy used by Hindutva forces. They are called Freedom of Religion Acts or “anti-conversion” laws and are state-level statutes that have been enacted to regulate religious

conversions. In five or six states these laws are in force: Arunachal Pradesh, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh (where I come from), Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand. All of these states have laws which seek to prevent any form of conversion to Christianity.

Responding to New Situations. These new situations demand that we take a fresh look at our practice of discipleship and evangelism. Where do we need changes and transformation? I wish to submit before you two main aspects: we need to transform our understanding of discipleship, and practice accordingly; and we need to transform our methods of evangelism.

I have drawn my major insights from the Asia Mission Conference which took place from 11 to 17 October 2017 in Myanmar. The theme was *Journeying Together: Prophetic Witness to the Truth and Light, in Asia*.

Transforming Discipleship. We understand, from the life and ministry of Jesus, that the mission unquestionably affirms the servanthood. Reaffirmation of the servanthood requires a new understanding of its own complex manifestations in the light of the context described above. It must challenge the hierarchical structure of society that marginalises people based on their nationality, class, gender and different abilities. In our country, a good majority of the Christians are Dalits who are marginalised and discriminated against. Our new understanding of servanthood means to care for each other, to minister to one another and to befriend one another. St Paul reminds us to “serve one another in love”

and “the entire law is summed up in a single command: love your neighbour as yourself.” (Galatians 5:13-14). Churches have a tendency to be authoritarian even now. It is here that we are challenged to rediscover the meaning of servanthood.

Journeying together with all peoples is the image used about our mission activities now. Mission has to be always with the practice of the spirituality of the Cross. It is a journey where we are embracing strangers, the Dalits, the tribes, transgender people and all the marginalised people in our arms of inclusion and love. It is a journey where men, women and children travel with equal dignity. In this journey we are called upon to suffer as well as bear each other’s burdens.

Coming to Transforming Evangelism. We journey together; ours is not a singular way or an exclusive path. We have to learn to accept others who are different from us. We need to respect the faith of others. We walk together, in communities, towards a common goal. As Christians, we journey with our sisters and brothers in churches who join together in communion with one another.

The creator God gave us the responsibility of the care of creation. We are asked to “dress and keep” it. This is becoming all the more relevant in our age of massive destruction of the environment and the fatal endangering of all life on earth.

Religious tolerance: Nurturing interfaith harmony. This has become a great necessity for human survival. We all hoped that the 21st century would bring in an age of peace and

justice in our world which is suffering from increasing violence and conflicts. However, we are deeply disappointed. The spectre of fundamentalism, with its characteristic exclusivism and aggressiveness, is on the rise in several world religions that were once considered peace loving. We are witnessing the volatile situation in the Middle Eastern countries. I have already described the Indian situation. In this context, we call upon all Christians to demonstrate the forgiveness and reconciling power of the Cross of Christ, in their relationship with other religions. We have to humble ourselves and give up our superior attitude. A good principle in inter-religious relationship is: accept whatever we can from other faith traditions and respect those things we are unable to accept. Learning about the faiths of our neighbours is an essential requirement of evangelism. We should not address people of other faiths as “non-Christians” but address them as fellow pilgrims. In this way let us make our evangelism really inclusive.

The Church of North India - the mission priority of evangelism and discipleship. In the last two Synods, the Church of North India had taken the CNI priorities as mission and evangelism and discipleship. In this context, I would like to let you to know that Bishop Andrew Rathod has sacrificed the Episcopal Ministry and joined the CNI programme department as mission evangelism director. We had a very big evangelistic conference, the Festival of Peace, in October 2017 in Jabalpur where 50,000 people gathered together and listened to the voice of God.

In the same way, I already told you that in the Khandhamal district in Odisha last October 250,000 people gathered together in the name of evangelism and listened to the Word of

God. Although that was the place where riots took place and 130 people were brutally killed, in the same place we preached the Gospel and preached about discipleship.

The Church of North India has established a Mission Evangelism Institute of Theology in Batala, Punjab, under the Diocese of Amritsar, where a training programme is conducted every month for evangelists, junior pastors and presbyters from all Church of North India dioceses to learn the method of evangelism.

I request the whole of the Synod of the Church of England to remember this ministry in your prayers and give full support to continuing this witness in India where multi-culture, language and a strong Hindutva movement prevails.

I must conclude now. Evangelism is the mission imperative of discipleship. Transforming individuals, communities and nations in the love of Jesus Christ is our singular task. In fulfilling our mission, we need to struggle as one body united in the love of Jesus Christ. I invite the Church of England General Synod to accompany us in this ecumenical journey.

May God bless you and may God bless us together to grow in Jesus' name

The Chair: Synod, before the Bishop of Kapsabet addresses us, may I say I have asked the secretariat to ensure, if possible, that we can have written copies of the speeches of the two Bishops made available to us because that will help inform our debates later in this group of sessions. Bishop, you are very welcome.

Bishop of Kapsabet, Anglican Church of Kenya (The Rt Reverend Paul Korir): Your Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and your Grace the Archbishop of York, all these esteemed delegates of the General Synod, we bring you greetings and love and grace from the Anglican Church of Kenya, particularly from His Grace the Archbishop Primate Jackson, who is raising the church to a second kind of level in terms of mission and evangelism, and from the people of Kenya. Receive those greetings because they belong to you. I will not go on too long because greetings in Africa take ten minutes, so in the interests of time I will not because we even ask if it is well with your soul.

What a great privilege and opportunity that His Grace the Archbishop of Kenya has sent me to represent him. I pray that the grace of God will be upon me so that I do not disappoint him, but that is for another day; for today it is me standing before you.

One day, A real story is told about a bishop who went to church and realised that the public address system was not working. As an Anglican, he said, "I want to apologise to the congregation because the public address system is not working". People are attuned and they know what begins in the services of the Anglican Church. Always they say, "The Lord be with you", and they will respond, "And also with you". This bishop stood and said, "There is something wrong with this microphone today", and people spontaneously said, "And also with you". Please, if there is something wrong with the microphone, it is well with my soul!

The Church in Africa - and I am addressing myself to the Anglican Church of Kenya - is growing and thriving. The spirit of God is moving but we acknowledge the source, and so we come to you with reverence and gratitude. Your people came to Kenya when Africa was considered a dark continent. They planted the seed and we are the fruit. We stand before you coming back home to you because you brought us the Gospel. Until and unless the Church becomes intentional in moving out, the Church is simply waiting to die. It is about going. We come to you with a lot of gratitude. On behalf of the people back in Africa and **back in** Kenya, we salute you and we appreciate you as the Church of England. Thank you for mobilising resources and sending missionaries when Africa was considered a dark continent. If you had not come, we would be nowhere.

In my family I am the first generation of Christians. That means that after I got saved my parents followed me. Coming here is in itself a testimony that God is at work and there is no disconnect. If the Church is growing in Africa, take pride and thank God because these are your seeds that you planted a long time ago. The only thing that is awaited is for you to come and see, come and witness what you planted some very many years ago. As I stand here, we have a team from the Diocese of Coventry led by Bishop John. They are in Kenya now in our Diocese of Kapsabet and last Sunday Bishop John confirmed 234 candidates in the Church at one service and the number is still growing, so we are very grateful and we thank God.

What is it that we are doing to continue evangelism, to continue mission and making

disciples? Number one, we are a sending church. The Anglican Church is a sending church. It is no longer inward looking. It is outward looking. The church has left the building. The dismissal is, "Go ye into the world and make disciples", so you have to account to God Almighty and to bring back a report. We are a sending church. We are very intentional. The Anglican Church of Kenya is very intentional. We are redeeming all the time because we are living on borrowed time: "As the Father sent me, so send I you". It is about commissioning and sending. Not much debate is happening at the boardroom. It is in the field where the labourers are few but the harvest is plentiful. It is about going: there is that urgency and people are going.

Number two is that we are intentional in making sure that the Church of today is a church for children, youth, teenagers and all people. We see children as a continuing church. When we have children in the service and they are crying, we see them as the voices of the Church. We do not send them away. We encourage them to cry even more because this is their church. If you send them away and they do not come back to church, you only have yourself to blame. We invite children to play a central role in the decision-making of the church, young as they may be. We want a sense of belonging that when you come to church you belong and there is no condemnation. In our context, we value, we appreciate, we affirm the children's ministry and we thank God for teenagers. We give space for everybody. That is what we are doing.

Another strategy is for us to continue as the Church, honestly speaking, to remain relevant and to be active in our present time and for posterity, we have to put discipleship at the

centre of the agenda of the Church. Discipleship-making, evangelism, winning souls for Christ, to mention but a few. We are intentional. We are sending a church. We take advantage of our schools. Chaplaincy in our schools is very prominent and is very evident. We want to save these young people. We want to make them disciples of Christ. We reach out to schools because that is our entry point, and we are very grateful because, in Kenya, the Anglican Church has so many schools that it sponsors. As I was coming here, we had done an induction for four months for those who are going to secondary school, in ten schools between January and February, and we are still going on. We emphasise and we strengthen chaplaincy in schools. We do confirmations in schools so that we confirm children in that context.

The Mothers' Union - women of the church, ladies of the 21st century, carrying on the vision of Mary Sumner. When you come to Kenya, the Mothers' Union is a ministry. When they put on their uniform, it is like a doctor at work. You will see the Mothers' Union working without any fear of contradiction. The Mothers' Union is given prominence and they serve without any fear of contradiction. The Mothers' Union is alive. In our diocese, the Diocese of Kapsabet, on behalf of the Anglican Church of Kenya, let me use Kapsabet as a case study, we have 2,730 in Mothers' Unions, young, vibrant and moving forward. The eldest are handing over to the coming generation. It is vibrant, it is nice, it is well. When they come to serve in the Church, they know they are doing that ministry. When they are in their uniform, they are in the ministry.

Man's ministry, Kenya Anglican Men Association is gaining momentum. We are asking men to play their prophetic role to serve as the priests, to serve us as the prophets and to serve as the prince even in their conduct. We are encouraging men not to take the backseat but to participate fully in the Church.

When we started this, it was very difficult to explain what KAMA would mean - Kenya Anglican Men Association. We say, "Instead of using a lot of words, we better say this is the Mothers' Union of men". We are doing very well because you can use now a lot of words. The Mothers' Union of men is gaining momentum and we want them to own the Church and raise sustainability for the Church, and that is it.

Equipping **the saints** for ministry. The lay readership and leadership in the Church is visible. You get a priest serving in a parish with a congregation of 20, so as he or she is in one church then the lay readers are in the other 19 churches. The lay readership is very pronounced. Lay readership and lay leaders in the Church are given prominence. They make decisions and they serve. They lead the matins, the morning prayers, and when the priest will come it is only to give Holy Communion service.

The clergy are formed and shaped and called into this ministry and given the tools and mindset of being a missional clergy. It is about winning souls for Christ. As much as we appreciate the serving of sacraments, then they have to go. They need to bring a report that, "As I entered into this particular parish, we had this number of people but God has been gracious".

We focus ourselves on family and the local church. Cell groups is what is thriving in the Church because we are asking ourselves how can we do church in the public square if we are not doing the church at the family set-up? So, cell groups, the neighbours but, you know, moving forward and appreciating and thanking God. Public theology and entering into the public space, we believe it begins in the home. In the family we are raising the family altar, whereby friendship is formed.

When Lord Bishop Dr Christopher visited us in our home, our 13-year-old was the one who was praying, giving thanks for their arrival. Two Bishops were in the house, but this is a young boy praying and giving thanks for their safe arrival. The family altar, our children, our people, the household is lifted to represent the Kingdom of God. That is evangelism, mission and discipleship.

I do not know how much time we have but, as a matter of respecting the moderator and the Chair of this session, I will be coming to a conclusion momentarily. The questions we are asking ourselves, for the Church to remain relevant for now and posterity, include the following.

One, what are people's hopes and aspirations? Two, what will address their worries, their fears, their loneliness, their hearts, their brokenness and their despair, so that the Church will be present? The Church does not want to behave like an absentee landlord. The Church should be present in the lives of the people, even in their struggles. Three, what

will be the solution for the many things going wrong in the world today? Four, what will constitute the good news in our society where everything else seems to be going wrong? Five, what opportunities are available that give meaning to the lives of the people, including harnessing both human and artificial intelligence for positive gain? Six, how can we advance God's morality as the unchanging truth, His Word in our generation? Seven, where and how do people experience community to shape their lives? Eight, what brings them together? Shared struggles, shared vision. Oh, my goodness, I told you!

In conclusion, the Anglican Church of Kenya is refocusing itself to the first missionaries' model of growing mission, evangelism and discipleship whereby the church, the school and the hospital were the signposts and symbols of a missional Church.

As we join you in this important Synod for your Church, we want you to know that the Church in Kenya is indebted to the sacrifices made by the first missionaries who came to Africa while it was still considered a dark continent. They braved a harsh climate, severe diseases, poor infrastructure, a language barrier, foreign culture, strange food, to mention but a few. As much as that was true, they brought the good news, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to our people. While we were sinners, they came to us.

On behalf of His Grace, the Archbishop of Kenya, and on behalf of the good people of the Anglican Church of Kenya and on my own behalf, we register our very sincere gratitude for your inviting us to be part of this narrative that is unfolding as we listen to what the Spirit of God is calling the Church of England to in this time, space and age.

Be rest assured of our prayers because, when we come together great things happen and God is glorified. May the Great Commission, as commissioned by Christ in Matthew 28.19, be our portion. I share these in the name of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

The Chair. The Moderator of the Church of North India again, briefly.

The Most Reverend Dr Prem Chand Singh: Friends, speaking to you in the General Synod of the Church of England is a very extraordinary experience. The first time in my life. I do not know whether again I will get a chance or not, but for the first time in my life I am speaking to you. I am always thankful to the God Almighty for the Church of England, the ministry they have done in India and across the world.

As I have gathered some information, if we talk about the educational systems and educational institutions you have established in India and across the world they are remarkable. All the time people remember these institutions. I also understand that the ministry the Church of England is doing in evangelism and also discipleship is remarkable for all of us.

I wish and I congratulate this General Synod to continue this spirit of loving and caring and spreading good news through this world. May God bless us. May God use us. We

become a tool to transform community to build and to make a new community and a community which love each other.

The Chair. Colleagues, I think Bishop Paul said at the beginning of his address to us that if this was in Kenya he would be asking, “Is it well with our souls?” I think we can say to both of our guests, it is a lot better with our souls for listening to the two of you sharing your wisdom and your passion for the Gospel over this last half an hour. May we thank our guests once again. That, Synod, concludes Item 4 and we have set a very high bar for whoever is going to address us next.

THE CHAIR: *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 4.57 pm.

The Chair. We now move on to Item 5 on our agenda. I call on the Archbishop of Canterbury to give his Presidential Address.

ITEM 5 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): It would save a lot of time if I simply said “Amen” to everything we have just heard, but no such luck. What I want to say today does follow on from those things to which we have been listening.

This Synod is devoted to the Great Commission to seek to make disciples of all nations. Inevitably, we will talk much about what we do, but equally important is the question of who we are when we seek to witness to the good news of Jesus Christ. We are not a club with a membership drive. Evangelism and witness are not means to something else, any more than worship is a means to something else. They are ends in themselves.

Both worship and witness spring from our own experience of the unmediated love of God in Jesus Christ, a love that captures and constrains us. Next year at the Lambeth Conference, the theme will be God's church for God's world. The Conference seeks to unite all those who come in, turning outwards to the world around and in love and passionate discipleship to seek to serve the mission of God, to share in the work of God in His world.

The biblical book of the Conference will be 1 Peter. It speaks to us of holiness, of suffering, of mutual love and commitment, of the transformation for each of us and for the world in the creation of the church of Jesus Christ, of its great themes of "what you were" and "what you are" and "what you will be" through being a disciple of Jesus.

The letter is written to insecure churches, threatened from without and uncertain within. It is beautiful in its sweep and call for pragmatic action to avoid adding unnecessarily to the offence of the Gospel and, at the same time, it calls for absolute faithfulness to Christ against the current culture. Christians, says Peter, are always to be ready to give a reason for their hope but to do so with gentleness and grace.

Out of the cosmic change of their incorporation into God's people comes the utterly down to earth need to witness faithfully, to live well and, above all, in 1 Peter 1:22: "Now that you have purified your souls by your obedience to the truth so that you have genuine mutual love, love one another deeply from the heart". In one extraordinary verse, Peter brings together salvation, truth, holiness and love.

Even if there were not hundreds of other examples in scripture, this one version puts paid to the absurdity, the insane idea that truth and love are somehow alternatives, that we can be in favour of one but not the other. To separate them is like separating breathing from the beating of the heart. The absence of either stops the other and brings death.

In holiness, God brings salvation through Jesus the truth, overflowing in love to every person on earth and, as we respond to that love, we cease to be what we were and become something new. Yet, Peter writes this letter because there is so much pressure to conform, and so much behaviour which is what the recipients of the letter had been; behaviour like those around them in their culture, the absence of love, competition, no grace, no hope. There is too much of what they were and too little of what God in Christ has made them.

Peter calls for a holy and loving Church, reaching out to a world that does not know the power of the Resurrection, nor understands that the sufferings of Christ were for them and the Church exists to communicate this truth. Communication is so very complex and

whatever is said has also to be heard and whatever is heard is not always reflected on in the same way as the original speaker may have intended. We show that all the time here in Synod.

I am constantly reminded of Metternich at the Congress of Vienna when he heard that Talleyrand, the notoriously slippery representative of France who had served five regimes without ever losing his head, had died and Metternich said, "Now what does he mean by that?"

Sometimes, the passion and enthusiasm of this Synod can be in danger of being misunderstood or can be mistranslated as we have another debate on Standing Orders, or we agree to set up a working group to bring forward a paper in order to set up a commission to investigate a problem which, in due course, will lead to us having a debate.

At the Lambeth Conference, the communication of truth in love, of holiness and salvation in one sentence, is made more difficult by hundreds of languages and cultures, by the very fact that phrases that mean one thing in one culture have a completely different meaning in another. That is why it is such a great joy to welcome our Communion and our ecumenical guests with us at this group of sessions.

It is always both informative and intriguing to hear observational comments on what we do and how we do it from our fellow Christians, fellow Christians from different cultures or churches. Their observations enable us to realise and learn from what we believe are

obvious and transparent ways of behaving that that is not always the case. It is good to hear what Anglicans do in other parts of the world that is not necessarily what we do here or behave in the way we behave here, nor do we necessarily and understandably share the same priorities.

Yet, the language of hope, love and holiness is a common language. The language of love, hope and holiness “walks in the light”, to use an East African expression. It recognises that its own interests are not the final word, but that self-giving and self-sacrifice is. It does not constantly seek advantage or gain. It is a language that the Church has always struggled with, from Paul writing his first letter to the Corinthians to this very day. It is a language made harder to speak by the real complexities of the world in which we live, the clash of cultures and the differences of personality.

The brokenness of the world, which we just heard about, is also the brokenness of the Church. There is an eternal struggle in each of us and among all of us to speak love fluently, and our tongues stumble over its expression and find law and rules and exclusion and a certain tribalism and club mentality come so much more easily to each of us.

Such living in so normal and earthbound a way cannot express the wonder of salvation or the glory of the treasure laid up in heaven for us set out in 1 Peter 4-5. It cannot set us free to declare to the world the wonderful works of Him who brought us out of darkness into His marvellous light (1 Peter 2:9).

To put it in the simplest terms, we must look like what we speak about. As Lesslie Newbigin said, “The business of the Church is to tell and embody a story”. So, we cannot talk about Jesus without looking like Jesus. I am grateful to Bishop Steven of Oxford for reminding me of this in a paper he wrote recently, *Rethinking Evangelism*. I hope he will speak to it and might even get a bit longer to do so than some of us, whoever is in charge of that. He sets out eight marks of witness to Jesus Christ, but at the heart of what he says is that the witness who witnesses is both the carrier of the message and its embodiment.

Here, we are not only any group of Christians but a meeting of Synod. Synod and synodality is something being discussed by many churches and with many groups at present. I do think it is well worthwhile considering what is our purpose here as Christians who are journeying together, we are “in the way,” “syn-odos,” walking together, those who are both trying to hear one another, understand one another and walk with each other in the light of Christ.

Synod is the focus of our day-to-day work but also of our differences. It is a test tube in which we mix up the ingredients of the Church and heat them to see what happens. If the resulting reaction is to be holy, hope-filled and truthful, it must be loving and in many places it is. The Church of England is not only alive and well but is showing signs of growth, renewal and reform. For this, we give thanks and rejoice with the God who made us, loves us and calls us to the hope that is in us.

Numbers of ordinands continue to grow. Parishes and chaplaincies work ever harder than before at the frontline of spiritual, emotional and physical needs in our country. Dioceses are showing immense effort and imagination in developing new models of church. Church planting goes ahead with over 2,500 planned before 2030.

We are alongside people either to give debt advice, to deliver food or shelter for those in need, or to provide relationships and friendships for those who are struggling with the daily grind of being human. We continue to educate more than a million children. The work we will hear about from the Estates Evangelism Group is encouraging. We are present for people in some of the most difficult and complicated situations.

Most of all, we serve and worship the God who raised Jesus Christ from the dead and whose activity we see all around us. Because of the Resurrection, we have hope, whatever happens. Yes, we argue; yes, we fail; we disagree about inclusion; we let people down; we mess up, but we do not leave the wonderful work of the Spirit of God out of the equation and, thus, we have good news to share and to show.

As we journey towards Lent, some of you may be considering what you might give up during the penitential season. I urge you to consider, especially as members of General Synod, giving up cynicism and renewing love for those with whom you and I differ. It is not easy. Some of them have views we find so obnoxious that we wish they were not with us in the Church. We even convince ourselves that, really, in God's mind because, of course, he agrees with us, they are not with us in the Church.

Yet, we and they are equally loved by God in Christ, equally sinners needing to repent, equally part of the body of Christ. So let us hear a little of why each of us has hope in Jesus Christ. I am now going to ask you to turn to your neighbour or perhaps to be in a group of three. I will give you about three and a half minutes or so, each of you one minute, to share your faith story with each other, to give to the person next to you a reason for the hope that is within you. Each in one minute, without jargon, explain your hope, not your hope in the Church of England but your hope in Jesus Christ. Are you ready? Go.

The Chair. Synod, you have one more minute.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Thank you very much, Synod. As we listen to each other, and as through this Synod as well as in legislative business we turn to evangelism, let us recall that we are in the presence of Jesus Christ by his Spirit.

Let us praise God afresh that we carry the ultimate good news, the good news of salvation and love, the news of Jesus Christ. Let us allow the Spirit to warm our hearts with affection and love for one another, to constrain us with the love of Christ. Let the Spirit of Jesus cause us to imagine how we can be the good news we proclaim.

We are not, in this Church, optimists or pessimists. We are those who hope because we are all followers of the risen Christ, sinners yet justified, failures, cracked pots of clay, yet with the only treasure that is the only answer to the bleakness of a world that too often finds its despair in seeking its own answers without Christ and needs the light and hope of the Gospel that is in our hands to proclaim. Amen.

The Chair: That concludes Item 5. We move on to the next part of the agenda.

THE CHAIR: *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 17.18 pm.

ITEM 6 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR OF THE PENSIONS BOARD (GS 2114)

The Chair: Synod, we come to Item 6, the appointment of the Chair of the Pensions Board, for which you will need GS 2114. I will be calling upon the Archbishop of York in a moment to move and speak to this item. Following that, it will be possible for interventions to be made from the floor and then the Archbishop will reply, if there are any, and we will then put the matter to the vote. We are operating to quite severe time constraints at this point because we do want to start Questions at 5.45, no later than, because we all know there is such a large number. Moving to Item 6 then at GS 2114, I turn to the Archbishop of York and ask him to move and speak to this item.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): GS 2114 sets out the process of the appointment of the Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board. The Church of England Pensions Regulations 1997 provided 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.

Jonathan Spencer has chaired the Board for over ten years and has decided to step down on 30 April 2019. The Synod will have the opportunity to thank him for his outstanding and exceptional service to the life of the Church of England and the Pensions Board on Saturday afternoon.

We sought someone to succeed Dr Spencer who had a record of senior leadership in the financial, public or third sector and had proven chairing and board level experience. This was no mean task given that the role requires a commitment of around 50 days per year, is unpaid and the individual had to be a communicant member of the Church of England. So it was not an easy task. The Archbishop of Canterbury and I are grateful to the Bishop of Manchester and the members of the selection panel for deliberating over a diverse and very able field of candidates.

Following an extensive executive career, Clive Mather undertook several non-executive roles, including the Chair of Tearfund, the Garden Tomb Association and as the Chair of the Shell Pensions Trust. He brings to the role the ability to shape strategy and lead the Board through its complex and significant financial decision-making.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and I commend the appointment of Mr Mather as the next Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board to the Synod. Chair, I beg to move.

The Chair: I now invite anyone who wishes to make any interventions or comments from the floor and amendments are possible. I see no one standing and, therefore, do not need to ask the Archbishop of York to reply since there is no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 6 to the vote, the appointment of the Chair of the Pensions Board, which we will do by show of hands.

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

The Chair: Thank you. That brings Item 6 to an end and we now move to Item 7.

ITEM 7 APPOINTMENT OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

The Chair: We have now Item 7, the appointment of two members of the Archbishops' Council. The procedure will be similar. I will, on this occasion, invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to move and speak to this item and he may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): As members will be aware, the Archbishops' Council was established by the National Institutions Measure 1998. When the Synod was debating that legislation, it was agreed that ten of the 19 places on the Archbishops' Council should be filled through various synodical elections; three, the Archbishops and one of the Estates Commissioners, should be *ex officio* members; and six should be for the Archbishops to appoint with the approval of Synod.

Why with the approval of Synod? Because these six appointed members become *ex officio* members of the Synod, so it seems perfectly reasonable that the Synod should have the opportunity to approve their appointment. The current vacancies arise from the resignation of Rosalyn Murphy in April 2018 and the retirement of Rebecca Swinson.

I would like to thank both Ros and Rebecca for their contributions to the work of the Archbishops' Council and for their commitment to both mission and evangelism. Their life experiences provided the Council with perspectives of youth, from the world of science, their viewpoint from Lancashire and the United States. During their time on the Council, it was richer for their engagement and I would like to recognise their valuable contributions.

GS 2115 sets out the recruitment process we have followed to find two new members to join the Council, the Revd Charlotte Cook and Mr Joseph Diwakar. The Archbishop of York and I, and those who advised us on these appointments, believe that Charlotte and Joseph will be able to make a considerable contribution to the work of the Council.

Charlotte's previous experience as a member of the Church of England Youth Council will stand her in good stead for her engagement. Her commitment to dialogue and discussion will be invaluable in her work.

Joseph is a prayerful lay leader and is engaged in mission and ministry as a pioneer missionary on one of London's newest estates. His experience of working in the Diocese of London will bring a different dimension to the discussions of the Council.

Their commitment to sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to change lives and seeing the Church of England thrive and grow, will prove vital to the work of the Council. I, therefore, move that the appointment of the Revd Charlotte Cook and Mr Joseph Diwakar as members of the Archbishops' Council for a term ending on 22 February 2024 be approved.

The Chair. The motion is now open to the floor.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I think it is easy, is it not, to perhaps take these very important decisions a bit on the nod and, therefore, I think it is helpful just to have a moment to think through the importance of this decision but also reflecting the Archbishop's comments both on Ros and Rebecca for their excellent work.

I have been on Archbishops' Council now for most of the last three years and it has been really important to have the contribution from people who are not, as it were, synodically elected and, therefore, sometimes caught up in the synodical bubble, who come in with perspectives that are very helpful and I certainly found that, particularly in the House of Laity through Rebecca.

Also, I think we should note the membership of those who were involved in the appointments. It was great to have Simon as a Prolocutor, in a sense, representing Liz, myself and the Prolocutors, but also Maggie from the Appointments Committee. I think it is important we go through the process. We see this as a really crucial point if you think of the leadership we have had on the Archbishops' Council from our elected members, some of whom are still obviously going strong. I do want very much to support the Archbishops in this appointment and support these two candidates.

The Chair: Thank you for that contribution. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I am from one of the dioceses from which one of these two candidates is coming and we very much welcome that appointment. I have got a question. In view of the Archbishop confirming to us that these two candidates will become members of this Synod, if and when we approve their appointment - hopefully, in just a minute or so's time - has either of them been invited to the rest of this group of sessions?

Miss Annika Matthews (Church of England Youth Council): I declare an interest because I was at Charlotte's church last year where she is currently curate in the church family there and I was very excited when I saw her name being written down as one of the people who was put forward for this post.

I would heartily endorse that because she just is a shining light in the church already in what she is doing. She just really encourages everyone in their faith and their discipleship journey and it is just a real joy to witness, to be there when she is talking in our church.

I know she has a great experience in Synod. She has been a Synod observer first with the Youth Council - as I am doing now as a rep - and she will bring such great experience, great joy, great presence and support to young people, in particular, I think in this role when she is elected.

I also wanted to say I was really pleasantly surprised to see the comment on the diversity within all the candidates who were just selected to the interview stage; the fact there were both BAME candidates, female candidates, and I am sure there was also other diversities within those people who came forward. In both the candidates' profiles, actually, I am very excited to see that and, hopefully, they will be elected to these roles in the Archbishops' Council.

The Chair: I do not see anybody else standing and so I ask the Archbishop of Canterbury to reply, please.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Thank you to both of you. To David Lamming, I am not aware of an invitation having been extended because it seemed to be presumptuous ahead of the Synod taking a decision, unless someone corrects me. I am looking nervously over my shoulder. No, nobody has corrected me yet. Secondly, Annika, thank you so much for that personal recommendation, which I think we welcome very much indeed.

The Chair: We now move to the vote on this motion and we do it by show of hands, of course, as before.

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

The Chair: That concludes this item of business and we will move directly on to Item 8.

THE CHAIR: *Mr Aiden Hargreaves Smith (London)* took the Chair at 17.32 pm.

ITEM 8 QUESTIONS

The Chair: We come now to Item 8, Questions. For this item, we shall need the yellow A5 booklet containing the questions and answers. In addition to the booklets, members will have found on their seats in the chamber copies of the questions and answers that were circulated by email on Monday.

As usual, I shall announce each question. As the answers have already been provided we shall move immediately to supplementary questions, if there are any. Where questions have been answered en bloc, I intend to draw the Synod's attention to that fact and then to move through each individual question in turn.

It will be helpful if those answering questions could make their way to the lectern as promptly as possible when we reach their question and if those who may be thinking of asking a supplementary question would ensure you are seated close to one of the fixed microphones. We can then hope to maintain a proper pace and make good progress through the questions and answers before us this evening.

As you will have seen, 120 questions have been tabled, more than at any Synod in the last 15 years, and I apologise in advance to those whose questions we shall not have time to reach. A significant number of questions relate to sensitive matters and I know that members will wish to have a care both for the content of supplementary questions and answers and the way they are expressed.

May I remind members that the key to a supplementary question is in the term: it must be supplementary, which under our Standing Orders means that it must be strictly relevant to the original question and the answer given - and it must be a question. This is not an opportunity for members to make points or speeches. I should also remind members that

a question must not contain any argument or imputation or ask for any expression of opinion.

Finally, I have been asked to remind members to give their name, diocese and Synod number in the usual way when asking supplementary questions. Now, our stellar, celebrity panel of highly intelligent, charming and sophisticated answerers - sorry, I am having trouble reading Canon John Spence's handwriting - is at the ready, so we can begin.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. *Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the Finance Committee: Since 2017, the Church of England has been paying the government's annual Apprenticeship Levy of 0.5% on its clergy payroll amounting to c.£1.6M over two years with a third instalment due imminently, but has not yet been able to recoup any of it. In view of the delays that have been experienced in working with the Institute for Apprenticeships to gain approval for an apprenticeship that might be suitable for clergy training:

- What steps have been or will be taken to enable the work to be progressed more quickly; and
- What plans are there in place to address the situation in which, due to the impossibility of spending down a significant backlog of money in a short space of time,

the Church of England through no fault of its own loses the opportunity to utilise some of these funds for the purpose for which they were levied?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Finance Committee: Many employers are finding it difficult to use the levy for training their workers. However, progress continues to be made towards the approval of a Church Minister Apprenticeship. An Apprenticeship Standard was conditionally approved in July 2018. Despite this, ongoing delays from the Institute for Apprenticeships are preventing final approval and implementation. The Second Church Estates Commissioner has recently written to the relevant Minister of State to seek resolution to this through a meeting between the Institute's senior staff and the appropriate Officers of the NCIs. Should that prove inadequate, a formal complaint would be raised with its Chief Executive. It is also possible to fund other eligible clergy on some relevant Apprenticeships to meet specific needs. Changes to the funding rules also permit a proportion of Levy funds to be transferred to 'other employers', for example staff in dioceses, and this option is being explored.

MINISTRY COUNCIL

2. *Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What guidelines and policy advice has the Ministry Division issued to dioceses to enable them to offer appropriate options and support for female ordinands who have a baby while training for ministry?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Ministry Division recognises the importance of supporting ordinands who become new parents during their training. Although arrangements for individual cases are a matter between the ordinand, DDO and TEI, financial support for up to 52 weeks is distributed through the pooling system and is thereby supported by the whole church. RACSC is in the final stages of drafting guidance recommending that discretionary means-tested maintenance grants paid to those studying full time at a TEI should continue to be paid during any period of maternity- or adoption-related absence for up to one year to enable them to resume their studies; and that accommodation should continue to be provided during that period.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming: Bishop, thank you for your answer, but concerning the existing financial support and the forthcoming guidance from RACSC, which we look forward to, given that I am aware from other principals of TEIs that diocesan approaches to supporting ordinands who have become parents during training vary very significantly, and, indeed, that some DDOs are unaware both of the existing policy arrangements up to 52 weeks as well as the forthcoming guidance, will Ministry Division consider taking additional steps to communicate both the existing policy and the forthcoming guidance so that ordinands are treated in a more consistent way?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I think the spirit of all this is about generosity and there are clear guidelines, which are generous, and we want to make sure that that

generosity is consistent across dioceses. We were certainly intending to share the work of RACSC and the guidance that will come out of that but, if, as you are suggesting, there is a reason to be sharing the current situation, then we need to do that too.

Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson (Chelmsford): What provision is proposed for those ordinands intending a stipendiary post who are pregnant in their final year of training in the event that they are not offered a curacy?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: That will be part of what RACSC is going to come back with and I cannot anticipate what they are going to say.

3. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: For each year since 2010, what percentage of new ordinands declared a disability as defined in the Equality Act 2010?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Between 2010 and 2018 the percentage varies between 2% and 5%. The details are posted on the Notice Board.

Percentage of new ordinands declaring a disability	
2010	2%
2011	3%
2012	4%

2013	2%
2014	2%
2015/16	3%
2016/17	5%
2017/18	4%

The format change in 2015 reflects a move to record the ordinands entering training in that academic year.

Mr Samuel Margrave: Compared with other organisations, these figures may seem shockingly low, especially when 20% of the population are disabled. Will the Chair of Ministry Council arrange for Synod members a meeting where we could maybe discuss how we can increase support and the number of disabled ordinands?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I am very happy to do that.

4. *Mr Andrew Williams (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Both on a national basis and per Diocese, what are the number (and percentage of total numbers) of disabled people:

- Entering the vocations process for ordained ministry;
- Being recommended for training;
- Completing training; and
- Receiving a stipendiary vs non-stipendiary title post?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: In the 2017/2018 academic year, 4% of those sponsored for a BAP declared a disability, the same percentage were recommended for training and a slightly higher percentage, 5%, sponsored for a stipendiary post.

The numbers are posted on the Notice Board.

	Candidates attending Bishops Advisory Panels Sept 2017 - July 2018		
	Total	Disabled	% of total
Sponsored for BAP	674	30	4%
Recommended for training	580	26	4%
Sponsored for Stipendiary Post	399	19	5%

We have chosen not to give the break down by diocese as the numbers are so small that it would be possible to identify the individuals concerned.

Mr Andrew Williams: Can I thank the Bishop for answering my question. While understanding he does not wish to give a diocesan break down due to the possibility of identifying individual people, would he be prepared to give us the figures over, say, five years so we could look at the statistics per diocese without the danger of identifying individuals?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Can we have a look at that? I think there is still the danger that they might be able to identify individuals, but we will have a look at seeing what that produces because I can imagine there may be some learning in terms of variants between dioceses.

5. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many clergy classed as Self Supporting Ministers in ministry statistics are in fact licensed to House-for-Duty posts?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Ministers who are provided with a house for the better performance of their duties, but no stipend, may be licensed as assistant curate, priest in charge, or incumbent.

There is no such legal category as House-for-Duty licence. It is unfortunately, therefore, not possible to identify the number of self-supporting clergy in House-for-Duty posts from their licence.

Canon Jenny Humphreys: Since self-supporting ministers form about one-third of licensed clergy, please could consideration be given to asking dioceses to supply this information so that the numbers of clergy working part-time on House-for-Duty terms and their gender and age groups can be included in the annual ministry statistics?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: We can certainly have a look at that.

6. *Revd Canon Ruth Crossley (Carlisle)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Given the overall increase in people entering ordination training since the implementation of Resourcing Ministerial Education, what has been the proportionate increase or decrease in students entering the three different pathways: residential, fulltime non-residential, and part-time regional?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The number of ordinands in training has increased by 23% since the introduction of RME for the academic year beginning September 2016. In the past two years the number training on context-based courses (i.e. full time, non-residential) has increased by 120%, the number training part time by 34%, and the number training full time residentially decreased by 14%.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TEs): While I know that the decline in residential training is not common to all TEs, I am conscious that the Ministry Division-led review will not report for another 18 months. What scrutiny has the Ministry Council enabled the Archbishops' Council to give to this concerning trend of the overall reduction and decline in residential theological education, given that theological education is such a major part of the Archbishops' Council's budget?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I think one of the things that I am hoping will happen in this review, which will be getting underway very shortly, is that we will be able to look at items, as it were, in sequence so that we should be able to look at some of these questions sooner than 18 months' time. The important thing for us is to understand the reasons. If we can get a picture of that, then I think that will be really helpful and we can then start to address it sooner rather than later.

What I would also say is I think it is the intention - and this comes from Ministry Council and from Archbishops' Council - that we look to see what do we need to do to develop a theological education ecology that is collaborative, not competitive, that is innovative and supportive, so that we are not facing questions where one part of the sector feels vulnerable when another part feels as if they are thriving, which has been a pattern for the last 20 years in one form or another.

7. *Mr James Lee (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Of the ordinands who began training in September 2017 and September 2018, please provide a numerical break down by training pathway (e.g. full-time residential, full-time non-residential, part-time) and by diocese?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The number of ordinands beginning training in September 2018 was 587 (up 8% from 2017). Of the total, 189 entered full-time residential training, 141 context-based (i.e. full-time non-residential) training and 257 part-time training. A detailed analysis by diocese is posted for reference.

New ordinands Training Pathways by Dioceses 2018/2019	Full time non-residential	Part time regional	Residential
Bath and Wells	3	12	10
Birmingham	1	2	6
Blackburn	2	7	2
Bristol	3	6	6
Canterbury	3	2	3
Carlisle	0	5	0
Chelmsford	9	14	9
Chester	11	10	0
Chichester	7	5	7
Coventry	1	2	2
Derby	0	6	1
Durham	0	2	5
Ely	1	7	3
Europe	1	7	7
Exeter	4	3	3
Gloucester	2	5	2
Guildford	5	7	7
Hereford	0	3	2
Leeds	2	3	6
Leicester	7	2	1
Lichfield	0	6	2
Lincoln	3	8	0
Liverpool	4	12	8
London	29	12	26
Manchester	6	6	7
Newcastle	0	4	2
Norwich	2	3	2
Oxford	1	19	9
Peterborough	2	3	5
Portsmouth	2	2	2
Rochester	2	9	3
Salisbury	2	7	4
Sheffield	1	8	3
Sodor and Man	0	1	0
Southwark	5	7	11
Southwell	4	3	1
St Albans	6	5	3

New ordinands Training Pathways by Dioceses 2018/2019	Full time non-residential	Part time regional	Residential
St Edmundsbury & Ipswich	1	0	4
Truro	4	3	2
Winchester	4	15	3
Worcester	1	4	4
York	0	10	6

8. *Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What was the reduction in the take-up of places for residential ordination training, for each of the last two years and cumulatively, and what are believed to be the causes of this change?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The reduction in those entering residential training was 8% in 2017 and 6% in 2018. Ministry Division is beginning the formal review asked for by Synod of the impact of RME and expects to report in July 2020. This will include collecting data from dioceses regarding the reasons for the training choices made in the past three years. It is unclear what the factors are given the high increase in full-time context-based training, and DDOs and bishops are indicating that they continue to discern pathways for training on the basis of the best formation for the ordinand and the most appropriate models of ministry for their future curates and ministers.

Revd Dr Ian Paul: Given that a third similar year this year would result in a nearly 25% loss of the numbers going into residential training, what provision will be put in place to mitigate the interim pressure on residential institutions while waiting for the outcome of the review?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I think the answer I gave to the previous question answers this question.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Can the Chair of the Ministry Council give any advice to DDOs, such as myself, contacted by prominent providers of context-based training who explicitly stress the cheapness of the training they offer and the advantages to the diocesan RME budget?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: It is an interesting question and how you do the sums. What I would want to ask is who is paying for the family support?

9. *Revd Charles Read (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What policy or strategy does the Council or the Division have regarding the spread of provision of ministry training so that when a TEI faces closure due to lack of finance or students, valuable resources are not lost to the Church and the sector does not become over-influenced by one provider?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Ministry Council maintains a close relationship with the 22 Theological Education Institutions providing training for ministry in the Church of England, including providing support advice for governance and finance when requested or when the need is evident through the seven-yearly inspection regime.

TEIs are independently constituted charities with their own governing bodies and Ministry Council has no power to interfere with that governance. In the forthcoming review of Theological Education and the impact of RME we will be looking at how to develop sustainability, collaboration and innovation that reflects the needs of the Church.

Revd Charles Read: Referring to the first paragraph of your answer, are you able to tell us whether St John's College, Nottingham sought support and advice from the Council and, if so, in broad terms, what support and advice was given?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I can tell you that there was very close contact between the staff of Ministry Division and St John's College. I cannot be specific about what that advice was given the number of parties involved and the issues involved.

REMUNERATION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Chair: Questions 10 to 14 are for the Remunerations and Conditions of Service Committee to be answered by the Bishop of Portsmouth as Chair of the Committee.

10. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Is the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee aware of how many dioceses conduct clergy “wellbeing” surveys or questionnaires; does it request any resulting reports from them for information; and, if not, would it undertake to do so prior to the planned debate on clergy wellbeing at General Synod in July 2019, to resource the discussions?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: We support efforts made to improve clergy wellbeing - at both diocesan level and via the clergy Covenant - although it is not currently part of the Committee’s role to monitor diocesan provision. Clergy wellbeing is best addressed locally where it can best be delivered, and we do not know whether any dioceses conduct these surveys. We consider that the Synod will be in a better position to take a view on how the NCIs might best support dioceses, parishes and clergy in providing for clergy wellbeing - and whether they should have a role beyond sharing and encouraging best practice - after the conversations about wellbeing have taken place. The Synod would need to agree additional resources for any extension of the Committee’s role.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell: Recognising that it is not the role of RACSC to monitor provision across dioceses, the question is simply asking whether RACSC would be willing to assist the Working Party on Wellbeing and thereby this Synod by gathering data on dioceses which presently have the good practice of conducting surveys of clergy wellbeing, and whether they are willing to share datasets and interpretation they have gathered along the time that they have been doing them because, collectively, the Church may actually have a trove of data which points well to good practice which is already happening and which may be shared to our mutual benefit.

The Bishop of Portsmouth: RACSC is very willing indeed to work collaboratively and, we trust, helpfully with the Clergy Wellbeing Group in advance of July's Synod. As you correctly say, RACSC has neither responsibility nor authority to monitor or demand information from dioceses but we will willingly work with you to do the best we can to inform this work and the debate which comes, we trust, at the next Synod.

11. *Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: In preparation for the debate on the draft Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing to be held at the July 2019 General Synod, can the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee provide data on: (a) the numbers of clergy who have left ordained ministry (other than by retirement at normal retirement age); (b) the associated costs, e.g. of absence on long-term sick leave prior to leaving ministry; and (c) the lost investment in training costs for each priest ending ministry early? If the Committee does not already hold these data, could they undertake to collect and collate

these data from the dioceses (anonymised to protect both individuals and dioceses) to underpin the debate in July?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: We are happy to explore with Mrs Stamper what information can be provided to underpin the debate on the draft Covenant in July and to support clergy wellbeing more generally (for example, aggregated statistics on clergy sickness).

However, existing sources of ministry information do not allow us to identify the number of clergy who leave ordained ministry other than by retirement. Research and Statistics are happy to discuss with Mrs Stamper specific areas of interest about these clergy and to report back to Synod on July on the feasibility of obtaining other information.

Other costs associated with leaving ministry are likely to vary and will be almost impossible to quantify. Supplying all the information requested would therefore require disproportionate staff time.

The average cost of training is between £19,000 and £43,000 depending on whether it is residential.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper: I think actually the Bishop has kindly answered the questions I was about to ask him. Thank you very much. We are very grateful for the answer, but we were asking about the welcome collaboration that you have already proposed to identify and request information in advance of the July Synod rather than only coming back on the feasibility of its collection. I think I hear an affirmative.

The Bishop of Portsmouth: I understand that a meeting has already been arranged between the RACSC Secretary and the group to offer what support and help we can.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper: I am very grateful. Thank you.

12. *Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: *The Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy* acknowledge “there is risk in all pastoral care”, and the Practice Guidance for Safeguarding recommends that “clergy should be offered appropriate supervision and support”. What has been the practical response in the dioceses/NCIs to these statements (both of which concern the care and well-being of the clergy), and what financial resources have been committed across the dioceses/NCIs to “supervision and support” in respect of pastoral care, both for safeguarding and in general?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Bishops are legally required to arrange ministerial development review (MDR) for their clergy, to keep these

arrangements under review and provide continuing ministerial development (CMD). Bishops must arrange for MDR to be carried out at least every two years, keep a written record of the review, and have regard to guidance issued by the Archbishops' Council in 2010. We do not have details of diocesan provision or expenditure, although we know that some dioceses have moved towards regular pastoral supervision.

The NCIs are very supportive of MDR and CMD through regular review and the sharing of good practice, but are not responsible for monitoring diocesan provision. If Synod were to give them such a role, additional resources would need to be found. I understand that, in a safeguarding context, the National Safeguarding Team would offer advice and guidance, but no sum of money is put against this work.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper: I think the previous answer refers. Thank you.

13. *Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Some but not all dioceses recommend that their full-time clergy take five days off a month (with two taken consecutively on one week): to what extent does a diocese have discretion with regard to the number of days per week that it expects its clergy to be 'on duty'?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: Clergy are legally entitled to an

uninterrupted rest period of not less than 24 hours in any period of seven days. Full-time clergy are also entitled to 36 days' annual leave. These are both minimum entitlements, and their statement of particulars may specify further entitlements, such as additional bank holidays, or specify restrictions on when rest periods and days off may be taken. There is therefore a degree of diocesan discretion.

Revd Canon Lisa Battye: Thank you for your response to my question. To be absolutely clear about the degree of diocesan discretion, if, in the interests of clergy wellbeing, a diocese wished to recommend that one or all of their full-time clergy members were to work five days a week rather than six, would there be no legal bar to them doing so?

The Bishop of Portsmouth: I cannot immediately answer that question. There are clear requirements in the basic arrangements for all clergy and then discretion for the dioceses, but we will gladly take up the detailed question that you ask.

The Chair: Questions 14 to 18 are for the Mission and Public Affairs Council to be answered by Mr Mark Sheard as Chair of the Council.

MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

14. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: For more than 15 years the Reverend Bassi Mirzania has worked tirelessly as

founding Chaplain to the Persian/Iranian community in Great Britain and witnessed a remarkable growth in converts. Her ministry has been totally reliant on donations. Although now formally retired, she continues to work. What steps are being taken (i) to fund this ministry in the future and (ii) to find a successor?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

The Revd Bassi Mirzania's ministry has made an inestimable contribution of the discipleship of Persian Christians, and it is wonderful to have the opportunity to highlight this. Her work is now being built on through the Presence & Engagement programme, as noted in GS 2063. P&E has established a network for clergy with Persians in their congregation, and in the last year has facilitated the translation and approval of liturgy for Holy Communion in Farsi. This will be launched next month at a Celebration Service with groups of Persians from many Anglican churches in attendance. Thus, while there are no plans to appoint a new Chaplain to Persians, the work of P&E combined with the identification of three bishops (Durham, Loughborough and Bradford) to champion this ministry means that its profile is being raised among dioceses and they are being encouraged to ensure clergy are equipped and supported to welcome and disciple Persians.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr: In the light of the welcome focus during this group of sessions on evangelism and the spectacular success of this particular evangelistic initiative by the Archbishops, but the negative answer to each aspect of my question, to whom would you advise that we turn in an effort to find and fund a successor?

Mr Mark Sheard: Whilst applauding the ministry of Revd Bassi Mirzania, I think I would encourage us to now start to think about what legacy has been left and whether, in fact, there is a greater risk of trying to vest that ministry in a single person and not to develop it into a broader area. I think one of the challenges for us is to ensure that we are equipped, and we are equipping leaders to integrate and reach out to the Persian community. I speak to that with some personal experience that we have a number of Persian converts in the church in which I worship. I am not sure I would necessarily say just go and look for funding for one post. I think I would rather be encouraging you, and I would be very happy to discuss this with offline with you, to look at alternative ways of broadening this ministry and strengthening it.

15. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Has the Council identified any examples of good practice in Church of England parishes modelling 'good disagreement' on European Union exit by bringing together 'Leavers' and 'Remainers' in positive ways, whether face-to-face or on-line, and whether it has any plans to do so if has not already?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Council has not sought to collect examples of parishes bringing leavers and remainers together, although we are aware of parishes which have reached out to European Christian congregations to reassure them of solidarity and concern. We have

also looked at issues of risk and mitigation regarding Brexit and are aware of parishes which are actively working to dispel tension in leave voting areas.

The Mission Theology Advisory Group has produced a series of Brexit-related resources to enable parishes to create “narratives of reconciliation”, in Bishop Nick Baines’ phrase. These have been well received and are available on the Church of England website.

16. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Two weeks ago my parish suffered the second murder of a young black man by knife crime in the past 18 months. What contribution to the response to this serious urban crisis can this Synod, the House of Bishops and the Archbishops’ Council offer?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The increase in knife-crime - not limited to London or BAME communities - is a terrible indictment of the division, exclusion and hopelessness ruining the lives of so many young people. The causes are complex and, the local context is key to addressing the problem.

IPPR research clearly identified the link between social exclusion and school exclusion, demonstrating the association between poverty, parental mental ill-health, overall deprivation and school exclusions. Professor Gus John, a CMEAC member, has done much work on this subject and his important evidence to the Youth Violence Commission

included findings that over 50% of teenagers (some as young as 12) in Young Offender Institutions had been permanently excluded from school. Prof. John called for a nationwide zero exclusion policy, CMEAC discussed Professor John's evidence with him, and has met the Bishop of Ely and the Director of Education to consider how Church of England schools are operating their exclusions policies.

Revd Canon Simon Butler: I thank Mark for his answer and I am sure he will join with me in sending our love and support to Lejean Richards and his family. As the answer focuses only on education, it has caused me to wonder who now holds the sort of urban faith and life brief in the Church of England that was once held by a bishop with that responsibility? I am not quite sure where the locus is in national terms around issues to do with urban living in the way that there are clear ideas about rural and other issues, and indeed estates as well.

Mr Mark Sheard: You are quite right, Simon. The role of Bishop for Urban Life and Faith was developed as a full-time role by Bishop Steven Lowe, I believe, after he ceased to be Bishop of Hulme. Following his retirement, there were no resources to continue this as a dedicated full-time and episcopal role, but I am sure both you and I would be absolutely delighted if another bishop were interested to take up the mantle on a voluntary basis. Speaking as Chair of MPA Council, we would be delighted to work with them.

17. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What representations has the Council made to the Lambeth Conference Company with

a view to environmental matters being included within the agenda of the forthcoming Lambeth Conference?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Mission and Public Affairs Council has made various representations to the Lambeth 2020 organisation through the World Mission and Anglican Communion Panel. The Lambeth 2020 Design Group have considered environmental matters at an early stage in the development of the agenda.

Ms Josile Munro: Thank you, Mark, for your answer. Please can you give us, as a Synod, any outline of these matters that are under consideration?

Mr Mark Sheard: I was interested the question was addressed to the Mission and Public Affairs Council because obviously we are very interested and very engaged in that. However, the Design Group is the people with whom the responsibility for the shape of the programme lies. They are unlikely to publish much in advance, so I think your question may be better addressed in that area, Josile.

18. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Since the adjourned Synod debate in July, what progress has there been on the development plan for the Church of England Environment Programme (CoEEP); and can Synod be reassured that this is aligned to all Five Marks of Mission?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council:

The Environment Working Group is about to publish its new Three-Year Action Plan which was informed by the issues raised at the July synod and includes some 19 actions detailed within the Five Marks of Mission. The plan features potential partners, the actions to be taken during 2019, targets by 2022 and who leads.

Revd Andrew Yates: Thank you, Mark, for your answer confirming that the environment plan is aligned to all Five Marks of Mission, not just the fifth one. I am grateful for that. In relation to the plan, I wonder if you are able to say how the new post that is being advertised, the open sustainable churches post, will help to contribute to that plan being developed.

Mr Mark Sheard: That is a very good question. That is work in progress at the moment, so I am not able to give you a precise answer at this moment, other than to give you what may be seen as a slightly vacuous assurance that it is crucial to get the two aligned.

The Chair: Questions 19 and 20 are to the Crown Nominations Commission and are to be answered together by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

19. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In November 2014 a list of CNC members for each CNC was published, showing substitutes when individual members of the “central six” were unable to attend for CNCs from 2010 to 2014. Please would you publish a new list to cover 2014 to 2018 (and ensure that it is also included in the Report of Proceedings)?

20. *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: In future could a complete list of the CNC members (i.e. the central members, any substitutes and the diocesan representatives) be published for each CNC as soon as its composition is known?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: With permission, I will answer Miss Buggs’ questions together.

The names of CNC members for vacancies since 2014 have been published on the Senior Appointments section of the Church of England website at www.churchofengland.org/aaad. This will continue to be updated for future vacancies.

A copy of the list of members has been posted on the Noticeboard, and will be included in the Report of Proceedings.

Membership of the Crown Nominations Commission from January 2014

* indicates Chair of the CNC - **bold** indicates CNC Central Member - ^ The Central Members elected in 2017 served from the CNC for London

2014

Hereford

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Archbishop of York
Mrs April Alexander
Revd Simon Cawdell
Revd John Dunnett
Dr Martin Elcock
Mrs Penny Evans
Mr Philip Giddings
*(standing in for Miss Jane
Patterson)*
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
Revd Claire Lording
Mrs Rosemary Lording
Revd Dr Judith Maltby
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Very Revd Michael Tavinor
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mrs Edward Chaplain

Guildford

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Archbishop of York
Mrs April Alexander
Mr Mike Bishop
Revd Canon Robert Cotton
Revd John Dunnett
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
Revd Dr Peter Harwood
Mr Keith Malcouronne
Revd Dr Judith Maltby
Mrs Anne Martin
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Miss Jane Patterson

Europe

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Bishop of London
The Archbishop of Lokoja
The Bishop of Newcastle
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of York)*
Mrs April Alexander
John Booth
*(standing in for Aiden
Hargreaves-Smith)*
Revd Canon Malcolm
Bradshaw
Mr David Coulston
Ven Patrick Curran
Revd John Dunnett
Mr David Fieldsend
Revd Canon Debbie Flach
Ven Christine Hardman
*(standing in for Revd Dr
Judith Maltby)*
Mrs Angela Mirani
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Miss Jane Patterson
Ms Caroline Boddington
Rt Revd Peter Price

St Edmundsbury & Ipswich

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Bishop of Carlisle
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of York)*
Revd Canon Jonathan
Alderton-Ford
Canon Tim Allen
Mrs Margaret Condick
Revd Andrew Dotchin
Revd Canon Perran Gay
*(standing in for Very Revd
Andrew Nunn)*
Revd Dr Judith Maltby
Dr Richard Mantle

Liverpool

The Archbishop of York*
The Bishop of Birmingham
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of Canterbury)*
Mrs April Alexander
Revd John Dunnett
Mr Paul Hancock
Aiden Hargreaves-Smith
Mrs Linda Jones
Revd Canon Bob Lewis
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Ven Ricky Panter
Miss Jane Patterson
Revd Canon Pete Spiers
Revd Mark Steadman
*(standing in for Revd Dr
Judith Maltby)*
Mrs Maggie Swinson
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

Revd Debbie Sellin
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

*(standing in for Aiden
Hargreaves-Smith)*

Ms Christina Rees

*(standing in for April
Alexander)*

Miss Jane Patterson

Revd Philip Plyming

Very Revd Dr Frances
Ward

Canon Michael Wilde

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mrs Edward Chaplain

2015

Southwell & Nottingham

The Archbishop of York*

The Bishop of Rochester

*(standing in for the
Archbishop of Canterbury)*

Mrs April Alexander

Canon Michael Arlington

Revd Amanda Digman

Revd John Dunnett

Mr Nick Harding

**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**

Revd Dr Judith Maltby

Very Revd Andrew Nunn

Miss Jane Patterson

Ven David Picken

Mr Colin Slater

Revd Canon Phil Williams

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mrs Edward Chaplain

Gloucester

The Archbishop of

Canterbury*

The Archbishop of York

Mrs Corinne Aldis

Mrs April Alexander

Revd John Dunnett

Dr Philip Giddings

*(standing in for Ms Jane
Patterson)*

Canon Dr Tudor Griffiths

**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**

Revd Dr Judith Maltby

Mr Ian Marsh

Revd Canon Richard

Mitchell

Very Revd Andrew Nunn

Ven Robert Springett

Prof Jennifer Tann

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mr Richard Tilbrook

*(standing in for Mr Edward
Chaplin)*

Newcastle

The Archbishop of York*

The Bishop of Lambeth

*(standing in for the
Archbishop of Canterbury)*

Revd John Dunnett

**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**

Canon Sue Hart

Revd Canon Dr Judith

Maltby

Very Revd Andrew Nunn

Miss Jane Patterson

Mrs Christina Rees

*(standing in for Mrs April
Alexander)*

Ven Dr Peter Robinson

Revd Canon John Sinclair

Canon Roger Styring

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar

Winter

Canon Carol

Wolstenholme

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mr Edward Chaplin

Oxford

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Archbishop of York
Mrs April Alexander
Lord Ian Blair
Revd Sue Booy
Very Revd Peter Bradley
*(standing in for Very Revd
Andrew Nunn)*
Ms Prudence Dailey
Revd John Dunnett
Dr Philip Giddings
Ven Martin Gorick
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
**Revd Canon Dr Judith
Maltby**
Miss Jane Patterson
Dr Anna Thomas-Betts
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

2016

Lichfield

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Bishop of Carlisle
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of York)*
Mrs April Alexander
Preb John Allan
Mrs Penelope Allen
Mr John Clark
Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh
*(standing in for Revd Dr
Judith Maltby)*
Mr Chris Gill
Rt Revd Clive Gregory
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Miss Jane Patterson
Revd Dr Philip Plyming
(standing in for Revd John

Leicester

The Archbishop of
Canterbury*
The Archbishop of York
Mrs April Alexander
Mr Chrispal Anand
Mrs Anne Bloor
Revd John Dunnett
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
**Revd Canon Dr Judith
Maltby**
Revd John McGinley
Very Revd David Monteith
Very Revd Andrew Nunn
Miss Jane Patterson
Revd James Shakespeare
Prof David Wilson
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

Sheffield

The Archbishop of York*
The Bishop of Chelmsford
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of Canterbury)*
Mrs April Alexander
Mrs Ann Brown
Rt Revd Peter Burrows
Mr Shaun James Clarkson
Revd John Dunnett
Revd Canon Geoffrey
Harbord
**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**
Ven Gavin Kirk
*(standing in for Very Revd
Andrew Nunn)*
**Revd Canon Dr Judith
Maltby**
Miss Jane Patterson
Canon Mark Russell

Dunnett)
His Honour John Shand
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Richard Tilbrook
*(standing in for Mr Edward
Chaplin)*

Revd Canon Ian Smith
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

2017

Sodor & Man

The Archbishop of York*
The Bishop of Winchester
*(standing in for the
Archbishop of Canterbury)*

Mrs April Alexander

Revd Canon Clive Burgess

Revd Dr Hannah Cleugh

*(standing in for Revd Dr
Judith Maltby)*

Revd John Dunnett

Very Revd Nigel Godfrey

Mr Stephen Hamer

**Mr Aiden Hargreaves-
Smith**

Mrs Susan Kennaugh

Miss Jane Patterson

Revd Daniel Richards

Miss Ruth Walker

Canon Dr Dagmar Winter

*(standing in for Very Revd
Andrew Nunn)*

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mr Edward Chaplin

London^

The Archbishop of

Canterbury*

The Archbishop of York

Mr Anthony Archer

Ms Christina Baron

Rt Revd Pete Broadbent

Revd Preb Marjorie Brown

Mrs Mary Chapman

Revd John Dunnett

Revd Canon Dr

Rosemarie Mallett

*(standing in for Very Revd
Dr David Ison)*

Revd Canon Dr Judith

Maltby

Ms Amanda McIntyre

Miss Jane Patterson

Revd Charlie Skrine

Mrs Sarah Tett

Ms Caroline Boddington

Mr Edward Chaplin

2018

Bristol

The Archbishop of

Canterbury*

The Archbishop of York

Mr Anthony Archer

Ms Christina Baron

Mrs Fran Brealey

Revd Beverley Charles

Professor David Clarke

Revd John Dunnett

Truro

The Archbishop of

Canterbury*

The Archbishop of York

Mr Anthony Archer

Ms Christina Baron

Ven Audrey Elkington

Mrs Chris Fry

*(standing in for Miss Jane
Patterson)*

Derby

The Archbishop of

Canterbury*

The Archbishop of York

Mrs Kat Alldread

Mrs Molly Andrews

Mr Anthony Archer

Ms Christina Baron

Revd Alicia Dring

Revd John Dunnett

Canon David Froude
Very Revd Dr David Hoyle
Very Revd Dr David Ison
Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby
Miss Jane Patterson
Mr David Tunley
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Edward Chaplin

Mrs Bridget Hugh-Jones
Very Revd Dr David Ison
Revd Canon Rosemarie Mallett
(standing in for Revd Dr Judith Maltby)
Mr Mike Todd
Mr Robert Perry
Revd Dr Philip Plyming
(standing in for Revd John Dunnett)
Revd Canon Lesley Walker
Revd Andrew Yates
Ms Caroline Boddington
Mr Richard Tilbrook
(standing in for Mr Edward Chaplin)

Very Revd Stephen Hance
Revd Julian Hollywell
Very Revd Dr David Ison
Revd Canon Judith Maltby
Miss Jane Patterson
Mr Mark Titterton
Mr Brad Cook
(standing in for Ms Caroline Boddington)
Mr Edward Chaplin

The Chair: Questions 21 to 23 are to the Liturgical Commission to be answered by the Bishop of Exeter as Chair of the Commission.

LITURGICAL COMMISSION

21. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: What plans does the Church have, and what resources are available, for services to commemorate the 50th anniversary of arguably the greatest event of the 20th century, the first Moon landing in July 1969?

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: The Commission is content to delegate arrangements for this anniversary to ministers in their exercise of the discretion allowed by Canon B 5.

Mr Robin Lunn: I thank the Bishop for his answer. As 21 July, the exact 50th anniversary, falls on a Sunday, will the national Church both on its website, in its app and in the media feed that it sends out, highlight this excellent opportunity of such a great human mission to assist our even greater mission that we fulfil?

The Bishop of Exeter: We will be happy to give that consideration.

22. *Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: Does the national Church intend to produce any liturgical or other resources to mark the UK's departure from the European Union, what form are these likely to take and when might they be available?

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: There are no plans at present to issue specific liturgical resources for this purpose. Within the existing provision, there are texts in *Common Worship: Festivals* for special intentions (the Guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Peace of the World) and in the Seasonal Material connected with the Theme of Unity in *Common Worship: Times and Seasons*. A number of individuals and organisations (including the Archbishop of York and the Association of English Cathedrals) have released prayers in relation to Brexit,

which may be used judiciously by ministers exercising their discretion as allowed by Canon B 5.

Revd Canon Jane Charman: Given that Brexit is an event of such significance for the whole of our society, and given that the Church of England is uniquely placed to offer a word of hope and a message of reconciliation at this time, would the Liturgical Commission be prepared to think again about whether it could offer any resources or guidance to parishes and clergy? I know this would be welcomed in my own diocese.

The Bishop of Exeter: Thank you, Jane. I think in this fast-moving political landscape it is really difficult to craft national liturgical resources that are experienced either as being partisan or else bland, which is why we refer people to the body of prayers that we already have within our corpus. At the same time, I have absolutely full confidence in our Archbishops in this changing landscape being able to speak well into it, as indeed happened with the Archbishop of York before Christmas.

23. *Revd John Dunnett (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Liturgical Commission: How much time did the Liturgical Commission give to consideration of the House of Bishops' draft *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition?*

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission: In addition to the participation of the Chair, Vice-Chair and staff members

in the initial drafting of the Guidance, the whole Commission discussed the original General Synod Motion at length in October 2017, discussed the implications of the proposed Guidance in May 2018, and applied careful scrutiny to the text of the Guidance during a significant proportion of its meeting in October 2018.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Thank you, Bishop. Does the “careful scrutiny” referred to in the answer normally include prior circulation of paperwork and was that the case in this instance?

The Bishop of Exeter: Yes.

The Chair: Questions 24 to 32 are to the Church Commissioners. Questions 24 to 28 are to be answered by the First Church Estates Commissioner.

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

24. *Revd Canon Dagmar Winter (Newcastle)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given the wide variety of clergy now employed by a DBF, will consideration be given to adjusting the rule that this makes them ineligible to be Church Commissioners?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Yes.

The Church Commissioners Measure 1947 requires that “A person shall be disqualified from being a Commissioner so long as he is a salaried official of any central or diocesan body in the Church of England”, so it will require legislative change rather than simple policy change.

However, it is a change I would like to explore.

Revd Canon Dagmar Winter: What might be the timeframe for this exploration, please?

Loretta Minghella: Well, members may know that two excellent members of the House of Clergy were elected but then disqualified earlier in the year. Looking at the provision that is in the Measure, it was there for a reason, so I think we need to think about it quite carefully and not have a kneejerk reaction to our own frustration. I hope that I will be able to bring this before the Commissioners’ Board later in the year, so I hope we will see some progress on it before too long. Thank you.

25. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Church Commissioners: In the Briden Report dated 17 January 2019 it is stated (paragraph 4) that “the complainant known as ‘Alison’ (not her real name) was represented throughout by Mr William Chapman of Counsel instructed by Switalskis Solicitors”. Has the Church (whether the Archbishops’ Council, the Church Commissioners, or any other church body) paid or agreed to pay the legal costs of such representation and, if so, what is the amount of those costs?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Church bodies must respond appropriately to any allegation of sexual abuse by a member of the clergy, no matter how senior, or by any person who holds office in the Church. Consistent with Lord Carlile's recommendation, in its response to the allegations made by Alison, the Archbishops' Council sought to ensure that the process was fair to all parties, and allowed them to provide appropriate assistance to Mr Briden on the points both legal and factual which required his decision. The family of the late Bishop George Bell wished to have the support of a very senior QC and a junior barrister. In order that she could participate on an even-handed basis, fairness required that Alison should have the benefit of appropriate legal support. The Commissioners agreed to meet the reasonable and proportionate costs of that support. It is not our practice to publish the amounts we pay in legal costs.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): The very senior QC referred to in your answer was Desmond Browne, who was baptized by Bishop Bell. Since the original stance of the National Safeguarding Team, as apparent from an interview that the Bishop of Lambeth gave to the Radio 4 *Today* programme in February last year, was to refuse to allow Mr Browne to represent Bell's 84 year-old niece, when that position was reversed was any offer made to fund her representation when seeking to ensure that the process was fair to all parties, otherwise it might appear that the Archbishops' Council, through the Church Commissioners, were funding the prosecution but not the defence?

Loretta Minghella: Thank you for the question. The Commissioners have a very narrow role in cases of this kind, which is to consider whether or not to meet requests to fund the costs to be incurred by a bishop in his or her office, and so we responded to the particular question put to us, which was whether or not we would fund Alison's representation. That was the decision that we were asked to take, and it is the decision we did take.

26. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Church Commissioners: What is the value of the Church Commissioners' investments in companies which have retail banking operations in the UK?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The Commissioners' most recent disclosure of our top 20 most valuable equity holdings was in our annual report for 2017 and included two companies with retail banking operations in the UK. They are HSBC Holdings plc (valued at £47.63m as at the end of December 2018) and Lloyds Banking Group plc (£29.11m). Financial Services comprise a large portion of global equity markets, so it is always likely that, at any one time, we may hold some additional positions in other financial stocks that have retail banking operations in the UK.

Mr Nigel Bacon: What consideration have the Church Commissioners given to using their position as shareholders in banks such as HSBC and Lloyds to press those companies to reverse their apparent policies of closing high street banks in all but the largest towns? As noted by the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council in February last year, the

poor provision of banking facilities has “significant impacts on older people, those without transport and low-income households.”

Loretta Minghella: We engage extensively with companies in which we invest. You might know that we voted in 7,900 management resolutions last year, for example - 29 in respect of HSBC and 27 for Lloyds - but none of them concerned the matters that you raise. Thank you very much for raising them. We will reflect on that.

27. *Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford)* asked the Church Commissioners: The Government is supporting Community Led Housing across the country as one of the ways of developing more affordable and sustainable housing. Community Led Housing is often enabled through supportive landowners offering their land at discounted prices to enable the community to build housing which will fit the need of local people and remain affordable in perpetuity. Where these have developed, often through Community Land Trusts, they make a great contribution to meeting local need. In Hereford we are awaiting news of a large planning application on Church Commissioners’ land, known as Three Elms site. This site could greatly benefit from the Commissioners allowing some of the development of affordable housing to be built by a Community Land Trust. Will the Commissioners consider working with such a group to bring greater local benefit through discounted land sale terms to enable an affordable Community Led Housing scheme to be established?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: The Commissioners' staff are aware of the desire for a Community Land Trust (CLT) to be established at Three Elms.

Whilst the Commissioners facilitate housing they are not housing providers or a housing charity, and are precluded by charity law from disposing of land held for investment at a discount to market value.

Provision of a CLT at Three Elms could be facilitated if it constituted affordable housing, as defined by Herefordshire Council. We have not discussed CLT as a means of providing affordable housing with Council officers. We would be happy to explore the point further.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell: Thank you very much for your extremely helpful answer. I note that you make the point that the Commissioners are unable to sell land below market value by charity law and I wonder does "value" include the concept of spiritual and community value that might be gained, for example, by the provision of a vicarage or a multipurpose church building which would be of real spiritual and community benefit? And, if it does not, would you be prepared to include this in the review of the 1947 Measure you have indicated in your previous answer 24, given that the promotion of the mission of the Church is very much within the Commissioners' remit?

Loretta Minghella: I do not know if I am the only person, but I am wondering about my own hearing. I could not really hear very much of that question.

The Chair: I think, in fact, Prebendary Cawdell's question is out of order because I think he is asking for interpretation of a matter of law.

Loretta Minghella: I am a lawyer, but I do not really know much about that.

The Chair: You may need to take that up elsewhere.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Can I thank you for the answer given. I notice that you have noted that you would be happy to explore this particular point further, and that is beneficial for the people of Herefordshire. In relation to the rest of us outside, are the Commissioners intending to explore the wider issue of possibly developing a legal entity to have a housing charity or to provide something similar in other dioceses or with councils in other areas?

Loretta Minghella: As I think I said in my answer, we are not a social housing provider and our job is to maximise financial returns within an ethical framework, so we will not be doing that directly ourselves. But out of the 9,200 houses, for which we have already got or are seeking planning permission, 2,500 of those are planned to be affordable houses. So, by virtue of being involved in the business of property development, we can increase the number of affordable houses in this country.

28. *Mrs Enid Barron (London)* asked the Church Commissioners: Since the debate on Investment and Climate change in July 2018, what progress has there been through the Transition Pathways Initiative in supporting the transition to a low carbon economy and to the National Investing Bodies' climate strategy?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as *First Church Estates Commissioner*: 287 companies have now been assessed against the TPI methodology, which is now supported by investors with \$12 trillion of assets. TPI is now a core benchmarking tool for the Climate Action 100+ engagement initiative which is backed by investors with \$32 trillion of assets.

Through TPI and engagement, the Church's National Investing Bodies are at the forefront of investor activity to promote the urgent transition towards temperatures well below 2 degrees (in line with the Paris Agreement).

Key recent engagement achievements include Shell agreeing to establish rolling targets to halve its net carbon footprint by 2050 and BP agreeing to align its capital expenditure with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

The Chair: Questions 29 to 32 are to be answered by the Third Church Estates Commissioner.

29. *The Bishop of Peterborough (Rt Revd Donald Allister)* asked the Church Commissioners: What progress has been made with the implementation of the recommendations of the Cathedrals Working Group Report approved by Synod in July 2018?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: Since July Synod, the Cathedrals Support Group (CSG), which I chair, has been overseeing at national level the implementation of the Cathedrals Working Group Report. Each of the CSG workstream leads is twinned with someone from the cathedral community to take forward their particular area of work.

The main CSG objective for Q1 – Q2 2019 is the preparation of the draft legislation for the new Cathedrals Measure which will start its passage through Synod in July 2019. The Chair and members of the CSG meet regularly with representatives of the cathedral community, including the College of Deans, the Association of English Cathedrals, and the Cathedrals Administration and Finance Association.

We are issuing regular email bulletins about progress, to which all interested parties are invited to subscribe. The latest edition of the Cathedrals Bulletin and a FAQ on the CSG can be found on the Church of England website at:

<https://www.churchofengland.org/about/our-cathedrals/cathedrals-working-group/implementation-cathedrals-report>

30. *Mrs Julie Dziegel (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: What progress has been made in discussions with the Charity Commission with regards to the registration of Cathedrals under the Charities Act as recommended by the Cathedrals Working Group Report?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: With the help of the Church House Legal Office, I have now had a number of useful meetings with the Charity Commission to discuss the practical and legal implications of the proposal for the new Cathedrals Measure to bring Cathedrals within the Charities Act 2011, which, if agreed by Synod, would require Cathedrals to register with the Charity Commission.

These meetings and discussions are ongoing and are expected to continue throughout the drafting of the new Measure.

Further information about progress can be found in our FAQs on the Church of England website at:

<https://www.churchofengland.org/about/our-cathedrals/cathedrals-working-group/implementation-cathedrals-report>.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel: Given the work involved in registering an additional 41 large and potentially complex charities, and the ongoing monitoring and support of those charities after registration, how are the Commissioners proposing to assist both the Charity Commission and the cathedrals during any transition and ongoing?

Dr Eve Poole: As part of our discussions with the Charity Commission to date, we have considered how cathedrals may be supported through the registration process by the NCIs and the potential of the Charity Commission to pre-agree some regulated clauses for inclusion in templates. We are hoping that if we can use templates, as we did with PCC registration, that will simplify the registration process for the cathedrals and for the Charity Commission itself.

We have also submitted a bid to the Triennium Funding Working Group for additional funding for transitional funding to help cathedrals resource this transition as well.

31. *Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners: What steps have the Commissioners taken to streamline their Mission and Pastoral Measure processes in response to the simplification strand of Renewal and Reform?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) answered as Third Church Estates Commissioner: In support of efforts to simplify NCI structures and processes, we have now streamlined our Committee structure, combining the Mission & Pastoral and Church Buildings (Uses

& Disposals) Committees to provide a 'one-stop-shop' for dioceses. As well as integrating our adjudicatory roles, this mirrors a similar move to combine these committees at diocesan level.

We can also now draft and publish schemes on behalf of dioceses. This builds on other streamlining in recent years, e.g., the introduction of sifting arrangements, whereby we now hold public hearings in only a small number of more complex contested cases. Recent legislative simplifications are reflected in our updated guidance and training for dioceses, including new arrangements for deanery plans and local mission projects.

Nationally, I am Deputy Chair of the Strategic Church Buildings Support Group which provides member-level co-ordination across the pastoral and buildings portfolio. We hope this group will identify further simplification opportunities in due course.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I am very grateful for the information given in the last paragraph of the answer in relation to further simplification opportunities. I am never one to miss one of those. We recently did some work in a scoping committee this week thinking about what else could be simplified. The Mission and Pastoral Measure came under our scrutiny. I wonder if I could ask whether we could have some kind of liaison at officer and member level such that that Building Support Group could be talking to us about what possibilities we could work on together, please.

Dr Eve Poole: We would absolutely welcome that, please.

32. *Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro)* asked the Church Commissioners: Who is responsible for paying for the English bishops and their spouses to travel to and attend the 2020 Lambeth Conference?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) answered as Third Church Estates Commissioner: The English bishops may pay for their attendance at, and travel to, the 2020 Conference from the annual grants provided by the Church Commissioners to fund their working costs.

Decisions on other requests for funding, including for bishops' spouses, will be made following advice from the Triennium Funding Working Group, on which the Church Commissioners, Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops are represented.

Mrs Susannah Leafe: Thank you for your answer. I note that the cost of the English bishops attending the Lambeth Conference will be in the region of half a million pounds and I presume that a similar amount would be required for spouses. I note that GS Misc 1216 states that the priorities of the Triennium Funding Working Group are funding ministry growth, strategic development funding and lowest income community funding.

The Chair: Do you have a question, please, Mrs Leafe?

Mrs Susannah Leafe: Yes. I wonder which of those three priorities will benefit from spouses attending the Lambeth Conference?

Dr Eve Poole: I think that might be an opinion that you are asking for which I cannot give you. What I can say is that bishops have discretion to deploy their expense account as they see fit, subject to *Daily Mail* provisions and the HMRC overview of such expenditure. The matter of spouses is still under review and any money that is to be committed in the future will be discussed by the Triennium Funding Working Group, so I cannot give you any information about that until their work has completed.

The Chair: Questions 33 to 46 are to the Archbishops' Council.

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

33. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Will the Council take any steps to highlight on the Church of England website and elsewhere the vital role played in the mission and ministry of the Church by churchwardens, particularly given that - even in the absence of collated national statistics - they collectively form a nationwide workforce of volunteers likely to exceed the total numbers of paid clergy and licensed readers combined, even allowing for the unfilled places in many parishes?

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Churchwardens play a vital leadership role in the life and governance of church congregations across the country, as well as having significant responsibilities for church buildings. The Council is very keen to ensure that all such lay leaders are thanked, affirmed and celebrated in their parishes, Deaneries and Dioceses. Parishes themselves can add details of the role their churchwardens play through the *A Church Near You* website, which collectively receives more than 10 million views each year and many churchwardens plan a key role in running this vital resource. Opportunities to affirm the role of churchwardens through the Church's *Faith in Action* video series will also be explored. Please note: my wife is a churchwarden.

The Chair: Questions 34 and 35 are to be answered by His Grace the Archbishop of York.

34. *Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Whilst it has welcomed the BBC's initiative called 'Year of Beliefs' has the Church of England questioned why the only regular religious television programme previously to be broadcast in peak-time, *Songs of Praise*, has these past few months been marginalized to a slot early on Sunday afternoons?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Joint President of the Archbishops' Council: The Church House Communications Office have been in direct contact with the BBC regarding the scheduling of *Songs of Praise*. The

BBC have informed them that the new scheduling time has been introduced in order to ensure that the programme holds a consistent place in the schedule after the lunchtime news and is not dislodged by the over-running of any sporting events being broadcast later in the day. The BBC have also stated that scheduling *Songs of Praise* after the lunchtime news ensures a consistent audience share and allows the programme to be available via iPlayer for a longer period on the Sunday.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): In a former life I was a BBC producer who worked on *Songs of Praise* in the days when the audience was six to eight million and it went out at teatime. Nowadays, it is so emaciated that I cannot bear to watch it. What advice would you or the communications team give to those people who would like the BBC to put more resources into *Songs of Praise* so that it becomes worth watching once again?

The Chair: I am afraid that the Archbishop is not able to give an expression of opinion and that would be saying what his advice to you would be, Prebendary Lynas, but you might find that outside the chamber he would be willing to give it to you.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas: Beautifully done.

35. *Rev Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What were the reasons lying behind the Archbishops' decision to form the Triennium Funding Working Group described in GS Misc 1216?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Joint President of the Archbishops' Council: The Archbishop of Canterbury and I wanted to encourage the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners to work together on spending plans for the next triennium as they have in previous triennia. We were also keen for the House of Bishops to be part of these discussions on how national Church funds can be most effectively used to help our dioceses and parishes in their challenges and opportunities.

We believe that this is a time of particular opportunity for the Church and we have encouraged the Group to think creatively how funds from the national Church should be best used to support various Renewal and Reform workstreams as well as our commitment to maintain a Christian presence in every community.

Rev Dr Patrick Richmond: What do you hope might be the results of the Group's work?

The Archbishop of York: I think that the House of Bishops and both trustee bodies are united in their analysis of the three main expenditure priorities for the next triennium. First, lowest income community grants, which will help the least resourced dioceses fund ministry in their most deprived parishes. Secondly, Strategic Development Funding, which has supported dioceses in their growth and mission challenges as dioceses are formulating increasingly ambitious plans, and that includes my own. Thirdly, national

Church support for the costs of the welcome increase in the number of ordinands and curates, these priests to become our future Church leaders replacing those of us who retire over the coming years. So I trust that the Working Group will encourage the Council and Church Commissioners to find a way to deliver significant financial support to these three priorities that have been set.

The Chair: Questions 36 to 45 are to be answered by Canon John Spence.

36. *Rev Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: At the July 2018 General Synod, several speakers noted the simultaneous financial challenges of increasing the number of ordinands in training and funding the additional curacies resulting from this, without knowing exactly when money will be saved through the expected increase in clergy retirements in the 2020s. What strategies to meet these challenges are being considered?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: From discussions with dioceses we are aware that most, if not all, dioceses will see insufficient savings from retirements from the current stipendiary clergy cohort to fund the costs of the welcome increase in ordinands which will soon result in additional curacies.

To keep the 2019 apportionment increase to a reasonable level the Council has budgeted

to use £2m of its reserves and obtained a one-year grant of £0.5m from the Corporation of the Church House. But this is not sustainable.

The House of Bishops has identified the increased number of ordinands and curates as one of the priorities for national Church funding in the next triennium. The Triennium Funding Working Group mentioned in GS Misc 1216 will be exploring options for unlocking national Church funding to support dioceses with this challenge and opportunity, and is expected to make recommendations for the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners to consider.

Rev Dr Patrick Richmond: In July there was discussion about dioceses assisting poorer dioceses from their richer resources. In your answer to Question 38, Canon Spence, you do encourage this sort of discussion. Are there any other plans or aspirations to allow, effect or assist dioceses that are richer to help dioceses that are poorer, or is it just encouragement?

Canon Dr John Spence: Thank you and can I thank David White for successfully nudging me to the lectern at the end. You may have noticed we had three false starts. We are very clear that as we move forward in looking to use all the assets of the Church for the period of sustained investment that we need, we will need to consider how best we can work with parishes with greater assets both to take a greater proportion from those assets in contributions to various funding streams, such as those described by the Archbishop

of York, and what other collaborative mechanisms might be put in place. So that is an ongoing piece of work that will all come out of this Working Group.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Thank you very much, Canon Spence, for your answer. You may be aware of some very innovative work by the Additional Curates Society who sell products in order to generate profit to fund priests and curates. I wondered, like local councils who have developed income-generating assets, whether any consideration about supporting dioceses to generate income-generating assets had been considered so that they can afford to pay for more priests through trading activities locally?

Canon Dr John Spence: I will admit to not being aware of the work of the Additional Curates Society and I am sure you will not get to the end of the week without briefing me. In terms of the need to think of all assets as income generating, yes indeed. We are working, indeed there is a meeting tomorrow in the margins of Synod, around things that we can do to generate greater income.

Let us be clear, however, the biggest constraint on the investment that we wish to place across the Church of England comes from the fact that the parish regime has got stuck, we have seen very little growth over the last decade in the totality of parish giving, and that is the key piece that one needs to move as part of the Renewal agenda as one of the marks of Christian generosity in order to give us the greater resources we require.

37. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Given an aim of Renewal and Reform is to increase the number of vocations, is there also a strategy to increase the number of title posts to ensure that all newly ordained people have such a post?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Yes. The rationale of increasing the number of vocations is to train and form priests to replenish the pool of incumbents. This pool which will be depleted by retirements which are expected to peak over the coming decade. An increased number of curacy posts is part of the strategy.

We know from recent dialogue with dioceses that most have an aspiration to significantly increase the number of curacies over the coming years. But dioceses are conscious of the associated financial challenge and so the Church Commissioners and Archbishops' Council are exploring the potential for national Church support towards these additional diocesan costs.

Mrs Josile Munro (London): Thank you, Canon, for your answer. Are you able to advise on a timeline for agreeing this national Church support?

Canon Dr John Spence: The work of the Triennium Working Group is ongoing. We well understand the desire of dioceses to have great clarity about the funding patterns for the coming decade and particularly the next triennium. That can only come, however, after

a process which enables the Church Commissioners to complete their work in understanding what they can afford to distribute under different methodologies and following actuarial reviews. After that, the Archbishops' Council will be able to prioritise how those funds are used bearing in mind the three top priorities that the Archbishop of York has outlined and, after that, we eventually come to dealing with the Church Commissioners Annual General Meeting where the final distribution is agreed.

38. *Mr Christopher Pye (Liverpool)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It is some time since the publication of the Church Commissioners' report *The Historic Resources of the Church of England* (published in 1983), and the Recommendation No. 23 regarding the equalisation of the capital and income resources behind each person in stipendiary ministry from the report *Faith in the City* (1985). Has a point been reached when the capital and income resources are equal for all stipendiary workers in all diocese, and, if not, when will it be reached?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: We stopped calculating resources per stipendiary minister several years ago, recognising the increasing diversity of ministry resource - such as lay and ordained, stipendiary and non-stipendiary. But, as shown in the replies to Archdeacon Heathfield's questions, the level of resources remains unequal across the dioceses.

There was an attempt around 20 years ago to explore collecting contributions from the

better resourced dioceses to be redistributed amongst the least resourced, but this came to nothing.

Resources and general deprivation are taken into account in the calculation of the diocesan apportionment and Lowest Income Communities grants. There is no specific plan to work towards equalisation of diocesan resources, though I would encourage the better resourced dioceses to explore opportunities for assisting those in more challenging circumstances.

Mr Christopher Pye: You will be very pleased to know that I am not after millions, just a few bob, and not necessarily from the Church Commissioners, but rather than involve the dioceses and others in onerous calculations, would it more fruitful to use the CUF deprivation list so that richer parishes could be involved in the mission of helping the poorer ones spread the Gospel?

Canon Dr John Spence: The CUF deprivation list is, of course, another valid measure in looking at these things and I am sure within dioceses we would always wish to have schemes which enable those who have surplus assets and income to support those who are struggling. We have only had the review of the lower income community distribution for about a full year. We need to let it continue to work through the rest of this triennium and review it thoroughly before we determine if an alternative measure could be superior.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I am also encouraged by your last sentence where you encourage “better resourced dioceses to explore opportunities for assisting those in more challenging circumstances”. What is the prospect for some teaching on the theology of mutual support from the House of Bishops and how it might apply to dioceses, to cathedrals, to deaneries and to parishes, so we have a much better Christian basis for approaching mutual support?

Canon Dr John Spence: I will need to defer to the House of Bishops to give the answer to that. Quite clearly, you are talking about a point of theology which they might wish to disseminate, and we would all wish that feeling of mutual support to be prevalent.

39. *Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester):* Noting the focus on ‘Resource Churches’ in recent funding announcements, what lessons have been learned from bids for Strategic Development Funding to date as to the types of projects that are well placed to succeed, both in terms of obtaining funding, and also in meeting their objectives for church growth or otherwise advancing Christ’s Kingdom on earth?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: All proposals are considered by the Strategic Investment Board on the basis of how well they meet the main criteria of making a significant difference to a diocese’s overall mission and financial strength. The Board has no bias towards particular approaches - it is responding to demand. It is for dioceses to determine what to apply for, which will include considering what approaches are bearing fruit elsewhere.

Every project is subject to monitoring and evaluation to ensure that they bear fruit in terms of growth and the development of the wider Kingdom.

It is early days, but out of the wide range of projects funded to date, evidence is emerging about the activity which tends to bear fruit, not just in terms of numerical growth, but in areas such as discipleship and contributing to the common good. This was summarised in the Strategic Investment Board 2017 annual report (GS Misc 1198).

Revd Julie Conalty: As a result of conversations with fellow archdeacons around the country regarding SDF bids, I wish to ask whether it is true that dioceses bidding are being directed not to a full spread of creative possibilities but to a much-reduced set menu of options.

Canon Dr John Spence: Thank you for the question, which would be really troubling for me if it had any substance to it. I would be clear that we wish to encourage applications from every part of the Church, every aspect of churchmanship and for every type of initiative that can be brought through. We have no desire whatsoever to limit or to persuade people that certain schemes should be preferred to others, and if anybody has evidence of that I will be very happy to hear of it outside of the hall.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Bearing in mind that in the ten years to 2026 we expect to commit about a quarter of a billion pounds to the Strategic Development Initiative should

we not have the outcomes assessed by an independent, objective and professional body which would give us a clinical view of whether its objectives are likely to be achieved?

Canon Dr John Spence: Thank you, Gavin. The figure you quote, which might have got people excited, would only be the figure that would be in place were the Church Commissioners to feel able to distribute at certain levels that enabled priorities to be continued at the current state while also accommodating other funding streams such as ordinands. We need to go far sooner than a decade to have a proper professional assessment and review of the outcomes of these pieces. We have been distributing funds since the start of 2017 under this piece and it would seem to me timely that after three years we need to think how best we can undertake such a review. I would not, however, wish to take that answer as committing us to an expensive exercise by a professional external body.

40. *Revd Canon Mark Barker (Rochester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Noting the success of the communication about Strategic Development Funding and its availability, together with the oversubscription in 2017-2019, does the Archbishops' Council have sufficient staff capacity to manage bids for Strategic Development Funding efficiently and effectively?

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As with all departments in the National Church Institutions, staff capacity is kept under regular review. As the amount of SDF awarded increases, we will of course ensure that

staffing is commensurate with the need to deliver the funding efficiently, including undertaking effective monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of learning across the wider Church.

41. *Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Archbishops' Council: What research has been commissioned by the Archbishops' Council on the effects of large resource churches funded by the SDF upon other churches in their locality, both Anglican and other denominations?

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: As with all projects supported by Strategic Development Funding, those involving resource churches are subject to monitoring and evaluation to examine the impact they are making, not just in their locality, but more widely across the diocese. The aim of Resource Churches is to act as resource for the diocese as a whole - for example, by revitalising cities and towns, producing ordinands, starting new congregations and supporting parishes in other ways. Evidence to date suggests they are fulfilling those aims and are producing new disciples.

Revd Graham Hamilton: Thank you, Canon Spence, for your answer to my question and the previous questions. I am pleased that the Board has no bias towards any one approach, but how does the Archbishops' Council monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of resource churches projects? GS Misc 1198 in 2017 said that £177,000 had been spent on research but it appears to be mostly peer diocesan review. If no research has yet

been commissioned on the impact of resource church models on nearby churches, both Anglican and other denominations, will the Council commission such research and publish it so as to help dioceses determine if this is the best overall strategy for growth?

Canon Dr John Spence: That is a great question. Of course we need to do that research. Let us just remind ourselves that this funding flow, while there was an initial tranche between 2014 and 2016 in much smaller numbers, the main flows of funding here started in 2017. It is very early to say what the impact of those models would be, but I entirely agree that we need to review that very carefully to research it.

I have no desire, on your behalf, to distribute funds in directions which will not yield the return for Christ that we wish. At least one archdeacon has reported to us that not only has the resource church in their diocese encouraged new members directly through their doors but that other local churches are benefiting as well. It is very clear to me that there will be a proper assessment in due course when we have enough evidence to do that, and, yes, I would want that to be published.

Revd Julian Hollywell (Derby): Experience from my own diocese, which may be mirrored elsewhere, suggests that a swiftness to bid for SDF funding might have led to mistakes, particularly in relation to the mechanism by which resource churches go on to plant with a negative impact on the sustainability of mission in parishes, contextual BMOs, and on hard-won ecumenical relationships. This may be relevant to an emerging and fragile

emerging mission on estates. Is such specific information in relation to church planting available and, if not, may I ask if it is intended to conduct such research?

Canon Dr John Spence: I do just wish to stress again that we want to encourage applications of all sorts, and, while this conversation has got into resource churches, I encourage anyone who wishes to attend our fringe meeting on Strategic Development Funding on Friday about reaching the missing generation to see the full scale and range of things that are under way. All of that information is in any case available. You tell me of an instance of which I am unaware. I would repeat, we will at the right time, which may not be far away, be keen to understand how we best review the totality of investment, not just in these resource churches but in these other types of initiative we have sponsored.

42. *Mr John Freeman (Chester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Can the Archbishops' Council please arrange to issue the forthcoming annual "Table of Fees" by the end of August of the preceding year? This will enable couples wishing to pay for their weddings early to be aware of the cost to avoid any future embarrassment should they be asked to pay any increase.

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: It will not be possible to issue the table by the end of August because the draft fees order specifies that the increase in fees is to be based on the change to CPI in August. This figure will not be available until towards the end of September. Previous orders have specified that the fees increase should be based on the September RPI figure. As a

result, this order does make it possible to publish the table a month earlier than in previous years, although not quite as early as Mr Freeman has requested.

Mr John Freeman: Canon Spence, thank you very much for your reply. I am trying to make life easier for my fellows out there in the sticks. Does it now lie with me to put an amendment down against the Fees Order in clause 6(3)(a) to insert “June” in place of “August” to make our lives easier and aid the Simplification agenda?

Canon Dr John Spence: Factually, I would say that were an amendment of that sort to be placed we would be acceptant of that amendment. I fear the time may have passed for that. I am only advised that. If that is the case, and if it is the will of the dioceses as expressed to me through the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum, we would be content to bring forward an amending Order in a year’s time in order to achieve that.

43. *Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: Drawing upon the knowledge of, and data available to, the Finance and the Research & Statistics functions within the NCIs, what is the total value of all historic assets (including endowment and glebe assets held under the Endowments and Glebe Measure 1976) held at diocesan level across all of the dioceses, showing, in tabular form:

- a. the range of these assets in league table form from richest to poorest diocese;
- b. the value of these assets on a per person basis for the population of each diocese;

c. the average weekly Church of England attendance in each diocese, as a percentage of the population; and

d. the percentage of each diocese's population in who live in the 10% most deprived lower super output areas nationally?

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council:

This information is provided on the Notice Board.

Question 43 – Supplementary Data

2017 Endowment and Glebe Assets by Diocese and Assets per Capita

Diocese	Endowment and Glebe (a)	Diocese population	Assets per capita (b)	Ranking of Assets per capita
2017	£000s		£	
Oxford	154,666	2,387,000	64.80	3
Lincoln	99,359	1,080,000	92.00	1
Southwark	87,705	2,864,000	30.62	16
London	66,993	4,306,000	15.56	26
Chelmsford	66,144	3,211,000	20.60	23
Coventry	58,375	881,000	66.26	2
Chichester	57,485	1,692,000	33.97	13
Norwich	55,073	912,000	60.39	4
Peterborough	52,587	920,000	57.16	5
St Albans	49,418	1,922,000	25.71	21
Leicester	46,270	1,049,000	44.11	9
Bath and Wells	40,891	955,000	42.82	11
Lichfield	37,904	2,159,000	17.56	25
Worcester	37,850	890,000	42.53	12
Ely	37,400	761,000	49.15	8
Exeter	36,704	1,184,000	31.00	15
York	33,952	1,442,000	23.55	22
Derby	32,199	1,057,000	30.46	17
Southwell & Notts	32,186	1,151,000	27.96	19

Leeds	29,959	2,735,000	10.95	31
Truro	29,849	564,000	52.92	6
Gloucester	29,165	668,000	43.66	10
Salisbury	29,038	955,000	30.41	18
Durham	27,341	1,487,000	18.39	24
Manchester	21,261	2,168,000	9.81	32
St Eds & Ips	18,934	679,000	27.89	20
Hereford	17,185	329,000	52.23	7
Carlisle	16,329	497,000	32.86	14
Rochester	15,138	1,358,000	11.15	30
Winchester	14,586	1,235,000	11.81	28
Bristol	13,765	1,030,000	13.36	27
Guildford	11,929	1,060,000	11.25	29
Blackburn	11,423	1,346,000	8.49	33
Chester	10,978	1,638,000	6.70	36
Sheffield	9,604	1,294,000	7.42	35
Portsmouth	6,474	789,000	8.21	34
Birmingham	5,470	1,581,000	3.46	38
Newcastle	3,666	822,000	4.46	37
Canterbury	3,531	1,138,000	3.10	39
Liverpool	1,040	1,607,000	0.65	40
Church of England	1,409,826	55,803,000	25.26	

Notes:

- Endowments and Glebe Measure (1976) does not apply to the Diocese of Sodor and Man.
- The Assets are only those covered by the Endowments and Glebe Measure, all dioceses will have other assets which are not included here for consistency.

Ven. Simon Heathfield: A supplementary for both 43 and 44, if I may. Canon Spence, thank you for the work your team has done in preparing the tables and answering questions. Members will be struck as they read them on the notice board in the answer

that Lincoln Diocese has £92 value per head of population and Liverpool Diocese 65 pence; an unjust contrast illustrating the urgent need to address generosity between dioceses and the way inequity undermines growth. So, as your second answer welcomes this work, when, where and with whom might it best begin?

Canon Dr John Spence: Thank you Simon. I am going to, if I may, ask that you leave me time to ponder that piece. There is a huge disparity, as you have identified, though I will be equally clear those who represent those dioceses that are on the face wealthier will explain to me why those funds are just as necessary there. This could be an immense piece of work. It could be very introspective. The important piece would be to undertake that work in a way which was collegiate and collaborative with our diocesan colleagues, and to fit that in alongside all the other demands on the staff that we have. Just at the moment, I wish to prioritise ensuring the adequate funding of all the priorities for the 2020-22 triennium, but I will not lose sight of the point you have made.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): Will Canon Spence use his considerable powers to get the information that he has published on the Notice Board made available to all of us through the General Synod app, if that is feasible?

Canon Dr John Spence: I may, sir, be charming and sophisticated, and I may have powers, but I do not control the app. However, I will certainly ask if it is possible for the information to be placed in that way.

The Chair: Canon Spence forgot the highly intelligent!

Canon Dr John Spence: I cannot stand one-upmanship!

44. *Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the analysis of historic diocesan assets requested earlier, would the Council support some work being undertaken to consider the level of historic diocesan assets and how these assets and the income arising from them impact sustainable giving, mission and ministry across the whole church?

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The Council will be willing to explore the correlation between assets per head, giving per congregation member and number of clergy.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I am just wondering whether the way dioceses produce their balance sheets is the same in terms of accounting and whether, when people compare one diocese to another, they are comparing like with like.

Canon Dr John Spence: Simon, that is an excellent point. It is not like for like but I do not think it is so directionally opposed that one cannot draw certain inferences from that piece. People will equally explain to me, as I have said already, that people will use funds in different ways in order to fund future missional activity and that merely to say that a

large amount of assets per head infers a key conclusion would be incorrect. I think the numbers give us enough indication of the general dichotomy.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Can you confirm in the light of these intents that you have that diocesan DBFs are independent corporate charities and cannot be compelled but can only be persuaded to give up their assets?

Canon Dr John Spence: You are absolutely right, of course, and any compulsion would require legislation. All we are trying do at the moment is to understand better what the differences of these figures mean, as I have said, and then to resolve whether there is an appetite to move forward in any work. That is some way down the line and I am being very realistic with Synod: I just do not see us having the resource to undertake a major piece of work until we have resolved these other pressing matters.

45. *Miss Emma Forward (Exeter)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What is the Church doing to encourage parishes to use contactless payment machines most effectively?

Canon Dr John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Detailed information, FAQs and short films are available on the Parish Resources and Parish Buying websites. These explain the need for, and the benefits of, contactless machines and how to use them. Diocesan Giving Advisors are eligible for free card readers so that they can demonstrate them with confidence in their meetings with

parishes. By the end of March 2019, staff from Church House Westminster will have given 15 training sessions in dioceses on how to use the machines, and have trained diocesan giving advisors through regional meetings. A contactless giving day involving 25 dioceses was held earlier this month to explore the full range of devices available on Parish Buying and the place of contactless giving alongside other forms of giving, all of which are important to the Church's ministry and mission.

Miss Emma Forward: Have the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council calculated how far the implementation of contactless payment machines nationally could improve the financial prospects of the Church of England?

Canon Dr John Spence: I must not state an opinion, but I believe it to be a fact that contactless card machines offer a significant opportunity for growth in income. However, in fact, it is not the installation that will do it. It is the training which people receive and the confidence they build in using these and understanding how best, therefore, they can be applied. We have, as you know, organised orders so that we can satisfy every church in the Church of England. Only a very small minority have so far taken the machines. A smaller number are operating them. That is why the focus has to be in training and giving confidence in order that we can build up. We hear very significant stories of income growth from parishes which have been able to deploy them and to deploy them well.

46. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the residents of the Archbishops' Council: In the answer to a supplementary question last February, the Archbishop of Canterbury replied

to a question regarding practical steps of encouraging ministry within the family that, “I would hope within a year or so that we should have the first materials coming out”. What progress has been made in this regard?

The Bishop of Ely replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops’ Council: GS 2121, the paper accompanying the debate on *Growing Faith*, sets out the vision of the Bishops which has been developing over the course of the year as well as a range of anticipated activity in this area. We will be encouraging ministry with children and young people through churches, schools and households across resources through *Setting God’s People Free*, *Renewal and Reform*, *Education and Evangelism & Discipleship* and a key element of this will be the development of a resource hub to signpost to helpful resources and materials. As part of the *Growing Faith* debate, reference will be made to the *Thy Kingdom Come* Adventure Prayer Map which is an excellent new resource being promoted as an example of the kind of development *Growing Faith* is seeking to encourage within families.

The Chair: Questions 47 to 102 are to the House of Bishops. Questions 47 to 50 are to be answered by the Bishop of Newcastle. We will start with question 47 from Miss Jane Patterson.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

47. *Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How much time was allocated to consideration of the House of Bishops' *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* in the Pastoral Advisory Group?

The Bishop of Newcastle replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There was an initial review of the project on 21 March 2018, followed by detailed discussion of the text on 26 September 2018 and again on 29 October 2018. Minutes of the meetings of the Pastoral Advisory Group do not record specific timings for each item.

Mr Anthony Archer (St Albans): Chairman, might I ask the Bishop if she is able to confirm my understanding about the House of Bishops, which, as this answer makes clear, has given the most careful consideration to the preparation of this Pastoral Guidance, done at the clearest possible request of this Synod, that the House of Bishops when it came to the issuing of guidance voted unanimously?

The Bishop of Newcastle: In this original question I am being asked about the time given in the Pastoral Advisory Group, on which I have done research. I believe that the House of Bishops voted unanimously to support this, but I am afraid I have not checked that out and so I cannot give you that assurance.

48. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House considered offering advice to bishops on whether a cleric who has entered into a same

sex marriage but chooses to get divorced in order to abide by the current guidelines of the Church of England can continue to hold permission to officiate, or (if it has been revoked as a result of their having entered into the marriage) can have it restored to them; and, if they have not issued any such guidance, will they now do so?

The Bishop of Newcastle replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As set out in GS 1158, one of the responsibilities of the Pastoral Advisory Group is “Offering advice when requested to bishops regarding specific cases they are dealing with in the areas of both pastoral care and discipline involving clergy in same sex relationships, and clergy responding to lay people in same sex relationships, to assist the sharing of knowledge and an appropriate level of national consistency in approach”. Were the situation described in the question to arise, the bishop issuing the permission to officiate would be welcome to consult the Group.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Thank you, Bishop Christine. Given that most of the people I know do not want to be treated on a case-by-case basis, but need a clear and consistent line from the House of Bishops on a matter when they are having to choose to put their call to priesthood above their call to marriage, can I ask that the House of Bishops look urgently at issuing guidelines which both current clergy in same sex marriages and those considering answering their call to priesthood who are in same sex marriages can be clear of before they go through such an upsetting and painful set of discussions with their bishop?

The Bishop of Newcastle: I can answer again for the Pastoral Advisory Group established by the Archbishops for the House of Bishops. We consider queries by bishops on a case-by-case basis. We do not get into answering hypothetical questions.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: It is not hypothetical.

49. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can it be confirmed that the position as set out in the House of Bishops' guidelines in *Issues in Human Sexuality* that clergy abstain from active homophile relationships remains unchanged?

The Bishop of Newcastle replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops' position remains that clergy should abstain from any sexual activity outside marriage, marriage being "in its nature a union permanent and lifelong, for better for worse, till death them do part, of one man with one woman" (Canon B 30).

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: Thank you for the answer. If this is the case, and, given the impassioned earlier plea of the Archbishop of Canterbury to holiness and to obedience; to love and to truth, what action is the House of Bishops taking to ensure dioceses are holding clergy consistently to the life-giving and Gospel witness of Canon B 30? Might they consider investigating say ten dioceses a year, starting with Portsmouth, Southwark, Salisbury and Manchester?

The Bishop of Newcastle: Should there be an alleged breach of this position, that is a matter for the relevant diocesan bishop and the priest or deacon concerned, in any issue not just on this one.

50. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that increasing numbers of people are reverting to their biological genders after transgender procedures, does the House of Bishops intend to give any guidance about recognising such reverting?

The Bishop of Newcastle replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House has commissioned the Living in Love and Faith project to help the whole church understand better contemporary developments regarding gender and sexuality and respond to them in the light of faith.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: Since the House of Bishops has given guidance before 2020 on the use of baptismal liturgy to welcome people who have transitioned, why can it not give guidance before 2020 to affirm and welcome those who wish to detransition to their biological gender?

The Bishop of Newcastle: The guidance issued by the House of Bishops is on the use of an existing liturgy, the Affirmation of Baptismal Vows, which can be used on many, many occasions and can be used to give a welcome to transgender people. There is no reason

at all why the Affirmation of Baptismal Vows could not be used by somebody who is deciding they wish to reverse that decision. The House of Bishops has not issued guidance on transitioning.

51. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What consideration has the House of Bishops given to the theoretical foundations of the relatively recent concept of gender (as differentiated from sex), and its relationship to Christian anthropology?

52. *Miss Emma Forward (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House of Bishops considered, or is it planning to consider, whether there are circumstances under which a typically biologically male person (with XY chromosomes and typically male phenotype) can be ontologically female, and vice versa?

The Bishop of Coventry replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will reply to Questions 51 and 52 together.

The House has commissioned the Living in Love and Faith project to help the whole Church understand better contemporary developments regarding gender identity and sexuality and respond to them in the light of faith.

Miss Prudence Dailey: In providing its *Pastoral Guidance in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, did the House of Bishops

consider whether, in addition to the pastoral concerns which they quite rightly considered, such philosophical considerations around the concept of gender might also have some bearing on the matter, and whether, therefore, such guidance should not have waited until after the completion of the Living in Love and Faith project?

The Bishop of Coventry: The Pastoral Guidance was in response to the General Synod debate and everything that set in motion. Alongside is the Living in Love and Faith project. That is giving exactly the sort of theological and philosophical attention to the matters you raise now.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Thank you, Bishop, for your answer. Given the real personal and pastoral issues around this question which many of us in the chamber, whatever our view on the matter, are very acutely aware of, given the enormous complexities of the question which you have alluded to in your answer, and given that the Synod motion last year was not asking for provision but was simply asking for consideration as to whether provision should be made at this point, what were the particular reasons the House of Bishops decided to issue guidance rather than defer guidance until the full questions had been considered within the LLF process?

The Bishop of Coventry: The decision, as far as I understand it, was made not to issue a new liturgy of any sort, as the Bishop of Newcastle has explained, nor to seek to develop a liturgy for transitioning, but to provide an opportunity for people to reaffirm their baptismal faith at certain points in their lives.

Miss Emma Forward: Will the House of Bishops continue to defend our right to ask questions such as mine in the face of possible accusations that they are against the General Synod Code of Conduct?

The Bishop of Coventry: Yes.

53. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Vice-Chair of the Liturgical Commission said in debate that to “produce a generic liturgy specifically for the welcome of transgender people could be cumbersome and complicated, and arguably insensitive”, yet the House of Bishops has now produced its *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*. How is this inconsistency to be explained?

The Bishop of Hereford replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Affirmation of Baptismal Faith, which has existed since the early days of Common Worship, is not a new liturgical rite, nor a ‘liturgy... for the welcome of transgender people’. Rather, it ‘recognis[es] and celebrat[es] a person’s] identity in Christ’, as paragraph 2 of the Guidance makes clear. It is used in many different ways in churches of all kinds, for a variety of pastoral reasons.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): For the sake of absolute clarity, is it intended by the

House of Bishops, with emphasis on “intended”, that the service of Affirmation of Baptismal Vows should be used to mark gender transition?

The Bishop of Coventry: I am not authorized to speak on behalf of the House of Bishops, but I have heard nothing that gives me the impression that that is intended at all, no.

54. *Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the guidance issued by the House on the use of the service of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition, what consideration has been, or will be, given by the House as to how clergy should pastorally care for family members and friends who would find it difficult to celebrate the gender transition of a loved one and for whom such a transition is a matter of grief and trauma?

55. *Mrs Gill de Berry (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What consideration was given by the House of Bishops when preparing *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* to its impact on friends and family of those with gender dysphoria for whom the identity transition is pastoral and personally problematic?

56. *Mrs Sarah Finch (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Does the House of Bishops have any plans to produce guidance about how to give pastoral support to those suffering from gender dysphoria, and to their families?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will respond to Questions 54, 55 and 56 together. The House of Bishops does not issue detailed guidance to clergy on pastoral care for people in every kind of circumstance: it has confidence in the processes of selection, formation, supervision and on-going ministerial education in the Church of England to support clergy in their pastoral work. Furthermore, bishops are always willing to assist their clergy either personally or through diocesan staff when individuals are faced with unfamiliar pastoral situations in which they do not feel confident in relying on their own experience and expertise.

Mrs Sarah Finch: Since the subject of gender dysphoria is very complex, and since it is likely to be lay people who come into contact with people suffering from gender dysphoria, would the House of Bishops consider commissioning expert materials that would help these lay people?

The Bishop of Willesden: There are two different answers to that. One is really in the answer that has already been given, which is we do not tend to give detailed guidance on everything that is a pastoral matter to parish clergy. The other is the Living in Love and Faith project can quite easily address that question if that is something that the House of Bishops and the LLF project think is the right thing to do. We have to hear the concerns being expressed, but it is not our habit, because we are a pastoral church, to tell people in explicit detail how to respond to pastoral requests.

57. *Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can the House clarify whether clergy may decline a request to conduct a service of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in accordance with its recent guidance if it is, for them, a matter of conscience?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The statement issued by the Secretary to the House of Bishops on 10 January stated that “Any priest who feels unable to offer this rite in this context is free not to do so. They should find appropriate ways to offer welcome and pastoral care, as they would to all people”.

Revd Canon Alastair McHaffie: Thank you, Bishop Pete, which was actually made clear after I submitted the question originally. Would I be right in thinking then that an incumbent can decline to have their premises used for such a service if they consider it to be inappropriate?

The Bishop of Willesden: I am not able to give you the final legal opinion on that, but it is normally the case that the parish priest would determine what services are held in a church. The service of the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith is a discretionary service, so I think the answer is 99% yes.

Dr Angus Goudie (Durham): Given the fact that this moderate and graciously welcoming guidance was in response to a significant majority in all three Houses, but particularly in

the House of Bishops, should we expect that all bishops will communicate and commend the guidance to their clergy?

The Bishop of Willesden: This is a provision that has already been passed by the House and will be made available in the normal way, as with all liturgical matters.

58. *Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What support will bishops give to any clergy accused of transphobia because they are not willing to offer the celebratory service permitted in the 2018 *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Guidance does not ask any clergy to offer a “celebratory service”. It notes that “the occasion should have a celebratory character”, as befits any situation where the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith marks “postbaptismal experiences of personal renewal and commitment”. The House has recognised that within the diversity of the Church of England, some clergy will not wish to encourage the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition, and no member of the clergy should be made to suffer for taking that view.

The Chair: Questions 59 to 62 have been answered together.

59. *The Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In preparing the 2018 *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* did the House of Bishops address the question raised in *Some Issues in Human Sexuality* in 2003 about whether it is possible to accept the reality of gender transition without also accepting a gnostic separation between the body and the soul?

60. *Revd Charles Skrine (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House of Bishops publish its rationale for considering that *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, is “neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England”?

61. *Revd Canon Andrew Cornes (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Why has guidance been issued on how to “encourage the unconditional affirmation of trans people” with a commended liturgy which is to “have a celebratory character” before any careful theological work on this controverted issue has been undertaken, comparable to that being currently worked at on sexuality in the Living in Love and Faith project?

62. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How did the House of Bishops give consideration to the theological debate about gender transition before *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in*

the context of gender transition was approved, and will it publish the theological reasoning which underlies the guidance?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will respond to Questions 59 to 62 together. There has been no change to doctrine or teaching as a result of the publication of this guidance, which provides explicit advice about how to use an authorized rite (the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith) in one of the contexts in which its use was originally envisioned: to recognise “post-baptismal experiences of personal renewal and commitment”. The focus on the unchanging identity of a person in Jesus Christ is clear. It is precisely because baptism is a dominical sacrament and at the heart of the Church that a transgender person, or any other person, might wish to affirm the promises made in their baptism.

Revd Angus MacLeay: In 2003 the House of Bishops said on the issue of gender dysphoria, “Can we go down this road without moving to new form of gnostic dualism in which the body is seen as separate from itself?” What is the answer to your own question: can you?

The Bishop of Willesden: I do not accept that those who believe that that provision should be made are capitulating to gnostic dualism. I think that most of us would hold that sense that the person is a unity - body, soul, spirit - and we have a Hebrew understanding of what it means to be human, which is what Paul picks up in New Testament theology.

I do not think that by making provision for those who declare themselves to be trans we are making the assumption that you suggest.

Revd Canon Andrew Cornes: Thank you for your answer. I have no desire to be confrontational but I do want, in perplexity, to ask with what theological rationale do we strictly forbid encouraging those who want to change, if possible, their sexual orientation but affirm and celebrate those who want to change their gender or sexual biology?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think we are talking about dealing with folk who come to us who are already in a situation of being declared as trans and that is what the Pastoral Guidance is all about. We are not, at the moment, making any more theological assumptions about where we go after that. That is something the LLF project is seeking, I think, to address. I do not accept the parallel that you are suggesting.

63. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In view of the widespread concern expressed by many laity, clergy and bishops from diverse parts of the Church of England, will the House of Bishops now (i) withdraw *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, and (ii) refrain from issuing any further guidance on this topic until the Living in Love and Faith project completes and publishes its work?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Pastoral Guidance represents the result of a motion that was clearly carried in all three

Houses of this Synod, which has been acted upon by the House of Bishops. The Pastoral Guidance does not pre-empt the work of Living in Love and Faith, which is committed to exploring matters relating to gender identity and transition.

Mr Clive Scowen: I infer that the answer to my question is no. Since the guidance is premised on the notion that it is ontologically impossible for a man to become a woman and vice versa and that the inner sense of gender is truer than the bodily and biological sex of a person, in what sense did it not pre-empt the work of the Living in Love and Faith group on gender identity and transition?

The Bishop of Willesden: Because the Synod passed, having had a fairly substantial debate, a specific request to make provision. There may well be issues that need to be addressed - as I have already indicated in my previous answers - through Living in Love and Faith, but all we are doing at the moment is saying those who have clearly stated and present before us as trans are to be welcomed in church. The way in which we do that is by using the provision of this liturgy.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): So the answer to the question will you withdraw the material is no. Is that correct?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think you can infer that, yes.

The Chair: Questions 64 to 69 have been answered together.

64. *Brigadier Ian Dobbie (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What consultation took place in developing the House of Bishops' *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* with the spouses and children of people who have transitioned, and how did the experience of such people help shape the pastoral guidance?

65. *Mr Stephen Hofmeyr (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In preparing *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, what consultation did the House of Bishops have with those who experience gender dysphoria but who believe that faithful discipleship calls them not to seek gender transition?

66. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Whom did the House of Bishops consult regarding the impact of gender transition by an individual on the individual's immediate friends and family, before issuing its *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*?

67. *Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In selecting consultants to advise on the preparation of *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, what process was adopted to ensure that more than one perspective was represented?

68. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What criteria were used to draw up the range of people (clergy and lay, trans men and women, ages and different theological traditions) consulted in drawing up *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition?*

69. *Mr James Lee (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What criteria were used to draw up the range of people (e.g. clergy and lay, trans men and women and their families, age, different theological tradition, as well as those who have de-transitioned) consulted in the preparation of *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition?*

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will respond to Questions 64 to 69 together.

In addition to the participation of three trans women clergy, members of the drafting group considered published and unpublished resources from a variety of backgrounds, and the Guidance in draft form was scrutinised by the diverse membership of three bodies (the Liturgical Commission, the Pastoral Advisory Group, and the House's Delegation Committee) before being presented to the whole House for approval.

Mr Stephen Hofmeyr: Thank you, Bishop, for your answer. In the light of your clear negative answer, what steps are now being taken by the House of Bishops to consult with the group to whom the question refers?

The Bishop of Willesden: There is a fairly wide consultation programme going on through Living in Love and Faith. I think it is only reasonable and it might be worthwhile that we pick up on that question as to how we consult with such folk as you suggest. I am sure those who are responsible for the project have heard what you suggest and can pick it up in due course.

70. *Revd John Dunnett (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House of Bishops confirm that they accept the widespread expression of concern regarding their *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* as a genuine engagement with that Guidance, and are they, like those signing the letter *A Response to the House of Bishops Guidance on Transgender Welcome*, “unreservedly committed to welcoming everyone to our churches and communities of faith, so that all might hear and respond to the good news of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ”?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House is aware of the concern regarding the Guidance expressed by a significant number of people within the Church of England and remains committed to enabling all to receive the good news of repentance and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. I might “hear and respond to the good news of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ”.

71. *Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Did the House of Bishops consider deferring the drawing up of *Pastoral Guidance on the use of the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* so as not to pre-empt the outcomes of the careful work being conducted by the Living in Love and Faith process?

72. *Dr William Belcher (Gloucester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Against the backdrop of the continuing Living in Love and Faith (LLF) discernment process, what is the justification for the House of Bishops (and certain dioceses) pre-empting the eventual conclusions of LLF by issuing their own guidance on human sexuality issues now?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will respond to Questions 71 and 72 together. In line with the parameters set out in GS Misc 1158, the House is supporting both the vital theological work of Living in Love and Faith and the activities of the Pastoral Advisory Group, which is addressing questions regarding identity and sexuality within the framework of the Church of England's current teaching. In preparing the Guidance, the House of Bishops was responding to the Synod motion in July 2017, clearly passed in all three Houses, which asked it to consider the matter. The House's decision - to commend the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith and to commission some guidelines as to how this existing rite could be used in a particular pastoral context

- does not pre-empt the theological work being done in the Living in Love and Faith process.

Dr William Belcher: Thank you very much, Bishop, for your answer. What advice would the House of Bishops give to those dioceses where use of the rainbow flag flying from cathedrals and draped over communion tables would seem to be signalling a rejection of the Church's current teaching on marriage and sexuality well before any conclusions from the Living in Love and Faith process have emerged?

The Chair: I am afraid, I think, Dr Belcher, that is outside the scope of the original question and answer.

73. *Revd Charles Skrine (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How did the House of Bishops select the scripture readings suggested in *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, and to what extent did it give consideration to the way in which their use in such a service would lend them to being interpreted in a particular way?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The readings were selected from suggestions in various resources during the drafting, including those suggested by transgender people. The readings in which a biblical character receives a new name (which form a minority) are not intended to offer a superficial parallel between these biblical characters (Sarah, Israel, Peter) and individuals

in the present day; they are transformative moments of faith for those characters. In general, any reading may be used at any service at the discretion of the minister, except where the Lectionary and Rules dictate otherwise.

74. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In view of the House of Bishops' *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition*, what is the teaching of the Church of England regarding the meaning of the sacrament of baptism?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Guidance has not altered the teaching of the Church of England on baptism, which is expressed in a number of sources, including its Historic Formularies, its ecclesiastical law and its authorized liturgies.

75. *Mr Brian Wilson (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When agreeing that the existing liturgy for Affirmation of Baptismal Faith could be used for a purpose other than that for which it had been first drafted, namely the 'celebration' of a change of name following a declared change of gender, from whom was legal advice taken that this new liturgical use did not constitute a new liturgy that required the assent of General Synod?

76. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Did the House of Bishops take legal advice as to whether *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with*

the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition, is “neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England”?

The Bishop of Willesden replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I will answer Questions 75 and 76 together. The Church of England’s Legal Office is represented at every meeting of the House of Bishops Delegation Committee as well as every meeting of the House. Legal advice was offered in relation to the use of the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in this context, confirming that in using the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context laid out in the Pastoral Guidance, people will be affirming the vows made at their baptism, following experiences of personal renewal and commitment: precisely the “purpose for which [the rite] had been first drafted”.

Mr Clive Scowen: Interesting though the answer is, it really does not deal with my question. The guidance is premised on the proposition that it is ontologically possible for a man to become a woman and vice versa, and that the appropriate response to gender dysphoria is to try to make the bodily and biological conform with the inner sense of gender. Where do those notions find support in scripture, the Catholic Creeds, the Ecumenical Councils, the Book of Common Prayer or the historic formularies of the Church of England? If they do not, would it not be necessary to have legal advice on the question of whether the theological innovation represented by the use of this liturgy for this purpose actually is consistent with the doctrine of the Church of England as derived from the sources to which the Canons refer?

The Bishop of Willesden: Again, let us emphasise that there has been no change in liturgy. This is guidance on how one might use a particular affirmation. I do not think I accept, again, the premise that we have changed anything in our understanding, but we can have that conversation outside the chamber.

Mrs Susannah Leafe (Truro): We have heard again and again that we have not got new liturgy and we understand that from what you are saying. However, in the Guidance that was put out by William Nye it was made clear that the context in which we use this was not just somebody coming and wanting to renew their vows and their commitment to Christ but also the word “and” - “and mark their transition”. We have been told ---

The Chair: Do you have a question?

Mrs Susannah Leafe: Yes, I do. Does the House of Bishops, therefore, suggest that the experience of personal renewal and commitment is that of transitioning or that of returning in repentance to Christ?

The Bishop of Willesden: The context of this service, which is one that I do most weeks as a Bishop in initiation, is that you invite people into renewal of vows, which include words such as, “I turn to Christ; I repent of my sins; I renounce evil”, and a whole catechesis of people about their faith. It is not the case that we are saying that suddenly you can pluck all the rest of that content out of what is one of our major reflections of the

experience of initiation in baptism and confirmation and make it something different. This is a way of celebrating with people something that is a change in their lives which they want to give thanks to God for but where they are also saying, “I place myself firmly in the context of being somebody who knows myself to be made new in Jesus Christ, and I do that because of my baptism and that is what I am reaffirming”. That is the nature of the service. Nothing at all has changed from the liturgy which we espouse.

77. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the publicity surrounding recent open letters and petitions, would the House of Bishops confirm that the *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* produced in response to the request of General Synod following the Blackburn DSM in July 2017, and which states “The Church of England welcomes and encourages the unconditional affirmation of trans people equally with all people, within the body of Christ, and rejoices in the diversity of that body into which all Christians have been baptized by one Spirit” remains in use; and that those using the Guidance can plan with confidence for appropriate services of worship as we go forward?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The position of the House remains that summed up by the Secretary to the House in his statement of 10 January: “It commends and encourages the use of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith for the purpose of a transgender adult wishing to reaffirm their Christian faith and mark their transition”.

Mrs Anne Foreman: Thank you, Bishop. Please could the House of Bishops consider giving a slightly louder voice to the words “commends and encourages” by recommending that examples of such services of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith be collated and distributed amongst the dioceses so we can perhaps listen and learn from each other?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think I would resist that approach simply because we are not about trading and pushing around liturgy. The liturgy we are using is the initiation service that the Church of England already has in Christian Initiation services and Common Worship. We are not looking to give people templates for new things. We are saying this is the service that everyone celebrates. As I welcome many people back to faith when they affirm their faith in Jesus Christ in the context of confirmation, affirmation of vows, reception into the Church of England, so I would expect there to be something which was local and suitable to the occasion; not something which we push around to dioceses and say, “Here is another service you can try off the peg”. It is local context in which we perform these services.

Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough): I am sorry to press – well, I am not really but I am sort of sorry to press this point. Can I refer you, Bishop Pete, to a previous question which says that it is to reaffirm their Christian faith “and to mark the transition”, but you have said it is not to mark the transition. Can we have clarity as to which it is?

The Bishop of Willesden: What we are saying is that people who come to us in a diversity of pastoral circumstances, where life-changing things have happened to them and they have experienced the love of Christ in a new way, may want to do so. This service is one I use with a whole heap of different sorts of people. One of those contexts and possibilities is someone who has transitioned and who wishes to give thanks for their new identity. That is the context in which I believe the service should be used.

78. *Revd Shaun Morris (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can the House of Bishops confirm that, under their *Pastoral Guidance for use in conjunction with the Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition* of December 2018, they would commend reaffirmation of baptismal faith in a celebratory service to mark the gender transition of a married ordinand or their spouse but that, under their February 2014 *Pastoral Guidance on Same Sex Marriage*, such a married ordinand would, as a result of that transition, cease to be eligible to take vows of ordination?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House prefers not to comment on hypothetical or individual circumstances. However, the Guidance states that: “Everyone’s journey through life is unique. Baptism is the place where we find our true identity in Christ. As with all pastoral encounters with people negotiating major life events, ministers will wish to respond sensitively and creatively to the person’s circumstances”. Where questions arise for bishops regarding care and oversight of trans ordinands and clergy, they are welcome to

consult the Pastoral Advisory Group, part of whose role is “to assist the sharing of knowledge and an appropriate level of national consistency in approach”.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Given the fact that Mr Morris has highlighted a very difficult pastoral and sensitive issue, is it possible to know at which part of the process of producing this Guidance this kind of very challenging what appears to be inconsistency and pastoral challenge was considered and how it was resolved?

The Bishop of Willesden: I am sorry; I do not understand the question.

Revd Dr Ian Paul: The question is: which part of the process - through the Liturgical Commission, the Pastoral Advisory Group, the House of Bishops - was this kind of conflict considered and resolved, given its very personal and pastoral implications?

The Bishop of Willesden: I think you need to realise that the whole thing was an iterative process. It came from the House. It went to the Liturgical Commission. It went to the House of Bishops’ Delegation Committee, to the Pastoral Advisory Group and back. There were several iterations through all those bodies, and we pushed around some of the big questions that did arise simply because there are major questions which have been identified by concerns expressed in the Synod. I cannot tell you at which stage we discussed all these matters, but the fact is they were pushed backwards and forwards and these guidelines were revised several times in the light of different submissions from different groups.

79. *Mrs Kathy Playle (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Will the House of Bishops either provide or commend theological resources for parish clergy being asked to support people considering gender transition, with particular reference to the role that gender continues to play in the life of the redeemed people of God?

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House has commissioned the Living in Love and Faith project to help the whole church understand better contemporary developments regarding gender identity, transition and sexuality and respond to them in the light of faith.

Revd Sarah Schofield (Lichfield): The focus in the questions is on the parish context and reception into the Church of England and also, Bishop, on people who have already transitioned. Would the Bishops consider offering specific reflective material for school and HE chaplains, particularly those in the university context, who, regardless of their theology on this issue, are dealing on a daily basis with the psychological and spiritual pain of young people who have perhaps not yet transitioned but are on a journey? This seems like a direction for people who have transitioned and for older people. Could you consider a specific something for those of us within HE?

The Bishop of Willesden: That is beyond the remit of the Pastoral Advisory Group. It is something that falls within the remit of Living in Love and Faith. I think we need to realise we are in an area where the whole question of trans and identity politics is contested in

our current society. People have different views. Certainly, it would not be the case that I would be wanting to rush into suggesting new forms of advice until the work of the Living in Love and Faith Group has actually gone a bit further. I think we also need to make sure we have a debate among ourselves. The questions that have been raised by colleagues in this chamber today do clearly indicate there are some great misgivings about this. We want to take that on board as well as saying that we have responded to a particular need. We hear what you are asking for and I would want that to be something which takes part of the conversation that goes on.

80. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In welcoming the issue of GS 2117, the *Code of Practice on Co-operation by the Church of England with Other Churches*, might the Synod be advised as to how our ecumenical partners (including, specifically, those who are represented in this Synod) have been consulted in the drawing up of this Code of Practice?

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Martin Warner) replied on behalf of the House of Bishops: Key to consulting other churches has been the Methodist Anglican Panel for Mission in Unity (MAPUM), which has worked on the Code of Practice at several meetings. MAPUM, besides looking at how the Church of England practises its ecumenism together with the Methodist Church, benefits from the active membership of representatives from the Roman Catholic Church and the United Reformed Church, who are full members of the Panel. Identifying a specific issue, for instance, it set up a working party with Methodists to consider Joint Confirmation. The Council for Christian Unity,

which has an observer from the Baptist Union of Great Britain as well as others from the Churches already mentioned, has also looked at the Code carefully. In addition, there have been informal consultations between National Ecumenical Officers and at the Enabling Group of Churches Together in England.

Mr Philip French: I am very grateful to the Bishop of Chichester for a full and informative reply. How has the Code of Practice been received by your ecumenical partners?

The Bishop of Chichester: I am not sure I am best-placed to answer that since I am very new to the CCU, but, on the whole, the response has been very positive, and, of course, they are waiting on the outcome of our debate tomorrow to hear it affirmed here in Synod. They look forward with anticipation to the ways in which it can renew and deepen our ecumenical relations and our shared witness in Christ.

81. *Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Does the House of Bishops maintain records of how many applications are made by its members for faculties under Canon C 4.5 to dispense with the impediment otherwise created by remarriage after divorce and, if it does, how many were made in the last year for which such records are available?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied: The House of Bishops does not maintain these records, but the Archbishops' Offices do. A total of 109 applications for faculty under Canon C 4.5 were made in 2018.

Revd Neil Patterson: Your Grace, given that the answer to this question and Question 7 mean that something approaching one-fifth of all candidates require a faculty, and that we are aware of the need to promote vocations with great urgency as in a recent letter from yourself and the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishops recently, are there any plans to revise the process, which is almost always the cause of delay (with some perverse consequences) under the procedures which are still in place from 1991?

The Archbishop of York: I am not aware of any plans for such a review. As I said in answer to a question on the same issue last year, Canon C 4.5 is there both for protecting individuals and also to protect the Church. We may not all agree how it works, but I am thankful to God for all those willing to embark on the process given their personal circumstances as part of the process of discerning God's call. It is a challenging process, but, nevertheless, people are willing to go through it. My experience is that bishops are diligent in the way they actually go about their task. The reasons for the Canon C 4.5 faculty are partly theological, partly pastoral and partly to avoid scandal. If you wanted to know a little bit more of the numbers you are concerned about, I can tell you exactly what happened when this was applied. In 2018, 652 people attended BAPs; 78 needed C 4.5 faculties; 569 were recommended, 70 of whom needed actual faculty, so it is not as big and deep as it may appear.

Revd Ian Patterson: Thank you for the very full answer.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): Is it not the case that the figure in the answer includes applications for C 4 faculties for lay readers also?

The Archbishop of York: Those figures I have given you are those who have gone to BAPs.

Revd Paul Hutchinson: The 109.

The Archbishop of York: It was the original question and I gave you the number of people who went to BAPs, how many required Canon C 4 and of those recommended were 70.

Revd Paul Hutchinson: I was just seeking clarification.

The Chair: I am afraid that brings us now to our allotted hour.

Mr Carl Fender: Point of order, Chair, very briefly. I have the Standing Orders in front of me here which have been reissued in this session. I am looking at Standing Order 116. I do not know if this is an appropriate question to be answered by you, Chair, but I note that the Business Committee, and I am reading directly from it, "must allocate in the agenda for a group of sessions one or more periods for time for answering supplementary questions". I am mindful that one-third of the questions have not been reached. I am therefore asking if some additional time later in the week could be found for supplementary questions to those questions which have not been reached by now.

The Chair: I am afraid, Mr Fender, I am merely the Chair of this item. It sounds to me as if your question is one for the Chair of the Business Committee. She will no doubt have heard it, but you will also see that we have a very full agenda.

Thank you, members of Synod that brings us to the close of this item. Before we leave, may I thank the Community of St Anselm for their praying presence in the chamber today. We now move directly to our evening worship which will be led by the Archdeacon of Halifax.

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

Questions not reached during Synod

82. *Revd Canon Mark Barker* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Noting gratefully the arrangements set out in GS Misc 1216 to establish a Triennium Funding Working Group, is it anticipated that the Triennium Funding Working Group will be able to assure the availability of additional monies to support the funding of ministry growth and the training of increased numbers of curates, over and above SDF?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Revd Dr John Sentamu) replied: The task of the Triennium Funding Working Group is to examine options for the use of funds of the national Church and to make recommendations to the House of Bishops, the Board of the Church Commissioners and to the Archbishops' Council, for each body to take into

account in exercising its responsibilities in determining distributions and the use of national Church funds for this period. Decisions on the availability of additional monies will be taken by the Commissioners and Council in exercising their trustee responsibilities. But they are well aware of the three main priorities for distributions in 2020-2022 identified by the House of Bishops of Funding Ministry Growth, Strategic Development Funding and Lowest Income Community Funding.

83. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: According to the Five Guiding Principles the Church of England is committed to the “mutual flourishing” of all its members and clergy. With particular reference to points four and five, what protocols are in place to monitor the flourishing of those of a traditional perspective? And has the House formed a view as to the extent to which there is mutual flourishing at Episcopal and Archidiaconal level?

The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Implementation and Dialogue Group has undertaken a general review of good practice in “mutual flourishing” in dioceses. The Group received responses from 36 dioceses and a number of examples of good practice for mutual flourishing were highlighted. The Group will be following up with five dioceses to undertake in depth discussions to examine what is in place in these dioceses to support the flourishing of those of a traditional perspective, particularly in relation to the treatment of vacancies, church planting and BMOs, with an aim to be able to share this across dioceses. The House has not yet formed any views, as this work is still in progress. A report will be

presented to the House of Bishops in May, in advance of the Group's final report in December 2019.

84. *Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In para 16 of the House of Bishops' Declaration (GS Misc 1076) in 2014, the House stated that "The House is committed to enabling parishes in one part of the country to receive broadly comparable and consistent arrangements to those provided in another ...". What guidance is the House of Bishops offering (or the Implementation and Dialogue Group proposing) to deliver this necessary and equitable consistency and ensure that it is in place and observed across all dioceses, with regard to responses to and provision for parishes that petition for "episcopal arrangements to be made, according to their theological convictions, under the House of Bishops' Declaration" - and especially where the diocesan bishop is male?

The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Implementation and Dialogue Group has engaged with five dioceses to undertake focus groups to understand how the House of Bishops' Declaration and Five Guiding Principles are experienced in lived reality. It is hoped that these focus groups will provide examples of mutual flourishing in practice. The Implementation and Dialogue Group will be reporting to the House of Bishops in December but there has not yet been consideration of whether guidance will be produced as a result.

85. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following assurances given in the responses to Questions last July with regard to how the principles of mutual flourishing might be reflected in nominations, in particular that the Chair of the Implementation and Dialogue group had been asked by the Development & Appointments Group to include senior appointments in its work as it considers examples of good practice and designs resources; what progress can be reported?

The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Implementation and Dialogue Group invited the Chair of the Development and Appointments Group to its meeting in November to consider senior appointments as part of its discussions. There were a number of questions raised through this interaction and work on this will continue. Members of the IDG have been invited to attend a future DAG meeting to take forward these discussions.

86. *Mr Philip French (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the high uptake and welcome impact of Strategic Development Funding grants from the Church Commissioners in 2017-2019 (with £44 million awarded in 2017 alone, to be drawn down over a number of years), what ambition does the House of Bishops entertain for the level of such funding in 2020-2022?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied: The House of Bishops has agreed that Strategic Development Funding should be one of the priorities for the use of the Church's national funding in 2020-22. The Archbishops have agreed

the creation of a Triennium Funding Working Group, drawing on members from the House of Bishops, Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners to advise on spending plans, including the quantum of Strategic Development Funding.

87. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Can the House of Bishops clarify how many people have been rejected for ministry on the basis that they have refused to sign a statement agreeing to the Church of England's position in *Issues in Human Sexuality*, that requires would-be LGBTI ordinands to commit to celibacy for life?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The current practice of the House of Bishops is to ask that candidates assent to the Guidelines contained in *Issues in Human Sexuality* at the point when their Diocesan Director of Ordinands sends in their Sponsoring Papers, six weeks before they attend a Bishops Advisory Panel. To that extent, there is no national data kept on those candidates who are unable to so assent and who therefore do not progress to a Bishops' Advisory Panel. Such data could only be obtained by a survey of 250 DDOs.

88. *Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is the House aware of the use of legally-binding non-disclosure agreements by any of its members in handling non-safeguarding matters such as clergy appointment, capability,

discipline, pastoral breakdown (including in curacy posts), et cetera? If so, what guidelines are offered to bishops in requiring/imposing such agreements?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I refer to the replies given by the Secretary General to questions 103 and 104. Because there is no obligation on Church of England entities or office holders to disclose the existence of non-disclosure/confidentiality agreements to the House of Bishops or otherwise, I cannot comment on the use of such agreements by members of the House. The House has not offered guidance on whether to require or impose such an agreement because the assessment in any case is fact specific and any office holder would need to take their own legal advice.

89. *Mrs Sarah Finch (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the Primates' Decision in 2016, that there should be consequences for the Episcopal Church's acceptance of same sex "marriage", has the House of Bishops considered to what extent the Church of England can be in Communion with the Episcopal Church, now that the three years have expired?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby) replied as Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops has not considered this issue. The Primates' Meeting has set up a Task Group to maintain conversation between Primates within the Anglican Communion and to enable those within the Anglican Communion who

take very different views on certain issues to walk together. The Task Group will report back to the next Primates' Meeting, which will take place in January 2020.

90. *The Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the statement in *Issues in Human Sexuality* that there should be an “open and welcoming place” in the Church for committed same sex lay couples, reaffirmed in para 18 of the 2014 *House of Bishops Statement on Same Sex Marriage*, and that readers are defined in Canon E4 as a lay ministry, can the House of Bishops confirm that throughout the Church of England, as in a number of dioceses, same sex marriage is not in itself an impediment to admission or licensing as a reader?

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Martyn Snow) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House of Bishops does not hold comprehensive information on this subject, though it is aware of a diversity of approaches. Responsibility for determining suitability for reader ministry, as for shaping its priorities and practice within the framework of the ecclesiastical law, lies with diocesan bishops. The 2014 Statement referred to in the question did not express a view with regard to Licensed Lay Ministries, including readers, who marry a person of the same gender.

91. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When will the report of the “Seal of the Confessional” Working Party be published?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House has had two discussions about the report. It has agreed that improved training should be developed and work on this is underway. The House hopes to be able to make the full report available for publication in the next few months.

92. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Within each of the following groups of Church leaders:

- diocesan bishops
- suffragan and area bishops
- archdeacons
- cathedral deans

What proportion hold the traditional complementarian view of male/female relationships, or are otherwise, theologically or ecclesiologically, unable to accept the ministry of a woman bishop?

The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Paul Mason) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: There is no central record of bishops, deans or archdeacons who, on grounds of theological conviction, cannot accept the ministry of women bishops. As a proxy, the diversity monitoring data collected at the appointment stage indicates that:

- 2 diocesan bishops
- 8 suffragan bishops
- no deans identify themselves as either traditional catholic or conservative evangelical.

There is no central record of this data for archdeacons. However, the labels which people

use to describe their church tradition do not necessarily correlate with whether they are able to accept the ministry of women bishops.

93. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House of Bishops considered encouraging the Archbishop of Canterbury to revisit the judgement he expressed on 15 December 2017 (on publication of the Carlile Review) that “a significant cloud is left over [Bishop Bell’s] name”, particularly in view of the Briden Report dated 17 January 2019 and the recent statement by Lord Carlile that “The Church should now accept that my recommendations should be accepted in full, and that after due process, however delayed, George Bell should be declared by the Church to be innocent of the allegations made against him”?

The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Paul Mason) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The National Safeguarding Steering Group accepted all but one of the recommendations made by Lord Carlile. In particular, it accepted that any posthumous allegation should be assessed on the civil standard, i.e. whether the information presented is made out on the balance of probabilities, not the criminal standard, and following appropriate due process. The legitimate quest for certainty in connection with allegations made against the late Bishop George Bell has been defeated by the nature of the case and the passage of time. Bishop Bell cannot be proven guilty, nor can it be safely claimed that the original complainant, “Carol”, has been discredited. There is an uncertainty which cannot be resolved. The House asks those who hold

opposing views on this matter to recognise the strength of each other's commitment to justice and compassion.

94. *Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the conclusion of Chancellor Timothy Briden in his report dated 17 January 2019 that the most recent allegations of misconduct against the late Bishop George Bell are “unfounded”, what consideration is being given by the House of Bishops to protect the reputation of clerics (living or deceased) who have had unfounded accusations against them reported in the press?

The Bishop to the Armed Forces (Rt Revd Paul Mason) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The National Safeguarding Team is in the process of drafting addendum practice guidance which will provide guidance on how to address posthumous complaints made against Church of England office holders. The addendum guidance is currently due to be presented to the National Safeguarding Steering Group in November 2019. This guidance will, against a background of the appropriate requirements of due process and established legal principle, set out the principles and procedures to be followed when handling past safeguarding allegations.

95. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Following the IICSA hearings in March 2018 the inadequacies and injustices of the present Clergy Discipline Measure were publicly acknowledged. Archbishop Justin was reported as saying “We are starting a review of the CDM and this is certainly something we have to

look at” ... “The Synod is capable of moving quickly when it needs to and when it wants to, but you have to prepare the ground”. Can the House please update us as to the progress of that review, confirm a target date for the presentation of proposals, advise us if a briefing paper on the system’s deficiencies will be forthcoming as tangible evidence of that ground preparation, and advise what else General Synod members can do to ensure that they are sufficiently informed to play their part to repair the failings of the system with all due speed?

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Bishop of Lincoln and I have conducted a survey of diocesan bishops’ experience of the Measure generally; the NST has analysed the results of its own consultation on the application of the Measure in the safeguarding context; and the Clergy Discipline Commission has started to consider a range of issues, including delay. The results of all these pieces of work will be brought together in a paper for the May meetings of the Commission and the House of Bishops, which will identify both the perceived problems and possible ways of addressing them, with a view to detailed proposals for both administrative and legislative reform being developed as soon as possible thereafter. The aim is to have some clear proposals by the time the Synod meets in July. In the meantime, Synod members can assist this process by contributing their own thoughts, via the Legal Office.

96. *Mr Ben Hodson-Franks (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Bishop of Bath & Wells stated in an answer to a question (Q55) at the July 2018 group of

sessions that 'Lessons Learnt case review guidance' was in development and that following consultation and agreement by the National Safeguarding Steering Group, would be published in late 2018. Given the huge value that such reviews can add to the whole Church's learning regarding our safeguarding procedures and any shortcomings, and as part of our responsibility in responding to survivors justly and with integrity, can the House of Bishops confirm that this guidance has now been published?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House remains committed to ensuring that the Church learns from past and current cases in order to improve its safeguarding practice in the future. This is reflected in current House of Bishops' guidance, 'Responding, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers' (Section 9.2). We have delayed finalising the guidance to allow the opportunity to address specific issues that have arisen from recently completed reviews in several dioceses. The 'lessons learnt case review' guidance therefore remains in draft form and it is envisaged that this will be published in June 2019 subject to approval by the National Safeguarding Steering Group and House of Bishops.

97. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: It is now two years since the horrific abuse perpetrated by the late Chairman of the Iwerne Trust, John Smyth QC, came to light. Following the Ruston Report and his exclusion from the Iwerne Trust project in England, Smyth was nevertheless able to continue working with young men in Africa. In a statement issued on 12 August 2018 on the Church of England

website, following the news of Smyth's death in South Africa, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Rt Revd Peter Hancock, said, "It is important now that all those organisations linked with this case work together to look at a lessons learnt review, whilst continuing to offer both formal and informal support to those who have come forward as survivors." Given the support, prevalence, and seniority of Anglican clergy within the Iwerne project, what has the Church been doing to ensure that transparency and accountability happens, and what outreach and support has been offered to those who suffered at Smyth's hands?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since February 2017, the National Safeguarding Team, working in cooperation with Hampshire Police, has sought to ensure that all those affected by the alleged abuse committed by John Smyth were offered support and counselling. Following John Smyth's death, the criminal enquires continued. In late October 2018 Hampshire Police confirmed that no other charges would be brought against anyone else regarding his alleged abuse. Since then, the NST has been in active dialogue with the key organisations relevant to John Smyth's involvement in the Iwerne Camps, with a view to securing a collaborative approach to the commissioning of a lessons learnt review. The Church believes that a meaningful review requires the engagement of all relevant organisations. To date, the Church has not been able to secure this agreement with the other organisations, but we continue to be in active dialogue regarding this.

98. *Mrs Katherine Alldread (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is there any evidence of any significant risk of office holders or institutions in the Church of

England being at risk of legal proceedings initiated by office holders or institutions in other provinces as a result of Church of England clergy who are seen here as presenting a safeguarding risk being allowed to minister in another province without that fact being made known to the receiving province?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I am not aware of any evidence to suggest that there is a significant risk in that regard: the Legal Office is in fact aware of only one case, dating from decades ago, in which such a situation may have arisen. Nor should such situations arise in future, as the House will be updating its guidance on inter-provincial movements of ministers to put in place arrangements consistent with good practice and the 'Protocol for disclosure of ministry suitability information between the churches of the Anglican Communion' (agreed at the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC 16)) under which sending provinces are expected to share relevant information on clergy and other ministers with receiving provinces.

99. *Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is the House satisfied that the approach adopted by the Church when dealing with allegations of misconduct in the safeguarding context is fully consistent with secular legal practice in relation to the burden of proof, procedural fairness and related matters?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The House considers that it is essential to demonstrate a capacity to

respond appropriately to any allegation of misconduct which is made in the Church of England, whether relating to safeguarding or some other matter. Allegations of misconduct may be addressed through a variety of mechanisms, including disciplinary procedures and civil claims. The consideration of any allegation of misconduct whilst being sensitive to the particular procedure should be consistent with the requirements of due process as established in secular legal practice, so far as that is possible given the nature of the allegation or complaint.

100. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the light of the independent reviews undertaken by Lord Carlile and Tim Briden, and the need both to follow established methodology and legal precedent and to recognise the fallibility of witness memory after many decades have elapsed between events and allegation, what guidance will the House provide on the principles and procedures for the handling of historic safeguarding allegations to ensure that, before reputations are destroyed, decisions on them are made in accordance with legal principle and without the intrusion of subjectivity, bias, or extraneous consideration?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Consistent with the approach agreed by the National Safeguarding Steering Group following the conclusion of Lord Carlile's review, the process followed by Mr Briden enshrined, so far as possible, the requirements of due process in order to be fair to all parties concerned. The National Safeguarding Team is in the process of drafting addendum practice guidance which will provide guidance on how to address posthumous

complaints made against Church of England office holders. The addendum guidance is currently due to be presented to the National Safeguarding Steering Group in November 2019. This guidance will, against a background of the appropriate requirements of due process and established legal principle, set out the principles and procedures to be followed when handling historic safeguarding allegations. In drafting the guidance, the NST and Legal Office will take account of the points made in the question.

101. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church commissioned and paid for the Elliott Review, the Moira Gibb¹ Report, the Carlile² Review and the Singleton³ Review all of which contained direct or implicit criticisms of decisions of, and/or the process followed by, Church office holders and bodies. Not one of these reports has been presented for debate on the floor of General Synod. Is this lack of presentation the result of settled policy, oversight, or case by case decision, and will (and when) all or any of them be made the subject of consideration by those elected to call decision-makers to account?

1 'An Abuse of Faith', June 2017, GS Misc 1172

2 15 December 2017, GS Misc 1173

3 Report of the Independent Scrutiny Team into the Adequacy of the Church of England's Past Cases Review, June 2018

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The reports cited were commissioned by the National Safeguarding Team and were formally received by the House of Bishops or the National Safeguarding

Steering Group (NSSG) acting on behalf of the House. These bodies considered the recommendations made in the reports and tasked the National Safeguarding Team (NST) and the dioceses to implement many of them. Many of the actions reported to Synod in GS Misc 1213 at this group of sessions and GS 2092 in July have some basis in the recommendations of several of the Lessons Learned Reviews including those cited. The approach taken reflects the fact that the detailed consideration of the “lessons learned” reviews is the proper function of those with responsibility for safeguarding policy and operations.

102. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many specialist Exorcists are employed by the Church of England, and how many exorcisms have been performed in the last five years?

The Bishop of Sodor & Man (Rt Revd Peter Eagles) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England does not employ specialist exorcists. The diocesan bishop remains the normative minister of exorcism and deliverance in each diocese, as made clear in the notes to *Common Worship: Pastoral Services*. The bishop delegates this ministry as appropriate to an appointed adviser or team. Clergy nominated as Bishop’s Adviser for the Ministry of Deliverance (or equivalent title) will normally fulfil this role alongside their stipendiary post.

Statistics for Exorcisms are not held centrally or in public records, as the Guidelines on the Ministry of Deliverance specify the minimum of publicity. A consolidated figure is

therefore not readily available, but could be obtained by a process of consulting all diocesan records.

SECRETARY GENERAL

103. *Revd Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General: Please provide your best estimate of the number of Non-Disclosure Agreements concluded within the past five years involving a) the Church nationally and b) dioceses, together with a list and the numbers of those dioceses which can provide accurate data?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: Non-disclosure/confidentiality agreements may be used in a variety of circumstances by the NCIs or dioceses, many of which are legitimate and proper, for example undertakings given to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse in connection with its work. There is no obligation on Church entities or office holders to report the existence of non-disclosure agreements (and, indeed, they may be prevented from doing so), for which reason I am not able to speculate on how many agreements may have been entered either by the NCIs or dioceses.

104. *Revd Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General: Recent guidelines will require Dioceses to provide details of serious safeguarding allegations/concerns to the Charity Commissioners. Has consideration been given to requiring all non-disclosure agreements, and the reasons for them, including those drawn up as part of an agreement

to discontinue action as part of the Clergy Discipline Measure, being similarly lodged, so that the incidence and distribution thereof may be known to both the national Church, and an outside agency, to ensure that they are not utilised excessively, or inappropriately?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: I repeat my reply to question 103. Non-disclosure/confidentiality agreements will often not relate to allegations of misconduct or serious matters of concern of the type which would require a serious incident report to the Charity Commission. By their nature they are often confidential to the parties and their advisers and their details cannot be shared except where there is a legal obligation to disclose. There is no legal obligation on Church of England entities or office holders to report the existence of such agreements and I am not aware of any relevant external agency or regulator that operates a register of nondisclosure agreements to which Church of England bodies could make such a report.

CLERK TO THE SYNOD

105. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: How much did it cost to send replacement voting papers to Synod members in December 2018 and in January 2019?

Dr Jacqui Philips replied as Clerk to the Synod: In December 2018, the election by the House of Laity to the Church Commissioners had to be reissued. The total cost was

£351.64. This included postage, printing and staff time. In January 2019, the election by General Synod to the Dioceses Commission had to be reissued. The total cost was £504.04. This included postage, printing and staff time.

106. *Mr Christopher Pye (Liverpool)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: I have noticed that in recent elections held by this Synod the age of each candidate is stated in their electoral address. Surely the Church should be taking the lead in eliminating all forms of discrimination, including ageism?

Dr Jacqui Phillips replied as Clerk to the Synod: Under Standing Order 133(1) the voting papers for any election to which Standing Order 132 applies (which include elections in which the Synod, one or more of its Houses, the Convocations or any other class of the Synod's members constitute the electorate) are currently required to contain the candidates' years of birth - which (under Standing Order 132(6)) must accordingly be provided when they are nominated. These requirements are not inconsistent with the Equality Act 2010, since none of its provisions apply to these elections. So whether the current requirement should be maintained is accordingly a matter of policy. The Business Committee will therefore be looking at this issue at its meeting in March, following which it will refer it to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration. If Synod members have views on the matter, they are invited to send them to the Business Committee initially.

107. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: What external evidence was sought and taken, and from whom, by the Revision Committee and

Steering Committee for the proposed new Church Representation Rules about (a) the desirability of and (b) the likely impact of introducing a rule to restrict lay members of deanery synod to two consecutive terms of office, unless a particular APCM votes to dis-apply the Rule (M 8 (7))?

Dr Jacqui Philips replied as Clerk to the Synod: The Revision Committee's report shows that it proceeded as required by Standing Order 56, considering the Measure clause by clause together with proposals for amendments submitted by 15 members of the Synod. The Committee heard oral submissions from the three members who exercised their right to speak, including Mr Greenwood. He proposed an amendment to enable the annual parochial church meeting (APCM) to impose a limit on the number of terms a person might serve as an elected deanery synod member. The Committee's report states that it considered there was merit in Mr Greenwood's proposal which could encourage growth and energy and allow flexibility. But the Committee decided that the proposal should be given effect in a way that was consistent with the existing term limit for churchwardens, i.e. a default maximum term of six years which could be disapplied by the APCM if it wished to do so.

108. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: Did the Revision and Steering Committee for the proposed new Church Representation Rules actively consider imposing restrictions on numbers of consecutive terms of office for membership of diocesan synod and General Synod? And, if so, on what grounds did they reject this idea?

Dr Jacqui Philips replied as Clerk to the Synod: The Revision Committee considered a proposal submitted to it by Mr Greenwood that provision be made enabling a deanery synod to prescribe a maximum number of terms of office for continuous service as a member of a diocesan synod. The Committee's report records that it rejected the proposal because it "considered that as it was often difficult to get people to stand for election to diocesan synods, introducing a limit on the number of terms a person could serve was likely to be unhelpful". No proposals were made to the Committee for limiting the number of terms a person could serve as a member of the General Synod.

109. *Mr John Wilson (Lichfield)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: In the light of the form of proposed new Rule M 8(5) of the Church Representation Rules, can the Clerk confirm (a) whether General Synod has considered the issue of limiting the number of consecutive terms General Synod and diocesan synod members can serve and (b) if it has, when was the last time it did so?

Dr Jacqui Philips replied as Clerk to the Synod: No consideration was given to the issue in 1997 in *Synodical Government in the Church of England - A Review* (GS 1252) ("the Bridge Report"). But it was raised in relation to serving on the General Synod in the 2003 report of the legislative drafting group charged with implementing the Bridge Report (GS 1484-7X). It recognised that limiting terms of office would encourage new people to stand who might otherwise be deterred from challenging a sitting member. But it saw stronger arguments against, including an impact on experience, vacancies not being filled,

depriving electors of choice and altering the balance between Houses (bishops not being subject to such limits). The group noted that there was already a substantial turnover of members each quinquennium. The Revision Committee for the legislation came to the same view later in 2003. The issue has not been considered since then.

110. *Mr John Wilson (Lichfield)* asked the Clerk to the Synod: In the light of the form of proposed new Rule M 8(5) of the Church Representation Rules, which (if any) office holders of: (a) the Synod or its Houses; or (b) the national Church institutions who are elected by the Synod, or by any of its Houses, are subject to any restriction on the number of consecutive terms for which they may serve; and in the case of the offices that are subject to such a restriction, what is considered to be the rationale for that?

Dr Jacqui Philips replied as Clerk to the Synod: Elected office holders in the Synod and its Houses - e.g. the Prolocutors and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity - are not subject to restrictions on the number of consecutive terms they may serve. Members of the Archbishops' Council elected by the Houses of the Synod are subject to a maximum term of office of ten years. There are currently no limits on the number of terms a person may serve as a Church Commissioner or a member of the Church of England Pensions Board. The Charity Commission recently endorsed recommended good practice that charity trustees should be limited to nine years' service while recognising that charities must develop their own policies in line with the requirements of their governing documents. The Charity Governance Code's rationale includes the statement that "it is

important to have a rigorous approach to trustee recruitment, performance and development”.

NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL

111. *Revd Peter Breckwoldt (Salisbury)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: In the light of the Education Secretary urging of faith leaders to convert more of their schools into academies, what plans does the Church of England have to encourage more schools to take up this opportunity? And where schools wish to join a Multi Academy Trust, are there plans to offer support from the National Church to encourage Diocesan Board Academies trusts (MAT's), where they exist, to actively seek partnerships with non-church schools?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The Church of England is the largest provider of academies, with over 1,000 Church of England school having converted to academy status. Whilst many schools have benefited from this process it is not the only solution and dioceses are encouraged to consider a range of options to ensure the schools in their care are best served and able to offer the quality of education all pupils deserve. The Memorandum of Understanding between the DfE and Education Office sets out the need for dioceses to develop a strategic plan that works for the benefit of all their schools securing their provision for generations to come. At a national level we support dioceses as they consider

alternatives and have agreed model articles and documentation that enables community schools to be part of diocesan and church schooled MATs.

112. *Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Is the syllabus/course “Understanding Christianity” being taught in the majority of Church of England schools? What plans are there to extend its reach?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Since its launch in 2016, Understanding Christianity has been extremely well received and is now being taught in the overwhelming majority of Church of England schools. The resource is accompanied by 15 hours of continued professional development for teachers and we are delighted that nearly all of the 5000 training packs of the original print run have been dispatched and the training for teachers implemented. In addition to approximately 4,500 Church of England schools using Understanding Christianity, a growing number of community schools are also using it. We will be encouraging the remaining 200 Church of England schools to take up the training and dioceses are increasingly being asked to deliver training for community schools, thus extending the reach.

113. *Revd Paul Langham (Bristol)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Given the disheartening statistics in GS 2124B which reveal the stark reality of the Church of England’s poverty when it comes to the presence of children and young people, what efforts have been made to determine the common factors which have enabled the 680

churches with more than 25 children and young people, and the 30 which have more than 100, to do so?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: There have been some suggestions in recent research such as *Rooted in the Church* or *From Anecdote to Evidence* of a correlation between factors such as the numbers and engagement of clergy and other licensed ministries or the presence of active children's and youth ministries and the presence of children and young people in worshipping congregations, but determining a causal link was not the purpose of that research. GS 2121 sets out a range of activity planned to ensure we capture the learning from those congregations which are engaging effectively with children and young people.

114. *Revd Paul Langham (Bristol)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Are statistics similar to those provided in GS 2124B available to show how churches of other denominations are faring in this regard?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The church attendance figures in GS 2124B are drawn from Church of England Statistics for Mission. The URC publishes national statistics and the Methodist Church and Roman Catholic Church report on a district/diocesan basis rather than national, and newer denominations do not report in this way so it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons. The attitudinal surveys and the statistics regarding the age at which people come to and leave faith in GS 2121 relate to other denominations as well as the Church

of England and suggest a common theme in terms of the importance of childhood in people coming to faith, with children in Catholic families being more likely to remain Catholic into adulthood.

CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL

115. *Ven. Gavin Kirk (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: In how many cases in 2018 was the advice of the Church Buildings Council sought, (a) at the direction of a Chancellor following the lodging of a Faculty petition and (b) by a parish at the request of a DAC?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: In 2018 14 cases were referred by Chancellors for advice from the Church Buildings Council, 165 were sent by the parish at the request of the DAC. The Council always prefers to see cases before they get to the Chancellor. It finds that advice given earlier in the process is more likely to be helpful and more welcome by the parish. Chancellor referrals appear to the parish to introduce further delay at the end of what can be a long process. The Council is working with the Rules Committee to change the faculty rules to encourage best practice in early consultation and, it hopes, reduce further the number of chancellor referrals. New delegated authority now available to the DACs and the Council increases flexibility for dealing promptly with matters where there are clear policies in place to inform a response.

116. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: How many Church of England churches have now received EcoChurch Awards, and how many dioceses EcoDiocese Awards?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: There are over 850 Church of England Eco Church registrations and at the last count there were 177 Bronze, 45 Silver and 4 Gold awards. There are 18 Eco Dioceses and 4 with bronze awards - congratulations to Salisbury, Winchester, Guildford and Birmingham. It is the aim of the Environmental Working Group's 3-year plan to reach 2000 Eco Churches and 30 Eco Dioceses by 2022.

117. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: What plans are there to recruit to the now vacant Environmental Policy Officer post?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: A replacement will very soon be sought, with a job advert poised to go out in the next two weeks through the Church of England's *Pathways* recruitment service. The job title has been changed to Open and Sustainable Churches Officer, to reflect the focus of this role on supporting our parishes to be more environmentally and socially sustainable. Please encourage any suitable candidates to apply.

118. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: What steps are being taken to ensure that the Listed Places of Worship Grants Scheme continues beyond 2020? Is the scheme likely to be affected by any post-Brexit transition arrangements?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The Church Buildings Council is working with all three Church Estates Commissioners, and the Historic Religious Buildings Alliance, as well as with DCMS officials, to evaluate the value of the LPOW scheme to churches and their communities, and work for its continuation. The next opportunity to have discussions with Government on this important issue will be when a Comprehensive Spending Review is announced. No date is yet set for this. VAT levels are currently governed by EU law. If the UK leaves the EU then, at some point, it will be part of the legislative agenda to re-evaluate current valuations. We will be alert to any such opportunity and represent the importance of a low or zero rate on repairs and restoration of historic buildings.

119. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: What is the estimated annual total cost to parishes of Insurance Premium Tax, and what is being done both to explain to Government how this tax impacts PCCs, and to seek the removal of this financial burden on churches?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The estimated cost is £5.1 million per year. The National Church Institutions opposed the introduction of the

increased rate in 2017, on the basis that since 2014 the tax will have been doubled and this is a disincentive to properly insure and care for buildings. Our suggestion was a charity exemption, as provided for under the 1994 Finance Act. The Charity Finance Group (of which the Church of England is a member) wrote to the Chancellor on this in 2017 but did not receive a reply. Exemption would cost the Treasury approximately £50 million. The Church Buildings Council is including the costs of IPT in its work with Government on possible future funding partnerships. It is separate to the issues of the Listed Places of Worship grant scheme, as IPT applies to all churches, whether listed or not. We remain certain that a charity exemption is the best solution.

120. *Canon Peter Adams (St Albans)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Recent reports are that the Heritage Lottery Fund are beginning to ask for naming rights associated with their grants, so for example “the National Lottery Wing” at an art museum. They are also exploring the sale of lottery tickets at funded venues. Given that many churches still face considerable moral questions around application for Heritage Lottery grants, and what can appear almost a stranglehold on the heritage funding sector by the HLF, what opportunity has the Church Buildings Council had for representation of the Church of England’s views on this issue? If not, will they consider making known the considerable problems this will cause to churches around the nation?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: I am not aware of any church being required to name part of the building after the National Lottery, nor being required to sell lottery tickets. If you know an example, please let me know as these are

not appropriate ways to acknowledge Lottery funding in churches. The HLF (now the National Lottery Heritage Fund) has given generous support to churches and cathedrals over 25 years. The Council has regular conversation with Lottery officials and with the government department responsible for it (DCMS) about priorities for Lottery funding. We particularly stress the importance of supporting volunteers running Church projects through training and simple application processes. We will monitor the new NLHF five-year strategic plan and work to help churches get grants. The Council is working with Government and other funders to try to increase options for funding for church buildings, including through the Taylor Review pilots in Suffolk and Manchester.

The Chair: I am afraid that brings us now to our allotted hour.

Mr Carl Fender: Point of order, Chair, very briefly. I have the Standing Orders in front of me here which have been reissued in this session. I am looking at Standing Order 116. I do not know if this is an appropriate question to be answered by you, Chair, but I note that the Business Committee, and I am reading directly from it, “must allocate in the agenda for a group of sessions one or more periods for time for answering supplementary questions”. I am mindful that one-third of the questions have not been reached. I am therefore asking if some additional time later in the week could be found for supplementary questions to those questions which have not been reached by now.

The Chair: I am afraid, Mr Fender, I am merely the Chair of this item. It sounds to me as

if your question is one for the Chair of the Business Committee. She will no doubt have heard it but you will also see that we have a very full agenda.

Thank you, members of Synod that brings us to the close of this item. Before we leave, may I thank the Community of St Anselm for their praying presence in the chamber today. We now move directly to our evening worship which will be led by the Archdeacon of Halifax.

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

**Full Synod: Second Day
Thursday 21 February 2019
HOLY COMMUNION**

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 10.30 am.

The Chair: Good morning members of Synod. First of all, I call on the Chair of the Business Committee, Canon Sue Booy, to make some announcements.

Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you very much, Chair. I declare that I am in headmistress-y mode. Beware! It was drawn to my attention by a number of people yesterday evening that I had not reminded you in the way that I sometimes do, as Synod opened, of the Code of Conduct. I wrote to you in December 2017, and I do often refer to the aspects of this in my speech, but could I just remind you about declarations of interest.

Our Code of Conduct, as well as commenting on financial interests, says that, "Personal non-financial interests as well as financial interests, including those which arise from membership of or holding office in the church and other bodies, such as acting as a trustee or officeholder of any organisation whose affairs are likely to be affected by the decisions of Synod, are asked to declare that interest when they stand to speak". And could I encourage you to remember to do that. It would be enormously helpful. The

reason for it is that people are able to put your comments and questions in context if they do not know you.

It has also been drawn to my attention that a large number of bags are being left on chairs when people just nip out for a cup of coffee. I am asked to remind you that for reasons of security this is not helpful, and also to remind you that Synod staff are likely to remove said bags and then you will have to go on a long hunt for them. It is in everyone's interest, please, if you could take your bags with you.

Notice Paper III on security is on the Synod app, and the Code of Conduct will appear there shortly. Speaking of the Synod app, could I just point out that it is currently not able to receive requests to speak. The Synod app is currently not able to do that. We are very hopeful that that will not be the case in July and we will have been able to update that, but for this Synod, I am afraid the pieces of paper are what you need. Thank you very much, Chair.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
ITEM 500
AMENDING CANON NO. 38 (GS 2047D)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Chair of the Business Committee. We come to Item 500, Amending Canon No. 38 GS 2047D, which is Article 7 business. Amending Canon No. 38 received final approval from the Synod at the July 2018 group of sessions and I have to report to this Synod that Royal Assent and Licence has been given in respect of

the Amending Canon. Under Standing Order 68, once the Instrument of Enactment for the Canon has been read to the Synod, the motion appearing on the Order Paper must be put to Synod and voted on without debate. I call upon the Registrar to read the Instrument of Enactment.

The Registrar: “Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, maturely treated upon by the Archbishops, Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the General Synod of the Church of England, in their Synod begun at Westminster in the year of our Lord 2015 and in the 64th year of the reign of our sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of her other realms and territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith, being a Canon entitled, Amending Canon No. 38, which received Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence on the 11th day of February 2019.

“We, being the Presidents, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Prolocutor of the Convocation of York, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity of the said Synod, do hereby declare and testify our consent to the said Canon entitled, Amending Canon No. 38. And in testimony of such our consent, we have hereto subscribed our names as hereafter follows, dated this 21st day of February, in the year of our Lord 2019 and in the 68th year of the reign of our sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II.”

The Chair: Registrar, thank you very much. I therefore move Item 500, “That the Canon entitled, ‘Amending Canon No. 38’ be made, promulgated and executed”. I am going to put this now to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is unanimously carried. I now therefore sign the Instrument of Enactment, after which it will be signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the prolocutors and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity. The Canon will now be sent for proclamation in the diocesan synods in the usual way. That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith* took the Chair at 10.39 am

The Chair: Good morning. Members of Synod, we come now to the Final Drafting stage of the Draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure. Members will need the draft Measure GS 2046BB and the Report of the Steering Committee, GS 2046ZZ and 2047ZZ. I think it is entirely coincidental the number of Zs associated with this piece of business. I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 501, “That the Synod do take note of this Report”. Archdeacon, you have up to ten minutes.

ITEM 501

DRAFT CHURCH REPRESENTATION AND MINISTERS MEASURE (GS2046BB)

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you Chair. A Steering Committee considering the final drafting of a measure usually deals with its business by correspondence and does not need to meet. Most unusually, the Steering Committee for the Church Representation and Ministers Measure's work attracted considerable attention from Synod members, causing us to meet twice - it was nothing but a pleasure - and to attend to a large postbag. Thanks are, therefore, all the more due to Legislative Counsel, to the Synod's Deputy Legal Adviser and to the entire legal team and their GDPR colleagues for their endurance in dealing with what has sometimes seemed a measureless Measure.

I will give Synod an overview of the Measure at Final Approval stage in a few moments time. But now, and in the light of the interest I have described, I intend to say rather more than is usual when moving a report of a Steering Committee on final drafting. We are very grateful to those of you who took the trouble to write with suggestions and questions. Some of the points for which we have made drafting amendments were identified as a result of your correspondence.

We have, however, had to disappoint some of those who wrote. Some correspondents sought to reopen issues that had been decided by the whole Synod at the Revision stage last July. Synod Standing Orders are quite clear that a steering committee is not at liberty to revisit such matters at Final Drafting. One provision exercising some members was

that contained in Part 9 of the new Church Representation Rules to limit elected lay members of deanery synods to two successive terms of office unless the annual parochial church meeting votes to disapply that rule.

I am aware that some concern remains about that provision. It may therefore be helpful if I remind Synod of its legislative history. The subject of limiting successive terms of office for elected lay members of deanery synod came up during the Revision Committee's consideration of the Measure in the autumn of 2017. The Revision Committee received a submission from my Southwark colleague, Mr Adrian Greenwood, proposing that the APCM should be able to impose a limit on the number of successive terms of elected lay deanery synod members. Mr Greenwood helpfully came and addressed the Revision Committee on his proposal and on a number of others he had made, and I should say that his proposal and that which is in the Measure before you is for successive terms; it is not two in the course of your life.

The Revision Committee thought that there was merit in Mr Greenwood's proposal. Creating vacancies, we thought, could encourage new members of the laity with new energy and insights to bring to the church. So far were we from desiring to reduce lay involvement that we were actually trying to bring more lay people into the life of the Church. The Committee, which is of course made up of lay and ordained members, was therefore persuaded that there ought to be provision for some form of limit on the number of successive terms that could be served as an elected member of the deanery synod.

But the Committee hesitated to recommend a positively imposed limit, not desiring to place APCMs in the position of seemingly taking action against sitting members of deanery synods. The Revision Committee also thought that the position would be much more straightforward procedurally if it worked in the same way as term limits for churchwardens, a six-year term limit being the default position, which can be disapplied by a parish if it so wishes. This is a procedure with which parishes are now very familiar.

The Revision Committee accordingly made an amendment to the Measure limiting elected lay members of deanery synods to two consecutive three-year terms. I would remind Synod that members were provided with the opportunity to revisit the Revision Committee's decision last July, when Mr Clive Scowen moved an amendment at the Revision stage to remove the provision. That amendment was debated but Synod voted against the amendment.

The whole Synod, therefore, took a clear decision to retain this provision for term limits as part of the new Church Representation Rules. And, as I have said, that decision cannot be reopened in the remaining stages of this Measure. There are, however, two remaining points to be made.

Firstly, no one will be affected by the two-term limit until the deanery synod elections that are due to be held in 2026, so in seven years' time. If members remain concerned after today, Synod has ample time to take steps to amend the Church Representation Rules as they currently are before you after the Measure is enacted. Secondly, that amendment

can be achieved by various means, including, for example, via reference to the Elections Review Group and by a Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, which would require a simple majority.

Permit me now to address some other points that the Steering Committee has itself addressed in considering the Final Drafting of the Measure. Throughout the progress of the Measure, we have tried to make it as easy as possible for parishes to comply with data protection legislation when operating the Church Representation Rules. At an early stage, we took the view that it would be too burdensome if parishes had to rely on consent in order to process electoral roll and other data under the rules. The Revision Committee's Report last July explained the basis on which electoral roll data could be lawfully processed without needing consent from each data subject, and that was welcomed by Synod.

A point that subsequently came to our attention related to the requirement for church electoral rolls to be published and to be available for inspection. This raised different issues from those which we had previously considered, because publication and rights of inspection will result in special category personal data being disclosed beyond the membership of the Church of England. We would have been very reluctant to abandon the longstanding practice of publishing church electoral rolls. Declaring oneself a member of the Church of England and being a member of an electoral roll should not be a secret. We were, therefore, pleased to receive legal advice that there was a lawful basis on which electoral rolls could continue to be published and made available for inspection without

burdening parishes with having to deal with the complex consent provisions in the data protection legislation, and we have explained this in the body of our Report.

Other points with which we had to deal included consequential amendments to the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 to take account of the replacement of team and group councils and joint parochial church councils with the new style joint councils provided for in the Church Representation Rules. Again, this is explained in the body of our Report, where members will see that we opted for the simplest approach to dealing with this.

Annex A of the Report explains the drafting amendments that we propose and which are shown in bold type in the new Measure as you have it set before you, Draft GS 2046BB. Annex B sets out and provides explanations of the special amendments that we are proposing and which Synod will be asked to approve in a moment. Most of these are concerned with ensuring that the new Church Representation Rules make full provision for the use of an online system of voting for elections to the General Synod next year.

I am very grateful to you, Synod, for bearing with me in this unusually long speech at this stage, and I now move that Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: Item 501 is now open for debate. Mr Hind followed by Mr Greenwood.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): Chair, I thank the Archdeacon for her attempted words of comfort for those who are upset by the restriction of terms of service for lay representatives on deanery synod. We need to ensure that it is reversed at the earliest possible time. A short distance away there is a legislature that is heading towards a precipice. They say that the law of unintended consequences is the only law they have never repealed. Please, Synod, help me to reduce the impact of the law of unintended consequences from this Report.

I have been involved in church politics since 1976 and recognise that it is now time for me to begin to disengage. Having served in General Synod since 1995, including holding the office of Vice-Chair of the Church of England Pensions Board and Vic- Chair of the House of Laity, I am now planning my exit at the end of the quinquennium. I guess that then I will be like Naphtali, a hind let loose.

Someone once said that visitors to His house, everyone who visited brought joy. Some on arrival and the rest on leaving. I hope I will therefore be seen as having brought joy to the Synod. My ability to function in all the things I have done has been possible because I have been encouraged at different times to take next steps. I had no idea what I was letting myself in for when I first stood for deanery synod. I learnt on the job. I was told then that the ideal would be to spend a term of office to learn, a term of office to do, and a term of office to find a successor.

But what if, like me, you get elected as a lay chair of your deanery after three years? I was 34 at the time. Here it is unlikely that one can be fully competent by the end of six years in office. Some might not be ready to be lay dean or lay chair after only three years; what a loss. Think about it. Most of us laity would not be here if this rule was in place and had been enforced. There are further issues.

Many rural parishes struggle to get people to stand for office of any sort. It is rare that we have a queue of applicants for deanery synod. We do not need barriers to be overcome by disapplication. The default position should not be that there is a difference in treatment between lay and ordained members of Synod. Raising leadership in Synod is difficult.

If a new lay chair or dean has only three years' membership, and can only serve for those three years, we have significant issues regarding succession planning, additional training by rural area deans as they cope with inducting new lay colleagues every three years. Deanery is the electoral college for Diocesan and General Synod. We need to have a reasonable percentage of members with a memory of the issues and how things work.

Disapplication was indeed the mechanism used in the Churchwardens Measure and, anecdotally, is honoured more in the breach than the observance. As I believe most rural parishes will need to disapply, it will mean an increased likelihood of churches acting technically illegally.

Possible avoidance techniques would be encouraged, which might include the rise of professional Synod people who would opt for election to diocesan/General Synod, therefore be on deanery synod *ex officio* and so avoid the rule which disallows them to stand. Please, Synod, think again.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I stand here before you, ladies and gentlemen, because, as Jane has eloquently recorded to you, I am the reason why we are having this little discussion about a very technical point about term limits for lay people on deanery synod. I will defer my main comment to the Final Approval debate but I just wanted to reflect on a couple of things as a result of this process.

The first thing to say is I can assure you absolutely that Jane and I are in very good standing and had a very good meeting on Monday afternoon, and this is not at all a spat with Southwark or anything personal. I had been asked by the Bishop of Southwark to work with him on one of his three charges, breathing new life into deaneries, and I did that by chairing two working groups over six years and I feel that we are making some progress with that. I just want to plug that one of the things we did produce in 2017 was a completely new set of Model Rules for Deanery Synods, which replaced the totally antiquated ones from 1995. I think we are willing, in Southwark, to supply them on fairly favourable terms if other people would be interested.

Before you ask, in that revision of the Model Rules for Deanery Synods, we said nothing about the number of terms for membership by lay people, except we put in an

encouragement that after three terms - nine years - they might think about passing the baton on to somebody else. We did put, in terms, in the rules, that officers, lay chairs, treasurers and secretaries and members of standing committees would stand down from that office after three terms of three years, so nine years, so we did put the limit in for officers.

Going back to the salutary lessons that this whole experience has brought for me, the concern is obviously that having put in a suggestion that this matter be put into the hands of annual parochial church meetings - and they have a similar power for limiting the number of terms of PCC members - I was dismayed when it came back as a top down proposal with the number of two terms inserted.

Jane has described the attempt by Clive Scowen in July to reverse this, and this is a salutary lesson, I think, for everybody, and I will touch on that in a moment. It went down, as you will know, it was not successful, and I then spent the last month or so mobilising the diocesan lay chairs of the country who have in turn been consulting with their deanery lay chairs, and I think you are going to hear a lot about that in the Final Approval debate.

So, three thoughts about this whole process. The first thing is that a Revision Committee on the whole responds to submissions that come from members or from themselves. It is clear from the answer to John Wilson's question, 110, that if they had looked at what this Synod had discussed when it last discussed the issue of terms, which was 2003, that actually there was no clear mandate from within this body as to what the answer should

be. Possibly there is a lesson there for the Revision Committee and how they do their work.

Secondly, the language of the Order Paper. When Clive's amendment went down, it was written in terms of deleting clause M6, 5 and 6. That does not mean anything to anybody. It was a very hot day, very few people were in the chamber and I do not think you knew what you were being asked to vote on, so I think we will look at that. And I do think, perhaps, we need to look at Standing Order 61, where a mistake, in my view, has been made. Could we find a way in which the Steering Committee is allowed to have a look at that again?

You will hear more from me later, but those are three observations. Particularly, Synod members, it does underline the importance that there is on taking our legislative role really seriously.

The Chair: I am sure that Canon Greenwood did not intend to suggest that Synod does not know what it is doing. After Mrs Mclsaac ---

Mrs Debrah Mclsaac (Salisbury): I believe I stood too soon.

The Chair: So you do not wish to speak. Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak at this stage?

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): I speak as diocesan lay Chair of Winchester, one of those mobilised by Adrian. There is much good in this legislation and I particularly look forward to the electronic voting in the next General Synod elections, so I will be voting in favour of this.

But I want to speak again about Part 9 of this legislation and particularly to support the lay members of deanery synods. Deanery synods, in my view, are really the engine room of the Church. We have already talked much, Synod, about the need for culture change, the need for new and younger people, and the reality of change and how we do things differently is very often realised in our deanery synods. We need good lay leaders to play a full role in deaneries. The reality is that it is not always laity who block changes and that in the same way that my friend yesterday suggested we will not change the make-up of this Synod by changing dates, I do not believe we will change the culture of deanery synods by limiting the term of office of lay members alone.

I want to tell you a story about a particularly difficult deanery synod that I was part of where a group of young lay leaders came and they formed a team who go into schools to do assemblies. They came as the assembly team to deanery synod to share the work that they were doing. They go into 22 primary schools around Winchester. It was very energetic. We all had to sing an action song. Not everybody enjoyed that but they did it anyway. It was very memorable.

Then they asked the deanery would they be prepared to support the work that they were doing and could we make this a deanery-wide initiative, so rather than just being from one parish church it would become a deanery schools team. This was blocked, not by the laity but by two members of clergy who did not want this school assembly team to come into the churches in their parish. You can see that in that very difficult situation we needed wisdom, we needed relationships and we needed people who had been there for more than six years.

For that reason, I have great concern about this. I have consulted with the 13 deanery lay chairs of Winchester Diocese and they have raised similar concerns to those raised by Tim Hind, so I am not going to repeat all those again.

I will vote for this legislation but I really ask that we look at other options to review this section, because I do believe that we need to think about how we support and develop lay leaders in deanery synods, not just to limit them. We also need to look at ways in which we can bring in new and younger people and encourage them.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I hope to say something on this issue that is just being talked about with regard to deanery synod membership when we debate the Final Approval. At this point I simply want to record some disquiet, as I have done before, at the use of drafting amendments to make wholesale changes to legislation which Synod can neither debate nor vote on. Paragraphs 18 to 26 of the Steering Committee's Report explain that a change made by the Revision Committee to the original draft Measure, which was not

challenged at the Revision stage, is now being reversed by drafting amendments, so that it will no longer be possible for pastoral schemes to make provision for the establishment of team and group councils and joint PCCs.

Now, a good case for this change has been made and, if we had been given the opportunity, most of us would no doubt have voted for those changes. But, because these amendments are drafting amendments, they are a fait accompli, and if we did not like them our only option would have been to vote against the whole Measure. I believe that however technically proper these amendments are, as a matter of policy drafting amendments should not be used for such a purpose.

I would urge that future Steering Committees and future chairs of Steering Committees, in particular, to be astute to ensure that substantive changes to legislation, which may need to be made at Final Drafting, are made by special amendment which this Synod can then debate and vote upon. It is too late for this occasion but I hope that practice will change in the future.

The Chair: After Canon Adams, Mrs Walker, at which point, beginning with Mrs Walker's speech, the speech limit is three minutes.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Synod, I have the privilege to be lay co-chair of Luton Deanery and recently to be elected lay co-chair of the St Albans diocese. Like my colleagues who have spoken previously, I welcome the majority of the Measure in

question. However, I, and at least 14 chairs of the 20 deaneries in our diocese, are deeply concerned at the impact of limiting the term of representation on deanery synods.

We welcome the intent of the move to revitalise deaneries, which are so often the Cinderella amongst us, yet I suggest in doing so we will most likely weaken deanery synods and the structures they support at that level and, thus, actually weaken the electoral base of the General Synod.

In Luton Deanery, and in many deaneries across our diocese, we may have a few embedded members, but by and large our problem is unfilled spaces. I spent 24 hours last week with my fellow deanery lay chairs and rural/area deans along with our Bishops and senior staff. Under the leadership of our Bishop Alan we are being asked, as deaneries, to provide together a significant level of missional leadership at a deanery level.

In my own deanery of Luton, our churches have a real need of such leadership. A visionary area dean began that process for us eight years ago and what had been a divided deanery is now mostly united in mission across our geography, across our churchmanship and our personal differences. For most, to provide the sort of leadership we are asking of members of our Synod in mission action planning, on Standing Committees, on the Mission and Pastoral Committee, wherever leadership forms best, in most of our deaneries that needs time and experience. To limit that would effectively, to be honest, be an act of self-harm.

I humbly submit the sort of renewal our deaneries need would not be based on limiting terms of membership, but in reimagining the role of the deanery in mission when deaneries become the place to belong because that is where things happen, election to membership of a veteran member “because we always have” will no longer work. Election of someone because they represent a faction will not stand in the face of a candidate who seeks to bring their gifts to the mission of the area.

It seems to me the reality is that deanery synods viewed at the governance level have relatively little role, serving in most cases as a sounding board, a communication point and, frankly, as I have said, the electoral body of diocesan and General Synods. It is really no wonder it is a Cinderella. It is at a missional level, in many cases, subgroups of it are best imagined. I hope at some point in this place we can return to that subject, to reconsider how we can reform our deaneries so they best fit that purpose to reimagine mission at that level. However, for now can I ask that we leave membership as it is. I accept we need to vote this measure through but we must revise it, disapply it, or whatever our Standing Orders allow, as soon as possible. Thank you.

The Chair: After Mrs Walker, the gentleman who is standing over here. I am afraid, sir, you are slightly obscured in my sight by the floodlight and the vision glorious that is the Vice-Chair of the House of Laity.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Debra Walker (Liverpool): I am lay chair for Liverpool Diocese and really wanted to add my support to words that have already been spoken about concerns of limiting the period of time a lay person can serve on a deanery synod. We already have difficulties in filling vacancies and this rule would limit the opportunity for new members to gain the necessary experience to confidently contribute to debates and put themselves forward for positions of leadership.

I also note that dioceses use their deanery synods in different ways. In Liverpool, our deanery synods are beginning to take much broader missional and financial management roles. This changing landscape requires people with appropriate skills, including strategists and those with experience as well as new faces amongst their members.

The general feeling amongst the deanery lay chairs is that each deanery is different and it would be better to have local rules to apply to enable individual deaneries to react to whatever situation they find themselves in. Perhaps the use of co-option for young people or new faces onto the synod and, indeed, should any young person or any other parishioner wish to serve on deanery synod, then elections should be actively encouraged. So I propose and plead that we do look to find a new way of looking at this rule, discussing it further and finding a way forward. Thank you.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I speak as the Chair of the House of the Laity for Truro Diocese and as a former deanery lay chair. I am very concerned with this proposal for a six-year

limit of the membership of deanery synods. I said this in York when we last considered it. Amongst many of the reasons which others have identified, I would just like to mention a small number of them.

We must remember that the role of deanery synods is crucial in our electoral process and it is in everybody's interests that we have an experienced and informed electorate. This proposal would mean that deanery synod members would probably only ever see one such election to this body. PCCs and deanery synods are not only part of the governance but are the means by which much of our Church actually happens.

Doing that needs not only freshness but experience, and experience is not readily achieved but is quickly lost. If the principle is good for churchwardens and deanery synods, then it surely should apply generally and - of interest to people here - to this body. Just how much in-depth knowledge and experience would be lost to this body if members were never here for more than six years. I certainly know, as a first-term member, that even after four years, I am very much at the start of a learning process.

Finally, we should recall the role of deanery plans, the possibility of which is now enshrined in our rules. Developing those deanery plans very much needs a lot of experience, a lot of knowledge in depth of the relationships which exist between parishes and between benefices in our deaneries. Particularly in rural areas, this is not always easy to discern. If there is a pool of talent waiting to come forward for deanery synods,

then most of us in rural dioceses would be highly delighted, but all too often we struggle to retain the good that we have.

I am delighted that a way forward is possible, particularly as a result of the enormous work that has been done by Adrian Greenwood in lobbying on this matter, along with others, and I trust that within the next six years we will find a better approach, not only to deanery synods but to all of our synodical structures which balances the competing aims of using experience and enabling new ideas to come forward. We desperately need both.

Revd Canon Sue Booys (Oxford): Synod, I am not standing to express a view about this matter, but rather in my usual spirit of helpfulness and in the hope of calming some of the fears that I have heard expressed. In doing so, I want to thank Mr Greenwood and Archdeacon Steen for the co-operation that has led to this intervention. I am intervening simply to offer my assurance in relation to a comment made by the Archdeacon. It is open to me, as Chair of the Business Committee, to direct that this vexed matter of the term of office on deanery synods is referred to the Elections Review Group of the Business Committee. I am standing simply to let you know, friends, that in the event, as I really hope, that this Measure passes, that is exactly what I plan to do. Thank you.

The Chair: Could I just observe, Synod, that we have heard a lot about deanery synod membership today. I am sure members of deanery synod will be delighted to know that we are taking them so seriously. I would be especially interested to hear if anyone has any points on any other aspect of the business before us.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): I should declare an interest that I am a member of the National Deaneries Network. Sorry to disappoint you, Chair, but this is also about deanery synods. First of all, I would like to say thank you to the Steering Committee for the enormous amount of work which has gone into this. There is an awful lot of really good stuff in this. We have already heard that there are serious concerns, which I share as Chair of the House of Laity for the Lichfield Diocese. This is to do with Rule M6, clause 5, this bit about restricting consecutive terms.

Back in December, I did a survey of the 28 deaneries in Lichfield and all reported very serious concerns about this two-term restriction; most saying that over 60% of their deanery synod reps would have to stand down. Some 93% reported that they had synod members who had served more than two terms of office. These deaneries said that 52% of their members had an excess of two terms and one had 99% of its members who had served two terms, so I dread to think what would happen if they all had to stand down.

All said they would struggle to fill many of the places on their deanery synod. Many would lose the skills, knowledge and expertise that their deanery officers had gained that the extended length of service brings. Indeed, the deanery would be poorer for the loss of this experience. This is echoed, as Adrian pointed out, in the answer to my question 109 when it was considered some time ago. The Revision Committee at that time said it found there were strong arguments against, including an impact on experience and vacancies not being filled, depriving electors of choice and altering the balance between Houses.

But, more importantly for me, is the unintended consequences that this particular clause will actually bring. Two years ago, Mark Russell presented to us the report on lay leadership which has become known as *Setting God's People Free*. As well as all the concerns that my deanery lay chairs have raised, the biggest one was about the impact of *Setting God's People Free* and that is what this clause will have. What it is actually saying is that lay members are not the same as clergy members. A clergy member can serve on deanery synod, is unelected and can serve for as long as they are licensed within that deanery, so there is a huge difference.

So there are some good bits in this and the dilemma we have is how do we get the good bits without this bit. We have heard from the Chair of the Business Committee - and thank you for your assurances - that we can actually get this through and have the revision later, but I would ask you, Synod, to think seriously about how we actually do this and if you feel you cannot support it, to abstain.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): This will still be about extended terms of service. I speak as someone who believes in deaneries. I regularly attend the National Deaneries Conference that John referred to. I want to take a slightly more positive view than those that have been expressed because, after all is said and done, the disapply rule is still going to apply. I speak as a former deanery lay chair and one of a rural deanery. We have 18 on our electoral roll, so I do know some of the issues.

Tim Hind referred to the length of time it takes to learn to do the job to fulfil the role. Well, to be honest, listening to that made me think if it takes that long to learn it then I really think the role needs to be reviewed. There are certain things in rural communities, in particular, which are changing. There is an influx of people with different skills coming into them and the one sure way of not getting any new people on is to keep standing for election. When you have vacancies, you may have vacancies for a while, but eventually things will happen and people will come. I know that from my own experience. I would ask you to take a slightly more positive and optimistic view of this and realise that there may be some very good unintended consequences as a result of it. Thank you.

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

The Chair: I think you could very much tempt me. Thank you.

Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter): This is not about deanery synods. I declare an interest; I have to write a parish magazine article by Sunday and it is time to write a new electoral roll. I think I tried to speak on this in July but did not get called. I do not know what it means to be a member of the Church of England. I am pretty sure I am one, but I am not quite sure what the rules are. I read the three clauses in the Church Representation Rules and I am confused.

I woke up this morning with the tune of “Glorious things of old are spoken” running through my head: “Saviour, if of Zion’s city, I, through grace, a member am”, and that assures me that by the grace of God and by faith and continual repentance I am a member of the Church of Christ, but who is a member of the Church of England? It is broad and it is confusing. I read a very helpful blog by Dr Ian Paul written a couple of years ago. And then I discovered a piece: at the request of the Church of Assembly of 1954, the Archbishops, Geoffrey Fisher and Cyril Garbett, produced a short guide to the duties of Church membership. In my congregation we have various people who would not call themselves Anglican. I am not quite sure what it means to be a member, but they want to be with us and I want to encourage them to sign up to the electoral roll. So could I call on perhaps the Committee or perhaps their Graces to renew a short guide to the duties of church membership, showing that although we want to welcome everyone, what does it mean to be a member and can we encourage people to engage, but even at a more basic level of belonging to our churches as members.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on Item 501.

The Chair: Mr Freeman has proposed a motion for closure on Item 501. That has my consent.

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

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. I now ask the Archdeacon to reply to the debate. She has five minutes.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you, Chair. Permit me to address your many speeches in reverse order, beginning with Mr Hamilton's question. You are a member of the Church of England if you say you are. It is as simple as that. This matter was considered in some considerable depth by the Revision Committee and I refer members to our report which came with your papers for the July Synod.

Glorious things are spoken of the Lord indeed. Mrs Foreman, thank you so much for your positive view of the idea that term limits to successive elected terms may actually be a way to bring new members into speaking of the glory of the Lord and even into the Church of England. That is what we had hoped and we were a very hopeful Committee. These rules are legislating for what we believe to be the future of our Church. In God's hands we believe this will be a wonderful future. It is God's Church. There are always difficulties. The Lord always tests us and the Lord is always faithful. So thank you so much for reminding us that, yes, there may be vacancies but the Lord does send us new people if only we give them, and the Lord, the opportunity.

Now I come to the concerns. Mr Wilson mentioned that 90% of the people he discussed this with would have served more than two terms and so would have to stand down. Actually, no, they would not, because if we do not amend this rule, the whole thing does not kick in until 2016. So no terms currently served count; we start again in 2026.

Canon Booy, thank you so much for your very helpful assurance that you will refer this to the Elections Review Group. Mr Todd, you spoke of a six-year limit for membership, but may I remind Synod that this is only a matter of successive terms, it is not a life sentence. Secondly, APCMs, you can disapply this and then reapply it if you want to. So own your strength. You are not simply the victim of an imposed top-down rule.

Mr Walker wondered whether a time limit would help and Mrs Foreman suggested, "Well, you never know, maybe it would." Mr Adams and others spoke of the problem of unfilled spaces and, yes, I do take the point, particularly in the rural church, but again I refer you to Mrs Foreman's experience of that.

Mr Scowen, your point is a slightly different one about whether we have used drafting amendments to make wholesale, if you like, special amendment changes. May I say two things on that? First, it is a sad fact of life but lawyers will differ. We did take legal advice on this and legislative counsel was helpful and considered, but felt that we could make, as drafting amendments, the amendments that we have made as such. Secondly, members will be familiar with Standing Order 61(7) where if you have a concern that a drafting amendment is being used to slide through what should be a special amendment, you may refer that to the Steering Committee who will then take it away and consider it and would even come back within the same session. So it is not quite as closed, Mr Scowen, as you might have thought.

Mrs Coulter spoke positively and, again, thank you so much for a positive comment, on electronic voting. I do entirely sympathise with the business of things being blocked by the clergy. I am sorry about the clergy; we all are often. Let us face it, we are sometimes sorry about the laity as well. But, seriously, I am very, very sorry about that. It is true, as another speaker said, that lay and clergy are treated differently but the House of Laity is elected and the House of Clergy is not, and there we go. If we look at limiting terms generally, that is a whole different question, particularly to this body.

Might I finally say, particularly to you, Mr Hind, that it is not for the end of your life, you can have successive terms; it is not a restriction forever. Thank you for recognising that there are times when you must disengage. It is not necessary to be on deanery synod to be elected to General Synod. We are not disenfranchising people from the General Synod.

Adrian, finally, I am sorry we did not think about all this earlier but, yes, we remain friends.
Synod and Chair, thank you

The Chair: Thank you, Archdeacon, I now put Item 501 to the vote. Point of order. I heard Mr Hind first.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): I call for a vote by Houses.

The Chair: Mr Hind has requested a vote by Houses. If there are 25 members standing, we can have a vote by Houses. There are not 25 members standing, so I put Item 501 to the vote.

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

The Chair: We come now to the special amendments. There are a number of special amendments proposed by the Steering Committee. They are set out in the Order Paper at Items 509, 510 and 511. Members will have noticed that Item 510 covers some 20 special amendments, all of which are concerned with making provision for the use of electronic systems of voting in elections to the House of Laity. Unless any member indicates now that she or he wishes to speak against a particular amendment in that group, I intend to take them en bloc. Thank you, so those will be taken en bloc. I now call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 509.

ITEM 509

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): The first special amendment amends section 7 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969. That section provides for the making of amendments to the Church Representation Rules by secondary legislation, in other words, without the need for an Amending Measure. A shortcoming of the provision as it currently stands is that it does not provide for the making of consequential amendments to other related legislation when the Church Representation Rules are amended. That

was one of the reasons why this exercise through which we are currently going in relation to the rules had to be carried out by Measure rather than by using secondary legislation. This special amendment will simply ensure that in future any secondary legislation amending the rules can also make the necessary consequential amendments to other legislation.

The Chair: Item 509 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 509 to the vote.

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

The Chair: I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 510 en bloc.

ITEM 510

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Detailed explanations of the next 20 amendments are given on pages 15 and 16 of the Steering Committee's Report. In summary, the purpose of these amendments is to ensure that the rules fully accommodate the use of a system of electronic voting for elections to the House of Laity and, by extension, to diocesan synods. They are quite technical but, because they represent a policy departure from that which the rules previously took, we have brought them forward as special amendments rather than as drafting amendments.

The Chair: Item 510 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so I put Item 510 to the vote.

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

The Chair: I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 511.

ITEM 511

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): The final special amendment transfers from the bishop to the chancellor, from a cleric to a lay person dare I say (usually but not always) the function of determining whether a form that has been used on a particular occasion is substantially to the same effect as the relevant form specified in the rules. This is a function of a judicial nature with which it did not really seem appropriate or right to burden the bishops.

The Chair: Item 511 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so I put Item 511 to the vote.

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

ITEM 502

The Chair: That completes the Final Drafting stage and so we move now to the Final Approval stage for the draft Measure and I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 502: “That the Measure entitled ‘Church Representation and Ministers Measure’ be finally approved”. She may speak for up to ten minutes.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): It is now two years since the Measure, along with what is now Amending Canon 39, was introduced and received First Consideration. The Measure in its original form emerged from the second phase of the work carried out by the Simplification Task Group. That group, you will remember, was set up to bring forward proposals to remove constraints to the mission and growth of the Church of England resulting from existing legislation and process.

The Task Group identified the Church Representation Rules, which in some respects date back to 1919, as an area ripe for simplification. Members recommended three major ways in which the rules should be reformed. First, they needed to be made less burdensome in their operation for the clergy and the laity in the parishes. Unnecessary provisions needed to be identified and removed. Other provisions needed to be streamlined. Secondly, parishes should be given much greater flexibility over their constitutional arrangements so they could operate in the way most effective for their mission, life and work. Thirdly, administrative burdens for those involved in running multi-

parish benefices, especially in the rural context, needed to be radically reduced, with benefice-wide structures reducing the work associated with many individual PCCs. This Measure replaces the existing Church Representation Rules with a completely new set of rules. Many of the concepts remain familiar: church electoral rolls, annual meetings, PCCs, deanery synods and diocesan synods, but there are significant changes to the ways in which the rules are presented and to their substance.

The new rules have been completely redrafted and, again, we are very grateful to the legal team and to Legislative Counsel for their hard work. As a result of this redrafting, the rules are a great deal easier to understand. As I said, when we first came to this matter, they are in English. They are no longer characterised by overly long sentences. Provisions are broken down into easily digestible parts. All the provisions relating to parish governance are now contained in a self-contained part of the rules. This should make navigation around the rules much, much easier for those in parishes and others who need to refer to them.

In terms of substance, one of the most significant reforms is provided for in Part II. The default position for parish governance is that set out in the Model Rules in Part 9, which apply to each parish, but the annual meeting of any parish can make a scheme to amend, supplement or replacing those Model Rules. This makes it possible for a parish to make governance arrangements that are best suited to the mission and life of church in that parish. There are, of course, some significant safeguards: a small number of essential provisions will remain mandatory and a scheme for making rules for a parish will have to

be approved by the bishop's council of the diocese and the bishop's council must be satisfied, among other things, that the scheme makes provision for the due representation of the laity and assures effective governance of the parish.

Another major reform is the provision for joint councils. The existing Church Representation Rules do make provision for joint councils in multi-parish benefices and other special cases, but, under the existing rules, joint councils are in addition to the PCCs of individual parishes. They thus represent a further layer of synodical government and add to the number of meetings which have to be held. Under the new rules joint councils can replace individual PCCs. Where that happens, the number of local bodies and the number of meetings will be reduced, in some cases very significantly, and that should result in an equally significant reduction in the administrative burdens imposed both on clergy and laity, and again particularly in the rural church.

Additionally, various provisions of the current rules were thought to be unnecessary or unduly burdensome and they have been pruned away. Anomalies have been addressed and doubts as to meaning have been removed, although we left "membership" just as membership.

Since First Consideration in February 2017, the Measure has been considered and amended extensively in committee. 15 members and four non-members made a number of submissions to the Revision Committee, which met on eight occasions. Among many other things, the Revision Committee addressed compliance with data protection

legislation and electronic communication, simplified the provisions relating to electoral rolls, made provision for the better representation of mission initiatives in the Church's synodical structures, enabled PCCs to do business by correspondence, increased the flexibility of provision for joint councils, clarified safeguarding provisions and provided that lay members must form a majority on a PCC.

I should briefly mention clause 2 - briefly, I promise. This provides the statutory basis for the General Synod to make the provision contained in paragraph 4 of Amending Canon No. 39 to extend the range of situations in which a newly ordained deacon or priest can serve his or her title.

The whole Synod considered the Measure at the Revision stage last July when 14 amendments were tabled, four of which were carried. We have just completed the Final Drafting stage. The Measure has therefore been thoroughly considered and I am glad to say improved by the Synod and I am now very happy to commend it to you for Final Approval.

The Chair: Item 502 is now open for debate. May I remind members that motions for the closure, the speech limit or next business are not in order in this debate. Perhaps I should also point out that the Chair's ability to call members to order for what the Standing Orders refer to as "tedious repetition" is unaffected.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): This is a really good moment in the life of Synod. I remember walking into the Archbishop of Canterbury, metaphorically speaking, fairly early on in his time in Synod, where he was, also metaphorically speaking, about to slit his wrists because he had experienced the last time we had tried to debate the Church Representation Rules and he groaned and said, "Is it always like this?" Happily, this debate has not been "like this" and this process has not been "like this". I want to pay tribute to Jane Steen, the Steering Committee, the Revision Committee and all those who have supported them. This is a very good product of simplification. It has taken us through into a different way of doing Church legislation and I think the model it provides is something we need to look at for the future.

We had a committee meeting earlier on this week where we talked about how Church legislation might look ten years down the line. That is something that both Simon Butler and I are very committed to trying to think through more, because there is a model here that says you do not need to write all the technicalities in. I am so grateful that this is in simple language, that it gives alternatives, that it benefits the mission of the rural church: it does all the things we asked it to do. I am so glad also that some of the debate that has gone on, although there have been some interesting technicalities, and we kicked a hornets' nest when we raised the question of deanery synod terms - there is always something that sparks interest - but the fact is we are now in a situation where we have much better ways of doing these things and where we will have some Church Representation Rules that are useable and where, when you are trying to advise people

who ring you up and say, “What do I do about this?”, you can find the relevant section without being a total Synod geek.

I commend this process. I think it has real ramifications for the future in terms of how we do things. This is simplification that has gone really well. Thank you to all those who have been involved and thank you to Synod for taking the process seriously. Let us hope and pray we can do better things. I have got my eye on the Mission and Pastoral Measure as the next one. I commend this to Synod and ask that you vote overwhelmingly for Final Approval.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I wish to add my congratulations to the Steering Committee for working its way through the immense piece of work that this revision of the Church Representation Rules is. They are a veritable cornucopia of good sense and helpful simplifications which will make the life of our churches, particularly those in rural and multi-parish benefices such as mine, easier. At last we have provisions for electronic elections, making our democratic system streamlined, modern and easy to operate, and, hopefully, it will encourage far higher turnouts than the sometimes depressingly low percentages that we have at present. At last we will have clear and modern provisions in line with charity law, for electronic communications in PCCs and even electronic meetings, hugely simplifying minor parish issues when gathering people together over a distance can sometimes be tricky. Finally, after a long campaign, we will have benefice councils with legal personality, which means that the law will catch up with reality, in that teams and benefices, which often purport already to employ administrators and youth

workers, will now be able to do so legally. Parishes will be able to delegate functions to a central body in the benefice without jeopardising deeply held parochial identities.

In the contentious matter around deanery synod term limits, which in any case may be disapplied by an APC, let me add a piece of personal history which illustrates the need for them, I think. Perhaps I am part of the problem because over two incumbencies I have been a member of my deanery synod for 21 years. When I joined at the beginning of my first incumbency, I was still a bright young thing aged 32 and by far the youngest member of the meeting. 21 years on, I am still there, hair greying (but I definitely do not need glasses!), wearing reasonably well, I hope, but a couple of clergy colleagues aside, I am still the youngest member of the synod. The other members have aged with me and are some of the sweetest, nicest and kindest Christians you would want to know, but you should not underestimate the effect particularly in small rural communities of older members saying that they are “willing to stand if there’s nobody else”. In truth, nobody wants to feel that they are giving them the push and, in reality, they would probably be only too happy to have a way out. I appreciate I may not be popular in saying this but without some well-constructed term limit we are in danger in some places of creating ecclesiastical occasional day centres, full of lovely people who are not quite sure why they are there or who brought them.

Mrs Coulter in the previous item talked about deanery synods as an engine room of the Church, and they should be, but unless we address this hard issue we simply will not achieve this. Speakers have talked about the difference between lay and clergy lengths

of membership. Myself aside, I wonder whether those opposed to the deanery term limits are aware of the average length of an incumbency. I do not have the figures in front of me but I suspect you will find it is somewhere around eight or nine years. Six years may well be too short for reasons others have expressed but nine years, I am sure, would bring an equivalence with average clergy lengths of service and, again, do not forget the rules can be disapplied locally making local circumstances possible to bring into account. They may need some tweaking, not least for officers, and we should trust the Elections Review Group to bring those tweaks, but for the sake of the renewal of Church life please do not simply remove the clauses. Deaneries deserve the possibility of renewal.

Please vote for Final Approval. I am fully aware that for the reason we have been talking about the final version may not be perfect, but this Measure gives so much that is good that will benefit the life of the Church.

The Chair: Prebendary Cawdell, thank you for bringing the voice of youth from your deanery synod.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): I am the lay Chair of a deanery synod. I am not sure that matters so much except in relation to the points about deanery synods. I would like to urge you, Synod, to think very hard before you vote in favour of this. So much good work has been done, and it has been done well, but I suggest to you that this Measure is not fit for Final Approval. First of all, there is that practical consideration of perhaps finding a workaround to the deanery synod limitation on terms which so many people have

spoken about, but the workaround will be found by others and we cannot bind the future or what will happen. People also lose interest in issues of this kind.

Secondly, the deanery issue raises a different concern. There is a potential change of polity to the electorate for General Synod and our elections are coming up very shortly. The attitude gets fixed in one's mind as to what is going to happen and, in the longer term, unless this is corrected, there will be a change in the nature of the deanery synod make-up. That is inevitable and that is the intention.

The other proposals which are referred to which were brought to the Steering Group which they could not consider referred to "significant" policy considerations. We do not even know what they are. The Team and Group Ministries Measure - these are, it seems to me, some points of substance rather than merely process. We were told yesterday that it is important that we do the important work of legislating. We also need to do it thoroughly. I do not think it is satisfactory that we are going into something knowing that many members would wish for that to be changed almost immediately. That is not doing our job as well as we could and that is what we should be aiming for. Much as it is important that we get electronic elections and all these other things happening, it is also important that we hold ourselves to a certain standard, and I do not think we have met it yet.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): May I first, picking up the comments earlier this morning of the Chair of the Business Committee, declare an interest. I was a

member of the Revision Committee for this Measure. I am the lay Chair of my deanery synod. That of course, by virtue of my membership of this Synod, makes me an *ex officio* member of the deanery synod and therefore not affected by the proposed Rule M8(5) to (7). It is on that that I wish to address my remarks in urging Synod this morning to vote overwhelmingly to give Final Approval to this Measure. It is probably true that we had an unsatisfactory debate about Clive Scowen's amendment in July in York when he proposed to delete the equivalent provisions. They were numbered differently then. There was a motion for closure which probably, in hindsight, was premature and did not allow the various concerns that had been expressed in the debate on the report of the Steering Committee to be expressed back in July. Perhaps there were too many Zs on that occasion in the Synod chamber.

But there is, as is clear from the debate earlier this morning, considerable disquiet about these provisions. The law of unintended consequences has been mentioned and certainly some of the considerations that have been expressed this morning were not expressed certainly in quite so forceful and clear terms in July. The question, of course, is what can we do about it? The one thing we should not do is to vote down or to vote against the Final Approval of this Measure. This Measure with the replacement schedule to the 1969 Measure, bringing in a completely revised set of Church Representation Rules, is needed. This morning we have heard from the Bishop of Willesden, Pete Broadbent, why this is such a significant Measure and needs to be passed and be passed as soon as it can be.

Absent a snap general election this year, and I suppose we cannot guarantee that in view of the volatile nature of our current political position, this Measure, if given Final Approval this morning, will then move forward to the Legislative Committee stage and hopefully will get Royal Assent before the end of the year. If it does, it is going to be possible to bring it into force and the new rules into force on 1 January 2020 and I would like to see that that is the date that we should all be aiming for.

At this point, I would like to direct the attention of Synod members to clause 3(3) on page 1 of the final draft version of the Measure, which I hope we all have before us this morning. We have been concentrating, of course, up to now in looking at provisions in the Schedule, but clause 3 deals with short title, commencement and extent and sub-section 3(3) (or sub-clause 3 as it is at the moment) provides: "The preceding provisions of this Measure come into force on such day as the Archbishops of Canterbury and York may by order jointly appoint ...", and then these important words, "... and different days may be appointed for different purposes". Then there is also in sub-clause 4, what will be sub-section 4, "The Archbishops may by order joint make transitional, transitory or saving provision in connection with the commencement of the provision of this Measure". Of course, "provision of this Measure" includes individual rules in the schedule such as Rule M8(5) to (7).

What the Archbishops could do when they make a commencement Order, and, of course, you do not make a commencement Order until the actual Measure has been passed, is to exclude from initial commencement these controversial provisions. We know from

what has already been said this morning by Sue Booyes that she is willing to refer it to the Election Review Group to look at and then of course to bring back to Synod.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Lamming.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I am just wondering if I could conclude because I want to just explain how it is that then this can deal with this situation.

The Chair: I need to treat all members of the Synod equally. Thank you very much for your speech.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): I also welcome the Measure before us. There are many great things within it which will simplify the life of our parishes, our deaneries and our dioceses. There is, though, undoubtedly concern about this bit about imposing a two-term limit on parish representatives serving on deanery synods. It is a concern for myself. I consulted with the deanery lay Chairs in Lincoln Diocese and they were also of that opinion, for the reasons which have already been well-stated earlier on when we were considering the Steering Committee Report. I will not repeat what was said then. I think it is very important that we listen to our deanery lay chairs on this. They sometimes wonder what we do here and so we need to listen to what they say and make adequate response.

It is for that reason that I welcome the statement by the Chair of the Business Committee that she intends to refer the two-term limit for deanery synod members to the Elections

Review Group. Where I think David Lamming was going, I would urge their Graces to defer implementing the relevant parts of the Model Rules - M8(5) to (7) - pending the conclusions of that review. Yes, we have six years to do it, but sometimes we find that it takes us rather longer to do legislative change than we had hoped.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): I want to invite you, if I may, to reflect for a moment on what this Measure is trying to do. This is intimately connected with reform and renewal. We are presenting ourselves in this Measure as an institution as a whole ready and fit for purpose for the 21st century to proclaim the Gospel in a way which embraces everyone, young and old. We do so, in the context of what has proved to be the most controversial part of the Measure in relation to deanery synods, in a way which allows people to serve two terms - six years. Walk into the street if you would and ask someone in the street: "Do you think six years is a long enough period for someone to get used to what is going on and to know what they should be doing?" You will get a very clear answer. We present ourselves as old, dyed in the wool, stuck in our ways, when we resist Measures which provide the opportunity for but do not dictate that change has to take place.

The provisions here make it very clear that if someone wants to carry on after six years and everyone agrees that they should do so then they can do so, but what it does provide for is the opportunity for change. It presents the Church as an institution which does not sit in a rut but promotes itself as willing to change. We should think very, very carefully

about the extent to which we qualify that and very carefully about what it says about us as an institution when we say: “Oh no, no. Six years is not enough”.

I invite you to embrace this Measure in all its parts and in every way for all that it does to drag us into the 21st century, to present ourselves as fit for purpose and, most of all, to present ourselves as willing to change both in the way that we do things and in the people that we have involved. I ask you, please, in an unqualified way, to vote for this Measure and to see every part of it implemented.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I too want to welcome Canon Booy's decision to refer the question of deanery term limits to the Elections Review Group which I chair. I do not claim for the Elections Review Group any inherent wisdom greater than that of the Revision Committee or the Steering Committee, but what we do have is time for proper consultation which those Committees did not have.

I intend to propose to the Elections Review Group when it next meets that it consults on a range of options with diocesan and deanery lay chairs and area deans, who will hopefully consult their deanery synods, and also with the National Deaneries Network. The options would include: keeping the term limits as set out in the rules before us and for which Mr Kingston has just made a case; reversing the default so that there would be no term limit unless the APCM voted to impose one; increasing the number of consecutive terms which could be served; or giving deanery synods power to impose a term limit applying across their deanery. I dare say there may be others. If you have others that

you would like considered, please do write in for the attention of the Elections Review Group and we will consider them.

I would hope that we could complete this work in time to report on recommendations to the Business Committee no later than its meeting in March next year. I want to assure Synod, and especially Mrs Mclsaac, that the Elections Review Group will take this matter very seriously and will not lose interest.

I also want to say that I long for the day when deanery synods are such exciting places to be, that the mission of God and his Church is so much at the centre of what they are about, that people will be queuing up at our APCMs to serve on deanery synods. No question of term limits would ever be needed in those circumstances. I have to say to those who resist this proposed change that is before us most strongly that really, if you want your deaneries to thrive, culture really does need to be changed, and I do not personally think you achieve that by term limits or that sort of constraint; you do it by having a focus on what the Church of God is here to do.

Finally, Chair, I would urge those who do have concerns about the term limits to support and vote for Final Approval rather than, as was suggested earlier, abstaining. Abstaining might seem an easy way of making a point and it still gets through, but the reality is that after this receives Final Approval, trusting that it does, the Legislative Committee will then have to convince the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament that this Measure is expedient. One of the reasons we always take a vote by Houses on Final Approval is so

that the support of Synod can be demonstrated to the Ecclesiastical Committee, and I have to say that cause will not be helped if the figures indicate that a very large number of people did not vote or that the vote was close in any of the Houses. So I urge particularly lay colleagues who have concerns about this, please believe that the Elections Review Group will do its work on this, that we will bring back proposals in the light of the consultation that we undertake, and in that confidence to vote for this Measure at Final Approval.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): Thank you so much for calling me again. I just want to make some concluding remarks on this matter.

The first is that this is an important improvement to the Church Representation Rules and it needs to be approved. It is part of the reform and renewal process and it is long overdue. The dilemma that some of us have been facing is wanting to see it go through when it contains an offending couple of clauses, so I am so pleased that we have found a solution, which is the referral to the Elections Review Group, and it is great to hear from Sue and Clive, with whom I am a member of the Business Committee as well, to see that through. I am satisfied that that is the way forward.

I do want to echo the request to the Archbishops that just to support this you have this power to defer part of Measure as it is introduced, and I would urge you to take that power when the time comes. It is not asking you to put it into the long grass. It is just saying, "Let's defer it pending the outcome of this review", which may be only a few months.

I want also to go back to the issue of renewal of deaneries - the thing that Bishop Christopher asked me to help with in Southwark. The big message that we have learnt, and we have learnt it through the National Deaneries Group in particular, is that deaneries will serve their purpose when they are united around the mission of the Church, the mission of Jesus Christ in this country, and the sooner we can get on to that agenda the better.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): If I had spoken in the previous debate I would have been very much alongside Anne Foreman on the possible benefits of short terms, but I would ask if the Electoral Review Group looks at this that they might consider some anomalies that arise because people like me who have been on this Synod, I accept, for far too long and have been on deanery synod for even longer might in those circumstances assume an influence which we would prefer not to see. Maybe those people should also have their terms limited. Maybe we should have limited terms for General Synod. It sounds a bit anomalous for me to say such a thing after being on General Synod for so long, but these things are, I think, very important.

The other anomalies arise from the different periods that we observe - diocesan deanery and PCCs work on a three-year cycle, General Synod works on a five-year cycle - so people who are on General Synod are automatically on the other synods for five years and therefore their periods of office exceed those of the other people on the Synod.

There are various other items in the Rules that the Electoral Committee could look at, but I would ask them to take those things into account particularly because there is a very poor fit between the various people who find themselves on deanery synods.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): I wanted to speak briefly after listening to various people's comments. I had a question perhaps for the Chair of the Steering Committee, but perhaps it is also a question for all of those present today.

I know people here today are chairs of various things: deanery synod, laity chairs, et cetera. I know that Clive Scowen said earlier that he is the Chair of the House of Laity. People are saying that as they come up to present their points of view. What that leaves me wondering - and what I wanted to ask - is about opportunities for deaf people to be involved, for disabled people to be involved in these discussions right back at the beginning, and, I wonder, are deaf and disabled people involved at the early stages of writing legislation? Are they able to influence so that there is a perspective of deaf people and disabled people, because we listen and I think it is important to have the opportunity to be heard as well?

I am involved in my local PCC in my church - and I need to be, obviously, because I am here at General Synod - but that is the limit of it. That is the total extent. I am not involved in deanery synod. Today, I have had a chance to reflect on all the different bodies that people are a part of, the different chairs and other avenues that people can influence, and I wonder about where deaf people and disabled people can have a voice as well on those

discussions that are happening prior and where we have a chance to be listened to and to influence legislation.

Revd Dr Rob Munro (Chester): I have to be honest, Church Representation Rules are not normally the thing that gets me out of bed in the morning. It is in those sorts of categories of necessary and beneficial for those with insomnia and is something that does not really inspire mission. Except what I do think about these particular proposals is not what they are limiting or legislating for but what they enable. I really wanted just to say that in terms of the electronic communications, not just in terms of voting but generally, that it enables for us as a Church will have a significant beneficial effect on the wider ministry and mission that we are engaged with.

I serve a church where, because of GDPR hassles, we have pretty much gone completely online in all of our registration, and so I was slightly distressed when I rang up my diocesan secretary and said, "Can we facilitate the process of electoral roll revision by sending out form 1s electronically and receiving them back with email?" and he said: "No, not yet". But under the new Rules, Part 8, 76(2), a facility where people are registered with emails, email receipts can be taken. We are looking forward to that. I wish it had been this year and not next year.

Actually, this seems to me to be one of those cases where our rules are catching up with the way that everybody else works normally. Most people - and certainly most younger people - are working now substantially online, communicating that way, representing their

views that way, and this enables us to do that creatively and positively, in a way that is accountable, but in a way that will facilitate our mission and ministry. This is not just a bit of legislative business. It is something that seriously helps us enter this century and enter the challenges that it presents with a new heart and a new opportunity.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): The Archdeacon and her team have done an amazing piece of legislative work, but it is not really about that but about the culture that I would just like to say a word. Something we could not write into our legislation but could write into our activity is that if everybody involved in any aspect of synodical government at whatever level took as a duty to be nurturing within the first three years of their term a successor, mentoring that person and bringing them on, then we might make a difference.

Dr Lindsay Newcombe (London): I have stood late in this debate because I was surprised and a little dismayed that the Final Approval debate had been dominated by just one point. I served on the Revision Committee, and in fact I was the lay member who spoke and voted against the limiting of terms for deanery synod reps, but I am reassured by the ways that this can be altered in future.

I am grateful to the Bishop of Willesden and to others who have said positive things about this incredible document that is before us. A huge amount of work has gone into this, and the results that we have before us are a significant simplification - clear Model Rules. We align ourselves with contemporary laws and expectations in terms of data protection and electronic communication. We include people who are members of mission initiatives for

the first time. Lay members are assured to be a majority on a PCC. We can avoid unnecessary meetings by using electronic correspondence. There are significant safeguards for the laity with that one exception that has been debated before.

I want to thank the Archdeacon of Southwark and Joyce Hill for their chairmanship of the Steering Committee and the Revision Committee, but especially thank you to the legal team. Huge thanks to the legal team. At every meeting of the Revision Committee, I was startled by the way that they had managed to put together the things that we had discussed in the previous meeting and they had been able to do it in very clear, concise language. So thank you very, very much.

The Chair: I see no one standing, so I now call on the Archdeacon to reply to the debate. Archdeacon, you have up to five minutes.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I do not think I can do justice to all of you in five minutes, but thank you for the many positive comments on the content of the draft Measure which I am not now going to rehearse. Bishop Pete said that this was a good moment for Synod, and several of you have commented positively on the chairing and the membership of the Committees. I now want to add my own thanks to Mr Timothy Briden, the Vicar-General of the Province of Canterbury. He has sat modestly and quietly throughout all of this procedure, but without his imagination, skill, expertise and original drafting we would not have the concept of Model Rules or the core drafting of what is now before you. At the

risk of using up 30 seconds of my five minutes, may I invite you to offer your thanks to him?

The Chair: He is, of course, the very model of a modern Vicar-General!

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you, Chair. You have quite put me off my stroke! Many of you have commented positively on the benefits of electronic communication and, in due course, electronic voting. Actually you can do your electoral roll renewal by emailing the form and emailing it back because you are not voting on the electoral roll; you are just getting on the electoral roll.

The Archdeacon of London, thank you so much. Nurture our successors - yes. Let us take that to heart and do so. Thank you to many of you - Mr Greenwood, Mr Scowen and others - who profess themselves reassured by Canon Booy's referral of the contentious clause to the Elections Review Group. I am afraid, Mr Scowen, I probably shall be writing to you. I am sure there are many ways in which we can go forward positively from here. Thank you to all of those of you who commended to Synod that we vote for this Measure and then deal with the difficulties afterwards.

Mrs McIsaac asked whether we are legislating well. I do take the point that it was a hot day when we discussed this in July, but let it be a lesson to us all. We did discuss this in July and we did make a decision. Let us make sure that when we make decisions we are making the ones that we actually intend to make.

Mr Kingston, thank you for pointing out that this is at the heart of reform and renewal, that we are equipping ourselves as a Church, albeit in an administrative sort of way, to proclaim the Gospel to young and old in the 21st century. Amen to that. If you are wondering what General Synod, deanery synod or anything else is for, there is your answer. We are a Church which is willing to change as the Lord calls us constantly to be transformed into His likeness, and if Church Representation Rules can contribute to that in a very small way then let us vote for them.

Ms Tupling, thank you for your very good question about the involvement of deaf and otherwise disabled people in the drafting of legislation. I think the answer to the question is that those who are members of General Synod are involved as members of General Synod, as it were, regardless of the colour of their hair or any other physical or mental attribute. Could I encourage all people associated with the General Synod to contact the Revision Committee so that their views can be made known in the course of legislation? People who contact a Revision Committee are invited to speak, and of course a Revision Committee will make appropriate provision to enable access and to enable voices to be heard.

That, I think, covers the majority of what people said. Thank you, Mr Lamming, for your point about paragraph 3.3. I am afraid that is not a matter on which I can comment and therefore I shall not do so.

We have all spoken of the law of unintended consequences. Please do not make it the law of unintended consequences that by voting against this Measure we fail to take ourselves into the 21st century. I hope very much that we stand as a Synod committed to proclaiming the Gospel and to having rules that help us do that.

The Chair: We come now to the vote on Item 502. The question is: “That the Measure entitled ‘Church Representation and Ministers Measure’ 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 26, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 126 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 146 in favour, two against, with seven recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The Chair: The Church Representation and Ministers Measure now stands committed to the Legislative Committee. That concludes this item of business.

ITEM 503

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 12.31 pm.

The Chair: We now come to Items 503 and 504. Beloved in Christ, Synod has now reached the Final Approval stage for draft Amending Canon No. 39 (GS 2047BB). 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 draft Amending Canon No. 39. I call on the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 503: “That Amending Canon No. 39 be finally approved”. The Archdeacon may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you, your Grace. I will not. Like the Measure, the Amending Canon originates from proposals drafted by the Simplification Task Group. The Revision Committee removed provisions originally contained in the draft Canon that would have enabled a person who had not yet been in Holy Orders for six years to be appointed a dean, archdeacon or residentiary canon. An amendment which would have enabled the Bishop to make alternative provision in place of regular morning and evening prayer was tabled for the Revision stage in full Synod but it lapsed as 40 members did not indicate that they wished that amendment to be debated.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 of the Canon are intended to help the situation of multi-parish benefices, especially those in rural areas where a number of parishes are spread across a wide geographical area. The existing Canons that provide for services of morning and evening prayer and the celebration of Holy Communion in parish churches are drafted on the basis that these services will take place in every parish church on every Sunday and

on every principal Holy Day. They also require morning and evening prayer to be said daily in each parish. With the number of parishes in some benefices in double figures, these requirements are not realistic in many places. But, as things stand, if these obligatory services are not to be held in a particular parish, the parish priest is supposed to obtain dispensation from the Bishop.

Paragraphs 1 to 3 amend the relevant Canons so that the statutory services have to be held in at least one church in every benefice, rather than every parish, every Sunday and principal Holy Day and that daily morning and evening prayer also take place somewhere within the benefice. In single parish benefices that will result in no change. In multi-parish benefices it may not result in any practical change, but it will mean that the parish priest is no longer in breach of the Canons if he or she does not obtain dispensation from the Bishop not to hold the statutory services in every one of the parish churches in the benefice.

Paragraph 4, which extends the range of situations in which a deacon or priest can serve a title, relies on clause 5 of the Measure, as I have already mentioned. Under the existing Canon law, an ordinand must be ordained to a title as an assistant curate in a particular parish or benefice. Under this new provision it will be possible for ordinands to be ordained to serve in any office held under common tenure. This would include being licensed to a bishop's mission initiative or to a non-parochial institution.

Paragraph 5 of the Canon makes amendments to Canon C8 so that any member of the clergy who is beneficed or licensed in a diocese will, in effect, also have permission to officiate anywhere within that diocese at the invitation of the minister with the cure of souls. This is intended to allow beneficed and licensed clergy the same flexibility in terms of providing cover and general deployment as clergy with permission to officiate. Again, this may make little practical difference.

The remaining provisions simply tidy up the Canons, either removing obsolete provision or making consequential amendments.

I therefore ask the Synod to give final approval to Amending Canon 39. Thank you, your Grace.

The Chair: Archdeacon, thank you very much. Item 503 is open for debate. May I remind members that under Standing Order 64 - motions for the closure - speech limits on next business are not in order in this debate, but vain and tedious repetition is not encouraged by Standing Orders. I see nobody standing, so there is no need for the Archdeacon to respond. So that the draft Amending Canon No. 39 be finally approved, in accordance with Standing Order 37 I order a counted vote by Houses. The Registrar will put the voting procedure into operation. In order to be carried, the motion requires a simple majority in each house.

The vote on Item 503: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 20, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 92 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 118 in favour, against 2, with 1 recorded abstention. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

ITEM 504

The Chair: I now call upon the Archdeacon of Southwark to move Item 504: “That the petition for Her Majesty’s Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2047CC) be adopted.”

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you. I do so move.

The Chair: Any debate? I therefore put it to the Synod.

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

The Chair: The motion is clearly carried. Synod, you have done so well, so instead of starting any other business you are dismissed for lunch. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Southwark)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. We come to Item 505, the Report of the Revision Committee on draft Amending Canon No. 40. Members will need the Report of the

Revision Committee, GS 2103Y and the draft Canon, GS 2103A. I call on the Chair of the Revision Committee, the Archdeacon of London, to move the motion that: “The Synod do take note of this Report”. Archdeacon, you have ten minutes.

ITEM 505
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103A)

Ven. Luke Miller (London): My thanks to the members of the Steering Committee, the Revision Committee and to the legal team, and especially to those whose questions and comments have helped us to revise the draft Amending Canon. I believe we now have in a form which will achieve its ends, which must be for the thriving amongst us of the dedicated religious life. In what I am about to say, as well as the documents before you, I shall also draw a little on the wisdom of Fr George Congreve, who in the 19th century was the “go-to” person in the Church of England about how to do religious communities and how to make them work.

We begin in the Canon with new material which goes some way to defining “religious communities”. With a helpful symmetry, Canon B 30 on marriage has a similar introduction, otherwise unusual in the Canons. This responds to the requests from religious themselves for more on the significance of the religious life. We also wanted to heed their caution that the dedicated life should not be understood as based on activism and utility. Congreve taught that religious dedication is itself already a result attained

such that the question of success or outcome passes away. A religious house, he said, is “the family, the home of Jesus Christ, not a boarding house for church workers”.

The descriptions of recognised and acknowledged communities from the *Handbook on Religious Life* – a handy document which you can buy from Church House – are given at paragraph 13 of the Report. While not repeating the descriptions, the Canon highlights the radical commitment shaped by the evangelical counsels, marked by consecrated celibacy, poverty and obedience of the recognised communities ensuring that this is not lost, while we also seek to provide for the varying patterns of consecrated life offered in acknowledged communities.

The Canon looks to Regulations to be based on the handbook and overseen by the Advisory Council of the Religious Life, which is now constituted as a committee of the House of Bishops with a majority of religious as members. This means that the Canon itself remains at a high level, setting out the areas that the Regulations will deal with in detail. It also means that religious themselves will continue to have great input into the evolution of the Regulations.

The balance between episcopal oversight and religious independence was neatly illustrated in the debate on vows between Fr Benson of Cowley and Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford at the outset of the work of the Society of St John the Evangelist. Wilberforce cautioned that to make a vow is to open a potential for sin which would otherwise not be there. I was going to try to be brave enough to do this from here but I am going to post

online afterwards an account of that debate for those who are interested. Benson, of course, won.

The Canon enables Regulations to specify conditions relating to governance, and so the role of the visitor is not defined in the Canon. It is necessary for communities to have cognisance or serve other areas of law, especially of charity law, and we have had a care not to duplicate provisions from other branches of Canon law here, which brings me to BMOs.

As the Archbishop has noted, historically renewal in the Church as a whole has been profoundly associated with renewal in the religious life. It is well-known that the monastic revival of the 10th century led to a spate of church planting such that the Cistercians can be described as the HTB of their age. If you are interested in those parallels, again I shall, after this, through a tweet post them online.

The Committee considered whether a community could be both a religious community and a BMO. We can see times when a community might be asked to run a BMO, as sometimes they do parishes, when a church set up under a BMO might be on the way to becoming an acknowledged community, or even possibly a recognised one. We concluded that flexibility should be maintained but we agree with Mr Scowen that a community should not normally be subject to two regimes and the House of Bishops' guidance should say that this should be the case, that they should not normally be under

two regimes, but we felt that it overcomplicates the face of the Canon to provide too much detail on the front of the Canon itself.

Long experience has shown that there is a need for a community to have a certain size to be sustainable. While this lies behind the desire to set a minimum size for a new community, the Committee certainly does not wish existing communities to be put under any threat by unintended consequences, of which we have heard so much already today. The Regulations will be the tool to ensure this and the reasoning is set out in detail in paragraph 26 of our Report.

Large communities working in more than one country face an issue that this Canon will regulate the means by which the constitution can be changed. As paragraph 33 of the Report sets out: "Communities working in the Church of England must abide by English Canon law and we must avoid a situation in which a community can be declared a religious community in the Church of England and then, with no further oversight, make significant changes to its constitution."

The Committee concluded that the Business Committee of the General Synod is the right body to determine synodical procedure with regard to obtaining approval of Regulations under the Canon to which all members of communities will be required to have regard. There is, indeed, no explicit requirement to consult all communities on those Regulations, but, in practice, the Advisory Council, with its majority of members being religious, will produce the Regulations and the guidance. The voice of religious will thus be large and

clear in the process. The Committee recommends that the terms of reference of the Advisory Council should be amended to make explicit the need for appropriate levels of consultation.

Finally, paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Canon allow the House of Bishops to designate the religious communities which form the most relevant electoral constituency for the purpose of electing representatives to Synod, bringing the wordings of the Canon in line with the new Amending Canon and ensuring that the Canon and the Church Representation Rules, about which we have already spoken so much today, are in line with one another.

This legislation provides a canonical framework for religious profession which is, as Fr Congreve said, an act which brings new results. It brings us, as every act of faith does, into closer relation to Christ. And it is for that reason, amongst the others that I have given you that, Chair, I beg to move that Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: The motion is now open for debate. 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, so I hope that you have had a look at the Order Paper. Would those wishing to speak please stand or indicate. Archdeacon Paul, you have up to five minutes.

Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds): I am troubled by this piece of business. I have been bothered about it from the outset and now even more so, particularly because of the new paragraph 1 in bold type. This may go down like a lead balloon, but here goes. I think this is the

first time ever that we would have made canonical provision for what is called “the religious life”. I do not think the Church of England has ever done this before, and I think for good reasons.

First, this phrase “the religious life”, I think there is a lot of rather loose talk about this, it has become a bit of a mantra. The Archdeacon of London alluded to it, that there has never been a renewal of Christianity without a renewal of the religious life. I find that very puzzling. I can think of many renewals in the Church that have had nothing to do with monasticism and some of them have been explicitly anti-monastic. For instance, the 20th century Pentecostal movement around the globe, the modern missionary movement, the early days of the Oxford movement, the evangelical revival, Methodism, the Great Awakening, the Reformation, possibly the first 200 or 300 years of the Church and, if you go back far enough, the New Testament. I think you can only link these with “the religious life” if you define it so broadly that it becomes almost meaningless.

The second problem is that this section does not define it so broadly; it defines it quite clearly by the so-called “evangelical counsels”. Now, what does this mean? “Evangelical” means it is in the Gospel and “counsels” means things that you do not have to do but it is a good idea if you do. These are what are traditionally known as counsels of perfection, and in this tradition counsels go beyond commands. Commands are what everyone must do and not to do them would be a sin. Counsels means things that if you do not do them nobody can say you are doing wrong but to do them is even better. These are known as

works of supererogation – my favourite word. In other words, going beyond what is required of you.

Chair, I expect when you were sitting up last night reading over the 39 Articles, as we all do before bedtime, I am sure your mind stayed on Article 14 which denies this head-on. I do not believe that the Gospel counsels poverty, chastity and obedience in the way that these things have been traditionally understood as being a better way. At the very least, these things are highly contested and debateable. We could debate them at great length and depth. We cannot do that now, but my point is that we have not so debated them and yet here we are about to make them a legal affirmation of the Church of England.

The history of monasticism is, like all aspects of the Church, highly ambiguous, elevating voluntary poverty above wealth creation, celibacy above marriage and procreation and unconditional obedience above personal responsibility. Well, of course, we will say that is not what we mean, but that way of thinking has a long and entrenched position which lies behind these words.

The risk is that you send an unintended message that a monastic or quasi-monastic life is the real thing. Here the phrase is “a radical commitment”, from which you could easily infer that most of us are not really as committed as we should be. Every tradition is vulnerable to creating first and second-class Christians and this is one example of that risk. If I look at some of the most radically committed Christians I know, as well as people who are engaged in the religious life, I would also include a busy midwife, a frantically

busy schoolteacher who is also a parent and has a special needs child, a senior bank executive, a professional rugby player and so on. Spirituality is not what they do in their spare time in quietness, it is what they do all the time in their vocation.

Now, of course, if people feel called by God to this monastic way of life, knock yourself out, that is great. This is not about devaluing anyone's vocation but it is about this specific text and what it says. I can see the need to bring such communities within the scope of safeguarding and other provision, but I am very uncomfortable with the way that these highly controversial concepts are being rather quickly made part of the legal definitions of the Church of England when they carry such a truckload of questionable theology and history. Thank you.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I need to declare an interest as a member of the Third Order of the Society of St Francis. The Canon is very carefully framed. It talks about radical poverty, chastity and obedience as a way of expression of the evangelical counsels. One to which we all subscribed at our baptism was our commitment to fight against sin, the world, the flesh and the devil. We act that out in many different ways. Particularly, I remember Richard Foster's lovely book, *Money, Sex and Power*, which describes those temptations perhaps more aptly for those who are not in the religious life formally.

This is a particular vocation and a way of answering that counsel of the Gospel. This is about being obedient to the Gospel. We are all called in different ways to obey. To say

that only one way of obeying is the right way is as wrong as saying you cannot do one particular way or the other.

The Chair: I see no one standing. Therefore, I call on Archdeacon Miller to reply to the debate. Archdeacon, you have up to five minutes.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): Why is this important? It is important because it is about how the gift of the whole life to God in community might be shown forth in the heart of the Church. It is not important as a command to everybody to live in a particular way. Nor does this Canon seek to stray into the whole business of salvation, which is why I think that the reference to supererogation made by Archdeacon Paul is not actually germane. The counsels of perfection are precisely that. The evangelical counsels, as he says, are indeed counsels, which we wish to see lived out in every part of our Church.

What this Canon allows us to do is to help to see them lived out in the religious communities amongst us and to enable us to be able to recognise, acknowledge those religious communities and to commend them to the life that we all hold together. I hope that Archdeacon Paul will feel that that enables him, as he puts it, to “knock himself out because it’s great”, because it is that we should attempt to commend this way of life to all.

I think Andrew Dotchin has put that similarly, that there are all kinds of different ways in which we may see the life that is enjoined on us to live in poverty, chastity, obedience,

and by the other counsels of the Gospel in the life of the Church and that together we may attempt to work in our common life for the growth that we seek.

The Canon, as I have said, does not seek too much definition. If you would like a little bit more, there is some in the handbook: how this works out, develops and changes in different eras and in different places, from the desert to the monastery, from the monastery to the Mendicants and teaching orders, to the new ways of life that we have amongst us today. What this Canon allows us to do is to recognise, without defining too much on the face of it, what we choose to say is a licit and proper way to do that amongst us. I hope very much that we will take note of the Report that lies before you and I beg, Chair, if I have not done so already, to move the Report.

The Chair: Thank you. Therefore, Synod, I put Item 505 to the vote: “That the Synod do take note of this Report”.

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

The Chair: We come now to the Revision stage for the draft Amending Canon. Amendments and other motions appear on the Order Paper. Where no notice has been given of any amendments and no members have indicated that they wish to speak against particular paragraphs, I give my permission under Standing Order 58(4) to their being taken en bloc.

As this is the Revision stage - and you need to listen closely to all of this because I am only going to read it once – we will need to use the 40-member procedure under Standing Order 59. Where an amendment is moved by someone other than a member of the Steering Committee and is not simply consequential on an amendment that has already been passed, the mover has not more than five minutes to speak to it. I will then call a member of the Steering Committee to speak for not more than five minutes in reply. If the Steering Committee does not support the amendment, the amendment will lapse unless 40 members stand in their places or, if unable to do so, indicate by some other means that they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken. Have you got that?

We begin with paragraph 1 of the draft Canon. I invite Mr Clive Scowen to move his first amendment, Item 512. You may speak for not more than five minutes.

ITEM 512

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I hope I shall not need five minutes. This very welcome new Canon makes provision for Regulations to specify the conditions which a religious community has to satisfy in order to be declared to be a religious community of the Church of England. Those conditions can relate to governance, financial affairs, safeguarding, making of vows or promises, and the minimum number of members of the community in order to be declared under paragraph 2.

What is not currently clear on the face of the Canon is whether those conditions have to be the same for everyone, one size fits all, or can be different for different types of community. The amendment that I am moving makes it clear that different provision can be made for different types of community, particularly provisions applicable to new communities may be different - it may be right for them to be different - from those applying to existing communities.

The particular thing I am concerned about is, as we know, sadly a number of recognised communities have been in decline in recent years and no longer have the number of members which might be considered necessary for a new community to be declared as a religious community of the Church of England.

I suggest it would be dreadful, Synod, if the faithful men and women who have sustained the Church by their prayers for decades were disqualified from being recognised because they were now so few in number. This is a simple provision which just enables the Regulations to be sensitive to that reality and to enable those established communities to continue their invaluable ministry of prayer even though they are only two or three in number; the point being that when two or three are gathered the Lord is with them.

The Chair: I call on a member of the Steering Committee, who I believe is the Bishop of Manchester – yes, it is – to speak to that amendment for not more than five minutes.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): In the spirit of today, declaring interests, I too am a member of the Third Order of the Society of St Francis from the very soles of my feet upwards. The Steering Committee is minded to be favourable to Mr Scowen's amendment. We did not think it was necessary and it is not the intention, and it is helpful to get that on record, that we would be wanting to say to an existing community that may have served for many years that has tipped below that number of members that we would normally consider the minimum quorum for starting a new community, we would not expect to deregister, cease to recognise or acknowledge a community that had slipped below that number. Nevertheless, Mr Scowen's amendment makes that explicit. It does not add too many words to the Canon. It does not take us into too much detail and on that basis we are happy to accept it.

While I am on my feet, Chair, it may save us a few moments later on if I say that should Mr Scowen wish to move his second amendment I would be resisting that; I think that does complicate things. We have agreed, and I think Mr Scowen has accepted, it is not the intention, as the Archdeacon said on behalf of the Revision Committee, that there will be double regulation. There may be something that begins as a BMO that then becomes a religious community, but BMOs and religious communities are very different things. We are not going to create double jeopardy for such organisations and so I can assure Mr Scowen we are not going to attempt to create the thing that his second amendment seeks to avoid and, therefore, I would hope that it is not necessary to consider his second amendment. Thank you.

The Chair: Item 512 is now, therefore, open to debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put the amendment to the vote.

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

ITEM 513

The Chair: That is clearly carried. We now come to the amendment at Item 513. I invite Mr Scowen to move the amendment. He may speak for not more than five minutes.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I certainly will not need five minutes on this occasion. Chair, in the light of what the Bishop of Manchester has said, which has put on the record of the Synod the clear intention that missional communities established under Bishops' Mission Orders will not be normally regulated under this Canon, I am content not to move the second amendment. I will content myself with taking the first amendment.

ITEM 514

The Chair: Thank you. Therefore, we move to Item 514. I invite a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 514: "That paragraph 1 [as amended] stand part of the Canon."

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): I do so move.

The Chair: This is now open for debate. I see no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 514 [as amended] to the vote.

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

ITEM 515

The Chair: That is clearly carried. I now call a member of the Steering Committee to move en bloc Item 515: "That paragraphs 2 to 6 stand part of the Canon."

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): I do so move.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing. Therefore, I put Item 515 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That completes the Revision stage for draft Amending Canon No. 40 which now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its Final Drafting. We will move to the next item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 2.57 pm

**ITEM 506
DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) (NO. 2) MEASURE (GS 2104A) AND DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2105A)**

The Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you. We come to Item 506 on the agenda, the Report of the Revision Committee on the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) No. 2 Measure and the draft Amending Canon No. 41. Members will need the Report of the Revision Committee, which is GS 2104Y and GS 2105Y, the draft Measure, which is GS 2104A, and the Canon, GS 2105A. You may wish to refer to the Financial Statement on the Fifth Notice Paper, paragraphs 5 to 6.

First of all, we will go through the Revision Committee Stage Report. I call upon Mr Carl Fender, the Chair of the Revision Committee, to move Item 506: “That the Synod do take note of this Report.” You have up to ten minutes.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln): Synod, this draft Measure and draft Amending Canon No. 41 received first consideration at York last year. The Committee met once and received thoughtful written submissions from eight members of the Synod. An additional written submission was also received from the secretary to the Lichfield DAC. We thank all those who did write to us. I also express my thanks to the Legal Advisers and team that assisted the Committee throughout the work that we did.

I will take the clauses one by one and summarise the decisions that the Committee made in respect of each of them.

Clause 1. The purpose of this clause is to make provision by Canon for a bishop to admit a member of a religious community into Holy Orders. The main amendment here followed a proposal passing the function of identifying members of religious communities who are electors to the House of Laity at General Synod. That function is currently with a body known as the Advisory Council for Relations between Bishops and Religious Committees, which is now a committee of the House of Bishops. The amendment reflects that transition.

Clause 2 is concerned with the intended creation of a national clergy register comprising the names of clergy who have permission to officiate; a recommendation of Dame Moira Gibb. Submissions were made about the inclusion in the register of lay people exercising ministry. The principle of this was accepted. However, there were practical issues to consider arising from the absence of equivalent databases of the names of those lay people who could be included in the register. Currently, databases exist for clergy and so a register for them would be completed much more quickly. The decision was whether to delay creation of a register of clergy to allow time for catch-up with regard to databases of lay people. It was decided that there should be a first phase for clergy and a second phase for lay people, and the draft Measure was amended accordingly.

The other point I wish to make is in subsection 5. It expressly states that home addresses and personal contact information should not appear on the face of the register for those included on it.

Clause 3. The Committee accepted a submission for the inclusion of a provision for lay officeholders to conduct funerals with the permission of an incumbent. This will cause an amendment to an earlier 2018 (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure which was approved last July in York.

Clause 4. In the civil courts, individuals receive exemption from or reduction or remission of fees. This clause mirrors that entitlement in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The question was who should cover the cost of such fees foregone. We accepted the suggestion of the Dean of the Arches and Auditor that such fees foregone should fall on a DBF as the only obvious candidate, as it was doubtful whether the Fees Advisory Commission could impose the liability on a DBF itself. The clause was amended accordingly.

There were no submissions in respect of clause 5 so I shall move then to clause 6, which is concerned with disused burial grounds in cathedrals and buildings approval. We chose to retain a new subsection 2(b) to the Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 as the Committee was advised that other approvals may be necessary in addition to that of the chapter under subsection 2(a) where works may involve disturbing remains elsewhere in the cathedral grounds. This clause was also subject to an amendment to define “relative”, as the original draft provided for objections from a relative but the degree of relationship was

not defined. A mirror provision for non-Church of England burial grounds was adopted and, accordingly, this draft Measure and other Measures will adopt the same definition to ensure that objections can only be considered from relatives within a sufficient degree of relationship to the deceased person.

Clause 7. This clause intends to amend the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 to allow for PCCs to make their own appointment for quinquennial inspection and reporting on its churches. The Committee respectfully rejected a submission that inadequate time for consultation had been allowed. Because of concerns about the appointment of persons who lacked experience or qualifications, the requirement for a PCC to consult was amended to a requirement to seek and have regard to DAC advice, and to follow that advice unless there was good reason not to. The Lichfield DAC secretary submitted that an inspector should be a registered architect or buildings surveyor, but the Church Buildings Council had advised that a wider range of professional qualifications could equip a person to carry out quinquennial inspections and the Church Buildings Council's statutory guidance provides for this, so the secretary's submission was rejected.

Clause 8. This intends to enact amendments to the Parochial Records and Registers Measure 1978 so that its provisions are consistent with Canon F 12 by the Amending Canon No. 41 for the electronic form of registers. The clause amends section 25 of the 1978 Measure so that compliance with its provisions depends on whether someone is using hard copy or an electronic format, so the context makes the compliance specific in

that regard. The Committee accepted submissions from the National Church Institutions' head of research with regard to third party access to electronic forms of register, for the purposes of research for example, and so the Measure introduces new subsections into the 1978 Measure for access to the records subject to consent and consultation.

Clause 9. Parochial records - the amendments here brought greater clarity to the definition of records. I will leave members to read into that.

I can move on to clause 10 quickly. This was on an issue of delegation of powers and it avoided legislation where the power already existed in the 1947 Measure.

Clause 11 is concerned with DAC membership and limits on successive terms. The issue here was dealing with a talent vacuum, and striking a balance between introducing new personnel to a DAC and retaining talent and experience when needed. A submission about lack of consultation was again respectfully rejected. The clause makes provision to permit a person who has served two successive terms to be appointed again either as an ordinary member or a Chair. The question was who should give that authorisation and then make the appointment, bearing in mind who has already made appointments to the Chair (the bishop) or membership (the bishop's council). The aim was to achieve transparency and avoid calls of rubberstamping of appointments for a third term. It was decided that diocesan synods should give the authorisation but not before receiving the views of the Church Buildings Council. The Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 2018 will be amended accordingly to reflect that.

Clause 12 deals with resolving a cyclical barrier to registration of any lease granted by a diocesan authority to a parochial church council. Currently, a lease of more than seven years will vest in the diocesan board of finance but cannot be registered because at common law a person or body cannot grant themselves a lease. The Land Registry has been consulted and is content with the provision in the draft clause.

Clause 13 concerns some updating of terms and titles. I will leave members to read those. There were no submissions in respect of clauses 14 and 15.

Synod, that concludes what I have to say about the draft Measure. Turning briefly to the draft Canon, we accepted a submission to remove “the amount of any alms” from the list in clause 1 on the basis that PCC accounts record that information. The Committee also proposed that the form in which the register may be kept could, with General Synod approval, be in electronic form, and then in clause 2, and at the request of the House of Bishops, the approval of translations of authorized forms of worship will stand with the House of Bishops and not its Standing Committee.

I move that Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: The motion is now open for debate. 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.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): This is one of those moments where you suddenly spot something and you wonder what it means. We are a Church that has a doctrine of marriage and it is the claim of some in this Church that our doctrine of marriage is now different from the civil understanding of marriage. In relation to section 6 of the Measure, can the Steering Committee make it clear whether the word “spouse” refers to a spouse as the Church of England understands it, a spouse as the civil law understands it, or both?

His Honour Judge Peter Collier (ex officio): In clause 4 of the Amending Canon No. 41 we are revisiting Canons in section G because the 1963 Measure has been repealed and replaced by the 2018 Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure. When I saw that this Amending Canon referred to chancellors of the diocese - and I have to declare an interest being one of that species - I saw that this included in paragraph 4 the phrase “updated statutory references”, and I could not resist the temptation to go and look at all the original documents and sources. You cannot beat that, I think.

The 2018 Measure is largely a consolidating Measure. It does not make substantive alterations to the law but because it removed section 27 from the old 1963 Measure it means that we have to update the Canon to take that out of the Canon as well. As I read on and compared the two Measures, I noticed something else. The 1969 Canons were

based on the 1963 Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure which used gender exclusive and excluding language for its description of chancellors and registrars, all the references being to “he” or “him” or “his”. The 2018 Measure uses gender neutral language throughout, so the “he”, “his” and “her” are replaced with “he or she”, “his or her” or by “a person”. I would like to invite the Revision Committee in its final revision and updating of statutory references to look, please, at this issue and to adapt the language of Canons G 1 through to G 6 to reflect the gender neutral language of the new Measure. I do not consider this as controversial in any way. We have only earlier today brought the Church Representation Rules up to date and the least controversial aspect of that updating was the use of gender-neutral language throughout. It received absolutely no reference at all in the debate. It was not even referred to, although it was a very significant part of the alterations that were made. It has, however, attracted the attention of the *Daily Mail* so that probably means it is a good thing! I appreciate that this might raise other questions about other aspects of the Canons but those are perhaps questions for another day. This can be seen just as an isolated piece of work, a pilot in relation to these particular Canons G 1 through to G 6, but please can we update the Canons so that their language reflects that of the underlying Measure.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): Just a couple of very trivial clarifications potentially. In the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure, in the newly introduced definitions of a relative, I wondered whether or not it needed to be spelt out whether when you refer to a brother and so on, it includes a half-brother, a half-sister and so on. On the Amending Canon No. 41 it says that once the decision has been made to keep the records in electronic

form they shall be recorded in that form in the future, and I wondered whether it was intended that “shall” meant that it was compulsory and that it could never be changed subsequently. I had in mind an electronic system which becomes redundant or obsolete and people want to return to a written record and whether that is not going to be allowed.

Dr Chris Angus (Carlisle): I am looking at the new clause 4, formerly clause 3, on fees exemption, reduction or remission. My diocesan secretary was really rather unhappy when he read this clause and I can sort of see why, but clearly it was put there for good reason. That reason was in part because that was the only place it appeared it could be put. I cannot put forward any form of amendment to this, and do not suggest one, but I do suggest that it would be good if we could look in the future at a better mechanism for handling this than simply dumping it on the odd diocesan board of finance.

The Chair: I see no one indicating that they wish to speak so I ask Carl Fender to respond to the debate, please. You have up to five minutes.

Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln): I will take them in the order in which the speakers delivered their observations. First of all, Simon Butler, thank you. I am advised that the definition of “relative” in ecclesiastical legislation retains the traditional view, so the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act does not apply in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and, therefore, the definitions that we have do not include same sex couples, only opposite-sex couples. That is what I am advised.

Vicar-General, thank you very much. The observations that you made, I think, are for the Steering Committee rather than for the Revision Committee, so I will not say much more than that. Apologies, but I think those objections are formally within their parish. I think it is a matter of judicial interpretation whether “brother” includes a half-brother or a stepbrother, but the legislation that was adopted from the secular world will have its own case law behind it, so whatever that is can be a guide to interpretation in terms of whether it does include a stepbrother or half-brother or not. That is a matter for case law, I would suggest.

Finally, Mr Angus, and the fees, the difficulty here is that where there is an entitlement to an exemption, a reduction or a remission, it comes out of the pocket of the registrars or the chancellors, and it was felt unfair to penalise them in a very small number of cases and, therefore, because we are only talking about a very small number of cases where fees foregone will fall on the diocesan board of finance in each diocese, that was felt to be the most appropriate way of dealing with this particular issue. I do not think I can say much more than that, but I understand that it is in a small number of cases that exemptions are going to fall on DBFs.

The Chair: We move to voting on Item 506.

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

The Chair: We move 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) for 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 it 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 if they wish the debate to continue or a vote to be taken.

ITEM 516

The Chair: Let us begin with clause 1 of the draft Measure. No notice has been given of an amendment to this clause. I call a member of the Steering Committee to move Item 516: “That clause 1 stand part of the Measure”.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I do so move.

The Chair: Thank you, Pete. I see no one standing so we will move straight to vote.

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

ITEM 517

The Chair: Similarly, we move on to clause 2 and I invite the Bishop of Willesden to move his first amendment to that clause at Item 517. You have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): We are on the question of the national register, which was originally the national clergy register. What we discovered as we were looking at the whole questions arising from safeguarding was that we do not have in the Church of England a proper place where a register of all those who have permission to officiate, who have benefices and licences was held in one place. We are now working very hard between the National Church Institutions and the dioceses to compile such a register. It is an obvious thing we need to do so we know who is a proper priest/deacon and has authority to minister. What was then put into the Measure was the suggestion that this ought to extend also to those who were authorized to minister as laity. You will see that the Revision Committee - it is reported in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of GS 2014Y - thought it would be a good idea to make mandatory a provision for lay people who had such authority also to be on a register.

They recognised that was difficult because there is no real existing register and half the dioceses will not necessarily be able to conjure up a register. Who are we talking about here? We are talking about whole different sorts of classes of people. The obvious one is readers/licensed lay ministers, but there are also other folk who have authority from bishops to do things. We have commissioned ministers, pastoral assistants and people who have been given authority to preach in parishes as laity. They all hold authority from the bishop and, therefore, you have not just a few people but hundreds of people. Passing this particular provision would necessitate down the line some way of getting each bishop to produce lists of those who had such authority and put them into the national register. It also necessitates other people who are not authorized by the bishop to be recorded on such a register. If you look at clause 2(1) as drafted, it does not make clear whether this is a sweeping catch-all for everybody who is given authority by the bishop to be caught up in this national register, or whether we can have a staged way of doing it.

My amendment seeks to make clear that we have got to deal with the clergy first and get a proper national register for them, but when it comes to lists of those who are authorized to minister who are laity, we need to give explicit power to the Archbishops' Council to make specifications as to which class of laity next needs to go on the register, clearly starting with readers and licensed lay ministers, and perhaps also to have some consonance about how far down you go in terms of what authority people have. You could extend this to people with authority to administer bread and wine at Communion because they have authority from the bishop as well. Rather than letting this loose so it is hundreds or even thousands of people across the country who will be on a register, this

clause makes explicit what is probably implicit in the Regulation anyway, that the Archbishops' Council will dictate at the proper moment what classes of laity will be put on the register, at what level, at what time. We need to get the clergy sorted first and then the laity by stages, but only sensible provisions for the laity.

I beg to move Item 517, which will achieve that, and I hope that will find the favour of Synod.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Pete. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to respond to what we have just heard.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): When the Revision Committee met we had two submissions, from Nigel Bacon and Clive Scowen, to include lay people on the register. We had that discussion and decided that would be a good thing, although clergy still remained our priority. To be fair, we had probably not considered the classes of lay people who could be involved. As a Steering Committee, we welcome and accept the Bishop of Willesden's amendment because we think it would be very useful to have that in at the start. The principle remains the same. We do want to get to a stage where clergy and authorized lay ministers are registered, but it is going to be phased. This will give the Archbishops' Council and us a chance to monitor the scope and to bring that in at the appropriate time. We support the amendment and thank you very much to the Bishop of Willesden.

The Chair: Thank you, Pete. We can now debate this.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): As one of the people who advocated the change which the Revision Committee put in, I welcome Bishop Pete's amendment. I think it is very helpful indeed and I support it.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): I think I want to counsel against this as a national project. I speak from my own experience in a large parish with an electoral roll of 250. We are just trying to make sure we get everybody trained for safeguarding. We have to train something like 30 leaders and 90 helpers in the church for all the activities and the spreadsheet is never right. We contact the leaders of the activities every term to make sure that what we have on the spreadsheet - and it is a very simple Excel spreadsheet - is right, whether people have left, whether people have died, whether anybody has noticed, or whether there should be some new people in there. It is quite a big administrative task. Bearing in mind what Bishop Pete has said about the various classes of lay people, I think it would be a good idea but keep it at a diocesan level so you actually have some contact.

Trying to design a scheme to keep this up to date at a national level seems to me to be a waste of resources. I would keep it as local as possible and not try to do it nationally. The clergy register is clearly a good thing, it makes sense, it is logical, it has to be done, but please be aware that the idea of a national laity register just fills me with horror.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): I also entirely support Bishop Pete's amendment. I know you cannot amend an amendment, but I could say something which perhaps, if the amendment is passed, could be taken away for consideration. In trying to do this at a diocesan level, in the mighty Diocese of Chelmsford the distinction that we draw is people who hold the bishop's licence. This seems to be a sensible and nationally observable way of dealing with this and therefore includes readers and licensed lay ministers. It can also include Church Army evangelists and licensed lay workers. It draws the line there and I would suggest that is a sensible place to draw the line.

The Chair: I see no one indicating that they wish to speak, so we move to vote on Item 517.

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

ITEM 518

The Chair: We now come to the Bishop's second amendment at item 518. As the amendment is consequential upon Item 517, the 40-member rule does not apply. Please ignore the rogue word "not" on the Order Paper at this point. It is on the top of page 7. Therefore, I call Bishop Pete, the Bishop of Willesden, to move Item 518.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): That puzzled me too. I do so move.

The Chair: Item 518 is open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak. Let us move straight to vote on Item 518.

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

ITEM 519

The Chair: Let us now move on to Item 519. Would a member of the Steering Committee like to comment, please?

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I do so move.

The Chair: Once again, this is open for debate, Item 519. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak. Let us move straight on to vote then on Item 519.

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

ITEM 520

The Chair: Let us move on to Item 520 and this is when we are taking a number of clauses en bloc. This is: “That clauses 3 to 10 stand part of the Measure”. Pete, you seem to be doing all the responding on behalf of the Steering Committee, so please go for it.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): It is all right; you will get another voice in a few minutes. I do so move.

The Chair: Item 520 is now open for debate. You have up to five minutes.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Chair, I am sure I am not the only person who heard the exchange in the debate on the Revision Committee Report between the Prolocutor and Carl Fender chairing, when it was stated that the word “spouse” related to the ecclesiastical understanding.

We have been talking quite a lot about the law of unintended consequences and in clause 6 of this Measure the outworking of that answer could have really awful consequences and really bad reputational damage for the Church in years to come - probably quite a lot of years to come. This is one of those sort of long-tailed bombs that we need to be aware of if, say, in 30 years' time a same sex spouse was to make a representation and was told because they were not a civil partner or a spouse in a heterosexual partnership they were not a relevant person.

Can I, therefore, ask the Steering Committee to have a very long and hard look at this and to see if some way can be made to specifically define “spouse” for the purposes of this Measure as including that in the Same Sex Marriage Act because, otherwise, we could find ourselves doing some quite serious injustice and that is without reference to wherever on the theological scale in this chamber we are on that matter.

The Chair. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak. Let us move to vote on Item 520. Sorry, would you like to reply, first.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much, Prebendary Cawdell. Yes, we can look at that as a Steering Committee and we can make an amendment and we can bring it back to Synod in July and you can vote on it and, if it is passed, that will be the wish of Synod.

The Chair. Let us move to vote on Item 520.

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

ITEM 521

The Chair. We now move on to Item 521. That is: “That clause 11 stand part of the Measure.”

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I do so move.

The Chair: Keith Cawdron has indicated that he wishes to speak, so please go for it.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): I want to invite the Synod to vote against this clause. I do so on the grounds that I believe it is introducing a procedure which is unnecessary, bureaucratic, contrary to simplification and will not achieve what is sought. Under this procedure, where it is suggested that a DAC chair or members of the DAC who wish to serve for more than two terms of office, if they need to serve longer this must go to the diocesan synod and the diocesan synod may only consider it if they have obtained advice from the Church Buildings Council.

When I read this clause, it rang some bells. I was on this Synod 20 years ago and one of the accusations against the Synod in those days was that it believed, rather too excessively, that we could secure righteousness by detailed legislative provision covering the minutiae of appointments, how they were made, and of consultation. Indeed, that was part of why we ended up having a Simplification Working Party. It seems to me that the proposal we have in this clause is reverting, rather, to how we used to do things in those days.

Let us just look at the two components. The diocesan synod is not required to appoint the DAC chair or any member of the DAC. This only comes to them in this one instance. I really seriously wonder what we expect a DAC to make of the fact that what a diocesan

synod will do when its only time for looking at membership of the DAC is in this specific very limited set of circumstances.

The other element is the Church Buildings Council. The Church Buildings Council is already, as I will explain in a moment, required to be consulted by the bishop on appointing the DAC chair. That is already in place. We probably have, I would guess, 500 members of DACs around the country and I really suspect that it will be very hard for the Church Buildings Council to have anything realistic to say to diocesan synods about DAC people of whom, quite understandably, they know nothing.

I suggest that this procedure will produce delay and a certain amount of paperwork, but will not actually achieve anything. Members will still be able to be reappointed for more than two terms, although what we have done is put a rather pointless obstacle course in the way of achieving that. Of course, there are members of DACs who have permanent membership - they are called archdeacons. What would happen if we removed the clause?

If you look at the Report of the Revision Committee, paragraph 57, it suggests that the chair of the DAC is appointed by the bishop and other members are appointed by the Bishop's Council. Well, yes and no. This is not a proper description of the way things work at the moment. When the bishop appoints the chair of the DAC, the bishop is required every time to consult the Bishop's Council, the Church Buildings Council - so that is already in place - and the diocesan chancellor, who appears to have disappeared

when we come to the possibility of renewal in this way. My advice from the legal department is that a renewal in office for a DAC chair or member is a new appointment; so, after five or six years, if the bishop wishes to reappoint a DAC chair, even after one term, the bishop must go through that consultation procedure again.

What about the wider DAC? Again, there are additional clauses and safeguards in place. Members are appointed by the Bishop's Council - yes, that is true - but actually the Bishop's Council must appoint two who are diocesan synod members. There is consultation required with local authorities, amenity societies and others over the appointment of particular members.

Indeed, I was thinking of proposing an amendment to suggest that that consultation should be required when we reach the point of a second reappointment, but my advice is that if we remove this clause then that will be the position. We are not left with nothing. We are left with the requirement that a bishop must consult over the chair and that the Bishop's Council needs to receive advice over certain appointments over the other members.

There is also a rather important clause in the relevant requirements that say that the Bishop's Council must take, whenever it is making appointments, an overview of the DAC to make sure it has got a balance of knowledge of history, a knowledge of liturgy, knowledge of architecture and experience of church buildings. If we remove this clause, then we have those safeguards already in place. I believe that is what we should do. We

should rely on them and we should rely on our dioceses to take sensible decisions and not bring in unnecessary and bureaucratic additional procedures.

Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford): I declare an interest as Chair of the Church Buildings Council and could I urge Synod to stick with the clause as drafted. Diocesan Advisory Committees are statutory bodies. We benefit from the ecclesiastical exemption. There are many, including a number of the amenity societies, who would wish the ecclesiastical exemption to go. I think one has to find a balance between ensuring good experience on DACs but that DACs do not become self-perpetuating secret gardens.

I was, in a more exciting part of my life, for four years a planning minister and when one went round looking at planning committees they looked like planning committees. When I became Chair of the Church Buildings Council, I went round and visited a number of DACs and, if I had not known that they were DACs, many of them looked very different. I suspect one of the reasons for that was that their membership had stayed broadly the same for a very long time and that each of them had kind of developed their own working method. We do need to ensure that our DACs can be robustly objective and have this balance between experience but not becoming secret gardens and, also, that they are open to encouraging newer, younger people, more women I would suggest, and others into membership of the DAC.

Lastly, none of this change is going to be radical or speedy and the fact is that the earliest that this particular proposal will come in would be 2032. I would urge General Synod, if

we want to keep the ecclesiastical exemption, if we want to remain objective, please stick with this clause.

Mr David Kemp (Canterbury): I declare an interest being an ex-diocesan secretary alongside Keith Cawdron. In my diocese, in Canterbury, there is increasing concern about the levels of parish share and the ability of parishes to pay. I hear that that concern is shared across a number of dioceses across the country. When that happens, what people say is, "We have got to cut the costs of diocesan house. We have got to cut the costs of diocesan administration".

What I just want to say to this Synod is be very careful about enacting anything which has the potential for increasing the administration at diocesan house because that is going to cause real problems in the future, not just psychological but financial.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I was not minded to speak in relation to this matter but, having heard Keith Cawdron, I thought I would just share what seems to me to be the probable experience of other diocesan synod members and that is that I very much doubt whether my synod would be particularly interested in the detail of a report coming to them to approve the appointment of DAC members for a third term. I suspect if the report were presented it would probably be rubberstamped, unless there was a particular individual who took an interest in that appointment.

I wonder whether the right course is not to refuse to approve this particular clause but to send it back to the Steering Committee, because it could still be for the Steering Committee to consider whether to have a limit of the number of terms a DAC member should serve but not require it to come to the diocesan synod to make that approval.

Mr Martin Kingston (Gloucester): I want to urge you, please, to listen to what Sir Tony Baldry was saying. As someone whose working life is dominated by the machinations of planning committees as well as DACs, the turnover is extremely important in DACs. It is extremely important that we put in place legislation which ensures that this element of the Church's work is subject to renewal, renewal in the sense of a turnover of the people who undertake it.

We are not exactly dashing at it, are we; 2030, plenty of time to get used to it. It is really important from the point of view of what actually happens on the ground in parishes with DACs where people have been in place for too long. I urge you, please, to listen to what Sir Tony had to say.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Right Hon Dr John Sentamu): I was going to say exactly the same thing except to add to what Mr Kingston has said, that Tony Baldry, when he was Second Estates Commissioner, worked very hard with Bishop Richard of London about our buildings and managed to secure quite a lot of funding for their repairs and their maintenance from the government. He is speaking with great wisdom and great insight because he spent a lot of time going around and looking at DACs.

Friends, nobody is suggesting that experience should be taken out of the DACs, but that as a Church we need to be working on our succession planning, which we heard earlier on. If anybody gets on the DAC to advise they should also try and train their successors, otherwise what you tend to get is people create a culture which becomes impenetrable and in some parishes they could complain whenever they go there. I am very grateful and I am very glad that I have got a wonderful vicar-general and chancellor who often have challenged decisions. We faced the whole problem of Hull Minster, whether pews could be taken out and whether everything could be done and, of course, the ancient societies were projecting, was the DAC really giving the advice we were looking for? I doubt. His judgment is still on the website.

So, friends, if you really want our church buildings to be looked after very well, my view is that you need great insight. They are not museums. They are places of worship. Some fresh blood could actually help in the planning and the execution. I am not so sure that members of the diocesan synod would not be interested in it actually, if the DAC work was constantly being reported, the terms of office of some people who have been there for two terms, and we have found someone who could come in and do a different job. So, please, do not go for the amendment. Stick with whatever is being suggested because, again, Tony Baldry, I think, has spoken for many in relationship to the way we need to renew our DACs.

Rt Worshipful Timothy Briden (ex officio): May I echo both what Sir Tony Baldry and the Archbishop of York have said in my capacity as a Chancellor of two dioceses and an occasional speaker at DAC Conferences. Looking at the draft of this clause, it struck me that it was extremely well-balanced in addressing the competing requirements on the ground for efficient running of DACs.

On the one hand, it is undoubtedly the case that there are DAC members who, because of their experience and expertise, are cherished members who need to be there for a longer term than the average. That may be because of their erudition. It may be because of their special skill in particular fields such as archaeology, horology and the like. That is one side of the equation.

The other side is that we are living in an age of many changes. It is essential that DACs should be well-equipped with the sort of changes which church buildings are facing these days and will continue to face in the future. As Chancellor, I am involved fairly regularly with the installation of telecommunication equipment in church towers. I am also involved, increasingly, with alternative uses of churches when, for example, local facilities such as post offices are run down and it gives an opportunity for a church to be used for such social purposes.

It is essential, really, that there should be representation in the DAC of people who are at the forefront of these developments and who are able to give good advice to parishes on matters of this nature. As I say, in my view, the clause is well-crafted in addressing both

those situations. I would urge Synod to support it and I would also urge Synod to keep the framework of the clause as it is at the moment because it addresses the spectrum of the problems with which we are concerned.

The Chair. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak, so I call a member of the Steering Committee to reply.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much, members of Synod, for your contributions to that debate. I am just going to make a few comments. I want to pay tribute, first of all, to all those who give of their time on DACs. It is often a labour of love and we appreciate their experience and expertise.

David Knight, the officer of the Church Buildings Division, has recently visited all the DACs in the country and the Revision Committee were indebted to him for the evidence that he gave us. He basically confirmed what we have already heard from Tony Baldry and from Timothy Briden that it is always good to have some churn in DACs and to have some fresh blood, which is where the suggestion for limiting terms of office comes from. We also received evidence that it does not look good to people outside the Church if it looks like a closed shop and that there are people that the CBC are in contact with who would like to be involved in DACs but for whatever reason are unable to get there and so we supported the idea of limiting terms of office.

And, then, how do you do that? Well, we have already heard from Keith Cawdron that, at the moment, the bishop has to do some consultation and that includes with the Bishop's Council and with the Church Buildings Council. We thought that would be a sensible situation if a bishop wanted to extend a term of office. It does not seem to me to be much more than that. Yes, it would occupy a five or ten-minute space on a diocesan synod agenda, but maybe dioceses could do a bit more of it and make something of that agenda item and affirm the work of DACs. I do not know about you, but these are one of the things that parishes often talk about. They want to be able to change their buildings and sometimes get frustrated with DAC processes. It would be good to have some more ownership at that level.

I want to correct something that David Lamming said. If you decide that this should not stand part of the Measure, it could not come back after further consideration to Synod at Final Approval stage. We have already heard that church buildings are an asset and so we need DACs who are going to help parishes bring out the full benefits of these buildings and, where necessary, make appropriate changes so that they are fit for mission in the 21st century.

Finally, archdeacons are not permanent. I do not expect to still be on the DAC in Liverpool by 2032 because I will have retired, but there will be changes all the way along the line. I think it is good to have fresh blood and I would urge you, Synod, to make this clause stand part of the Measure.

The Chair. Thank you, Pete. We come now to vote on Item 521.

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

ITEM 522

The Chair. We move on to Item 522. Again, we have got a number of clauses en bloc: “That clauses 12 to 15 stand part of the Measure”. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to make a comment, please.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I so move.

The Chair. This item is open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to debate this. We will move straight on to voting on this then.

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

ITEM 523

The Chair. We will move on then to Item 523: “That the Schedule stand part of the Measure”. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move this, please.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I so move.

The Chair. This is now open for debate, Item 523. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak. Let us move on to vote then on Item 523.

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

ITEM 524

The Chair. We move on to Item 524: “That the Long Title stand part of the Measure”. I call upon a member of the Steering Committee to move this.

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I so move.

The Chair. This item is open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak, so again let us move on to vote straight away then on Item 524.

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

The Chair. That completes the Revision stage for the Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure which now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting.

ITEM 525

The Chair. Let us move on to the last stage of this whole section this afternoon and that is the Revision stage for the draft Amending Canon. We now take the Revision stage for draft Amending Canon No. 41. No notice has been given of any amendments and no members have indicated that they wish to speak against particular paragraphs. I, therefore, give my permission, under Standing Order 58(4), to the paragraphs being taken en bloc. I invite a member of the Steering Committee then to move Item 525. That is, “That paragraphs 1 to 6 stand part of the Canon.”

Dr Michael Todd (Truro): I so move.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak. Let us move, once again, to vote, this time on Item 525.

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

The Chair. Thank you very much, everyone. That completes the Revision stage of draft Amending Canon No. 41. The Canon now stands committed to the Steering Committee in respect of its final drafting. That concludes this item of business. We will move to the next item on the agenda in a moment. Thanks, everyone, for your contributions.

THE CHAIR: *The Bishop of Manchester (Right Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 16.02 pm.

ITEM 507
DRAFT PAROCHIAL FEES AND SCHEDULED MATTERS AMENDING
ORDER 2019 (GS 2116)

The Chair: On we move, Synod. We have now reached the Draft Parochial Fees and Scheduled Matters Amending Order 2019, Item 507 on our Order Paper. For this, you will need the draft Order, GS 2116, and the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 2116X. You may also want to look at the financial comment on this item at paragraphs 8 to 10 of the Financial Memorandum, which was the Fifth Notice Paper, which is usually in green if you are looking for that. I invite the Bishop of Portsmouth to speak to and move this item. He has up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster): I stand to move that the Parochial Fees and Scheduled Matters Amending Order 2019 be approved. It is five years since Synod considered the second draft Fees Order to set fees according to the arrangements agreed by Synod in 2011. I now move the Order setting fees for the next five years.

Debating fees should not obscure the reality that funeral and wedding services represent important moments when we meet and minister to people at key moments in their lives. Organising or attending a funeral or wedding might be a first or rare contact with the Gospel and the Church and a moment to offer all involved a good introduction to both at every step.

I begin by setting out something of the wider context of the opportunities for mission presented through the Church of England's Life Events Ministry. In 2017, there were over 38,000 weddings in the Church of England. Though this is a 22% decline over the previous four years, it still gives considerable opportunity to meet and talk with 77,000 brides and grooms and to ensure that the half a million guests who attend these weddings have a good experience of Christian worship and values.

Funerals too decline, with 20% fewer in 2017 than in 2012, a decline that is even more pronounced in crematoria funerals. Now 77% of all funerals involve cremation. Through funeral ministry, the Church of England engages with nearly half a million bereaved people at funeral visits and upwards of seven million people attend funerals led by a Church of England minister every year. It is in that context that we consider this Fees Order.

The thinking behind the arrangements was to make sure that parochial fees were justifiable in relation to costs, uniform across the Church of England, inclusive, leaving extras to those matters over which people have genuine choice, and affordable. In setting fees, a balance must be struck between not inhibiting the significant mission opportunities afforded and covering costs.

The 2014 Order prescribed fees for 2015 to 2019 and set fees according to a formula as allowed for under the Measure as amended. This proposed 2019 Order prescribes fees

for a further five years from 2020 to 2024. This avoids the need for an annual Fees Order but, if it is felt that fees are out of step and require reconsideration, it will always be possible to consider an amending Order during that five-year period.

Turning to the formula, the Order is to cover five years, so we must ensure that an annual fees review is built into the order. The Measure provides that the increase may be prescribed by specifying, “A formula related to a published index of price or earnings increases which is of a general application”. For the 2014 Order, we chose the Retail Price Index and, specifically, the September change in each year before the fees came into effect.

For the 2019 Order, the Archbishops’ Council now considers that it would be more appropriate to use the Consumer Price Index for the purpose of calculating increases. CPI is now considered a more robust and effective measure of inflation and is, increasingly, widely used. Stipends too have risen more closely in line with CPI than RPI. Further, it is proposed that, for the new Order, the August CPI figure will be used rather than the September figure. This will enable an updated parochial fees table to be made available earlier in the year.

For this first year, the uplift is to be applied to the base figures in the Order and in subsequent years to the level of fees in the year before. If there is a negative change in the CPI there would be a nil increase. How are the base figures calculated? One of the principles on which proposed fees were set is that they should have reference to the cost

of providing the service. The calculation of the base figures includes elements for the cost of clergy, church maintenance and running costs, churchyard maintenance and the cost of administration.

This Order makes the following changes to the Measure. Firstly, it makes provision for no fees to apply for funerals for and monuments commemorating a person aged less than 18 years - not 16 as at present - in order to bring these in line with government proposals to remove local authority fees for the cost of burials or cremations for those under 18.

Secondly, a fee is included in the Order for funeral services in other places than churches, cemeteries and crematoria, such as a funeral director's private chapel or a woodland burial site, both of which have been deemed to be lawful and are likely to become more common.

Thirdly, the Order proposes abolishing the small PCC fee for a funeral service at a crematorium when there is no service in church. There is no clear justification for a PCC to receive a fee where a funeral takes place in a building or other place for which the PCC has no responsibility. Furthermore, it simplifies matters considerably since administration of this fee is far from straightforward because of the difficulty for funeral directors of identifying the PCC to whom the fee should go.

To conclude, marriage and funeral services are a vital part of the Church's mission and ministry. They are a significant channel for our pastoral care and outreach to those who

may not otherwise have much contact with the Church and the Gospel. The Church should feel confident in the value of the ministry it offers and should not be embarrassed about requiring a contribution towards the provision of ministry in the form of a legally payable fee. I beg to move.

The Chair. Unusually for us today, we have no amendments on this. It is a nice straightforward debate and then we come to a decision and a vote at the end.

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North): I probably ought to declare an interest because I am mortal and, thus, will one day require a funeral. It will though be a wonderfully splendid funeral. You will all be very welcome because we will be celebrating because, for those alive in Jesus Christ, death has lost its sting.

That really brings me to the heart of what I want to say because fewer and fewer people are hearing that message of good news. I think it would be remiss if we passed on from today without noticing the impact that the decision made in 2014 has had on our ministry as a national Church. Since that year, in the Diocese of Blackburn the fees collected have gone down and down and down. Behind that figure is the reality that fewer and fewer people are able to afford the pastoral and sacramental ministry that we want to offer them; fewer weddings, fewer funerals, fewer opportunities to proclaim that in Christ death has lost its sting, fewer opportunities to reach out evangelistically to our communities and to celebrate our identity as a national Church.

It is quite clear that the impact of that has been shown most in poorest areas. Anecdotal evidence suggests that for clergy working in areas of poverty, the funerals have almost dried up completely and the weddings altogether. That is because of decisions that we have made. It is something we brought on ourselves because of a false premise that lies at the heart of this fees table, which is that the amount that people pay in fees should be proportionate to the hours that a priest works. That undermines the nature of priesthood, which should be offered to communities as gift.

What is more, it is not a principle that we apply to any other area of ministry. When I was a parish priest, I did not invoice Akela when I popped in to pray with the Cubs, so why apply it in this particular case? If we are serious about being a Church with and for the poor, we will not achieve that by pricing the poor out of the pastoral and sacramental ministry of the Church. No doubt the answer to that will be that we can always waive fees, but I am absolutely sick and tired of hardworking people, who are struggling to make ends meet because of a bust and broken economic model, having to beg for charity.

The Church of England should not be colluding with that. It should be speaking against it prophetically. I am going to launch a one-person rebellion against this Fees Order. I did that in 2014. Two of us voted against the Fees Order then. My co-conspirator has, sadly, left the Synod, so no doubt I shall be voting alone, but that is not going to stop me.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Philip. I can correct you, you did not need to make a declaration of interest. You will not be required to pay for your own funeral. That will fall to somebody else in due course.

Revd Peter Kay (St Albans): I would like to thank the Committee for their work, but I would also like to register my concern with the reduction to zero of the PCC element of cremation funerals. The justification that has been given for that, just to give Synod the overall scope of that, is currently £195 of which £165 would go to the DBF and £30 goes to the PCC. The proposal is for the whole of that £195 to go to the DBF.

There are two reasons that have been given for this. The first is that there is no clear justification, so goes the argument, for a PCC to receive a fee when a funeral takes place off site. The second is, well, that it is all too difficult to administer.

I think there are really two responses that I would like to make to that. Firstly, there is a clear justification for the PCC to receive a fee and that is because, although it is off-site, it is quite clearly parish ministry. Of course, it is parish ministry. The reason that a funeral would come your way will be because of some sort of parish element. It is quite appropriate for at least some fee to go to the parish itself.

There is also what you might say an opportunity cost to the parish because the parish priest will be giving their time and energy to this particular funeral; and, also, that actually this is a helpful way of just oiling the wheels to make sure that when the question inevitably

comes in PCCs, “What have you been doing?”, well, at least you can point to something and some benefit for this, “Of course, there is much wider pastoral ministry that goes on.”

I would suggest that the better way of responding to this, and particularly thinking about the idea, is to restore that element so that it does help, some of the money does go to the PCC, but also just simply to simplify the rules that actually go around to where the actual fee goes to, which parish, who is a resident, all the electoral rolls, so then it is much clearer and works better.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I am a parish priest. Some have accused me of not liking change, which is a fair comment. One exception was the 2013 Fees Measure which, coming so soon after I became an incumbent, excited me greatly. One of the key changes for clergy and administrators was there was to be a PCC fee element for cremations. This has now been changed back, as we have heard, because it has been deemed too complex to determine which PCC should get the fee. I want to mourn the loss of this token £30. My first reason is that, despite its existing for nearly seven years, many clergy have only just got their heads around it. It is really not that hard to work out which PCC the fee goes to. It is the parish in which they were resident when they died, unless they are also on the electoral roll, which in the vast majority of cases is not relevant.

It does complicate matters, I concede, but I think there is a good reason for it. Quite often, the minister taking the cremation is not the local parish priest of the deceased and, technically, whoever does take that cremation is supposed to obtain the permission of her or him. This does not always happen, and that is quite an understatement. Having a legal requirement that some of the fee goes to the parish gives real teeth to this requirement because not passing on the fee to the relevant parish is, in fact - and this is a technical term - very naughty.

This is not just about petty parochialism. It is about enabling proper pastoral links between local ministry teams and the next of kin if they still reside in the parish, where appropriate. How can the Church offer pastoral care or invite to a remembering service if they have not been told that a parishioner has died and an Anglican cremation service has taken place?

The obligation to gain the permission of the local parish priest still exists, but ensuring this fee continues to go to the right place makes this more likely, as people are, understandably, more nervous about being in trouble for misdirecting funds, albeit small, than being discourteous to fellow clergy. Making things simpler is a good thing, but I feel the reason given, that it is hard to work out where the fee goes, is not a good enough reason to have made this change.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): In 2014, we decided, acting on behalf of a group of six parishes and ten churches, to continue to employ an administrator. We had employed

the administrator on the basis of a precept based on our Fairer Share. When the new Fees Order came into effect in 2014, we decided that each of the PCCs would pay over into what was a team - I guess I now need to call it the parishes - for the purpose of paying the administrator a proportion of those fees. We retain about 40% that would otherwise go to the individual parishes.

The reason for that is it makes it very fair to employ an administrator, partly based on all being in it together but also partly based on the amount of work that is done. Released for Mission, you will recall, for the rural church urged the employment of professional administrators and that is what we have gone to do. Any decrease in the amount that is retained, of course, undercuts our ability to continue with the paid administrators. It is an important part of the income flow, so please do not do this.

Revd Christopher Smith (London): Following up on the Bishop of Burnley's point, I wonder whether the Bishop of Portsmouth could tell us whether the Committee asked itself if the market is telling us something and whether they considered the possibility of putting the fees down?

The Bishop of Chester (Rt Revd Dr Peter Forster): I have some sympathy with that, as will become clear. I was surprised when this item was introduced that there was no discussion of the fact that the fees are falling so significantly in all our dioceses and some analysis of the reasons. Is it the secularisation of our society? Is it that other premises are available? Is it that there are more and more skilful and experienced funeral

celebrants offering their ministry? Or is it, in fact, down to the increasing cost which we significantly raised five years ago? I would, I think, have expected some analysis of these matters at this point.

The second thing I would want to say is that one of my jobs is to relate to the Church of Scotland and they have a principle that ministers are not allowed to charge any fees for their services. I declare my solidarity with the Bishop of Burnley at this point because, while Scotland is in many ways even more secular than England as a country, I notice that the relationship of the minister in the parish is not beset by these complicated and really quite significant fees and for families that are not particularly well-off, £200 for a funeral - and we are proposing to charge £200 for a funeral even in the chapel of the funeral director - is really quite a lot of money.

I realise there will be a great grinding of gears and we cannot do it now, but, looking to the future, I would want to cut the costs of the ministerial element, not only because I think we are probably charging too much but because of the importance of the pastoral outreach which this ministry represents. Why do we charge for this and so much?

Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford): I am with Bishop North on this matter. I think it is a complete no-brainer. It is just wonderful to hear this idea we are putting all this money into renewal and reform and into evangelism. Just imagine the scenario, a family comes in to organise a funeral and the funeral director says, "Well, you can have the humanist person or you can have this person or you could even have a Christian minister". The

family says, "Well, what is it going to cost?" And they go, "Well, the humanist will cost this much and ... but, of course, the Christian minister will be free". Everyone jumps up with glee and says, "Yes, we will have a Christian funeral". At one stroke, you have got a whole load of people wanting to come back into church for their funerals because we are giving them a gift.

In terms of evangelism and outreach, I just think it is a complete no-brainer. I think we should go for it. Take some of the money from reform and renewal, if you need to, to bolster up the coffers, and give people the very thing that they want, which is a really good send-off done with love and with joy. Go for it.

The Chair: Has a Fees Order ever provoked such passion in this room?

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I will declare an interest. I am a PCC treasurer. Between this Synod and the end of this month, we have two weddings in the parish, one paid for last year and one paid for this year before the new Fees Regulations came in. I did not know what to charge them, so I put it to our friendly standing committee who said, "Don't be so miserable, Freeman, they can have it" for what they did, but I have still got to pay the DBF who want their corn, the organist, the vergers and the bell ringers, et cetera. The PCC took the hit, you will all be glad to hear.

I am asking that, when we look at this, the August figures that have been used for years come out too late. I am making an appeal that you switch to the CPI. That has brought

it back a couple of months. I would like you to switch to the June figure. In the long run, it will not make a ha'porth of difference. I may be late in the day for doing it now, but I am putting down a marker there is a very good reason to make the life of PCC treasurers easy and if you take all the fees away it will make our lives even easier.

Revd Paul Cartwright (Leeds): One of my favourite jokes, which brings the NHS and the Church together, is the question that is often asked by nursing staff in some of our hospitals which have not removed the chaplaincy provision and cares holistically for those receiving treatment. The nurse goes up to the patient and asks, "Do you want us to record your faith?" To which the patient replies, "No, it's ok, I'm Church of England". You may be wondering why I have told you this joke today, but simply it reminds us that we are a Church for all and not just a chaplaincy for our congregations.

The Fees Measure relates to all those life moments where we as a Church are privileged to be able to minister to those we have the cure of souls of. That is everyone in our parishes. There used to be a time when the majority of funerals conducted were done for families who were on the edges of our congregations or families who had never previously walked through the doors of the buildings. These times were a fantastic opportunity for mission and within my own parish and deanery we have seen people come to know our Lord better and join the worshipping communities through the ministry they have experienced at the time of their bereavement.

There are some things within the Fees Measure that I do like. Thanks for bringing in the change from 16 to 18 regarding the free services. That is fantastic and, yet, there are still problems with what we are passing today if it passes. The fees charged for the occasional officers still manage to marginalise the poor, outpricing the church for weddings and funerals. Hotels now offer all-inclusive cheap weddings knowing that they will make their money over the bar when the marriage is celebrated, or the undertaker offers a cheaper civil celebrant who is happy to include the “our Father” to make it a Christian funeral.

We have heard from the Bishop of Portsmouth that there is a decrease of at least 20% in the numbers of weddings and funerals. We are really missing a great opportunity for mission and proclaiming the Gospel to those who may not have heard it in adult life. I know that some may say that we have the ability to waive fees, but certainly in our diocese there is a need to seek approval from the archdeacons for this. Even when the PCC has chosen not to charge the fees for funerals, that reduction of £28 which could be offered for a cremation funeral has now been removed as the full fee will go to the DBS.

Others say that that the cost of a church wedding is nothing compared to the celebrations that take place, but let me give you an example: two weeks before one of my weddings the year before last, a couple came forward to cancel the wedding because they could not afford it. I became like a benefits assessor and said to them, “Well, how would you celebrate it?” and their answer was, “My nan was going to make some sandwiches and we were going to the pub.” The reply was, “We’ll do it for free”, and the organist did it for free, too.

Synod, I realise that we need a Fees Measure but I am going to vote against this. I am going to join Bishop North and I urge you to do the same. It is not right. Let us pull together, let us offer the communities where we serve something that they will remember the Church of England for rather than trying to fleece them out of more money.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Point of order. In view of the views that have been expressed very strongly about funeral fees, the motion as it stands before us at the moment would require us to approve the whole Order or vote down the whole Order. If we were to adjourn this debate, my question is: would it be in order to bring it back in July with separate votes on the weddings and funerals' fees?

The Chair: I will take some advice on that for a moment, if you will excuse me. The lawyers tell me the difficulty is that it is too late to put down amendments, so we would simply be in the same place in July as we are at the moment. Sadly, that is not possible.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): If I could deal with a couple of the points first. As I answered yesterday to Mr Freeman, were those charges to remain intact after today we would be amenable, should dioceses indicate to us, that we would put forward an amending Order next year in order to bring the date forward to June. We have no problem with that.

In terms of the £30 going to the PCCs, it is not just the complexity of working out which PCC it is; there is actually a cost involved in doing that which erodes quite a lot of the £30, and that is the piece.

So then we come to the Bishop of Burnley and I may be your Finance Chairman second, but I am a passionate Christian first. I think we need to ask you, please, to pass this amending Order today in order that we have a fees structure in place. I have not been able to take legal advice, but I believe it would be quite possible to come back to this item at a later date without committing yourself to the full five years if research proved to you that there was a better way forward than these fees.

If I could just extrapolate something. If, by taking away these fees, we were to achieve an explosion in the use of our premises and our priests for weddings and funerals, and with new contactless card technology which we are introducing now, I could well make the argument that the Church might not just have a wonderful missional opportunity through these weddings and funerals, but might actually be financially better off as well. Actually, the PCCs would get all of that income; the DBFs would not get any.

I believe that legally I need to ask you to pass this and I believe it will then be possible for research to be undertaken as to what is really driving the changes of pattern of usage and we might even be able to find a way in which we could trial a different approach going forward.

The Chair: Thank you, Canon Spence. As nothing if not a megalomaniac, I am minded to use that new power the Chair now has to put to you a motion for closure without having to wait for Mr Freeman or another friend to help me in that. If you do not like the Chair doing that, you know what to do, but I think we have had a useful debate. So I put to you the motion for closure on Item 507.

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

The Chair: I therefore invite the Bishop of Portsmouth to reply to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster): I and colleagues are grateful for the powerful contributions to this debate reflecting how important this part of the Church's mission and ministry is. You have given RACSC and the Archbishops' Council much to consider as we look forward and I promise on their behalf to do so.

The Bishop of Burnley, funerals are indeed expensive. The average cost of an essential funeral these days is about £4,300 and our fees represent about 8% of that, closer to 5% for crematoria funerals. This is not all about cost. There is, indeed, competition out there, competition from many sources and competition which, on the whole, appears to use our fees as the benchmark or the basis – often the basis – for setting their fees.

Peter Kay, recent legislation allowed any member of the clergy to officiate at a funeral at the request of the family. Tiffer, permission of the local parish priest, following the recent decision of this Synod, is no longer required. The link to a specific parish is not always clear and makes life in that sense more difficult for funeral directors.

Debrah Mclsaac, Christopher Smith, the Bishop of Chester, Rosie Harper, we are continuing to engage in research and learning about our ministry and our mission in these areas. In the past three years, around 2,500 clergy and lay members of the Church of England have learned about that research and been supported in it in 35 of our dioceses.

To those who are pressing for an immediate and radical change, an amendment, of course, would directly have tested the opinion of this Synod. Without that, I invite you this afternoon, following Canon Spence, to support this Fee Order for now with all its elements, including the raising of the age at which fees are automatically waived to 18, and give us opportunity to consider how best to reflect on the points you have made and return in due course with further proposals within the five-year term of this Order. We hear, for instance, the wish of John Freeman, and perhaps others, for the fees to be settled even earlier than the improvement we are offering in this Order.

Thank you very much for all the contributions you have made. We hope you will be able to support this Order today and for us to engage in further research, to listen to you and to consider how best to continue to serve the people of our nation through this important ministry. I invite you to pass this Fees Order. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. I therefore put Item 507 to the vote.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of order: given the effect of this beyond this House it would be good to have an accurate count of Synod. Would you order a count of the whole Synod, please?

The Chair: If 25 people stand to indicate they want that then I shall do so. I think we have made 25 so we shall a count of the whole Synod. The lawyer cannot find a microphone. I have never seen a lawyer lost for words before. A microphone has arrived.

The motion was put and carried, 165 voting in favour, 80 against, with 22 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: I declare that the motion is passed. Can I thank you, Synod, for a very enthralling debate and one which has not only done the urgent business but I think has sent some helpful signals back to RACSC and those in this building who will need to take matters forward. Thank you very much. That brings this item to a conclusion.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 4.47 pm

ITEM 508

CODE OF PRACTICE ON CO-OPERATION BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH OTHER CHURCHES (GS 2117)

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 508. You will need the Code of Practice, which is detailed in GS 2117, and the Explanatory Memorandum, which is GS 2117X. I call the Bishop of Chichester to move Item 508: “That the Code of Practice on Co-operation by the Church of England with Other Churches be approved.” You may speak for up to ten minutes.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner): The Code of Practice is required by the Ecumenical Relations Measure 2018 5B and it refers throughout also to the new Canon B 43, both of which have already been approved by the General Synod. The Code of Practice enables the Measure and the Canon to be put into effect and it explains how their provisions are to be applied setting a uniform standard for the Church of England’s relations with other churches.

It states that officeholders in the Church of England, that is mainly clergy – vicars, curates, archdeacons, bishops, deans and chapters – “shall have regard to the Code.” To “have regard to the Code” can sound a bit feeble, but it is not. The Code is a mandatory guide not to be ignored. There is clear benefit to having legislation defined by Measure and Canon which is then applied to specific circumstances according to the guidance of a Code of Practice. Over and above this mechanism for adaptation and flexibility, there

have been significant changes to the Ecumenical Relations Measure and the Canon which required a new Code.

This package of Measure, Canon and Code of Practice, introduces two important changes to the present ecumenical provision. The first is provision for local designation of a church by a diocese. This enables newer and minority churches that do not have a national presence and associated structures to come into the framework we have for ecumenical hospitality and partnership. The second new provision is a revision of formal ecumenical partnerships, which are now to be called local co-operative schemes, allowing the greatest degree of freedom that is possible for Church of England parishes to work together with neighbouring churches.

The Code of Practice gives context-specific guidelines with different provisions for different cases. It gives a list of exceptions, often the most interesting part of a Code of Practice, and it seeks to encourage bishops and others in the use of their discretion. It is designed to be comprehensive and easy for busy people to find the information they are looking for.

The recent publication of *Walking Together on the Way*, the first report of the Third Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, has outlined a model for receptive ecumenism as we seek to deepen the level of communion we already share. It asks us to look at what we bring to each other and how we receive from each other. This reminds us that in our relationships as Christians on earth, as in our relationship with the

communion of the saints in heaven, we are no longer strangers and aliens, but fellow citizens with the saints.

My hope and prayer is that this Code of Practice will bring those words to life in our pilgrimage together on earth as we seek to deepen our communion with our brothers and sisters in Christ.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. Those wishing to speak are invited to indicate by either standing or indicating in another way. I call Revd Philip Cooper for his maiden speech. You have up to five minutes.

Revd Philip Cooper (Ecumenical Representatives): One of my roles within the Moravian Church is the role of being the National Ecumenical Officer, which means I represent the Moravian Church on the Churches Together in England Enabling Group. This Enabling Group has played a large part in producing the new ecumenical framework, a new framework for local unity in mission. This new framework is a response to the fact that the ecumenical landscape has changed immensely in recent times within this nation, with more Christian churches engaging ecumenically in new and ever diverse ways, particularly at the local level and motivated by mission. The new framework seeks to respond to that changing landscape, realising that a lighter touch and more flexible approach is needed.

The Code of Practice that we are discussing this afternoon at this Synod, I believe embraces and supports that ethos, that new way of working which is so vital to mission. I, therefore, welcome this Code of Practice. I am deeply encouraged by it. I am excited by it and the opportunities that it makes possible. I am grateful for the time spent and the hard work done in producing this Code of Practice as well. I feel sure that this Code of Practice will be widely welcomed within ecumenical circles as an extremely helpful Code of Practice and a very positive development in our ecumenical life together.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon Lucy Docherty (Portsmouth): I also declare an interest in that I too sit on the Churches Together in England's Enabling Group. In paragraph 2 of this Code of Practice is a clue to what this document is all about. I quote: "It is a response to the substantial shifts in the Christian and ecumenical landscape in England and beyond, as well as new patterns of ecumenical mission emerging at local level". So because the Church of England abides by the rule of legislation, we find set out here in somewhat dry legal detail what is, in fact, the beating heart of our Christian commitment, which is our desire to work together so that all may be one.

There is much good practice in these paragraphs and much that is already being done in parishes up and down the country is now set out clearly before us. I hope also that it will provide a timely reminder to all of us of how many practices that have been available for

some time, such as the common baptismal certificate mentioned in paragraph 92. I hope that if this is not already being offered routinely, when appropriate, it now will be.

For me, personally, the common baptismal certificate allowed all my four children to belong symbolically to both the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England through their baptism. It is an acknowledgment of how we are all members of the one universal Church of Christ and was, for me, a very precious and rare example of my husband's Church and mine working together to help interchurch families like ours. My children were all baptized in the Catholic Church and then welcomed into our Anglican Church family the following week and presented with their common baptismal certificates.

Paragraph 161 is another good example of really good practice that, in my case, has enabled my Roman Catholic husband to play a full part in the worship and life of our Anglican Church. The ecumenical landscape of this country has changed enormously in the last ten years. Anyone who was present at the Churches Together in England Triennial Forum last September can witness to this.

In 2019, we have a very lively, energetic and beating ecumenical heart pumping a new lifeblood into the Body of Christ in this country. We have often had speeches in this Synod which attest to the lively and committed work of local churches together in their communities and a good example will be the way so many Churches Together groups already work well to tackle homelessness in their communities – something we will be discussing very soon.

Our own particularly Anglican contribution to ecumenical co-operation in this Code of Practice may seem somewhat dry but, as the title says, it provides a framework for co-operation with other churches which should be a real enabler of ecumenical good practice, and I commend it to the Synod and ask you to pass it.

Revd Canon Professor Paul Fiddes (Ecumenical Representative): I am the Ecumenical Representative for the Baptist Union of Great Britain. Chair and members of Synod, thank you for calling me; perhaps to answer the plea in questions yesterday for a response to this document from an ecumenical representative. Like two buses coming along at the same time after a long wait, you are getting two such responses today, the Chair graciously permitting.

I greet this Code of Practice with great enthusiasm. According to an old cliché, it is not just doing ecumenical things but doing things ecumenically. Putting the provisions of the new Ecumenical Canon B 43 into practice, it can awaken a vision of working in partnership in all the matters that concern us in this Synod: evangelism, care for young people, for the homeless, for the environment and for minority groups. Working with the Code's guidelines, or "recipes" as the authors put it, will enable us to understand the Church of Christ as one body engaged in God's mission. An extraordinary amount is possible under the hospitable provisions of Canon B 43. With imagination and goodwill, we can live now in an age of considerable visible unity (while of course we work and pray for fuller unity) so we can be that witness to the world for which Jesus prayed.

On a corporate level, the Code addresses the application of Canon 43 to what are called “local ecumenical co-operative schemes”. The creation of three kinds of scheme - working agreements, partnership agreements and constitutional agreements - offers shared worship and mission in flexible ways responding to actual need on the ground. It extends many of the benefits of the existing local ecumenical projects - LEPs - without the cumbersome structures this has sometimes involved, returning direction to the local congregations. Just imagine, for example, a shared mission project under a short-term working agreement which results in people coming to faith in Christ for the first time. They could be baptized and then received into a local congregation in the context of several churches, that is the Church of Christ gathered together to welcome them and celebrate their entry in to a new life.

In the ecclesial tradition of covenants, Christ is the covenant mediator. In covenant people agree together not out of convenience but because they believe they are called together by Christ, summoned by Him. It is nothing less than a question of being a disciple.

The Chair: After Mr French, I would be minded if anybody wanted to put a motion for closure.

Mr Philip French (Rochester): To declare an interest, or at least a context, I have worshipped for the past 20 years in a local ecumenical partnership of the United Reformed

Church of the Church of England, where I serve as both elder and churchwarden. Hands up - I am the member who gave notice under Standing Order 71(2) to require a debate on this item. I did so because we have something here to celebrate and as a courtesy to our guests from other denominations from whom we have just heard. No doubt this was scheduled as deemed business as it was thought uncontentious in principle and to save time. Yes, but it is important: both to us and to our ecumenical partners, and for our witness to the nation.

Taking unity seriously is a Gospel imperative. It is not a peripheral concern. Jesus prayed for the unity of his disciples, John 17:11. Non-Christians look at divisions between and, indeed, within denominations with bemusement and it damages our witness to them. There is so much more that unites us than divides us: our belief in God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit; as Creator, Redeemer and Sustainer. If this is really the Synod of Evangelism, surely we must rejoice in the opportunities we have already taken and those we have yet to grasp, to work with our partners in the Gospel, to be enriched by their faith and insights as they are in turn enriched by ours.

So let us turn to the Code. Much of the Code deals with simplifying ecumenical co-operation, all of which is welcome. Part 2, section 5 deals with longer-lasting relationships. I have mentioned that my parish is part of a formal LEP as it is now. In the new language this would be a Type C agreement for a local ecumenical co-operative scheme. As an aside, that does not so much trip off the tongue as trip it up.

Thinking about our local circumstances, four points occur to me. First, the Code concentrates on entry into new LECSs. There is an equal need for both clarity and sensitivity in honouring existing arrangements. For partner churches which have in good faith entered into what were understood to be permanent covenants, there could be a worrying shift from LEPs to LECSs in the notion that covenant relationships can be broken unilaterally.

Secondly, it is encouraging to see at paragraph 112 there is no upper limit for those arrangements. Thirdly, paragraph 159 indicates that partner churches would be expected to have some influence on Church of England ministerial appointments. That is welcome but it is also toothless. It is written as a commentary on a Measure which does not require that consultation. There is at least one known painful example where it did not happen and there is no apparent remedy or right of appeal. Would the House of Bishops give further consideration to this, for example whether an amendment of the Patronage (Benefices) Measure of 1998 might help?

Ecumenicalism involves taking risk and permitting innovation. Like light, we let the Holy Spirit in through the chinks in the walls. The Bishop of Chichester noticed there is room for discretion. Hoorah! Thank you to the House of Bishops for preparing this. Please join with me in welcoming it wholeheartedly.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Madam Chair, under Standing Order 31, I am

happy to assist you in proposing a motion for closure, but under the Regulations you also can propose a motion for closure.

The Chair: I know I can. Are you proposing a motion for closure? Mr Freeman, do the honours.

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

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

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

The Chair: I now invite the Bishop of Chichester to respond to the debate.

The Bishop of Chichester (Rt Revd Dr Martin Warner): Can I first of all say thank you to two of our ecumenical representatives, Philip Cooper and Paul Fiddes, for their very helpful and detailed response to the Code of Practice and for the huge encouragement and enthusiasm with which they have received it. May I also underline our thanks to all those who are in ecumenical partnership with us who have helped form this Code of Practice. May I also say thank you to Lucy Docherty and Philip French who have identified the ways in which it might land within our own lives, in our parishes and in our families, and invite Philip French to write to the House of Bishops to ask for clarification on the question that he put.

We hope that this will be, as has already been noted, a sign of encouragement and enthusiasm which will lead to the renewal and deepening of our life together and our witness to Jesus Christ. It is on that basis that I move “That the draft Code of Practice under section 5B of the Church of England (Ecumenical Relations) Measure 1988 be approved”.

The Chair: We now put Item 508 to the vote.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order: given the interest of our ecumenical partners, it would be good to have an accurate count of Synod. Would you order a count of Synod?

The Chair: I will need to see 25 members standing for that to be in order. I do not. We shall not have a counted vote by Houses. We now put Item 508 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That concludes Item 508. I now need to invite the Chair of the Business Committee to come and address Synod.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): My friends, my definition of a sad day is when I stand in front of you too many times. If you are following the timetable carefully, you will realise that we have reached a moment of very tricky timing. We failed to guess accurately your

interest in various legislative items and we are left with a mere 20 minutes for Item 9, the Private Member's Motion on the Homeless Task Force. I think I need to apologise most of all to Mr Gray, but it seems to me that, desirable as it is to debate his motion, it may be that now is not the time because we have timed business at 5.30 in which there is also a great deal of interest. With the permission of the Chair, I should like to test the mind of Synod on a variation to the order of the business that would move us straight on to Item 10.

The Chair: We shall do this and test the mind of Synod. Those in favour of the variation to the order of business as proposed, please show.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Point of order: I do not really know how to respond to this unless I am given some assurance that this debate will take place in due time, because we are rather squeezing this issue in the way our society squeezes the issue of homelessness in general.

The Chair: I invite the Chair of the Business Committee to respond.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I would be applauding with you, friends. I am extremely unhappy about this. I have apologised to Mr Gray both privately and publicly, but I do not think we can do his motion justice in 20 minutes. We have timed business at 5.30 pm. I have explained to Mr Gray and will explain to you that I cannot promise that we will be

able to take his motion in this group of sessions, but we will make absolutely certain that nothing prevents its being moved in July. I will have to take advice.

If I could explain to Synod that if you vote at this stage to begin this piece of business, which you have every right to do, it will nevertheless finish at 5.30. I have looked as carefully as I can at the agenda and to promise you that Mr Gray's motion will be taken, I will be having to ask somebody else to give way.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): Point of order. I should know this but I do not: why can we not cut the time for the 5.30 to 7.00 presentation?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I think I hear my good friend and colleague Mrs Foreman suggesting that I move a variation of business so that we take the Living in Love and Faith question time at 6 o'clock instead at 5.30. That is a variation to move the timed business forward.

The Chair: I am content. We will test the mind of Synod on that variation of business.

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

The Chair: That item will now begin at 6 o'clock. We now move to the next order of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 5.15 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon again, everyone. As you know, we come now to the Private Member's Motion from Mr Andrew Gray, Item 9 on the agenda, the Homeless Task Force. For this item members may like to have GS 2110A from Andrew and the related note from the Secretary General (GS 2110B) available. Please also refer to the financial comment on page 4 of the Fifth Notice Paper. Without further ado, I call upon Mr Andrew Gray to move Item 9. You have up to ten minutes.

**ITEM 9
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION
HOMELESS TASK FORCE (GS 2110A and GS 2110B)**

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): I would like you to come with me on a journey. It began over three years ago in June 2015. I was on my way to Sunday Mass. I walked to the centre of Norwich and descended into a place called St Stephen's underpass. The underpass is a gloomy series of passageways running beneath a busy roundabout close to the city centre. It is named after St Stephen because it lies within the parish bearing his name. Stephen was the first Christian martyr who suffered a violent death. The name on this occasion was sadly appropriate.

As I passed through this subway I noticed a little blanket tucked against the wall. Upon it lay bunches of flowers and a card in which these words were written: "I am sorry I did not

help you more. I am sorry I didn't know your name. I am sorry I ignored you. I am sorry will never change. May you find the peace in death you couldn't find in life". By the exit a police notice had been fastened to the wall appealing for witnesses. A homeless Polish man named Sergiusz Meges had been discovered at 7 am the previous Wednesday. He had died from internal bleeding. In response to this death, the parish church of St Stephen raised funds for the local homeless shelter. Thereafter, the story faded with time but the circumstances of his death had seared my conscious.

Nearly two years later, on a frosty February evening, I was approaching Trafalgar Square when I came across the body of an old homeless man. A paramedic was standing above him making notes while the rest of London continued its business. What had killed this old man? Alcohol, drugs, exposure? All three? Living on the street killed him. It is like playing roulette with death: in the end the house always wins. That year 597 homeless people died in England and Wales, an average of 11 every week. Because of them this motion stands before you.

The first part of the motion acknowledges the work being undertaken by Her Majesty's Government. The Homelessness Reduction Act has placed new requirements on local authorities to intervene earlier with those at risk of homelessness. The government has also pledged to halve rough sleeping by 2022 and has provided additional cash for supported housing. These are steps in the right direction but we should not rely on government alone. Since 2010 homelessness has risen by 169%. On a given night, nearly 5,000 people will sleep on the streets of England. Those are the official figures

taken from the street counts, but in reality the problem is much, much bigger. Crisis believes there are 236,000 people across the UK living on the streets, in cars, in tents, in shelters or in unsuitable temporary accommodation.

It is easy to become angry with the failure of politics but we must avoid the temptation to apportion blame because that is how secular politics works. We are representatives of Christ's Kingdom and we must lead by example. That is not just my opinion; that is the word of scripture, Isaiah 58: "If you do away with the yoke of oppression, with the pointing finger and malicious talk, and if you spend yourselves on behalf of the hungry and satisfy the needs of the oppressed, then your light will rise in the darkness, and your night will become like the noon day".

So where do we begin? I have contemplated two questions at some length. First, how can I ask the Church to form a strategy or task force when the average parish is struggling to pay the quota and to maintain congregation numbers? Answer: by faith. We must put our trust in God. Friends and supporters will emerge from the unlikeliest of places. The Church has a proud history of helping the homeless. Organisations such as Centrepoin, Shelter and Housing Justice were founded on Christian activism. At a parish level the church operates over 375 night shelters. The Church Army runs a refuge for homeless women escaping domestic abuse. Its success rate in rehousing and supporting those women is 100%. In other words, it can be done. There is much of which we can be proud but we can and we must do more.

Now to the second question: why not just leave it to homeless organisations? Professional charities do a sterling job but they are fighting a rising tide. This motion seeks the authority of Synod to go forth and establish a task force. From the outset that task force will work closely with major homeless charities to support and to scale up their efforts. It will be an agile task force, it will be light and it will be fleet of foot. All of those charities with whom I have spoken have expressed the strongest interest in gaining the support and the help of the Church.

Homelessness varies between different areas and the approach that we will undertake with them shall be a pragmatic one. How can we, the Church, best help you the agency? Homeless organisations want different things. Crisis has launched a national strategy of its own and feels that the Church could assist by helping to reverse the public perception that homelessness is an unsolvable problem. Housing Justice runs emergency shelters, but to do that requires training people within each diocese and sourcing volunteers. St Mungo's is looking to grow its supported housing provision. This is where a developer builds housing and leases it back to the charity which in turn provides support services. This Housing First approach in Finland has seen homelessness cut by 50%. Green Pastures and Hope Into Action are already doing this. How can we help them grow? As a Church we have land. Can we work with developers to increase the provision of affordable housing? Some 79,000 families live in temporary accommodation. The mother and the three children who are crammed in a one-room bedsit are not rough

sleepers on the pavements but they are still homeless. Our forebears managed to provide alms housing. I do not believe it is beyond our capacity to do so again.

It is essential that we partner with professional charities, otherwise there are multiple ways that intervention can actually make the problem worse, however noble the intentions. This bring me to the downsides. Any strategy, however grand, faces pitfalls and limitations. Not everybody wants to be helped. Not all those who claim to be homeless are genuine and, of those who are, many are violent and have deeply rooted mental health issues. There are no quick-fix solutions and there will be failures. These are some of the tempting reasons not to act, but in this age of political disenchantment we must hold high the light of hope. In this age of bad news and fake news, we must live the good news. I shall leave the closing words with Isaiah: "Then I heard the voice of the Lord saying, 'Whom shall I send? Who will go for us?' And I said, 'Here I am. Send me'." Let that be our answer this day. I commend the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Synod, we need to get on and debate now, please. Item 9 is open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Millie Cork (Leeds): Up until last summer I was working for a church plant in St George's Crypt in Leeds, which is one of the north's largest homeless shelters. The Church Lighthouse is specifically for those battered and bruised by the storms of life, many of whom have lived experience of homelessness. As a part of this ministry, I came

across many who were homeless: rough sleepers, those sofa surfing and those who were in emergency accommodation. I welcome this task force as a concerted effort to implement change.

I was part of conversations in Leeds for a homeless charter which was employed in Manchester to provide joined-up thinking between the council, charities and many new grass-roots organisations. One of the unique parts of this charter is to include people with lived experience of homelessness, and so I would urge the task force to take on this and include those who have been or are homeless.

However, I think there are also several ways that the Church can stand out in bringing hope in some on the root causes of homelessness. In Leeds, I found that many of the people who I met and ministered to were stuck in addiction, which is a severe problem for getting in and staying in stable housing. Yes, as we have heard, we do need housing first but we do not need housing only. One of the things we saw, though, was the massive difference that the Gospel made to those who were stuck in addiction. Jesus in his Jubilee Manifesto in Luke says that he has come to set the oppressed free. We saw this. We saw miracles of people coming off heroin and we also saw the hard slog of living in addiction and yet growing in Christ and freedom. I am not saying Jesus will heal the addict, but I am saying that as a Church we have a unique message of freedom and the blessing of a great community to welcome people into. We must be doing more through Christian-based recovery initiatives to bring good news to people stuck in the pit of addiction.

Another part the Church can play is through looking out for the most vulnerable. At Lighthouse there are many with multiple and complex needs who fall into homelessness and are particularly vulnerable. For example, there is a lady who, after many years of being in unsuitable housing, has since September been living in a bed and breakfast after being evicted from her previous property. She has autism and major behavioural issues and yet she is made in the image of God, is precious to Him, and very precious to Lighthouse. She knows that the church abounds in grace and love and so actively seeks the church to help her. Her vulnerabilities stop her from accessing many kinds of normal emergency or council accommodation. We have been campaigning for years for her to be treated with dignity and respect.

The Chair: Thank you. After Bishop Stephen has spoken, the Archbishop of York, Archbishop Sentamu.

The Bishop of Ely (The Rt Revd Stephen Conway): I share my home with an elderly cat, and the reason for mentioning her is that, in the hierarchy of charitable giving, if anything were to happen to me, my cat stands a better chance of being looked after charitably than most homeless people. That is part of the shock that we face and it is very good to hear of the possibility of a task force following up on what the government has been saying, not least by now saying that it wants to eliminate rough sleeping altogether by 2027.

But the government itself admits this is only going to happen if there is a thorough working together of the voluntary and public sector and for faith communities to be fully involved. The opportunity is for us, as the Church, is to provide disruptive leadership in this whole area, to be those who are saying that against the odds, where homelessness is increasingly seen as a despairing norm, that we, among others, can provide the glue in pulling people together to be ambitious about working with those who are completely dispossessed.

Cambridge, in the Diocese of Ely, has been designated as the most divided city in the UK, socially and economically. This does not include homeless people who fall beneath even that assessment. The opportunity for the church's homelessness project in Cambridge, pulled together a summit around homelessness pulling everybody involved in the needs of homeless people together, uniquely in our region. The task force proposing to operate nationally has the opportunity to be the glue in an alliance to work with people who, as we have heard, are not necessarily the most attractive, agreeable or easy people to work with.

When Jesus talks about His "little ones", He is not just talking about children, He is talking about all the left out people in his own time, and we need to remember and celebrate that our calling, in serving His kingdom is to be with him not where we think the centre is in the middle, but with Jesus on the edge, which is the centre for him.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Madam Chair, Andrew Gray is to be congratulated first of all for a fairly carefully balanced motion. He knows the dangers in some directions, so he has drafted it with such great care. He spoke from the heart and you could hear the Gospel of Jesus Christ coming through. This was not some kind of pure social action but for the Gospel imperative for us to be what Jesus called the neighbourly Samaritan, that the Church should be the neighbourly Samaritan, you should see your neighbour. What of course is interesting for me in that parable, people always called him the Good Samaritan. Jesus never called him that, He never called him good, He simply said a Samaritan. Could we be that Samaritan that actually looks around with some very careful eyes and still see that she is still lying there, he is still lying there.

When I was a curate in Herne Hill, Margaret and I decided to take in some homeless people. We did this regularly until one day it became not secure for our children and so we supported the local group that was taking in, during the winter months, quite a lot of homeless people, so I know from experience what the challenges we heard from Andrew are given to us. I am the President of UK YMCA England and in the years I have been President, nearly 12 years, it does an amazing job with homeless young people. Not only does it provide them with accommodation but also manages to get them back into work, back to education.

I will be very glad as President of YMCA England to say, "By the way, do you know the Church of England through the Archbishops' Council is trying to set up a task force". We

know the results of a good task force. When we faced the pension crisis, what did we do? The Archbishops' Council with the Church Commissioners set up a task force to address it. When the whole question arose of how we were going to deal with the money that the Commissioners are giving, again, there was a financial task force. So we know that it can work throughout the country.

Andrew, thank you very much, and I just hope that that wonderful vision of Zechariah, who says that in the latter days, people are going to get the hem of a Jew and they will say, "We want to go with you because we know God is with you". By doing this, people may want to get the hem of our trousers or skirts, whatever it is, and say, "Church of England, we want to go with you because you know and we know God is with you". Why? Because we have become the neighbourly Samaritan.

The Chair: After Lisa, I call Stephen Hogg for a maiden speech, please. Thank you.

The Revd Lisa Battye (Manchester): My homeless young friend Daniel, when asked why he liked being in church said, "Because I feel safe". I serve in a diocese that is partnered with one of the devolved authorities – Manchester - and I am proud of the Manchester Night Shelter, also of my own parish's involvement with the Boaz Night Shelter for failed asylum seekers seven months of the year. I have seen at first-hand inner city churches in Salford reaching out to rough sleepers on their door. I have walked the streets of Manchester city centre as a street pastor. I have seen the growth in the number of rough sleepers, I know how important this is. I have also slept out overnight with hundreds of

Christians in the rain raising funds for the Booth Centre which has a fabulous record of serving homeless people for years.

Recently, I have even visited Finland on an exchange visit and learned there the extent to which the social care that the churches provide is funded by the state. In all these things I have seen good practice working best, I think, when it is conceived, planned, delivered and partnered locally not nationally. Our Church is good at devolving decision-making about caring for people in need to local church leadership through our dioceses. I think there is a danger if we do adopt this motion to “scale up and co-ordinate” the Church’s efforts to help in this current crisis of homelessness, that it will become disempowering of the effective work on the ground that is already happening and works best when it comes from local initiative.

I also think it may send a signal that we want to reassume the role of social care provider in our nation without state support for it. So I ask that if we do create a central base for work to alleviate homelessness that it would be using a light touch, working with what we already have rather than trying to direct the works from a centre and that its focus be on influencing national policies in the direction of caring for all citizens rather than on co-ordinating the church’s efforts to help.

Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds): I wish to highlight two things. One is what homelessness is not, and the other about what we could do, and it is more than just setting up a task force to talk; it is about what that task force can do. Homelessness is not just people on the

street, we need to address the entire process surrounding those with no safe home. Sure, it is about finding a place indoors for rough sleepers but it is also about helping them cope with living indoors again and it is ongoing help for the vulnerable and damaged.

My cousin David died as a result of homelessness. Family breakdown found him on the street at 16. 14 years later he was found a place to live, but his years of drug abuse and the inappropriate flat he was found did not make things better. In the end he had to have his leg amputated through years of heroin abuse. After surgery he was taken back to his upstairs flat, and, sadly, after a few weeks his body was found. Suicide, overdose, we will never know. He was 32. Early intervention and support could have saved his life. He was in unsuitable housing - an upstairs flat - with no furniture, no help and mentally and physically disabled.

Chair, I am sure we all have sad stories and many will have great stories of efforts by charity and church and Glass Door in London and St George's in Leeds are great examples of real results but we lack co-ordinated, consistent efforts.

The Church is seen by some as inward looking and obsessed with certain issues. Homelessness is a serious, real and current problem. Let us do something serious, real and now, and let us have it co-ordinated by a task force. We have influence. We have assets. We have people. We could enable the building of social housing on appropriate Church land. We could free up surplus buildings. Dare I say, we could sell off some of the family silver and invest in shared homelessness programmes, partnering with

providers, diocese, charity and government. Chair, we can do something, for God's sake, let us do something.

Revd Rachel Wilson (Rochester): It was not my intention to speak in this debate, so I do not have finely crafted words but I do have something important to say. God works in the most extraordinary ways sometimes. I came here by train yesterday. A young man who was clearly homeless was outside the station, I gave him a cup of tea and we had a chat. Some people came into the station after me and they were speaking about him in a way that made him sound as if he was a bit of inconvenient litter which really should be tidied away.

I am in support of this task force, not least because it was a subject close to my heart in my curacy parish. I sound just one note of caution. Knowing how hard it is for parishes to do things, my concern is that if this becomes known as what the task force does, people in parishes will think it is nothing to do with them. My deanery, rightly, has a good reputation for the support and outreach work that it does, but I know on a parish level there is, frankly, far too much squeamishness about dealing with people like that because, frankly, "it will affect the price of my house". As a priest, I find that deeply embarrassing.

I have been in my parish for two-and-a-half years, and it is hard work. My brothers and sisters, we need to be honest with ourselves and know that it is no longer good enough to say warm words about these things as long as somebody else actually deals with it. This is too important to leave to somebody else. Yes, we need to have a task force

because as a church we need to be the people who do the work of Jesus Christ, but we need to find ways and I do not have all the answers sadly, but I do sit in my church every Sunday and I watch the same faces - they are going to love me when I get home - I watch the same faces going, "Well, that's all very well but I am thinking about my house".

We need to change. We need to find ways to say this is everybody's business. People and dying and it needs to stop. For those of us who are privileged enough to live in affluent parishes it is more incumbent upon us to do something about it. And I thank you very much.

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio): Synod, as you know, I have the privilege of chairing the Mission and Public Affairs Council, and I know I speak for all members of the Council and all members of the staff team in MPA when I wholeheartedly thank Andrew for this motion and for the passionate and articulate way he presented it.

The rapidly growing number of homeless people in our land is nothing short of a national scandal and an indictment of our society's values. If a society is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable members, well, Synod, our nation is failing abjectly. But, of course, it is not only our society who will be judged by this measure. Jesus was unequivocal that He would come to judge us all, each one of us, by that same standard, sheep or goats.

That is why churches have long been at the forefront of the public and charitable response to the needs of homeless people. Many members here are very close to some of the

excellent work going on in over 70 % of our parishes, as Church in Action survey records, and we have heard some of their wonderful testimony. Of course, there is need for that excellent work to be expanded and deepened, so, Synod, I support this motion with all my heart.

I want to make it quite clear, in the expectation that you will pass it, that we will implement it effectively and we will do it by asking you to interpret the call for a national task force with flexibility and imagination, because that is what the urgency of this issue requires. The evidence from successful projects in parishes is that local context is all-important. One size does not fit all. The motion that calls for a task force could include bishops, clergy, laity and immediately you conjure up an image of something cumbersome and inflexible. We cannot do that.

We need something agile, something that is going to make a difference now, something that is going to improve the lot of the most vulnerable this coming winter. We cannot wait for big reports, when all is said and done and so much more is said and nothing is done. So I urge you to support this motion on the understanding that we will put together a task force, not like the task forces of old, not of the great and the good, but one that is energy-rich, agile, and will deliver effective and rapid solutions to rid this land of the scourge of homelessness, not in a few years' time, when we may be in a position to afford more resources, but now. Thank you.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of Manchester (The Rt Revd David Walker): I really want to endorse much of what Mark Sheard has just said. I chair the Manchester Homelessness Partnership Board on behalf of the City Council and all its partners across the universities, public sector, business sector, charities and faith organisations. We have found what really matters there, as Canon Lisa Battye said earlier, is the local knowledge, the local passion about our community, our city, our people, homeless people we know on our streets.

The other lesson I have learned from that work is about co-production. Everything we do, every meeting we hold, whether it is a task group or a board, we make sure there are enough people who have got the actual experience of being homeless in the room, in voice, in strength, in that meeting. If they are not there it is no good the rest of us pontificating about solutions that will work for them. If we are going to make this work, let us do what Mark Sheard has said, keep the task force notion very flexible, let it be the glue that holds things together not the glue that gums up the work, to build on Bishop Stephen's analogy from earlier on.

I have been passionate about homelessness for 30-odd years. I am so grateful we got this debate today. Let us get on with the work, let us get on with it quickly and not be bogged down with bureaucracy in doing it.

Mr Simon Friend (Exeter): Chair, I am pleased to use my maiden speech in support of this motion. I have the joy of being a property developer, a house builder. Often when I

tell church people this, I can see in their eyes a polite but quizzical look asking, “Is it possible to be a Christian and a property developer?” Well, I am pleased to report that I think it is.

I love the work I do. I find it fulfilling and particularly enjoyable to be able to create spaces which people can call home. I also have another role of being chair of trustees of a small homelessness charity in mid-Devon, which will be celebrating its 25th anniversary next year. Like many other housing charities, people come to us when they are facing the most fragile time that anybody can face in their life. Homelessness is not simply about rough sleepers. Somehow that picture can be quite distancing. The reality is that for many people, like you and me, a sudden illness, or a bereavement, or loss of job can very quickly escalate within a matter of weeks into a housing crisis.

This motion is a real opportunity for the Church to be ahead of the curve on an issue, to be at the forefront of a new national initiative, seeking to work collaboratively with other stakeholders to find positive solutions. We should be taking the lead. The Church has tremendous assets, not only with land but also healthy balance sheets. One of the main issues for social housing developers is finding land. There is the potential here to form partnerships with social housing developers to build new homes on Church land. I would love to see the task force develop blueprints of legal structures that could be rolled out across dioceses to enable this to happen. I urge you to support this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Simon. After Andrew has spoken, I will be looking for a motion of closure please.

Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby (Southwark): I am really pleased that we are speaking about this issue. It seems to me that the Church's motivation and reflection on these issues is deep and sustained over many generations. I hope that we can look at Gospel solutions and also work at asking the question how can we remove the causes of homelessness. People ask me why I am on General Synod, having joined recently, and I would love to be able to go out from here and say that this is one reason why I think our work is important.

Our experience in our parish is that we, as Christians, can be both hospitable in welcoming people and dogged in pursuing solutions for them in quite distinctive ways as people of faith. Our experience is as being part of an ecumenical winter night shelter, and I hope that we as a Church would want to work ecumenically on this issue. We also see this issue affects people from all backgrounds, but especially the resident alien, the widow or widower, and the orphan, whether that is literally or in practice. We may think that it is impractical, but I thank Andrew for his presentation and hope that by faith and hope and love we can vote this through.

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

The Chair: Thank you John, 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 ask Andrew Gray to respond to the debate, please. You have up to three minutes.

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): Obviously, in three minutes it is going to be a bit tight to respond to everyone's points, so if anyone wants to talk to me afterwards feel free to do so.

Firstly, a big thank you to all of you that spoke and it is very, very inspiring to hear some of the work that is happening locally within the dioceses. I do want to make a point that I think that has come up a couple of times. I want to pick up on what the Bishop of Ely said. He said about the task force being a glue, that is exactly what the idea is behind it. What I am not proposing with this task force is to set up a sort of 1950s government ministry that dumps centralised plans on everybody. The idea is about seeing what works locally, bringing in national charities, bringing local charities together, bringing those local and national initiatives and actually helping to scale those up. It is very much about what works on the ground and how do we expand that.

So much to say, so little time. The Archbishop of York, thank you. Yes, I think you referred to the Good Samaritans. We have to be reminded again and again that we are

not just engaging here in social work, we are trying to do something that is very practical, very focused, very pragmatic, but which always has at its heart the Gospel message of hope. I think that is something that happens at a local level and we need to make sure it happens on a national level as well.

Stephen Hogg referred to the case of his cousin. We need to be getting the good news out there, and that happens in a number of ways. One is the Gospel message of hope, but the second, as I say, is the practical side of it. Had he had access to supported housing, who knows, maybe it would have been a different outcome.

Rachel Wilson, thank you for your comments. You referred to in your experience at the railway station. There is a hardening public attitude towards rough sleepers and it is quite concerning. Over 35 % of rough sleepers are victims of violence at any one time and often very serious violence, as well as minor assaults.

I want to pick up on the point that Mark Sheard made for Mission and Pastoral Affairs when he talked about the flexibility of the task force. Again, that is absolutely spot on. What we are not talking about here is creating a big bureaucracy. I am an entrepreneur and I come from an entrepreneurial background and, as far as I am concerned, what I want to see is a very small, focused group that delivers outcomes very quickly. That means sitting down and having open and honest conversations with national charities, with diocesan efforts, with parish efforts, and saying, "Okay, what works? What has really worked here? Perhaps what has not worked. What can we learn from each other?"

You know there is a big process to be done there, but I think the result for that process and the gains that we could make in terms of putting a serious dent in the number of rough sleepers and hopefully in the number of long-term homeless is a goal that is worth aiming for. We have to try. I believe that we can do it.

I believe that if we go out there and send that message to the people of the United Kingdom in a time of serious political division that we are bringing other people to work together with us to solve a problem, I think that is a serious message of hope, and, going to what Andrew Moughtin said, we can leave Synod saying, "As well as doing the legislation and the stuff that needs to be done, this is why we are on Synod". I would seriously hope that you give this motion your support. I am sorry, I am out of time but thank you for all your contributions.

The Chair: Thank you Andrew. We move to vote on Item 9.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of order: due to the nature of this debate, and if I am reading the opinion of Synod correctly, I think it would be excellent to show the wider community our commitment on this issue. Therefore, would it be possible to have a counted vote of the entire Synod?

The Chair: Does that have 25 people in agreement?

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

The Chair: Yes, it does. Thank you. I order a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The motion was put and carried, 395 voting in favour, 1 against, with no recorded abstentions.

The Chair: As you know, that concludes this item of business. I have a couple of points that I do need to stress to everybody, so if I could have everyone's attention that would be great. Thank you. Please remember that the next item of business, Item 10, will be filmed, so, if you do not wish to be filmed, please may I encourage you to sit in the public gallery. In order for us to prepare the platform for that item, Item 10, there will now be a very short break. Thank you very much for your contributions, everyone.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 6.09 pm

**ITEM 10
LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH AND PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP (GS MISC 1200)**

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 10 on our agenda. We shall begin with prayer.

Loving God, bless us with the Spirit's grace and presence and keep us steadfast in faith and united in love through Christ your Son, our Lord. Amen.

Just by way of introduction, this will be an item with two presentations, one from the Pastoral Advisory Group and one from the Living in Love and Faith Group. Then there will be an opportunity for questions which will be addressed to a varied panel where you may get a number of responses to your questions. It is hoped that after our introductions, there will be enough time for our questions. I am aware that there is a slight frustration about the shortening of the time. I do intend to propose a slight extension a little bit nearer the time should that be the Synod's mind.

To begin with, I invite Bishop Christine to introduce the item.

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): I am going to ask those members of the Pastoral Advisory Group who are here tonight to introduce themselves.

Mr Ed Shaw (Bristol): My name is Ed Shaw, a member of the House of Laity from Bristol where I am a licensed lay minister and pastor of a BMO.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): My name is Rosemarie Mallett. I am from the Diocese of Southwark. I am a parish priest in Brixton and a director of Social Justice.

Ven. Cherry Vann (Manchester): I am Cherry Vann. I am a member of the House of Clergy here. I am from the Diocese of Manchester and my day job is Archdeacon of Rochdale.

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): I am Robert Atwell, the Bishop of Exeter and, as Chair of the Liturgical Commission, I am on the PAG group to ensure that the left hand know what the right hand is doing and that we are co-ordinated.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am Jamie Harrison from Durham, a member of the House of Laity and I am a general practitioner.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): I am Pete Broadbent and I am Bishop of Willesden.

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): You can see that even those members who are here are a varied bunch. We are going to begin with a living letter for you.

Mr Ed Shaw (Bristol): “To the members of the General Synod of the Church of England. Dear Sisters and Brothers, this letter comes to you, dear members of General Synod, from us, the members of the Pastoral Advisory Group. We want to tell you about our work in a way that signals our desire to generate trust and vulnerability among us as we reflect together on some of the implications of the tasks we have been given.”

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): “We are drawn from different parts of the Church and bring different personal experiences of faith and life to bear. We are

extremely aware that we are not 'representative' of every aspect of human experience as regards gender and sexual orientation and we make no claim to speak 'for' others. However, our engagement with our task has put us into contact with many people from LGBTI+ communities, in addition to those members of the Group who consider themselves to be part of these communities.”

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): “A key task with which we have been entrusted is to produce pastoral resources ‘consistent with the current doctrine and ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England’. In producing the Pastoral Principles, we have become highly sensitised to the fact that in offering almost any resources we could be accused of seeking to affect teaching and doctrine. It is for this reason, therefore, that the Group does not intend to venture into the realm of offering guidelines and resources for public prayer. Responsibility for this, correctly, lies elsewhere in the Church.”

Ven. Cherry Vann (Manchester): “This has been a difficult realisation for us, because people are making pastoral requests for prayer – we have clearly heard this. Prayer means standing alongside people in often complex and sometimes impossible situations and offering our concern for them to God. It is inherently costly and risky and utterly in line with the ministry of Jesus.”

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): “We would now like to turn to what we believe we can confidently offer, which is a proposed diagnosis of those things that are a bar to good pastoral practice in the Church. We believe that acting on this diagnosis

could be potentially transformative for the Church. Our hope is that the Pastoral Principles will help shape the life of the Church, in such a way that when the time comes to discern a way forward, the Church can do so together, unimpeded by defensive and adversarial impulses.

“We have identified what could be called ‘six pervading evils’: ignorance, silence, fear, hypocrisy, misused power and prejudice, and we would like to offer them to you now for discussion.”

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): “Can it be right that some with pastoral responsibility in the church are so often ignorant of what it is like to be LGBTI+? The foundation of all good pastoral care is understanding and knowledge. Ignorance is unacceptable and can be addressed.

“Can it be right for our church communities to have a policy (whether conscious or subconscious) of silence about matters relating to sexuality and gender? As we have learned increasingly in the area of safeguarding, silence can shelter abuses of power. People must speak and be allowed to speak – so that those who are vulnerable can hear and thus not feel that they are alone. Good pastoral ministry among LGBTI+ people can never happen in an environment where their presence or questions are intentionally ignored by those in church leadership. This will be perceived as putting their own reputational concerns before the needs of their people. If our Church really believes that

it wishes to welcome everyone, no matter what their personal circumstances, then this welcome must be clearly voiced.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): “Can it be right that anyone lives in fear of one another in our churches? Our observation is that many are living in that kind of fear among us today. There is fear in the clergy of how they may be held to account as they attempt to care in the light of their theological convictions. There is fear that a bishop’s known views on a matter will colour her or his engagement with their people. There is fear that if one’s personal circumstances or beliefs are known then one will be deprived of home or office. There is fear about ‘breaking ranks’ and speaking out. Whatever the causes, this kind of fear must be challenged: it corrupts our common life and imprisons individuals. It cannot be right that such fear is one of the biggest determining factors in church life today.

Mr Ed Shaw (Bristol): “Can it be right that there are situations where people who might wish to be open about their sexual orientation feel forced to dissemble, or where parishes find themselves evading issues of sexuality? This can lead to a place where the Church is – with some justification – accused of fostering a climate of hypocrisy. Jesus clearly calls out hypocrisy. How can we become a church community that is appropriately open about matters of sexuality, gender and relationships?”

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): “Can it be right that pastoral encounters still take place without awareness of disparities of power? Inequalities of power have led

to abuses in the past and will continue to do so unless all who exercise pastoral care reflect continuously on the power that they hold. Power must always be acknowledged and care exercised with the greatest awareness possible.”

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): “Can it be right that anyone fails to explore her or his own prejudices? No one is unconditioned by their experience of life, positively or negatively. All of us must reflect deeply on our attitudes and our behaviour. All are loved children of God. The cross of Christ is for all. But the journey from prejudice to hatred is a short one, as so much online commentary sadly shows.”

Ven. Cherry Vann (Manchester): “These are, we believe, ‘six pervading evils’ that our reflection on the experience of LGBTI+ people has led us to explore. Indeed, the experience of LGBTI+ people has been a lens that has focused them for us, and as such is a gift (if a bittersweet one) from the LGBTI+ community to the Church as a whole. We believe that if we are able to receive this gift, and to address these evils through Principles that apply to the whole Church as well as to LGBTI+ people, then we will be able to establish a transformative ethic around which people of different theological perspectives might cohere.”

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): “This ethic will not resolve the theological issues that relate to questions such as same sex marriage or gender identity, but we hope that it will help us to stand on an extended common ground from which we

might then resolve these issues, because it will place us in a better relationship with each other and with all God's children, knowing that we are held together in the love of Christ."

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): "This letter comes with joy in the faith we share and strengthened by our trust and hope in Christ. The members of the Pastoral Advisory Group: Bishop Christine Hardman, Bishop Pete Broadbent, Bishop Nicholas Chamberlain, Bishop Jan McFarlane, Bishop Robert Atwell, Helen Berry, Jamie Harrison, Rosemarie Mallett, Ed Shaw, Cherry Vann."

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): Earlier today, in a meeting, I heard the Pastoral Principles described as being "nice." Nice is the last thing that they are. They name things which are corrosive of human flourishing and diminish our humanity: prejudice, silence, ignorance, fear, hypocrisy, misuse of power. But they go beyond naming these things and offer us a way we can, each one of us, examine our own attitudes and behaviour, and they have the potential to be transformative if they do not just stay as words on a page but become embedded in our hearts and our souls. They are for all Churches, the Pastoral Principles. They are not focused on one particular kind of church or churchmanship. They are not a covert attempt to change doctrine or point to a particular direction for the Church in terms of change. They are a genuine invitation to each one of us, all our churches, to examine our own behaviour and to move into transformative ways of behaving.

Each pack contains six cards. I am not going to spend too much time on them, you can pick them up and look at them. There is one copy here in this building for every Synod member. To collect it, please go to the Convocation Hall either tomorrow morning at the breakfast time fringe meeting or lunchtime, or Saturday lunchtime. Please take one of these and share them. You can also find them on the Church of England website. We will be promoting these there. For those who would wish to be able to reflect on it, copies of our living letter are also available for you to take with you. Thank you for your attention, we really appreciate it.

The Chair: I now invite the Bishop of Coventry and Eeva John from the Living in Love and Faith Group.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you to Bishop Christine and the Pastoral Advisory Group. We now move in to a focus on the Living in Love and Faith project. Thank you for that opportunity to bring you up to date with a few developments. You will see I am joined by members of the project. They will introduce themselves later.

May I say right from the word go, thank you to them for being here today, for the level of engagement that they with over 40 colleagues have shown to this project. I have really enjoyed working with them thus far. I have learnt a huge amount from them and those others we are working with. I really hope that you will enjoy listening in to them as they respond to your questions and perhaps do a little bit of discussion among themselves.

We are keen to model something of the way we have been working together and draw the Synod into that experience.

Before that, if we may, we are going to bring you up to date with what we have been getting up to, and there is no better person to do that than Eeva John.

Dr Eeva John: I would like very briefly just to bring you up to date. I would like to talk to you first of all about how we have recently articulated exactly what it is that we are hoping from the Living in Love and Faith resources. I would then like to tell you about what we are doing right now with my colleagues here and others, and then maybe just shine a little bit of light on what are we actually going to produce by the end of the project. Finally, I would like to say a little bit about what we have been hearing as part of our wider participation process.

So, what have we been hoping? We have articulated what we call learning outcomes, and you have hopefully had a chance to look at those in your papers, but I would just like to very quickly run through them because they are an important way of framing and checking that we are on track in relation to what we would like these resources to do for us as a Church.

These learning outcomes are articulated in the sense that when people engage with these resources, when we engage with these resources, we hope that people will be inspired by scripture's glorious and joyful vision of God's intention for human life. These resources

will be good news. We hope that people will discover the rich biblical, theological, historical and scientific thinking in a way that deepens their desire to know God and follow Christ. This is about discipleship. We hope that people will have a deeper understanding both of the Church's current inherited teaching and of the emergent views on Christian Living in Love and Faith.

We hope that we will encounter the voices and experiences of people who otherwise would have been invisible to us or we might not have met. We hope that we will learn different ways of reading scripture together well, allowing it to exert its transforming and revelatory power. Scripture is the heart of this project for that reason. We hope that we will be helped for our everyday Christian discipleship in all its diversity, physicality, messiness and grittiness. We are all sexual beings and our discipleship relates to the pastoral care of that aspect of our lives.

Finally, we hope that these resources will enable people to be alert to the life of the Church in its cultural context, and so be equipped with some confidence to engage in the public square about what it means to be human and sexual. These frame the direction of travel for our learning resources.

So, what we are doing right now? You may remember from July Synod last year that I described the work that we were doing in 2018 as a process of gathering together the raw ingredients - biblical, theological, historical and scientific aspects of human identity,

sexuality and marriage, as well as the oral histories that we have been gathering as part of the wider participation work.

Our job now is to start mixing the ingredients to bake the cake. This is a little bit messier and potentially contentious. In what order do we mix things? Eggs and sugar or eggs and butter first? Do we start with Bible or theology or maybe experience? What proportions of each will we need? Are we going to go for a tiered cake, like a wedding cake, or just a classic Victoria sponge? Thankfully, we have come across an agreed recipe, or should I say structure.

So, here is how we are going to go about doing this. Here are the themes or the layers of the cake that we are planning to bake together. The first layer: what is going on? What is going on in our society today in relation to sexuality and human identity? What is going on in our Church and what are the contexts in which we are considering these matters? How much might the Church have absorbed aspects of culture without realising it for good or for ill?

The next layer: how does God communicate. In this complex context in which we live with so many different voices, how do we hear God's voice for ourselves and for the Church, and how is it that as Christians we hear different things?

Then the middle layer, the really important layer which brings us to the heart of the matter: who are we as human beings and as the Church? What does it mean to have been

created in the image of God? How does that relate to our bodiliness, our sexuality, our relationships and our life together as the Body of Christ, the Church?

Then, and only then, when we have looked at those three areas, can we begin to think about what is it that we might be discerning God to be saying to the Church of England today and where might we go from here? Perhaps we thought we knew what the questions were, perhaps about same sex relationships, but maybe we will find that there are others also that we need to address.

So you see our work is in itself a learning process where we are working our way through these various layers of cake. Moving on from that, what is it that we are actually producing? What will these resources look like? So far we have produced about 80 academic papers. We have gathered over 200 stories of lived experience, either orally or in written form, as well as material from other churches and faith communities. We will need to creatively convert these into forms that are not only accessible but enticing. Yes, a book, but also films, podcasts and online learning materials. These different forms of learning materials will need to enable people to engage with real-life stories. They will need to engage with some of the tough topics and tough questions. Hopefully they will entice people to go deeper and also maybe even engage in a guided study course.

All of these we will present in ways that enable people and encourage people to ask questions; to question one another, to question the subjects that they are looking at so

that this becomes a form of transformational learning, a means of being transformed into Christ's likeness.

Finally, I would like to say a little bit about what we have been hearing through our wider participation process. This has been the process of gathering stories from individuals and groups in churches. This is a vital aspect of our work. We must keep the human face of these matters constantly before us as we study and learn. It is good and important to do systematic surveys and research, but somehow they do not find their way into our hearts in quite the same way as stories do. So far I have met with about 35 individuals, from Newcastle to Brighton, young people, older people, gay people who are married, in civil partnerships or who have chosen the path of celibacy. I have met people who identify themselves as bisexual, asexual, transgender and transsexual. I have met the spouses, children and parents of these people. These stories will be woven into the work of the Living in Love and Faith team when they meet together with the members of the Pastoral Advisory Group in one month's time. They are stories of pain, anger, darkness, doubt and confusion, as well as - and often together with - stories of gratitude, freedom, joy, love and faith in Christ. It has been an immeasurable and immense and deeply moving privilege to hear these stories first hand and I look forward to sharing them in creative ways through the resources.

And, yes, I have listened to the depth of disagreement: stories of fear, despair, anger, pain, offence, rejection and deafness to the other. A phrase that is often used to describe what we are hoping for is "good disagreement". I have begun to wonder whether our task

is even more challenging than that. I wonder if we need to go further and strive for what we might call “appreciative disagreement”. The resources are not asking anyone to agree with one view or another, but we are asking the people of God to engage deeply and charitably with the views, experiences and perspectives of the other, those perspectives which we struggle to even countenance perhaps, and to find there something worth listening to and something to learn. We are asking people to exercise a hermeneutic of generosity and love rather than a hermeneutic of suspicion or even of rejection.

In the Pastoral Principles we talk about difference as a gift. This is easily misunderstood as an exhortation to a post-modern libertarianism where anything and everything goes; different views and behaviours do not really matter as long as we love each other. That is not what is meant here. What is meant is that the tensions that the differences between us cause are what God uses to form us, to hone us and to shape us, individually and as a Church, into Christ-likeness. They cause us to wrestle with God rather than with one another, to draw nearer to him so that by grace we can draw nearer to each other and to the glorious truth of the Gospel of which we only see dimly and in part. That is what we mean by seeing our differences as a gift.

Will this lead to us a decision? No, not yet, but it may put us, the people of God, in a better place to live and talk together in love and faith. Speaking of love and faith, of course there is a missing word, and it is “hope”. Hope is the word that underpins the whole of the Living in Love and Faith process. The word hope is the watermark that will be on every page of the resources. The Living in Love and Faith resources are about

creating a space for us, the Church, to exercise this discipline of hope in a Church and a world that too easily resorts to cynicism, division and polarisation. After all, our hope is not in a process, not even in scholarly knowledge, not even in bishops or Archbishops. Our hope is in Christ, who holds out His arms on the Cross to hold us together in love and faith and, in so doing, transforms us, His Church, into his own likeness. Thank you.

The Chair: Synod, we will now have the introduction of each of the panel members and then I will be handing to Bishop Christopher to convene that tricky thing which is going to be a conversation between Synod and the panel. I am very aware that there will be many questions which will not get addressed here today, but I invite first of all brevity of questions and responses and then please do take the opportunity to take the questions to the various fringe events which will continue with both groups. I will now hand to Bishop Christopher.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): We thought it would be best for members of the team to introduce themselves and perhaps we could begin with you, Giles, but first may I say a special thank you to Dr Susannah Cornwall for being here. Susannah, you are the only member of this team not on Synod so you do not have to be here. We will begin here and end up with you.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): My name is Giles Goddard. I am the vicar of St John's Church in Waterloo, which is the church opposite the station. Some of you have seen a picture of me strategically placed between there and here. I have been

involved in these kinds of questions for about 25 years so it feels like I know some of the issues quite well. But, because I think there is more to life than sex, I also do a lot work on climate change. I am one of the very few LGBTI+ members of this process, which feels like quite a heavy responsibility. My partner is a sociologist of religion, Shannon, and he and I have good conversations about the complexity of these issues and how we might find ways forward and I am glad to be part of it.

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): My name is Jason Roach and I am a member of the House of Clergy here and a vicar in London. I am a member of the co-ordinating group alongside Giles.

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): I am Sarah Mullally, the Bishop of London, and I chair the social and biological thematic working group. You will know I am a nurse by background so I would not go anyway near classing myself as a scientist, and I am really there because I chair a good meeting. For me, it has been just a real joy to have explored science. One of my hopes is as to how we can enable people to catch that.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): We have moved into this mixing-up stage. We have representatives from the four different thematic groups as well as two colleagues from the co-ordinating group. From science, over to history, and Andrew.

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): My day job is at Wycliffe Hall in Oxford training ordinands for parishes. I have been part of the history group. My particular interest is the history of modern Anglicanism. On Sundays we are part of the little village congregation just outside Oxford.

Revd Dr Isabelle Hamley: I am Chaplain to the Archbishops so I am not technically part of Synod but I am here under duress, as it were. I am part of the biblical group. I am a biblical scholar in my spare time. I am particularly interested in the bits of the Old Testament that most people try to do their best to avoid: the hard stories of violence and abuse and my interest is to ask: why are they there? What do we do with them as Christians? What do they tell us about how we shape our identity, how we think about the “other”, who is so different from us, and how relating to the other so often ends up in violence, and why is that?

Dr Susannah Cornwall: I am Susannah Cornwall. I am a constructive theologian based at the University of Exeter. A lot of my research has been in the area of variant sex and gender, with a particular focus on trans and intersex within Christianity and also the other Abrahamic traditions. I am a director of the Exeter Centre for Ethics and Practical Theology and the current research project that I am leading is in partnership with an NHS gender clinic down in the West Country. We are looking at formulating a spiritual care framework for people going through gender transition. I am a member of the Theology Working Group for Living in Love and Faith.

The Chair: Synod, we are going to open for questions and Bishop Christopher will invite reflections from a couple of members of the panel and perhaps even discussion between them. Those wishing to speak, please do indicate, those who have a question.

Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TEs): I am also a member of LLF as one of the members of the history workstream. My question is about GS 1158, the document in June 2007 that started this whole ball rolling. In that document this project was described as an episcopal teaching document. My question, which is slightly rhetorical, is: would it be fairer now to say that what we are developing is a learning document not a teaching document?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Judith, another member, as you say, of the group. It would be very interesting to hear your experiences of whether this is teaching or learning and what way they might come together. Giles or Jason from the co-ordinating group, how are you seeing it?

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): Teaching and learning. Is that too much of a fudge? The way that it is shaping up, particularly for example in those three sections - where are we, how do we understand how God communicates and then who are we and who are we as a church - each of those sections are bringing together a number of people who have different personal views and run across different specialties. As they come together and discuss those things, they are going to be producing some material that will explain

and expound different points of view and yet, as we engage with those different points of view ourselves, enable us, so we are learning as we do it, but we hope that what we produce will also enable all of us to learn as a community as well. There will be teaching in it but it is hopefully presented in such a way that it can transform our understanding of all of those different views as well.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Is that how it feels to you, Giles?

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): For me the key word is “resource”; it is not so much a document. It feels to me like we really need something as a Church which helps us to talk about these matters. I am very conscious that we have had seven reports over the last 40 years and none of them has made its way into the heart of the Church’s not so much doctrine but depository. We need something so that when we have these conversations at Synod we can look at it and say, “This is how we reach the positions that we reach”. They will be different positions, but I am hoping that this will be a resource that we can refer to enable us to have better conversations from now on. So it is both teaching and learning; I am with Jason on that.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): It would be great to spend longer on this, but I am conscious of time and the Chair wants to move us on.

Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield): I am grateful to see reference to singleness in the learning

outcomes, but just wondered if the Pastoral Advisory Group had considered Pastoral Principles for pastoral ministry amongst single people and, if not, why not, since this is another significant group of people that in many parts of the country family-focused churches have often let down in their welcome and inclusion, albeit often unintentionally?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Chris. I should have said this is an LLF panel but Bishop Christine is on standby for any Pastoral Advisory Group questions and those are of course invited as well.

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): I am very grateful that this point has been raised and I could not agree more. The Pastoral Principles are specifically for LGBTI+ people because that is what we have been asked to do, but, actually, they apply to anybody, and they challenge anybody because what we are looking at is how we unintentionally - usually - exclude people, without even noticing we are doing it. That can happen so often. We have people on our group who are single and I hope you will find that those principles will be as applicable to singleness as any other characteristic which can sometimes be ignored.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Andrew, that was a Pastoral Advisory Group question but we have found ourselves in our different groups considering the whole experience of singleness. Is there anything you would like to say from the history group on that, whether this is something you have been able to explore from a historical point of view?

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): We thought quite a bit about the nature of the family and the way the Church has reconceived the family in different ways over the generations and therefore the role extended family and the role of church as family and how single people have worked in that over the generations in different ways, but I do not think it is a theme that we have explored as sufficiently as we should in this process.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): And there certainly is an intention to do that as we continue working.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): Given the recent resignation of the Revd Dr Tina Beardsley from the co-ordinating group of the LLF process, can you give me any indication of your plans to ensure ongoing trans representation in the core dimensions of the process?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Perhaps if I could give a clear answer to that. We are very grateful to Dr Christina Beardsley for her contribution to the group. We have benefited enormously and we are also grateful to Alex Clare-Young who has been invited by the Archbishops and agreed to join, so we are very pleased about that.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): That is wonderful news.

Miss Debbie Buggs (London): In principle four, it is noted that we need to be realistic about the call to costly and self-denying discipleship. Please would the various groups consider expanding on that in the various documents as that is a key teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): That was triggered in a sense by the Pastoral Advisory Group, but it would be good if we had a little response to that. Would anyone be keen to come on to this?

Revd Dr Isabelle Hamley: I think it is a subject that we have kept returning to whilst discussing other subjects. One of the real questions is when you talk about identity how do identity and discipleship actually relate together, both in the Bible but in our entire lives? Can you deny something that is part of your core identity? Which part of us actually falls under what you can change and what you cannot change? What does it mean to be continually transformed and sanctified? Those questions are part of our discussions, but there is no easy answer, I am afraid.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): We certainly want this to be help for people to live out their Christian discipleship.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): It is a really fascinating subject and, for me, we talk a lot about identity and Isabelle has just mentioned identity. It is how we work out our

identities in Christ. We are all called to be self-denying. One of the challenges that we have is the difference between self-denying and denying other people their identities in Christ. One of the challenges we are facing as LLF is how we can enable people to be the people who Christ is calling them to be fully and to be part of the Church of England, and that is what we are struggling with.

The Chair: Synod, before we proceed any further, I should remind Synod that we are due to complete this item before us in a few minutes. However, under Standing Order 15(6), with the general consent of Synod, I may extend this sitting by not more than 15 minutes in order that we may continue. Does Synod give its general consent for that? (Assent) Thank you. This item will be completed by 7.15.

Rt Hon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford): Do Bishop Christopher and Bishop Christine accept that we cannot choose our sexuality any more than we can choose our eye colour or whether we are left handed or right handed?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): These are matters that, Bishop Sarah, the science group is of course attending to in some way. Would you like to say something about that, how you are going about that work?

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): As part of the social and biological sciences group our aim is to try to collect together the science and to get a sense of where is the centre gravity. What we do not want to begin to do is to cherry-

pick science. One of our concerns is to understand what science is, what does it tell us and where is the centre of gravity. The bigger question is how that engages in the dialogue of theology and biblical studies. There are huge papers on this area, but I think what we can say is there are a number of things that contribute to gender identity and sexual identity, and one of the aims of this project has to give us the material to understand where it is. There is a lot of evidence that you cannot change it, which is part of a lot of the work that has gone into conversion therapy and what that is about. The question is if this is the gender identity, there are questions about how that engages with theology.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Susannah, if I may, my understanding is you work in a way listening to scientific comment, views and then, exactly as Bishop Sarah has said, say, “Well, so what? What does this mean theologically?” Is there anything you would like to bring into that by means of method or anything more specific?

Dr Susannah Cornwall: You have heard about the way the thematic groups were set up and I think it would be false to assume that we have been siloed from the beginning. Formally, we are now into a more interdisciplinary stage of the process, but from the beginning we have all been aware of wanting to listen in to what other groups were doing. We have all had access to common resources on Dropbox, so we have been able to track what other groups are doing. We are now at a stage where we are working more consciously across those groups. Eeva talked you through that a minute ago and I am

part of the group grandly called What's going on? We all wish that we had answer to that, I think. Certainly we are all thinking about holding together these different dynamics, both in terms of the sub-disciplines we are working with, in terms of theological persuasions and traditions and so on. Everyone involved in the process is deeply committed to taking difference seriously and being aware that sometimes that will mean not glossing over it, not pretending that there are not differences which might seem intractable, and we are going to need to work out what we do with that, but we have been aware of those differences from the beginning and wanting to work across them.

The Bishop of London (Rt Hon & Rt Revd Dame Sarah Mullally): Just to add, one of my hopes around the material or the learning that we will do is to better understand what science is and what it is not. Often, after any of these events people send me huge amounts of science papers which say whichever way I said something that proves the other way. One of the things I would hope that we would begin to do is to better understand what science is and what it is not. Scientists are very clear that they will not say they know the answer. What they say is given the evidence they know today that this is the probability. You will see that all the time. I also hope that what we better understand is what science is and what it is not and the information we have. That is that sense of exploration about how we explore that with our biblical studies with history and with theology.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): If I may say so, one of the things I am really enjoying about this whole project is the way some pretty fundamental

questions of how we understand, how we know and how we do theology come about. We are just seeing an example of that here; the interface between science and then theological judgment. That is enough from me, sorry.

Revd Kevin Goss (St Albans): This is addressed to Bishop Christine and the Pastoral Advisory Group, please. In July 2017 General Synod voting overwhelmingly to ban conversion therapy for homosexual people within the Church. Please can the Pastoral Advisory Group tell us how this has featured within your work and from your perspective how is this key issue being addressed?

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): I think there is no doubt that within the Pastoral Advisory Group there would be a general agreement that conversion therapy is wrong. In terms of our general approach to our work, which is the profound respect for the worth and dignity of every person, conversion therapy starts from a premise that there is something wrong that has to be changed, so that presumption cannot accord with our core value of the innate rightness of people in their essential identity. Although we do not have minuted discussions on this particular topic, it is at the heart of everything that we are doing, which is about valuing, welcoming, respecting and honouring each person as a child of God.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): Just in response to that last comment, I am grateful that I am a child of God, converted away from my sin to Him, and that great

conversion story that is in Him. The great and beautiful and transformative power that turns me away from my sins ---

The Chair: Your question, please.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): But that was in response to the loaded terms that were being used just a moment ago.

The Chair: We need a question.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): Is the objective of the groups and the materials they are producing to reach one coherent theological view or to produce two mutually exclusive, irreconcilable and contradictory visions and versions of the Gospel for the Church? How can materials be produced without working out these two positions, naming them and stating them?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much. Anyone from anywhere? Andrew, please, and then perhaps Isabelle.

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): As I see it, a part of what we are trying to do in this project is to understand the scriptures better, to dig into them more, to listen to each other as we read them together across the whole Church globally and down the centuries as well. So yes, I hope that we are going to find a fuller and fuller understanding together,

and that there will be something coherent that we can cohere around. We do not want a project and think Eeva spoke about this in her introduction where we basically have a menu of a hundred different ways of thinking as an Anglican and you can take your pick. That would lead to a cacophony of chaotic voices. I certainly would not see it as two polarised views. There are multiple ways of looking at this question, which is why we need to listen to each other with great attentiveness to find where we can cohere.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Isabelle, we have said all along scripture is central to this task. Would you like to share something?

Revd Dr Isabelle Hamley: I think it is helpful to move beyond the idea of two polarised views and particularly beyond just narrowing down the debate. In the biblical studies group we did not start by talking about two polarised views. We started by asking ourselves: what does it mean to be human? Within what means to be human, what does it mean to be in relationships? What does it mean to have a body? What does it mean for us to experience God's grace? What does it mean for us to read scripture together? How do we hear God? All of these have yielded quite a lot of consensus between us. It may not help necessarily with the two polarised views, but I think it does offer a theological vision for what it means to be human together, and, within that, a background on to which we can start exploring not the two views but the multiple different approaches to exploring sexuality.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): May I add one of my best

moments? I think it was my best moment, almost a mystical moment in this process. We thought we were doing an exercise in theological anthropology: what does it mean to be a human being? The very first bit of drafting I saw though was not: who am I, who are we, but who is God? That was deeply exciting. Who is God? Can we begin with a theological question? There should be a lot we can agree with on who is God and who are we in the light of God.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I know there are more questions waiting to come in, but the other really fascinating thing is looking at the history. I have been doing some work on the last 200 years in the Church of England and the way in which we have lived with diversity in so many different ways. On some things we have changed and on some things we have not. Some things we have opened up and others we have not. I hope that that will be reflected in this as well, the complexity of our history and how that has fed us.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Chair, I do not want to overstep things but there is something opening up here on the panel.

The Chair: Carry on.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Susannah?

Dr Susannah Cornwall: I am so glad that the word “transformative” was used, because I

think all of us within the process are committed to saying what does it mean to take tradition seriously, understand ourselves in some sense as inheritors of a tradition, but also to say of course tradition is not something static; it is dynamic. We are also all transmitters of the tradition as well. Thinking about what is it that we are being transformed towards, we talked about being transformed into the likeness of God. What is the tradition that we want to pass on and want to disseminate? Again, I keep coming back to difference and to taking it seriously, but I certainly do not think anyone in the process is saying you can have this position, you can have that position. We are wanting to interrogate what it means to hold a range of positions in good faith, to assume that, indeed, people do hold different positions in good faith and to get past perhaps some of the tribalism that has sometimes been part of these conversations in the past.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): Thank you to everybody who has been involved in giving such attention to this process. I think it is your commitment that allows me to stay interested and involved in the process, with only a little bit of cynicism, and with a spirit of hope and, hopefully, a little bit of charity as well. Thank you for listening to people's stories in all the work you are doing.

The Chair: Question, please.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): There is a question. Reading the learning outcomes and the section that says this will require the resources too, you specifically make reference to the Church's theological tradition, pastoral and liturgical practice. There has

been, to my mind, a slight attempt to divorce liturgy from pastoral practice and doctrine and an expression of hospitality. I would like to push you towards a little bit of the end of the process and ask ---

The Chair: Can I have your question, please?

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): --- how can we ever affirm and express anything separate from liturgical practice, us being the Anglican Church, it being our epistemology?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): That is an interesting question. I have to say we have not moved on to liturgical implications, in a sense, for exactly the reason you describe or the connection that you describe, in that we are not in the business of trying to come to particular answers about contested matters. The responses to those answers will need to be worked out liturgically. We are quite a few stages back from that. Would anyone like to come in on that? Andrew?

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): I think the principle is a good one that the way in which you worship reflects what you think; the way in which you praise God says a lot about how you understand the Gospel and how you understand the relationship between God and humanity. Those things are inextricably linked together definitely. We have not touched on those questions in this process but there is no doubt that there is a very intimate link between them.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Thank you, Eeva, for that presentation about the shape and the outcomes which felt to me to be the most helpful and hopeful exposition of the task that I think we have seen. In it you made two observations. The first was that you said something along the lines of, “We are not going to make anyone agree with any particular position”. Any of us who are clergy in the Church of England have taken a public vow to teach the doctrine of the Church, so there is a sense in which there is not much option but to agree, or at least to look as though we agree, with a certain position.

That relates to your second observation, which is you alluded to at some point - and I would be interested to know when you think this might be happen - there will some decisions to be made. I guess my question is: what decisions are those? We are not coming to this with a blank piece paper. The Church of England does have a teaching position on this.

The Chair: Your question?

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): The question is: what is the decision? Is it a decision to change our doctrine or is it a decision to say, “We might need to do some thinking to change our doctrine” and surely it is not a decision simply to make up our minds assuming we do not know anything at the moment?

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I think it is back to this word “resource”. We

are putting together a resource and this is not copping out and it is not saying we are avoiding these difficult questions because we are confronted with difficult questions, but in the end it is for other people. We are producing something, or the House of Bishops is producing something - not us - and it has been very good to be involved so closely with them in this. It will then be for the Church at large, for this Synod, for diocesan synods and PCCs to consider it and to look at how and if we move forward. It may be that people decide that we are not going to move forward and we are going to remain exactly where we are. That is not for us to decide on this group. What we are doing is trying to serve the Church by providing a robust resource which will enable us to have grown-up conversations because I think that is what we have not been able to have for the last 30 years.

Revd Dr Isabelle Hamley: It is also helpful to think about the work that various groups have done, including the biblical group, on what are the issues on which we can disagree and what are the issues on which we need to have one immutable position. A lot of the groups have been exploring that. In the biblical group we have just had a discussion in our latest meeting on whether this is a first-order issue or not. There is diversity in the group and we do not all agree, you will not be surprised to hear, but I think in general we have been trying to explore what are the boundaries of disagreement.

We have gone back to scripture and looked at contentious issues at various points in the history of the people of God; issues that were enough to tear the people of Israel apart and to tear the early Church apart. We have asked: how have those issues carried on in

the Church? How did the Church deal with it? How did it decide it was something it could agree on or could agree to disagree on, and what was an issue that led to schism?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): There is a whole lot for us to learn about God, about what it means to be human, about what it means to be married, and for me to learn deeply about the doctrine of marriage, as a married man, I am coming up to my 40th wedding anniversary. There is just much we can learn if we allow ourselves before we get into some of the more tricky questions that we will face.

The Chair: A quick question and quick answer please, Anne.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): Thank you very much for the six principles, which I find encouraging and challenging. In terms of principle five I wonder if the Pastoral Advisory Group could share with the Synod just how light can be shed on the structures and practices that are involved in the discernment process for those testing their vocation in order that we can value holy living but combat hypocrisy?

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): This is an area we are exploring in the Pastoral Advisory Group and I think we are very convinced that we have to hold together the sense of naming hypocrisy and holding on to integrity and these things really matter and cannot be separated.

The Chair: Synod, we are out of time for this business. I wish to express my thanks to

the panel, to all those who are praying, all those who have been involved in the two groups and presenting what is a tricky issue and in a tricky context for Synod. Less tricky though, we now conclude this item and move to evening worship which will be led by Mrs Margaret Swinson. Thank you.

Mrs Margaret Swinson (Liverpool) led the Synod in an act of worship.

**Full Synod: Third Day
Friday 22 February 2019
WORSHIP**

THE CHAIR: *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 10.30 am.

**ITEM 11
DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTION
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMMES (GS 2094A AND GS 2094B)
(Resumed debate)**

The Chair. Good morning, brothers and sisters. We now come to Item 11 on our Order Paper. This item is supported by three papers, GS 2094A from the Dioceses of London and Truro; GS 2094B from the Secretary General; and GS Misc 1212, which provides an update since July. I also refer you to paragraphs 14 to 16 of the financial comment on the Fifth Notice Paper.

This is the resumed debate on the Diocesan Synod Motion on Environmental Programmes that was adjourned at the July 2018 group of sessions. The original motion was jointly agreed between the Dioceses of London and Truro, both diocesan synods having passed motions in the same terms. The text in the agenda shows the motion as amended in July 2018 in the form it took immediately before the adjournment of the debate.

Because of the lapse of time between the adjournment and this resumption now, I propose that Mrs Enid Barron, the mover of the original motion, should be given the opportunity to speak again for five minutes to reintroduce the business.

As this is a joint Diocesan Synod Motion, I also propose to allow the Revd Andrew Yates of the Diocese of Truro to speak towards the end of the debate, prior to Mrs Barron's formal response to the debate. I would also propose to call Canon John Spence to make a financial comment, should he wish to do so. In order to do all this, brothers and sisters, I need to seek the general consent of the Synod under Standing Order 21(3). Does this proposal have the Synod's general consent?

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

The Chair. Thank you very much. Synod also needs to note that this item is followed by timed business at 11.30. I now call upon Mrs Barron to speak. Mrs Barron, you have up to five minutes.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): Good morning, Synod. The motion we have here makes provisions to enable the Church of England to significantly step up its action on environmental issues and especially in relation to climate change which, as you know, is a very serious issue. It will enable the Church to meet its commitments for reducing CO₂ emissions.

I think Synod recognised the threat and seriousness of climate change in that very passionate and lively debate we had on the TPI in July in York. I am going to very briefly run through the provisions of the motion. It looks a bit daunting on the agenda, but basically it provides action for the Church to scale up its environmental work by ensuring every diocese has an environmental programme with a senior staff member as its leader and promoting communication and peer review.

I must add here that the motion is not prescriptive about how dioceses achieve this and it does not suggest extra expenditure. That is entirely up to dioceses. It is not called for in the motion. The motion calls for the Environmental Working Group along with others, such as the Mission and Public Affairs Group, to create a plan to promote, co-ordinate and accelerate its environmental action and to report on progress to Synod every three years so that we can keep an eye on what is happening.

Another thing it provides is to measure the Church's CO₂ emissions so that we can check progress in relation to targets and, thus, also have the moral authority to influence others. The Church can be a very effective ambassador for climate change and has influence way above its own actions, if it acts correctly. You have heard from the Chair that the motion was adjourned in July to allow for assessment of the resources needed.

I want to tell you that that period of adjournment has been extremely helpful and positive because various things have happened which might not have happened before. For example, the Environmental Working Group, with the Church's Environment Campaign,

has drawn up a plan of action which is fully aligned with all Five Marks of Mission and it is aimed at making substantial progress on environmental work, including reducing CO₂ emissions.

A proposal has been made, which would be funded centrally, to enter into something called an “intelligent client service agreement” with Historic England which would enable practical advice to be given to parishes to help them take practical steps to reduce their carbon emissions and, in that way, also save money. An assessment has been made, as was promised, of the resources needed centrally to deliver the motion.

Arrangements for measuring the Church’s CO₂ emissions have been investigated in a very, very positive way and addressing the concerns raised last year, so that a system has now been devised which can use the existing statistics for mission annual returns with some modifications and cross-referencing those returns with other available data. This method, if this motion is passed, will be piloted before it is rolled out to the whole of the Church and it will, crucially, for parishes provide them with very helpful feedback individually.

During the adjournment, Truro Diocese has made excellent use of the time by running its own experiment in measuring CO₂ emissions. The results from this were very encouraging. Nearly half those contacted responded and it took them between five and 20 minutes to reply.

We are very grateful to Canon Spence and his team for the time they spent on discussing resources. This was presented to the Archbishops' Council. We gather that they regard the environment as a very high priority, but we will hear more about that. I hope Synod will agree that the period of the adjournment has been put to good use and will feel able to give very strong support to this motion. I beg to move this motion on behalf of the Diocese of London.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. The speech limit is five minutes.

The Bishop of Truro (Rt Revd Philp Mountstephen): I am honoured to make this maiden speech on a subject that has been close to my heart for many decades and I am delighted, therefore, that our Diocese of Truro is sharing this motion with London. I am not going to get into the detail so much because we know who we find in the detail but, rather, urge us to keep the big picture.

Climate change cannot be a matter of indifference for any of us, not least in Cornwall where it is already having a significant impact on coastal communities and where the main railway line to London was cut not so long ago by what would once have been described as a freak weather event but the like of which is now all too common, thanks, quite simply, to climate change. I do not believe that we can underestimate the seriousness of this for our planet.

In my previous role with the Church Mission Society, I witnessed already marginal communities in Northern Argentina living yet more marginal and precarious lives through flooding events of increasing severity, inundating the land on which they depend for their very survival. I witnessed, too, migrants being cared for from sub-Saharan Africa forced to migrate, not only through conflict but also through increased food insecurity caused by climate change. Behind the conflict too, of course, there is so often the issue of ecological degradation destroying traditional ways of life.

Who are the prophets of our age who are sounding the clearest warning about this? It is not, I fear, the Church of God. I suggest it is, rather, the schoolchildren who were out on the streets last week, children who were chided by senior politicians for doing so and patronised by political commentators for doing so. Well, I do not want to chide them nor patronise them. I want to say, rather, that I am 100% with them.

Behind this motion is a fundamental desire to see us as a Church recover our prophetic edge. For that to happen, I believe we need prophetic people to stir us up, people like our own environmental officer in Truro, someone whose purpose is not to chide but, rather, to envision and to excite.

Just this last Monday our environmental officer, Lucy Isaacson, took us to see the United Downs Deep Geothermal Project, which is tapping into the hot rocks beneath Cornwall. Amongst the many, many superlatives that we can claim in Cornwall, we have the hottest rocks in the country underneath our feet. This will produce clean, renewable, sustainable

and abundant power for years to come and, what is more, the project is wholly replicable across the county.

Then, again, we have ideas for using glebe land to house batteries for electricity storage. The grid in the south-west is at capacity, so often wind turbines stand idle because there is simply nowhere for the generated electricity to go, but this idea of using glebe would help Cornwall reach its target of 100% renewable energy by 2030 and generate income in the process. So what is not to like?

The point I want to make is that we would know nothing of the geothermal project and its very significant potential nor of the idea for battery storage if we did not have an environmental officer leading our environmental programme who can not only point out what is already happening but also open our eyes to potential and to possibilities; in other words, to play a truly prophetic role for us, so we as a Church can play a prophetic role for the communities we are called to serve, awakening them, in turn, to significant potential and possibilities.

In turn, again, through such programmes and people, as a Church across our dioceses we can pool our imaginative potential to imagine a better and a more hopeful future for the whole country and the wider world. We can become, in other words, truly prophetic, which is surely what we are called to be. I urge you to support our motion.

In closing, let me just briefly address the financial issues which it so often raises. Far too much of our debate, and indeed the wider debate about all this, has been framed around the question of whether we can afford to do this, but I want to say how on earth do we think we can possibly afford not to. This is literally costing the earth and, at present, we are massively failing in our creation mandate to care for the planet and we will be held liable before our God for doing so. I urge us all to take this issue with the full seriousness it surely demands and to support this motion.

Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council): On 15 February, thousands of young people left their classrooms and took to the streets to stand up for their futures. This protest took place in more than 60 towns and cities across the UK. Their protest slogan, so to say, was, “We need change and we need it now”. These young people demanded that the Government should declare a climate emergency, therefore acknowledging the severity of this situation.

I am glad that this motion seeks for the Synod to recognise the escalating threat of climate change and so I urge you to vote in favour of this motion. However, I am led to question how much change this will actually bring. What is required is not more documentation but clear plans, clear actions and clear deadlines. It is not enough just to recognise that climate change is a threat to God’s creation. We must understand that we are to blame for this and it is our responsibility to fix the problem.

God's creation is a gift, one that we have been tasked with the stewarding of. However, we have so far failed to fulfil this duty to care for it. Do we really currently care about climate change enough to take it seriously and to make it a priority? The motion highlights a key achievement of the now 880 Eco Churches and 18 Eco Dioceses. I am proud to say that both my home diocese, Birmingham, and my university diocese, Bristol, are a part of this.

But why have we not set a deadline for all our churches and all our dioceses to be eco-friendly? In fact, the only deadline that is suggested in this motion is that CO₂ emissions will be reduced by 80% by 2020. Why are there no more deadlines? I believe this is the case because we are still not taking this issue seriously. This is the challenge of our generation. If you are hoping for this debate to go away, think again. This debate will continue for years to come and so it is time to start listening.

In 2017, Archbishop Justin Welby reminded us that reducing the causes of climate change is essential to the life of faith. It is a way to love our neighbour and to steward the gift of creation. However, God's call to love one another seems to be lost on those in the generations to come. If your attitude towards climate change is indifferent, I urge you to think about your children and your grandchildren. These will be left to face the consequences of your decisions on climate change, both here today at Synod and in your everyday lives.

The young people protesting earlier this month are engaged in the future of the world and I invite you to engage in a similar way. Perhaps these young people care so much because they are conscious of having to live through more of the future compared to some of our voters here today, or perhaps they care so much because they are more attuned with God's call for us to care for His creation. This is the model of faith and action that we should base our lives on.

As I said, I urge you to vote in favour of this motion but I also ask, please, pray diligently about your duty to protect God's creation and to change your attitudes about the lives of the generations to come.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I am going to say something that I have been wanting to say a long time about this and that is that any effort and resources that we put into attempting to reduce climate change is going to be but the tiniest, tiniest drop in the ocean. This is a case of, if we all do a little together, we will do a little.

As the Danish environmentalist, Bjorn Lomborg, has said, if all the ambitions of the Paris Climate Agreement were fulfilled at a cost of trillions of dollars a year, by the end of the century we would have reduced global temperature by approximately 0.3 of a degree and that money could have been spent on projects that would have far more impact on the poorest in the world.

The fact is that, even if the UK and all the other countries in the West succeeded in becoming carbon neutral - and we do not have any idea how we might do that - there would still be negligible effect because other countries which are developing rapidly, such as India and China, are pouring carbon dioxide into the atmosphere at an accelerating rate. Along with that has gone an unprecedented reduction in global poverty, about which we hear very little, which is still continuing.

There is simply no mechanism for industrialising and reducing global poverty without generating CO₂ emissions. We have no right to deny the poorest people in the world the basic standard of living which we in the West regard as a basic human right. To say that there are no easy solutions to this problem is not to deny that the problem exists or to say that it does not matter, but the fact is that the solutions will be large scale and they will be technological, including possibly the use of nuclear.

We as a local church should quite rightly focus on the things that we can, collectively and individually, do to improve the environment such as not pouring plastic into the oceans. Those kinds of realistic, sensible environmental programmes are something that we should all espouse, but I just think we should not kid ourselves that the local church can do anything whatsoever about climate change.

I think we just need to face up to reality and accept that that is not something we can do. I know that there are members of Synod who agree with me because I have spoken to

many of them. I suspect that they are all in the tearoom at the moment and I would urge them, please, to come out and vote. I would ask Synod to vote against this motion.

Canon John Spence (ex officio): Global warming is, indeed, with us and I am feeling the need to cool things down after the contributions from the hot rock Bishop of Truro and that red hot contribution from Sophie, as well as Prudence.

We were grateful for the debate last July and we were grateful for the agreement to adjourn. As Enid has said, that enabled us to get a much clearer handle on the sort of resource implications of the motion and to engage, as Enid again has said, with her and Andrew and the others, very positively in trying to work out how best we could move forward together. It also enabled a full debate to take place at the Archbishops' Council meeting in January, where there was universal recognition of the issue and its importance and universal support for that to be reflected in the prioritisation of our allocation of resource.

As a result of that, Archbishops' Council has resolved, regardless of the outcome of this debate, to procure a carbon footprint tool which will enable not only the aggregation of the Church of England's impact on carbon footprint across all church buildings to be measured - and, hopefully, trended downwards - but a tool which will also be of use at local level in parishes and PCCs and benefices being able to identify exactly what their footprint is without a huge amount of marginal administrative work and in order that they

can actually get those financial savings as well as the environmental impact savings by managing their estates more effectively.

We have agreed to procure some expert consultancy. We have agreed that we need to increase the amount of resource available in Church House to support the work going on at diocesan parish level. The exact nature of that increased resource has yet to be absolutely calculated. The footprint tools will enable that individual or individuals to be more effective in any case, but shaping the exact amount is contingent on how we develop the budget for 2020, which is work now underway.

Let us be very clear, there are no individuals sitting around Church House with nothing to do. The debate yesterday on homelessness and the creation of the task force, however lean, and the work today on environment, is work that we will accommodate. It will mean that we have to take resource from elsewhere or increase apportionment. So be it. We understand the will of Synod and so we will create that resource - that is our very clear commitment - because we understand the importance of the issue.

I was very grateful that Sophie reminded us that this is about God's creation. We talk often about intergenerational responsibilities. Surely, there is nothing more apart from ensuring that the joy of Christ is brought to the heart of communities and individuals in generations to come. Surely, the quality, the preservation and the stewardship of that wonderful creation matches that.

I am very happy to say, on behalf of Archbishops' Council, we recognise the motion. We cannot, Sophie, impose targets on parishes and dioceses - that is a local matter - but we will work with everyone to maximise the impact of this work in preserving the glory of God's creation.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam): Well, I am really glad to follow Canon John Spence and to hear that encouraging news. There is something really interesting going on in Synod through this debate. Since we last met, since the motion was adjourned, some significant work has been done which has raised the game for us but notice, please, that it has done so in response to diocesan motions from Truro and London, building on the work of the Environmental Working Group set up by a motion from Southwark Diocese.

Friends, this is happening because, as a Church, we are doing something bottom up. Actually, local churches are concerned about the care of God's creation and we are bringing the matter to Synod and asking Synod and the Archbishops' Council to help us construct a framework which will allow us to respond in a way that has significance for Church and world.

The Five Marks of Mission were adopted in the 1980s by the Anglican Communion and those with long memories might remember that the Fifth Mark was an addition a couple of years after the first four. We sometimes think of it as, "Well, it is an extra, an addition, it would be nice if," but it is, of course, integral to all Five Marks of Mission.

You cannot strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth if you are not seeking peace and reconciliation, responding to human need, teaching, baptizing and nurturing new believers, proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom. It does not make sense in our day without doing that in terms of the care of God's creation. Young people get it.

In the last five years, since the Synod motion from Southwark Diocese, we have made enormous progress. The Transitions Pathway Initiative is world class in setting a framework that holds companies to account for their alignment with the Paris Agreement. The Primates of the Anglican Communion have made it clear that the care of God's creation and the environment and global warming are a priority for the next Lambeth Conference in 2020.

At home, the Church of England is doing amazing stuff on a shoestring. I was really grateful to the Bishop of Truro for highlighting the work of their DEO because she makes such a difference as somebody who is a paid resource. As a national Church, we have less than half a full-time equivalent post to help us to do this. Over 1,200 churches are now engaged with Eco Church, over half the dioceses. We are making great progress but, unless we put serious resource into this and the Archbishops' Council can deliver in the way Canon Spence has encouraged, we risk ourselves not being aligned in the way we are asking others to be.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Preb. Catherine Edmonds (Exeter): This is my maiden speech and when I looked at the sort of code of practice for Synod it mentions something about in a speech you could have some humour. However, I do not think that this is the subject about which we can be humorous. It is an extremely important motion.

I speak in support of the motion on the Environmental Programme. I have had recent experience of the disastrous consequences of global warming and climate change on the peoples of small island states in the South Pacific. I have witnessed the flooding of homes and churches and the loss of livelihoods in Melanesia where islands have been completely destroyed by rising tides and changing weather patterns.

Since returning from the Solomon Islands last July - which, incidentally, followed the Synod where the motion was adjourned - I have been contacted by the Community of the Sisters of Melanesia, of which I am an associate, informing me of the destruction of their gardens by the recent unusually heavy storms which have caused severe flooding. These gardens, as they refer to them, are the main supply of food for themselves and those whom they support.

I could tell of numerous accounts of the harmful effects of rising sea levels, as even this week there have been reports that the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have suffered severe consequences of a cyclone. There are many stories of these adverse and

changing weather patterns which are affecting these small island states. When islands are being submerged, the local population has to move to higher ground, if that is possible, on their islands, or relocate to neighbouring islands, causing problems on that local population with severe social consequences. I encourage our dioceses who have connections with these small island states to support them in whatever way they can, not least in gathering information from their partner dioceses and publicising the effects that we in the northern hemisphere are having on those in the southern hemisphere.

Our young people, as we have heard, have recently been moved to protest about the lack of action against climate change, attempting to elicit more action from the Government. We in the Church must show how we too are committed to those aims of Shrinking our Footprint, and now the C of E Environmental Programme, to be good stewards, as we have heard so much, of God's Earth and, of course, which was stated in the Fifth Mark of Mission and to provide resources as required.

We must undertake the actions which this motion puts forward, starting now. The effects are happening now. We have waited too long. We have deliberated too long. Now is the time to make a real difference. If our youth are moved to act, we must be ready to support them.

I was struck by a placard held in the recent pupil demonstrations calling the Government to be "part of the solution not the pollution". We too as a Church must be part of the

solution and ensure that our churches, church buildings and the whole Church family are not part of the pollution. I hereby call on Synod to support this motion.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I am very pleased to support this motion from the Dioceses of London and Truro. I sometimes feel the long delays in dealing with diocesan motions leave the dioceses concerned quite dispirited. On this occasion it has been fruitful, but that is not always the case. This first came forward in 2016. This is a missionary initiative of the first order in line with the Five Marks of Mission, as we have been reminded, and this is a national and international issue. Its focus is being heightened by David Attenborough and Prince William, amongst many others, campaigning globally and nationally. Despite Donald Trump's state of denial, or perhaps because of him, the air we breathe is becoming warmer.

This issue is particularly important to young people. We have all been reminded that school children - and I am a retired teacher - were on the streets encouraging us to take this seriously. Members here will remember Shrinking the Footprint in 2006 and the Church and the Earth in 2009. We need to be seen to be caring for more than God's acre.

The proposals in this motion currently do not involve huge, significant costs. We are told that reprogramming to enable recording and reduction of energy will cost £10,000. We are told that £10,000 is needed to buy 25 days of consultancy time. We have already heard that an extra post may be required. This is in the Fifth Order Paper. Surely most

dioceses would support this. We all have environmental concerns of many types. I hope - and thank you to John Spence for making this clear to us - this can be actually supported centrally. I think it is very important that we take a resounding message back to our dioceses that they can both move things through this General Synod and that they are effective.

Miss Annika Mathews (Church of England Youth Council): I have not prepared a really great speech because I was actually half thinking to speak but Sophie kind of did that for us in terms of the urgency of this issue now for young people in particular and about why it is really necessary to get on and do something about climate change, but I felt more called to speak and stand up in relation to Prudence Dailey's comments actually, in terms of can the Church actually really do something big about it? I think it is about what we can do, not what we cannot do.

My church, which I am currently serving in Manchester, has just become the first urban church in the diocese to become an Eco Church, so they gain an Eco Church award. They are working really hard to do lots of small things, in terms of looking after the environment, in terms of recycling points. They are setting up a community garden. They are going to have an eco-fest in the summer time. I feel that lots of these things are really important, and it is good to do them, but the Church has a real impact in terms of raising awareness about climate change and that is something we all can do.

In my church, the curate in particular is really passionate about this issue. She has set up an eco-group within the church where people can come to pray about these issues, importantly, and also debate how we can help spread that towards the general community as climate change is really something, especially in the area of Manchester I am in, which the general community are really behind. It is affecting all of us, not just Christians but every single one of us in this world, regardless of faith or anything else. In our community there is a climate change action group. People from my church have been able to go to that from the church to give a Christian perspective or just themselves show that Christians are interested in this issue. It is important to relate that to the community.

I feel there is a real impact the Church can have in a positive way to connect everyone together in our society. Lots has been said, but I feel it is important to again reiterate the fact that we are all stewards of God's creation. God loves His world, has said he loves His world, and He loves us. He loves the creation that we live in. So I feel that we need to step up and love it back too. It is about being passionate about it. Actually, the environment is not something that I was hugely passionate about before, but it is necessary to get involved, regardless of level of passion or interest, as it is affecting all of us. It is as important as learning ABCs and maths in school. You may not like it, but it is something affecting us and will continue to affect us, so let us stand up now and act to sort this issue before it gets any worse for our world that we live in.

Revd Canon James Allison (Leeds): Correspondent from the dark, satanic mills of Halifax! Not quite so dark, not quite so satanic!

Do any of you remember 22 November last year? I remember it well because I was late for a diocesan environment committee. I was running very late. It would not have been quite so bad, but if you are going to an environment committee and you drive into the centre of Leeds you are frowned upon for not using public transport or walking or hiking or whatever it is you might have done to get there. That did not make it a bad day. But 22 November was a really bad day, because that was the day when the BBC announced that CO₂ emissions had got so high that there was no going back; whatever we did, it was too late to make a difference. I had heard the report in the car but it had washed over me like it probably washed over you. Whatever we did was too late to make a difference. And I was too late for my meeting.

But it had sunk into my meeting. When I arrived late, they were already sunk into a deep despair. There was a series of cataclysmic prophecies, some I understood: sea levels rising, flash flooding in the valleys - I had that when I lived near Hebden Bridge - and a loss of life as we knew it. I was able to slink in at the back. Nobody noticed me arriving.

Although I am a spiritual director, what happened next was surprising, because I distinctly heard God say to me: "James, you need to say the word 'hope'". Needless to say I did what any sensible spiritual director would do on this occasion: I ignored it. But as I heard people saying "How can we get people to listen? How can we get people to do something? Surely they will be afraid now and that will motivate them" I felt the voice say again "Hope". At that moment the Bishop looked at me and said: "Well, seeing as you've

arrived late, you can do the prayers. And we'd like a word, please". I said: "Hope. Let's pray". Nothing changed dramatically, but at that moment the feeling in our meeting was quite different. It was as though we had discovered a super power. Lots of things we were saying "That probably won't work" to, but people started looking at each other and saying, "But maybe with hope something could happen". Something had changed.

I want to call upon you now to hear that word spoken - hope. We, above all people, need to be people who are people of hope, who throw out the net another time even though we have never caught fish before, who do things which are extraordinary, because we have a God who is extraordinary, with whom even the impossible is possible. I commend hope to you. I commend this report.

Ms Loretta Minghella (ex officio): Let us be clear about where we stand in this battle because at the moment the world remains on course for catastrophic climate change. This is a problem all over the world, but it is the biggest problem for the people who have done least to cause it: the poorest people in our world in the most far-flung places. If we do not do what is necessary, we are going to need Plan B. The trouble with that is that there is no Plan B because there is no Planet B.

You asked us in the summer, as the National Investing Bodies, to get on with the job of persuading the companies that we invest in to do more to align their business plans with the Paris Climate Agreement. You gave us quite a short deadline to work to for such an enormous task. Since we last saw you we have moved Shell, we have moved BP, we

have moved Exxon, we have moved Glencore. Congratulations to my colleagues at the Pensions Board and at the Church Commissioners who have done so much to move on this agenda. Thank you. They deserve that.

The timetable cannot just be demanding for them. It has to be demanding for us. We have to get our own house in order if we are going to stand up and call others to change. We can do more. I do not agree with somebody who spoke earlier to say that we cannot affect this agenda. If it is not in our hands, who does it belong to? This is God's world. It is our world, but it is not ours to squander because we hold it on trust.

Those of us who have industrialised on the back of the world's carbon, we have more to do, not less, in the fight against climate change. Yes, everybody in the world has a responsibility, but what we say - and the international politics of this - is that we have common but differentiated responsibilities and ours are greater.

Friends, next year we will entertain our colleagues from around the Anglican Communion, many of them from the countries we know who are hardest hit. Will we tell them that we are leaving it to others to solve this problem? Or will we say to them that across our Church we are doing everything we can? I think there is only one answer to that. I ask you to support this motion.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): If you are playing Synod bingo, this is your chance to cross off the box that says “I did not intend to speak in this debate”. There are two reasons why I did in the end want to speak.

One is that we have an Environmental Working Group, but unfortunately, through some technicalities, no member of that group is able to speak in this debate, but they tell me that Synod may like to know that they warmly or strongly support this motion and the implications of it, particularly in terms of the resourcing that is needed. One of the things the Archbishops’ Council may want to give some thought to is how practically this can all be resourced - this is paragraph (e) of the motion.

That leads me to the second reason why I found in the end I wanted to speak in this debate, which is connected with some of the things that Prudence Dailey mentioned. One of my favourite 20th century theologians - yes, I am a bit geeky because I do have some favourite ones - is Reinhold Niebuhr, who was a North American Baptist theologian. I like Reinhold Niebuhr because he takes sin seriously. In many of his writings he points out that there are two sorts of sin into which human beings can lapse. One is the kind of sin that we are all too familiar with where we try to do things that we should not be doing or which are beyond us, but he also points out that there is another sort of sin where we are faced with a difficult problem, perhaps a large and complicated problem, and we throw up our hands and say, “Dear me, poor little me, what can I do? I won’t make any difference”. He points out that it is also sin to abrogate our responsibilities.

It seems to me that looking at environmental issues is a very good example of that temptation to that second form of sin because we are called to be stewards of creation right back in the creation stories in Genesis 2. To abrogate that responsibility is sin.

One thing that the Archbishops' Council might be able to do, therefore, is to act as a kind of clearing house of ideas of how we might be able to do small things that add up together to making a difference. For example, in my church in Mile Cross, in the north end of Norwich, where I am the associate priest, we have one Sunday a month where we do not print anything on paper. We have a paper-free Sunday. We have the kind of building where you can project things on a screen and everybody can see because we do not really have pillars in our church. So a very small thing, but those kinds of things all adding up together can make a difference in the spirit of James Allison's urge to hope. I think a sharing of those good ideas, where we can learn from each other, could be something that the Archbishops' Council could do, if it can facilitate that, to help us make a difference so that we do not abrogate our responsibility - because, my friends, to abrogate responsibility is a sin of omission.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: would you welcome a motion for closure on Item 11 after the next speaker?

The Chair: I would welcome that very much, Mr Freeman, thank you.

Revd Andrew Yates (Truro): Thank you, Chair, for bending the rules to allow me to speak here. Of the many positive things that have happened at this Synod, I would like to highlight two momentous moments. The first was at around six o'clock on Wednesday evening, in the Questions, when at number 18 Mark Sheard confirmed that the EWG plan we have heard about is firmly aligned to the Five Marks of Mission and not just a tag-on - and thank you, Bishop Nick, for emphasising that in your speech - crucially recognising that it is missional and it is seeking justice that this ministry is about. The second moment was our very moving Eucharist here in this place yesterday morning, which showed that we can bring into our worship of God our relationship to His creation in celebration, in penitence and in song.

Thank you to all those who have contributed to this debate, particularly Sophie and Annika, for those that have spoken about the urgency of this matter, for those that have tried to answer Prudence and say, "Yes, there are things that we can do". Thank you to Cate for talking about the impact elsewhere. Andrew spoke movingly about the underpass in his city yesterday. What I took away from July last year was Loretta's story of her visiting to India and the impact of flooding when she worked with Christian Aid. It had a similar impact on me.

Thank you especially to all those who in this adjournment have worked so hard behind the scenes to make progress, and to John Spence for being willing to meet Enid and I and also for his commitment today. Thank you to all who have contributed in that way, particularly to the Bishop who is new - I have to creep up to him - your point about it is

not what does it cost but what will it cost not to do it? One of the elements that further contribute to this motion is to encourage every diocese to have an environment programme.

To get you ready for the vote in a moment, I would like to have a bit of a practice and see how we are doing. I am going to ask you to raise your hand if your diocese does have a DEO or someone who looks after an environment programme in your diocese. The voting starts now. I would ask you to keep your hands up if you have had some direct contact with that person - and I will allow email as well. Thank you. Interesting. As we look around, I think some of you might be a bit shy because 35 dioceses are supposed to have someone. Maybe you have not woken up yet; I do not know. But perhaps there is something in that response about the challenge that we still face as a Church.

As we have heard, we have a partly funded diocesan environment officer. Before she was on the scene, it was part of my brief - a wide portfolio of social responsibility. It was often a very lonely furrow. There were friends outside the Church who got what I was talking about. There were not so many colleagues within the Church who were interested or recognised this as important. Can I ask everyone here when they go home to meet with their DEO and to give them some encouragement? They may take some time to reply - they are part time, they are voluntary - but make contact with them and encourage and work with them to make this issue something important for our whole church. Thank you. I support this motion.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Motion for closure on Item 11.

The Chair: I would welcome a motion. 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 now call upon Mrs Barron to respond to the debate. Mrs Barron, you have up to five minutes.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): Thank you, Synod, for that really encouraging debate. I am going to be very quick because time is running out.

I want to thank all those people who have spoken and made many points in favour of this motion, but I want to do Prudence Dailey the courtesy of responding to her call to oppose the motion. I just want to say something about a few people not being able to make a difference and ask if, as Christians, we would be here today if a handful of disciples who witnessed the resurrection had thought “We can’t make a difference”. People have made most of the points I wanted to make.

I want this to be a good news headline for the Church. Often we get bad news headlines, but something like “Church of England on front foot on climate change” or “Eco granny

votes for the climate". The Bishop of Truro gave us a lovely one: "Cornwall rocks!"
Hurray!

What more can I say? Much of what damages the planet is the result of sin - good or bad, old-fashioned sin - greed, avarice, envy, lust for power, sloth. Need I go on?

We have heard in this Synod about a number of dioceses across the world who are really suffering. What Prudence said about "We must let the developing countries have their way" - we are the problem, we have caused their problems, but it is those countries who are going to suffer most. We must help them by developing the clean technologies which will actually benefit them in so many ways. Think of the awful smog and fogs in certain developing areas we can think about. God has provided a fantastic source of energy, it is called the Sun. From just a few solar panels on the Sahara Desert we can actually provide all the world's energy for ever. I cannot go into the technicalities. It is possible if we can transmit it and we can harness it.

Thank you so much to all who have spoken. I hope that if this Synod votes strongly in favour of this motion it will give more power to Canon Spence and others to ask for some more resources, which I do not think need to be huge. The amount we need to spend in order to make a difference is not a lot. The whole thing we can do through this is missional. It is deeply embedded in the Gospel and the outworking of God's love.

Somebody referred to the Lambeth Conference. Do we want our Archbishops to have to say to their brothers and sisters from across the globe, “We have heard your pain but, so sorry, we can’t afford to, or spare the time, to do anything about it. Tough”? Or do we want them to say, “We have heard your pain. We’re doing all that we can, with God’s help, to make a difference. And look, we’re already doing something”?

Now is the time to act. The matter is urgent. I urge you, Synod, to support this motion. Thank you.

The Chair: Point of order, Mr Scowen?

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Chair, I wonder if you would order a separate vote on paragraph (e), which seems to me to be now entirely redundant and otiose, we have been told that the resources assessment has been done, and it asks for a report back in February 2019, where we already are. I think this motion would be greatly enhanced if (e) were not part of it. If we could have a separate vote on that, I would be very grateful.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Scowen. I am not inclined to agree to that request because, as you say, we already have many of the resources published that this asks for, and I think that the intent of this clause, if not the exact detail, is clear.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order: as this is a matter of interest that goes beyond this house, I wonder if you would order a count of Synod.

The Chair: Are 25 members standing to support that request? There are. This is a counted vote of the whole Synod.

The motion was put and carried, 279 voting in favour, 3 against, with 4 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: Thank you, Synod, for a very good debate. This concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker)* took the Chair at 11.32 am.

The Chair: Synod, welcome to Item 12 on our agenda. This is the first of a series of debates in this group of sessions that take us into the area of Evangelism and Discipleship.

If I just set out how I am proposing to take us through the process of the next 90 minutes or so. Once the speaker has moved the initial motion, we are going to have perhaps four speeches, five minutes each, on the main motion. After that, I will invite each of the four proposers of amendments to speak to, but not move, their amendment. I am going to cut them down to three minutes because we have a lot of speakers wanting to engage. When they have each spoken to their amendments, we will then have a bit of a shape about

what the whole of the conversation is about. We will go back for a bit more general debate. Then I will ask each of the amenders to formally propose their amendment, we will get a response from the proposer of the main motion, but pretty limited debate on the amendments. None of them seems to me to require that very focused debate, with lots of speeches just on the amendment. So we will try to deal with the amendments in the middle section of this debate. Then I would hope that would then give us 15 or 20 minutes back to general debate, when we know what the final shape of the motion is about, before we come to the original proposer responding to the whole debate and the final vote.

So that is the broad way in which, hopefully with your approval and connivance, we shall get through this debate. Far more people have put down to speak than we can possibly call, but we have just had a good debate on the environment. I am sure those of you who are not called this morning will be able to recycle your speeches for one of the subsequent debates before we get to tomorrow afternoon.

I therefore invite the Revd Barry Hill to move Item 12. Barry, you may speak for up to ten minutes.

ITEM 12 EVANGELISM AND DISCIPLESHIP (GS 2118 AND ANNEX A)

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Good morning. Declaring an interest, I was a member of the Archbishops' Evangelism Task Group and I am a member of the College of Evangelists and the board of *Thy Kingdom Come*.

Three weeks ago, for my daughter's birthday, we went to the sing-along version of *The Greatest Showman*. I appreciate it may not be the cup of tea of all Synod members, but for my 11-year-old daughter, for the 500 of us that packed into The Curve Theatre in Leicester, it was an evening full of joy and full of singing and a little bit of dancing, and also an evening full of empathy as people evidently saw something of their stories reflected in the stories of those on the big screen. I guarantee over the coming days a good proportion of those that were there told others about the experience that they had had.

We all witness, consciously and subconsciously, to dozens of things every day. We witness to stuff: the kinds of clothes we wear, the kinds of electronic devices we use during debates, no doubt just to take notes, the kinds of cars we drive, the kinds of wigs that we wear. We witness to stuff. We witness also to experiences: "Have you tried that new restaurant?" "Seen that film?" "Read that book?" "Been to that fringe meeting?" Every day we all witness to what is important to us, what we find helpful and what makes a difference in our lives.

If we manage to do that for the parts of life which often are here one day and gone the next, how much more can we witness to, as the Archbishops worded in their introduction

to this Report, in Jesus Christ having received the very life of God? We are all here because others have witnessed to us of the joy, the life, the salvation and the hope freely offered to all in God.

Friends, it would be scandalous if, in a world of longing and need, others did not have the same opportunities which we have had, to lead lives of eternal purpose, saved from debilitating shame and guilt, saved from slavery and consumerism, a constant chasing after the wind, lives set in meaningful Christian community, which for sure can be hard work, but, as I am reminded in the team of churches I serve in by those coming to faith, meaningful Christian community is a great blessing we often take for granted.

We have had all of these opportunities and privileges because of two things and two things alone: God made it possible, through Jesus Christ; and someone, somehow, somewhere, showed, told or invited us. Yet the sharing of this hope and life is something which for most of us can be hard. I used to work in a diocese travelling around training in evangelism and witness and countless times encountered people for whom sharing faith felt to have the same difficulty level as rebuilding the Large Hadron Collider blindfold in the dark. Whether because of fear, because of our history of imperialism, lack of practice and security or whatever, we have often made evangelism and witness rather complex. Little wonder some shy away or feel we need just one more training course before we give it a go.

We have the opportunity over these four debates in the next two days to reflect to our Church that it is the joy and the calling of all, that in a specific Christian network of family and friends, of classmates and colleagues, there is no one better placed in all of human history to witness to God's love than they and that it is not as hard as we think. To quote the Bishop of Chelmsford, it is about the overflow of the abundance of our hearts, hence why worship and catechises are central, building us up as disciples of Jesus Christ to share the good news.

None of this is an encouragement to glib answers in a complex world, but as I spend time with those exploring faith, rarely I find they are drawn by the theologically perfect answer, important though academic apologetics is, normally by a combination of being heard, so we listen first; of being with, not just doing to; and by seeing often the messy reality of God at work in a person's life. There is no stock formula. There is no set form of words. We listen to God, we listen to context, we show, we tell, we announce that God has come near.

As John Stott once said, most people in England are not Christians because they think it untrue but because they feel it trivial. We are called to show that this is the least trivial gift ever.

National Mission and Evangelism Adviser Dr Rachel Jordan reminds us that when people go to a hotel mostly these days they do not first look at the brochures; they first go to Trip Advisor. If you like, we are "Trip Advisors for Jesus". You can put that on a t-shirt! Or, if

you prefer Lesslie Newbigin's words, "The Christian community is the hermeneutic of the Gospel" - a slightly bigger t-shirt. It will be fine for me!

That is what people see when they encounter any of the 33,000 Church-supported ministries serving people in need. It is what they see when they encounter life events - baptisms, funerals, weddings. They encounter digital evangelism. It is what they see when someone invites them to find out more. And that is what these two Reports before us are about - not for structure and organisation, but encouraging the baptismal call to all Christians as witnesses to the risen Christ, in the power of his spirit, in word and in deed.

Evangelism does not belong to any one part of the Church. We need all our Church to reach all our nation. As Michael Green, great mentor and friend, encourager and model to so many of us, wrote, "If faith doesn't start with the individual it doesn't start, but if it ends with the individual it ends".

So in that context, without repeating all that is in the Reports before us - and mindful they are merely the tip of the iceberg of all God is doing in our dioceses, our local churches - we have seen God bless a new global movement of prayer for evangelisation, *Thy Kingdom Come*, less than four years old, millions of Christians in over 100 countries, 60-plus denominations, not just praying generally but praying specifically for five particular people to come to know Jesus. We have seen increased focus and resources to support witness by the *Whole People of God* and *Setting God's People Free*, in chaplaincy on housing estates, as we will hear in the related debate later, with greater diversity, because

that is at the centre of our Gospel and because it needs all Christians to reach all peoples, with young people and households, as we will hear later and tomorrow, and with greater focus amongst those training for ordination.

This did not start with the Evangelism Task Group and it does not finish with it. These are now being taken forward in the formation of the priorities for the new Evangelism and Discipleship team lead by Dave Male, the work of the new team embodying four principles, handily all beginning in the same letter: complementary to all that is going on, because evangelism and witness is not an app which runs on the operating system of Church; it is at the core of our operating system. Concentrated, not adding a myriad of new things to burden down the local church but doing a few things well to motivate the million regular worshippers. It is about congregations, focused on Christians in local worshipping communities, because we do not exist as individual religious consumers but in community. The Brazilian theologian Leonardo Boff, writing of the Trinity, said “In the remotest beginning, communion prevails”. And, as we have heard, it is about developing, fourthly, confidence - not as expert answers to questions but, in our brokenness, one beggar offering another beggar gold.

A wise person said “If our priorities do not shape our diaries, our diaries will shape our priorities”. Most people struggle with time. It is instructive for us, therefore, that in our Archbishops, in our Bishops, we have models of leaders probably not overwhelmed with free time but choosing to dedicate significant and increasing proportions of it to sharing faith.

But, as we know, England will not be converted by the clergy alone. Most people know a Christian. Most do not know a bishop, and most even do not know a vicar. We need to learn from the examples of the *Whole People of God* showing and telling what this looks like in workplaces and schools and homes and hospitals, clergy being those who cheer the saints on Monday to Saturday, not doing it all. God alone brings growth, but as we step out He meets us, He shows us that He wants to, that He can, that He will, and as He draws people to us, so they respond in bringing their gifts, and we must therefore allow ourselves to be changed as a Church by all they bring.

So, to conclude, the motion calls for each worshipping community to make evangelism a planned priority, to pray more, because God alone gives growth, to reinforce and support this through the wider Church. We live as 16,000 churches and over 1 million regular worshippers amongst a society with deep longings for which we have hope and gift of hope in Jesus Christ. In the days we are tempted to make, because we love the Church and want it to continue, this about offering good news to others as a survival mentality for the institution, we can repent because our motivation is not self-interest or survival; it is because we have a gift which God longs to offer to others and has chosen to use us in doing so. I move the motion standing in my name.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): I want to declare an interest as I was a member of the Evangelism Task Group, and so, of course, I highly recommend to you the Report I have

helped to write and hope, Synod, you will feel able to give your full support to the motion before you.

It has been a huge privilege to serve on the Evangelism Task Group. I hope my colleagues will agree that I have been a passionate proponent for lay witness and also making the link with the *Setting God's People Free* work and Report. But this is indeed what we are setting God's people free for: to be confident witnesses to Jesus in the places and with the people where God has already put us. I shamelessly took the quote from Michael Jenkins in the Report from Bishop Rachel, who is our episcopal champion for *Setting God's People Free*, because I love the image of all of us dripping our wet baptismal footprints around the places where we are, rather like teenagers who have just come out of the bathroom - for those of you who have that experience. Perhaps more to some people's taste, Paul speaks about us taking the aroma of Christ with us wherever we go.

So I want to urge Synod to keep this at the heart of our thinking and work on evangelism. I have every confidence in Dave and his amazing team, but I know how easily things in our Church become ossified and institutionalised. Evangelism is not something we can outsource to even the very best team in Church House. We all need to be committed. So Dave, I urge you and your team to remember this and to continue to involve and challenge each of us. *Thy Kingdom Come* is a great tool to keep us focused. I learnt on the Evangelism Task Group from Archbishop Justin not to use the word "initiative" - and Evangelism is not an initiative. It is our way of life as witnesses to Jesus. I hope we will

approve the motion and make *Thy Kingdom Come* a priority for every parish, but we need to make sure this also does not become institutionalised and lose its life.

I have already noticed, like a game of Chinese whispers, some confusion about what *Thy Kingdom Come* is. I do not think it is a call to pray for the Church or for the nation, although these are good and we should do this. I think it is a time for us to focus on praying for our witness as individual Christians called together by God to live in the world as we thought about in 1 Peter this morning. It is a chance to ask the Holy Spirit to continually fill and equip each of us as we remember how the Holy Spirit equipped the disciples on that first Pentecost. It is an opportunity, as Archbishop Justin has also said, to talk to Jesus about our friends before we talk to our friends about Jesus. It is not a Beacon Cathedral event, although I have certainly enjoyed the events at Winchester Cathedral. It is a moment for each Christian to pray and ask that they will be effective in our witness. I am keen that this does not get lost as time goes by.

I am staying in the Premier Inn at Waterloo. I have this amazing view over Waterloo Station. I have been looking out of the window in the morning and thinking and praying for the people travelling into London to work, many from Winchester, I am sure. I want us to keep remembering in this chamber the sent church as well as the gathered church. Please, Dave, and your team, keep focusing on equipping and challenging those of us who are out in the workplace to be salt and light for Jesus every day. We need to encourage every person to pray for their witness. We can only be effective witnesses if we pray.

So I urge Synod members not only to vote for this motion but also to set an example, to pray and encourage your friends and your brothers and sisters in your own churches to fully partake in *Thy Kingdom Come*, to resist making it a church-focused event but to encourage each person to pray for the Holy Spirit to help and equip them to be the people Jesus calls us to be in all our cities, towns and villages.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): Of course mission and evangelism must be our priority. Archbishop William Temple said that the “world needs more and better Christians”. For me, that is a wonderful pithy statement of the needs of the world. Paul Bayes, Bishop of Liverpool, has recently written about a “bigger Church making a bigger difference”. So growth is, I believe, important. Growth and difference and the ability to do things are directly correlated. So mission and evangelism must indeed be a priority.

But where to start? What sort of picture do we start with in our own mind’s eye? I wonder if the work that we have produced is necessary but perhaps just a little bit thin and can do with a lot of thickening out. What does the Kingdom look like? What does the Kingdom look like not just for ourselves but for society? What does Thy Kingdom really look like in the here and now, incarnate and real, for people who will both accept it and people who might be inclined to reject it? What is it that we are inviting people not just to accept but to reject? Because there seems to me to be an awful lot of rejection of Jesus in the Bible.

So I believe the work remains just a tad thin. It does not paint a picture for me of the vision glorious, a society for the Kingdom of God on Earth as in Heaven. It does not in some ways discuss the very character of God. I think it is ecclesiological a little thin. What sort of Church are we trying to be? Where does the energy from the Church come from? Obviously from prayer. What are the characteristics of the Church? What is to be the public perception of the Church for a group of people who are not even looking in that direction at the present time? The Church appears to me to be God's fact on Earth, the body on Earth. There is not enough for me about the Church in this Report.

I worry that mission and evangelism is reducible to conversion. Is that all that mission and evangelism is? What does mission and evangelism mean in a multi-faith, multicultural context? What does mission and evangelism mean to the God-fearing Jew, Muslim, Hindu or Sikh? Or does it just stop with the conversion of souls? What does mission and evangelism actually mean in many of our most challenging, diverse, plural, contexts?

I worry about all of these things and think they need to be fed into our work. Our approach to mission and evangelism needs thickening out. It needs to include conversion at its core but not to be reducible to conversion. I worry that that seems to be the case at the moment. I worry about what Church we are trying to build. What does it say to the poor, to the disabled, to the gay, to the not sure, to the imprisoned, to the wealthy? What does it say to the Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman at the well? How does it speak into all of these contexts? What does it say to people who are scared and wary of the body

of Christ? These are missional questions and ecclesiological questions. They are questions we must answer as we thicken out our approach to mission and ministry and evangelism, always building a perception of the Church which allows people to do one of two things - to accept or to reject - but never to remain in antipathy.

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft): Archbishop Justin, thank you for your encouragement to speak and your gentle plea for extra time. I need to declare an interest as one of the authors of the paper which set up the Task Group, and also one of my sons, Andy, was a member of the group. I think personally they did a great job, and thanks be to God.

Synod, we need to leave behind the idea, I hope, that evangelism and the passing on of faith in today's culture is easy or straightforward. It is very difficult. Technical solutions are inadequate for the spiritual challenge we face. Reminding the Church continually of our decline simply saps our energy and morale. Pretending the solution is obvious when it clearly is not undermines our confidence.

The work of an evangelist in this moment, I think, is primarily the work of listening and asking questions and deep reflection on our culture. We need to recover the seven classical disciplines which have been at the heart of passing on the faith in every generation: listening in prayer, love at the heart of our mission, apologetics, initial witness, catechesis, ecclesial formation and forming new ecclesial communities. We need to set

them at the heart of Christian formation and ministerial formation. There are more details on each in the article Archbishop Justin referenced on Wednesday.

I want to focus what I have to say in this debate on our motivation and our vision to hand on the faith. What is it that sets our hearts on fire? I think we find our inspiration in two places: the first will be a deeper understanding of the needs of our culture, and the second will be catching a fresh vision of Christ and of Christ as the pattern for the Church.

We need to see the crowds as Jesus sees them - like sheep without a shepherd. The deep question of our age is, without any doubt, "What does it mean to be human?" The question is asked of us by the environmental disaster we are living through, by rapid developments in technology, by the complete erosion of privacy by big tech and by our popular culture. At either end of the spectrum, I think the most significant book of this year will be Shoshana Zuboff's book *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, which looks at the way technology mines our personalities for profit. At the other end of our culture, listen to the beautiful, brave, heart-breaking song by Jess Glynne "*I don't wear make-up on Thursdays*" which she performed brilliantly at The Brits on Wednesday.

We need to see and proclaim afresh in the face of that question "What does it mean to be human?" We need to proclaim afresh that God came to live among us, the creator of the universe, who took flesh and became a human person and who gave His life that we might live.

What would it be like, I wonder, if we took as our guide to evangelism the beatitudes of Matthew 5, eight beautiful qualities which are a portrait of the character of Christ. They show us what God is like. They show us what it means to be human. They show us what it means to be the church.

Our evangelism is meant to be poor in spirit, dependent on God's grace and God's spirit and witnessing to a life lived in relationship with God. Our evangelism is meant to weep with compassion and take seriously the suffering of the world, held within the deeper context of God's joy. Our evangelism is to be meek and gentle, like our Saviour, listening and modelling a different way to a world confused by power and treading softly with the frail and vulnerable. Our evangelism is meant to be hungry and thirsty for justice, like Jesus, and proclaiming the upside-down values of the Kingdom in a world longing for fairness.

Our evangelism should be clothed with mercy: practical love and service but also carrying the good news of God's forgiveness and strong love to a fragile and fragmented world, much of which believes it has fallen short. Our evangelism should be pure in heart, offering a model of integrity because that is who Jesus is. We are offering fullness of life to a world hollowed out by chasing appearance or fame or fortune or afraid to show its real self.

Synod, I hope in each of these debates we will hold before us these key questions. I hope we will take note of this Report.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. I think we have got the point. After Canon Carol Wolstenholme, I will be looking for Fr Thomas to speak to but not move his amendment. From then on it will be a three-minute speech limit.

Ms Carol Wolstenholme (Newcastle): I do so very much welcome the convergence and congruence of thinking that is taking place and the Evangelism Task Group and Discipleship Teams coming together with *Setting God's People Free*. I particularly want to talk about the 12(c) objective which speaks of encouraging dioceses to envisage, equip and enable lay and ordained to be more confident in the sharing of the good news of Jesus Christ in our everyday lives.

I want to make two points in support of how we might do that. The first is what would enable, and dare I say, excite lay people to be more confident in their discipleship? At a recent *Setting God's People Free* learning event, I was struck by how many dioceses have undertaken research to establish both what that might be and how they might do it. Research in my own diocese in Newcastle is certainly one of them that I want to speak about. We did some research with lay and clergy and we have established what I will call a top-ten list of what lay people say would help them be more confident. Within that list are things like to have a better understanding of the Bible, the skill of opening a conversation about faith, the opportunity to talk and share and learn together. None of them are rocket science and none of them ought to be too difficult to promulgate - other than how we do it. The consultation in Newcastle on how we do it includes pleas towards

using e-learning and social media platforms as a way of that learning and development. My first plea to you is: will you stop us all inventing wheels and produce some good quality materials that can be delivered in all our dioceses in a variety of ways, emphasising e-learning and social media platforms as one of the ways of doing it?

My second point is about what we include in the training of ordinands. There is nothing like a lay person telling you what ordinands should do. For lay and clergy to work well together, I think we are bound through our mutual baptism as disciples and to do that to me the leadership of our clergy is absolutely crucial to encourage and kick-start those lay people who are not feeling too confident. For me, one of the things I would like to see is: why cannot we include team development, how teams function, team roles, facilitation skills as part of the core curriculum on all schemes? I think that would really kick-start a change in culture in our churches. We need you, the Evangelism Task Group and Evangelism Discipleship Teams and *Setting God's People Free*, so please walk the walk with us and work together to develop materials, influence the training of ordinands so that we can and we will accelerate that vision to motivate the million regular worshippers to pray, articulate and live out our faith in the world.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Chair: Fr Thomas to speak but not yet move his amendment, after which if Dr Andrew Bell would do the same with regard to his amendment, I would be very grateful.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): My amendment serves to make three points. When I first read the Report I did have difficulty in really understanding what it was about. It is a good Report and I am not criticising the report. When I read it for the second time I realised that it is part of a phenomenon of our Church that we all speak different dialects. I think we share a common language but our dialects are different. Sometimes it is churchmanship. Sometimes it is other perspectives. There is, I think, a risk that many people who are at home in the dialect I speak feel it hard to understand the dialect in which this kind of report is made. The difference in the dialect is not so much about whether evangelism is a good thing or not but about where the stress comes in relation to evangelism and worship.

I understand that in the dialect in which this Report is written that it starts with evangelism, and then worship, which is also important, is second. In the dialect I speak, worship comes first and evangelism second. My amendment wants to relate and to draw in, I hope, the people who speak my dialect into the conversation. I think our dialects are mutually intelligible, by and large, but, as with all dialects, you can only say some things in one dialect and in others it is hard to say things. If you think of somebody who speaks Geordie trying to understand somebody who speaks Scouse, you will understand what I mean.

The importance of worship for people like me - and I recognise that worship is vitally important for all of us - is that it is understood as a place where not only Christ, not only

the Spirit, not only time, not only the people there are involved, but a far greater reality. It seems to me that for many people who are among that middle third to which the Report makes reference at paragraph 12, we have perhaps taken for granted some of the things which happen in that worship. I really do think that to engage with evangelism one needs to engage with the deep mystery which is given to us in our ordered worship. I think that is what my amendment is about.

The Chair: Thank you, Fr Thomas. Dr Bell has the shortest amendment I have ever had to chair. You will get 90 seconds per word at this rate. After that we were due to have Lisa Battye moving her amendment. I am told that Canon Lisa Battye is unwell but that Jacqueline Stamper has agreed to speak to the amendment on her behalf, if that is in order. After Dr Andrew Bell, again speaking to but not moving his amendment, if Jacqueline Stamper would speak to but not move the third amendment.

Dr Andrew Bell (Oxford): I thoroughly welcome the emphasis on evangelism at this group of sessions and I thoroughly support this motion. As the Chair has already said, my amendment must be one of the shortest to come to Synod adding just two words. I hope it is also one of the least contentious.

When I read GS 2118 and saw this motion, particularly the call to make evangelism a planned priority for the coming year, my immediate thought was, "Why just for this year, surely evangelism must always be a priority?" Calling people to repentance, faith, new birth and discipleship is what the Church is for. It is the Great Commission that Jesus

gave us. We have previously been encouraged that evangelism should be a standing agenda item on every agenda from PCC upwards and should drive all other agenda items: yes, finance and everything. That surely makes sense if we really believe that evangelism is what we are here for, as it is, and as Barry and other speakers have emphasised.

My initial thought for this amendment was simply to delete “for the coming year” but, after discussion with Barry and those who put together the motion, I can see the point of those words, that it needs to be a priority now, not next year or in five years’ time, when we have talked about it some more. I propose we simply add two words emphasising that evangelism should be our priority in the coming year “and always”. I trust this will be seen as an entirely friendly and uncontroversial amendment. Thank you.

The Chair: If, after Jacqueline Stamper, the Revd Stewart Fyfe would also speak to but not move his amendment.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): I am speaking on behalf of Lisa Battye, Manchester, 169. Lisa has given me the words she would have used had she not been taken ill.

“This motion is so important at this time that we need to give it every chance of becoming an effective catalyst for growth in depth and numbers of those whom God is calling to faith in Jesus. To do that, I believe that we need to keep the work of nurturing new disciples close to that of evangelism from the start, and, at the same time as calling for

evangelism to be a priority, to call for a shift in how we use clergy time that will make evangelism more effective in the long term. We all know that many Anglican clergy are not natural evangelists, but, surely, one of the key purposes for training our clergy is so that they can take a lead in passing on the faith through teaching it to them who are learning it. And yet with clergy increasingly overseeing multiple congregations, the pressure on them is simply to keep the show on the road and to delegate work with people, such as the provision of confirmation classes, to differently qualified people, in order that they, the clergy, have time to sit in committees or perform tasks that other church members could be set free to give to the work of maintaining things.

“Freeing clergy to support evangelism in the way that they are particularly prepared for will require a culture shift in our churches and that is why I am asking that we make this explicit within this motion from the outset. I urge you to support this motion and this amendment”. Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: We will have Stewart Fyfe to speak to but not move his amendment and then back to a little bit more general debate and Philip Plyming next.

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): I am the most reluctant amender of motions and I intend this as the friendliest of amendments, to bless this motion by making it clear that we are not speaking only to the Church nor is our task merely about Church growth. We also want to address the nation and to reclaim a confidence in Christian mission as a valuable contributor to our national life. For much of my early life, Christian mission was seen even

by non-churchgoers as an intrinsically good thing. These days, sadly, it is often seen as a rather shady business: scalp-hunting, manipulative and self-serving. If that is an unfair characterisation of what we believe we are doing, we also have to acknowledge that we are partly responsible for that misconception. We have too often approached evangelism with an overtone of arrogance and we must be seen to have repented of that arrogance. It is all the more important that we avoid giving the inadvertent impression that evangelism is about empire-building. My amendment seeks, I think, to address some of the concerns raised by Andrew Lightbown in his speech and to ensure that we as the national Church engage with the nation; to make it clear that we are seeking to make a positive contribution to our national life. We are offering hope to a nation in these difficult times because we ourselves are broken yet transformed by the resurrected Christ. We are living embodiments of good news received by the poor.

Yesterday I had the privilege to hear the story of Sid, the son of Synod member Giles Williams. He told me of his work with the Message Trust running a bus as a mobile youth centre in Anfield. Their approach is flagrant. They preached the Gospel, invited to people to faith and disciplined them in it. After a little while the police came to them and offered them money to run a gang intervention project. "You do realise", he said, "that all we do is tell people about Jesus?" "Well, do you have to do that?" "Yes, because it transforms lives". So they ended up being paid to do evangelism by the police, and at the end of the project crime in the area had been reduced by half. It speaks volumes about communities being transformed by encountering the living Word of God in the person of Jesus.

Above all, it is a story I can testify to in my own life. Having come to faith at the age of 17, it has rescued me from a life of terrible depression and gloom. It has not prevented me from making stupid mistakes, but it has rescued me over and over again, most notably saving my marriage and my family life. Why brothers and sisters? Why when we are so broken do such amazing things happen when we are around? Because we embody what it is for humanity to encounter the living Word of God; to be recreated in the image of our Creator, the amazing triune God of life. My amendment is about saying to the nation, "We want to come to talk to you about this, not to grow the Church, but because we care about you because coming to know Jesus transforms lives, families and communities". It is the greatest joy we can offer.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TEIs): In welcoming the Report, and indeed all four amendments, I want to comment specifically on the selection and training in the area of evangelism and witness, something which is dealt with at priority six in the report. I am speaking from the perspective of someone who is currently teaching mission and evangelism to all the first year ordinands at Cranmer Hall where I serve. I also teach leadership and I am glad to assure Carol Wolstenholme that we do talks and teach on leading and developing teams.

I want to make two points. First of all, I am happy to reassure Synod that training in the practical skills of witness and evangelism is already part of the general curriculum within the TEI sector. The students I have been working with have been developing expertise in understanding the different contexts in which we seek to witness, learning how to tell

our own story of faith in such a way as to point to Christ and leading people to make a faith commitment for themselves. All students were part of a faith-sharing weekend team working in different churches and contexts throughout the north-east just a few weekends ago.

Secondly, however, I would contend that the most important thing we can teach ordinands is not the technique of witness and evangelism, valuable though it is, but the theology behind evangelism itself. I am a passionate believer that good theology feeds good mission and evangelism and it is theological insight, deeply explored and deeply held, that will cause our hearts to burn for evangelism and witness. It is theology that will remind us for all the value of modelling the good news that we are also called to proclaim the good news of God. From Isaiah, "I will tell of the kindnesses of the Lord, the deeds for which he is to be praised". To Jesus in conversation with a demon-possessed man, "Go home and tell them how much the Lord has done for you". We hear the language of proclamation, language reflected the Five Marks of Mission. Theology reminds us of the value of presence, of serving, of listening and, yes, with all gentleness and humility, of proclaiming. It is also theology that will refresh us with confidence in the Gospel itself. The good news of Jesus is indeed like a multifaceted diamond which both sparkles at first sight and becomes ever more beautiful on closer inspection. Putting down deep theological roots means we see how Jesus, in both his challenge and his comfort, is good news in a changing and complex world; crucified and risen Christ absolutely, but incarnate Christ, ascended Christ, returning Christ and reigning Christ. He is good news to us and the world. Evangelism is not a church survival strategy. It is not a set of techniques

designed to get more people to buy the product. Evangelism is ultimately a theological activity and it is that great task with which TEIs are engaged and which will fire our Church with Spirit-filled mission.

The Chair: After the Bishop of Leicester, I am going to invite Fr Thomas to formally move his amendment.

The Bishop of Leicester (Rt Revd Martyn Snow): I very warmly welcome this Report. I am really pleased that Synod is spending time thinking about how best to share the joy of the Gospel. I want to make a plea within the report for a greater focus on receiving the gift of the evangelist. Like some other Bishops, I have taken time over the past year to spend long weekends in particular parishes with a group of curates and ordinands, and my one request to the incumbents in organising our visit has been to make sure we spend time with people who do not come to church rather than those who do. Not only do I find myself extraordinarily energised by these weekends, but I found that clergy and congregations alike have been energised and inspired for what we in Leicester now call everyday faith conversations. One incumbent wrote to me and said that as a result of the visit, the landlords of the local pub had invited the church to start a weekly gathering in the pub. The landlords, who were not Christians themselves, liked the idea of their pub being a place where people could explore questions of faith.

I had never really thought of myself as an evangelist until recently, but now I find not only do I love these everyday faith conversations, but the more I do it, the more others around

me also seem to grow in confidence that they too can have such conversations. Evangelists, then, are a gift to the Church. Their role is not to do evangelism so others do not have to but, rather, to equip all the saints to witness to God's Kingdom. That is why I applaud the aim of identifying and equipping and releasing 1,000 new evangelists of all ages and traditions. We need more evangelists because their gift to the Church is precisely in the area of equipping every person to be a witness.

Today's evangelists will not be lone rangers. Today's evangelists will not be loud extroverts who frighten everyone with their enthusiasm. The evangelists of today need to be team members who mentor and coach others in everyday faith conversations, helping people overcome their anxiety, helping them think through the tough questions that anyone who publicly owns the name "Christian" will get asked, and helping people grow in prayerfulness and compassion. I count it a great privilege now to chair the Archbishops' College of Evangelists. For 20 years this college has been supporting evangelists across the country. I hope and pray that the Church will raise up many more evangelists.

The Chair: Synod, we are coming on now to dealing with the various amendments. Each of the proposers of the amendments, in turn as we deal with them separately, will be invited to come and say the three magic words, "I so move". After that, I will invite Barry Hill to say whether he supports or resists the amendment. If he resists, we go to the 25-member rule. If he supports, the debate opens.

As the amendments are not contentious, I would first look to anybody who wants to oppose such an amendment. If there is no opposition to a particular amendment, I do not think I want to trouble us with hearing speeches in favour of it. I would rather have as much time as possible on the main substantive motion. I propose to deal with each one in turn. If you are really against one of these amendments your big moment is going to come very shortly. Fr Thomas, over to you.

ITEM 42

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I move my amendment.

The Chair: Barry, would you like to comment?

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I will restrain myself with all four amendments because I think all four are friendly. I will keep it brief because I am conscious of the need to give as much time for other members to share their experience as possible. I think the point on dialect is really critical. The Gospel is always spoken in our mother tongue, in our native dialect. The point of starting with worship, which certainly we felt as a group Fr Thomas' amendment brings much more clearly into the motion, we would support it: our witness welling up out of that deep life-giving well of worship. It is put beautifully, if you have not read it, in those callings for a thickening out of evangelism, in Pope Francis' wonderful

Encyclical on the joy of evangelism which takes worship as its starting point. All I need do is finish with the words we say every day, “Oh Lord, open our lips”.

Synod: “And my tongue shall announce Thy praise”.

The Chair: And we responded with true Anglican mumbling! Would anybody wish to stand to oppose this amendment? You have two minutes, Tim.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): I want to oppose this amendment because I do not think it actually adds anything to the general thrust of what we are talking about, and it may actually detract a little. In Bath & Wells we already have a priority of putting mission and evangelism at the heart of everything we do. I think this is a timeline issue. Worship is an absolutely key resource for those who want to engage in evangelism, but it is not the only resource, and I want to keep the focus on evangelism. Therefore, I would resist this particular motion.

I would just like to say on Andrew’s concern for the length of his amendment, we did have an hour and a half talking about “ec” some years ago. We did have one amendment which was about a single letter when we were talking about marriage and asking whether or not it should be “forsaking all other” or “forsaking all others”. Do not worry about the length of the amendment; I am sure that will not be a problem.

The Chair: You are showing your age there remembering “ec”. Do we have anyone who

wants to speak in support of the amendment? Sir, two minutes again, after which I will be tempting you with a motion to close.

Mr Ed Shaw (Bristol): I suspect I will be seen as speaking with a different dialect to Fr Thomas - we certainly dress differently - but I do want to support his amendment. I am part of a BMO in the centre of Bristol with an average age of 25. We found, recently, as we seek to keep evangelism a priority, we need to do what this amendment urges us to do, which is make sure that we do not seek to discourage people into evangelism by just beating them over the head with all the stats that could easily discourage us all but, instead, we seek to encourage people by presenting the Lord Jesus to them. On a recent weekend away entitled "Sharing Jesus", a title nicked from the Archbishop of Canterbury's website, what we did was basically spend our time talking about Jesus. We wanted evangelism to be the result, but the way that we sought to do that was by focusing on Jesus in word and sacrament, praising and praying to Jesus, and it is out of that worship and experience and reminder of all that He has done for us that evangelism comes and, as a result, that is why I would heartily support this amendment.

The Chair: As I see no one standing, we can go straight to a vote on this item. We are voting on Item 42, which is the amendment that stands in Fr Thomas Seville's name.

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

The Chair: We move on to the second amendment in Dr Andrew Bell's name, again the three magic words.

ITEM 43

Dr Andrew Bell (Oxford): I move my amendment.

The Chair: Four words! Do we have anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to this amendment? First, I need to ask whether, Barry, you support this. I am sorry, I was getting ahead of myself there. Barry Hill, do you support these two little words?

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I do, yes. I would just add the quote of J C Ryle on John's Gospel, "Terrifically urgent but never in a hurry", and how we embody that sense that the need is urgent - we see that in our parishes every week and every day - and yet we are not anxiety ridden and hurried, so "this coming year and always", at least until our Lord returns.

The Chair: Thank you. This is now Item 43 but, as I see nobody standing, I am going to put Item 43 to the vote.

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

The Chair: Item 44. Jacqueline.

ITEM 44

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): I move the amendment standing in Lisa Battye's name.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I am just going to say a tiny bit extra here because the stats team helpfully gave us some figures a few days ago that I thought Synod would want to hear in relation to this. From annual returns last year, when we averaged that across the year, in the four days that we are meeting now as Synod, 350 people have joined our Anglican churches who have never previously been part of any Christian Church. Another 130 have returned to faith in our churches. That is 480 people over these four days alone. So how the nurturing, the disciple, the learning from is reflected in the diaries not just of the clergy but of the whole people of God is a very helpful challenge. I am grateful to Canon Lisa and Jacqueline for moving. We do support.

The Chair: This is, again, open for debate. If anyone would like to oppose this amendment I would like to see that first, and then I will take a speech in favour of it, if there is one. Two minutes is still the limit.

Mr Ian Yemm (Bristol): I would ask you to resist this amendment on the basis that it emphasises something that for me is counterintuitive to 12(c) which states about “equipping and enabling lay and ordained people to be more confident in sharing the good news of Jesus Christ.” It puts the emphasis obliquely on the clergy, and I think that is something that I would like to avoid. If this is about collaboration and partnership, most of my Christian life has been developed by discipling of the whole people of God and I just think it takes us in the wrong direction by over-emphasising the role of the clergy, important as that is.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I am rather confused, and I think there may be other people confused by this particular amendment. I think it is open to misinterpretation. The clause within it that worries me is about our existing communities. They are the garden in which we are inviting people to come and join us in joy and worship. When we send out a motion passed by this Synod into our parishes and into our dioceses and deaneries, I think we have to be very clear what we are actually saying.

*With *Setting God’s People Free** we are all as one, are we not, in this evangelizing of the whole nation. I am just a little concerned that in identifying our current communities in this way, it may well be seen by those who do not have the privilege of hearing all the debate and reading all the papers that we do - and it is a privilege - then it might be open to misinterpretation. I just leave it to Synod.

The Chair: I would like to hear somebody who wishes to speak in favour of the amendment.

Mrs Margaret Swinson (Liverpool): I do not have any kind of issue with this as undermining the laity. I think it absolutely in some ways does the opposite. It is very easy for us in our churches to expect the vicar to look after us. There are a lot of people who still expect the vicar. This is about us saying actually how do we want our vicars, our clergy, to be using their time. Our laity are there and can also do that looking after the current existing church communities.

Our clergy are a scarce resource. We must think carefully how we use them and in building and discipling new Christians, that is a really good way to be using them. This is also a warning to the rest of us not to expect them to be looking after us. We must look after one another. Clergy and laity look after one another, but we must absolutely use our scarce resource where it is most needed and that is, at the moment, in the discipling and nurturing of those people who are coming and new to our churches.

The Chair: Prolocutor and then I will be looking to close this particular amendment.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I would like to oppose this amendment as well, partly because it is vague in its wording. The other day I was on a Facebook exchange about the words “motivating the million”, and some rather sniffy clergyman said, “Well, what about converting the million in the first place?” I think the point being is that if we

are going to focus on the discipling of new Christians, we need to ensure that the people of God are equipped to do that. In my context, that focus needs to begin with nurturing and encouraging the people of God I have, because they will be the evangelists. That is what this focuses on. I think this is a false dichotomy between two things that are both essential in the same process and it is shifting the weight in the wrong direction and I would ask you to reject it.

The Chair: As I see nobody else standing, I am going to put Item 44 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly lost, which brings us on to Revd Stewart Fyfe's amendment.

ITEM 45

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): I do so move.

The Chair: Thank you. Barry, a comment?

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Again, I see this as friendly and I am happy to support the sense, particularly, of this being for the common good, Stewart, for which we are grateful. This is not empire-building; we do not do this. In fact, we should give ourselves up as

church for the sake of the other; we should not expect them to add to our weight, if you like. In the sense that Jesus did not see a body or a soul, he saw a holistic person, an evangelist or witness integral to all our different dimensions of mission, holistic evangelism being so critical. I am very happy to support.

The Chair: Once again it is open for debate, but I would like to hear first if there is any opposition to this amendment. As I am not seeing anybody standing, I am minded that we go straight to a vote on this. As there is still nobody standing to resist that, we now move to a vote on Item 45.

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

The Chair: That also is clearly carried. Can I thank you all for having dealt with the amendments? We now have the final version of this as we will be voting on it, including 42, 43 and 45, but not 44. We go back to the main debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): As we come to the final stages of this debate, I want to return to the link between evangelism and discipleship. Bishop Steven, the Bishop of Oxford, put this very, very clearly when he spoke of the fact that evangelism looks at the needs of the culture and the vision of Christ, that we need to see the world as Christ sees it. It means that discipleship and evangelism

are at the foundation of Christian life; they come inextricably together. They are not activities for some, let alone an elite or a part of the Church, but they spring from compassion and love in the depths of our hearts from our own experience and knowledge of Christ. That means discipleship and evangelism demand change in us, and if we support this motion, which it looks as though we will, we are also committing to very radical change.

It is not one thing among many, but it is an overwhelming force that directs our life, our action and our words. We will talk more about prayer, about estates, about structures, about time. We have spoken of priorities. It changes our attitude to youth, the elderly, those at work, those on the edge and 65 million others in this country. It changes everything. Discipleship and evangelism embed in us the gift of the love of Christ, strengthening us in the ups and downs of life, enabling us to be comforted in sorrow and preparing us for death and glory. Discipleship and evangelism lead us into communities of worship. I am so grateful to Fr Thomas for emphasising that and putting it at the top of the amendments.

Our discipleship is influenced by our witness. To tell leads us to grow. It leads us to grow in faith, confidence and worship. We see that when Jesus sends out the disciples. They come back with a whole new idea of what it means to be a disciple of Jesus Christ. So when we talk of evangelism and discipleship, we are talking about a radically differently shaped Church which starts with being filled afresh with the spirit of God, consumed with

the love of God for us, for the world and obsessed by the vision of God of the world which we seek to change to show the shape of his love.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): Thank you, Chair, for inviting me to speak on this pressing and exciting subject. I welcome this Report as someone who has long argued that the Church needs to recover the language of evangelism as the work of the priesthood of all believers. And I especially want to welcome this Report as providing, in its six priorities, a series of challenges that interrogate those, like me, who in some quarters might be written off as flimsy progressives or liberal Catholics who refuse to grasp the urgency of the good news.

Though there are moments when the Report deploys terms which might strike some of you as inelegant, terms such as “envisioned” or “motivating our million.” I hear the song this Report seeks to sing. I readily appreciate what priority 2, which speaks of releasing people as part of the whole people of God to live out the good news of Jesus, gestures towards. In the modest wondrous often precarious church of which I am rector, I have witnessed how an inclusive, searching and invitational culture has led to growth in numbers and depth, especially at the younger end of the congregation. As one younger member said to me recently, “St Nick’s is a place where one may turn to the person on the right and hear stories of old Manchester, and then turn left to hear someone’s hot take on FUCO.”

Our fellowship is often precarious and perhaps it is so called to be, but in its sometimes clumsy, always joyful way, we have begun in Eucharist, in discipleship, our theology groups, to equip each other to live out the good news of Jesus. This is where I do wish to strike a modest note of caution. I should be alarmed if the somewhat programmatic language of this Report was read in a reductive prescriptive way without the subtleness characteristic of Anglicanism at its best. Communities like those I serve have Christ absolutely at their centre in word and table. The Body of Christ is the locus of our embodied stories and lives. There is a generosity in orthodoxy, which allows persons to locate their complex real lives in Christ's defining story.

One size will not fit all and I can see how this Report might mistakenly be read as about creating followers of Christ's agents of grace who are supposed to be packaged mini-mes or Anglican Borg. Do not be alarmed by what this Report says. To be a seven-day disciple does not exclude space, grace, glory and mystery.

The Chair: After Angus MacLeay, Mark Murthen for a maiden speech, please.

Revd Angus MacLeay (Rochester): I wish to speak to the paragraph relating to the issue of developing confidence in our faith. There are plenty of anecdotes that I can share from my current church experience, but I want to build on how scripture tackles this issue by using 1 Peter, which has been referred to at a number of points within this group of sessions. 1 Peter 2:9-12 stands at the hinge of this significant letter linking the first main section and the second.

The first section focuses on the enormous privileges, both future and present, which are enjoyed by God's people through the glorious Gospel. As a result, Peter can conclude that we are "a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's special possession. Once you were not a people but now you are the people of God; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy."

Peter wants us to be reminded of these staggering privileges which have significantly changed our identity. What a transition to celebrate. But, as a result, he is able to say that our new purpose is "that you may declare the praises of him who called you out of darkness into his wonderful light." In other words, a vision for all God's people being active in evangelism is based on the constant thrilling reminder of the way that our Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ has shaped and changed our own lives.

But Peter does go further and immediately encourages believers with these words: "Dear friends, I urge you as foreigners and exiles to abstain from sinful desires which wage war against your soul." In other words, holiness, as was stressed in our morning Bible study and derived, 1 Peter says, from Leviticus, is to be the mark of every believer's lifestyle. A Church without an understanding of sin and without a passion for holiness will not be able to hold out this life changing Gospel with any integrity and, therefore, effective evangelism is certainly what we want, but it must be based on the faithful teaching of God's word to remind us what Christ has done for us and it must be linked with a serious engagement with holiness with the help of God's Spirit. 1 Peter offers us a holistic vision

for engaging our culture with the Gospel, which should renew our confidence in this glorious work of evangelism wherever we are. Thank you, Synod.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: after the next speaker would you carry on using your newfound power.

The Chair: I was hoping to squeeze in just one more after Mark Murthen if Ms Mary Bucknall is wishing to speak.

Revd Mark Murthen (London): Thank you to the Evangelism Task Group for the Report. I have been looking forward to this debate since we met in York last summer and hoped to speak then after attending a fringe meeting that presented the results of the Talking Jesus research and introduced the Talking Jesus course. I am really pleased that some of the findings from that research were included in the paper because, frankly, they are shocking.

First, we have some incredible news that by and large people know churchgoers and they like us. Shocking, isn't it. Some 70% of us said that we knew someone we could invite to church, but 85% to 95% of us said we had no intention of doing so – 85% to 95% of those who knew someone they could invite to church said, "We have no intention of doing so." That is a scary thought. Now, I am not reciting that stat to bash us over the head, but we need to be clear of our starting position. I am sure that figure goes across all

traditions. I am an evangelical, I'm proud of that, and yet when I read that statistic I think that is something I need to repent of.

On the first day of Synod, the Archbishop of Canterbury asked if we would give up cynicism for Lent and those words have played in my mind for a while. I think I also need to give up my own self-confidence, and by that I mean any confidence that I have in my own ability to bring about someone's conversion. I think that is why it is great that the Report calls us to pray, to pray continually, to be dedicated in praying for five people to come and know the joy of sins forgiven in Jesus Christ.

For this country to be evangelised again, we need to get that right sense of confidence. Of course, we really do need to be equipped and we have never had as many resources as we do now to help us in that task, but we need confidence in something outside of ourselves. We need confidence in the power of the Gospel to save because, without that, we will never go beyond superficial conversations with our friends and colleagues; conversations about something out there; conversations about a big man up in the sky; conversations about the spiritual but with no sense of the Holy Spirit of God.

Synod, let us not be merely better informed about evangelism but let us be transformed again by the power of God's word to get over that awkwardness, to get over that pain barrier and to talk about the eternal things of life.

The Chair: Mary Bucknall, after which I will be seeking to bring things to a conclusion

Miss Mary Bucknall (Deaf Anglicans Together): Chair, I wish to draw the attention of Synod members to the needs of profoundly deaf lay and ordained people, Item 12(c). They are unable to accept standard evangelism and discipleship materials produced by diocesan and theological education institutions without British Sign Language interpretation and/or subtitles. I am a member of Deaf Anglicans Together with my own experience of deafness and the isolation this causes. With permission, I would like to raise the following points.

One, there are currently no theological courses aimed specifically at deaf people in British Sign Language. Previously, there was a church certificate in Christian ministry in partnership with the University of Chester, but this proved too expensive to run.

Two, there are large annual conferences, such as New Wine and Spring Harvest with British Sign Language interpretation and a deaf stream, but these are one-off events.

Three, currently, there are 17 dioceses out of 42 without a deaf chaplain, ordained minister or a licensed lay minister working with deaf people.

Four, training for authorised ministry is run with sign language interpreters, but this is not the answer. The costs of funding interpreters also raises the question: who pays?

Five, services in British Sign Language are usually held only once a month in deaf churches.

Six, there is a wide variety of online resources for evangelism and discipleship, some of which are subtitled, for example, the Pilgrim course. There is also British Sign Language translation of some materials in Christianity Explored. This is to be commended but it is disappointing that the new Bible Society course has videos which are not subtitled.

If profoundly deaf lay and ordained people do not hear, how can they pass on the Gospel message to others, including deaf people who may be in even greater need. As a past theological student myself, I long to see more in-depth Bible training which is accessible to deaf students to counteract their sense of isolation and lack of fellowship with other Christians, so that they can realise their potential and become effective at living for Christ in the world.

The Chair: As there are people still standing, I am going to have to put a motion for closure, which I can now do as Chair.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. So we move now to the final bit of the proceedings. I invite the Revd Barry Hill to respond to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Synod, an inspiring and, at times, moving debate and the challenges that we have heard from speaker after speaker of making sure that this is not the start, it does not end here, that it spills out into the radical change and transformation of our Church which a number of speakers have mentioned.

Particular thanks to Alison Coulter for reminding us we cannot outsource this. This is the calling. It is our baptismal call. I am reminded by the Bishop of Burnley that the prime sacrament of the Church is baptism and, through that, all of us are witnesses, kind of whether we like it or not. It felt a very helpful conversation, I think, one which I hope is echoed up and down the land in churches. What is the role of clergy and what is the role of the whole people of God in that? I was reminded of the beautiful words of the Ordinal, which if you haven't read lately, particularly in reference to evangelism and witness, I would suggest we go back to in prayer regularly. Interestingly, on the section in evangelism and witness it starts with the words, "With all God's people".

Thank you also for mentioning *Thy Kingdom Come*, of which I think there will be a free gift possibly on your chairs as you return from lunch. As we saw in the research last year, over 40% of those who prayed, that prayer led to them sharing faith more with others, "When you pray, move your feet".

Andrew Lightbown, thank you very much. I agree we could do with thickening this out. I am reminded a little of the words of St Augustine, it is solved by walking and as we walk

this out together - I do not think we can sort all the answers and then we work it out, but as we walk it out, hopefully in God's grace, we can work it out.

The importance of multi-faith, I could not agree more. A few of us were talking this morning and I was struck in my own close family I have Jewish, atheist, Muslim and Christian relatives and I often find it is those of other faiths who encourage me to share with them, "What is this hope that you have in Christ?" Really very important indeed.

The Bishop of Oxford and the Archbishop of Canterbury reminded us this is not a technical solution. There is not a sticking plaster that works for this. It is radical transformation of every Christian community and, dare I say, to allow ourselves to be radically transformed by those that God draws to us with the gifts and perspectives that they bring as well. It gives me an opportunity to highlight, as many have, Bishop Steven's blog as well on this.

To Carol Wolstenholme, the excitement, the joined-up thinking with *Setting God's People Free*, I am sure the Chair of Ministry Council has heard comments there both about ordinands made by you and Philip Plyming and also, importantly, by Mary Bucknall towards the end as well.

The Bishop of Leicester has seen in Leicestershire the difference in the time he has taken and other bishops have taken around the country in working with ordinands and with deacons and with the whole people of God in showing what this looks like and how we are transformed by this as a Monday to Saturday not just a Sunday task. As an old

theologian used to say of church on a Sunday morning, “This is for that, the Dismissal, the Mass”, the most important part, arguably, of our service.

Rachel Mann, some may have missed it at the end but I loved the image of an Anglican Borg, which I am sure we are keen to avoid, although it is the time of year when toymakers are thinking about what to put in the shops for Christmas and I am sure that a number will take that idea away and it will be popular. That says it is so important that there is not one size that fits all, there are no cookie-cutter solutions.

It is so important, and I am so grateful of you reminding us that it is not that all traditions are needed in this because we have some bizarre theology of fairness and if part A of the Church gets to do it then part B also needs a fair crack. We need this because we are parish people and we are set in parishes where God has called us to serve all of the people of this nation, and that is a diverse group and that needs the gifts of each tradition in order to do that. Thank you for reminding us.

Angus MacLeay, the gift of freedom, of salvation, of identity in Christ, touching again, as others have, that this will transform us. If we, as Christians, and those we seek to serve and reach are not transformed, then we have missed something fundamental.

Mark Murthen in Talking Jesus, people know us and they like us. It may be a surprise. We have not got it all sorted but we are not arriving at a party empty handed, we have been given a gift not of ours but of God's.

Mary Bucknall, to finish, I think, just a profound and beautiful challenge in words to the Church. How do we make sure that in our evangelism we embody the call of God that this is a gift for all, that God goes to those who feel they are forgotten and marginalised and ignored? He goes to those with hope and longing in their hearts and says, “I see you and I love you and I need you and I call you”, and that is what this is about, not technically agreeing to these words or those words in the Report but allowing ourselves to be changed by God forever.

The Chair: I therefore put Item 12 to the vote.

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): Point of order.

The Chair: If we must.

Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle): I am sorry, Chair, but the text of the motion as it appeared on the screen a few moments ago did not include my amendment which was passed. Can we just be clear what we are voting on?

The Chair: Apologies for a breakdown in the AV system. This is Item 12 as amended by 42, 43 and 45; 45 being your amendment. Tim, is this another point of order?

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): Again, Chair, on the way in which the amended motion appeared on the screen just now it did not make sense because Fr Thomas' amendment had not been put in correctly, so it needs to have an (a) in front of it for it to make some sense.

The Chair: We will shoot the people who are running the text system! What appears on the screen is illustrative; the definitive text is on your Order Papers as amended by the amendments in the wording put on the Order Papers. I therefore put this item --- This is your dinner time.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): May we have a count of the whole Synod?

The Chair: I really would rather not, but if 25 members stand we will have to have. Are there 25 members standing. I see no 25 members standing, we therefore move to a show of hands.

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

The Chair: Synod, we are about to go to lunch but, before we do, on a personal note can I thank you. This is the last time I will be on the Panel of Chairs. I have thoroughly enjoyed working with you. You have made my life more interesting and exciting, especially with your points of order. I look forward to making my own interventions from the floor as obstreperously as I can in due course.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm

ITEM 23

54th REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (GS 2119) PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2120)

The Chair: Please be seated. Good afternoon, members of Synod. I trust you had a good lunch. We now come to the 54th Report of the Standing Orders Committee, and there is quite an important introduction so please listen carefully to this. For this debate you will need the orange Order Paper V, but you will also need the yellow Notice Paper, the first Notice Paper, or in your first mailing, because that has the items in detail that we will be going through, whereas the Order Paper does not have them all, and I will explain. You will also need GS 2119, which is the 54th Report of the Standing Orders Committee, as well as GS 2120, the proposed changes to the Standing Orders relating to the Crown Nominations Commission.

The Business Committee has determined, under Standing Order 40(5) that a number of the proposed amendments to Standing Orders, namely those contained in 23 to 26, 28 and 29 on the First Notice Paper, did not need to be debated. No member having asked for any of Items 24, 25, 26 and 28 to be debated or given notice of an amendment to them, have already been deemed to have been approved.

In a further case, Item 29, although members asked for it to be debated as reported on the 11th Notice Paper, the Standing Orders Committee has decided not to move it since it wishes to give the matter to which it relates further consideration.

All of which means that for the purposes of this afternoon, we are debating Items 23, 27 and Items 30 to 38. That is 11 items in total and we have been allocated about 75 minutes before we have very important debates on Growing Faith and Estates Evangelism. So, Synod, I would urge you to consider that as we come to the debate this afternoon. I am going to try and move us through this business as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, I am going to ask Geoffrey Tattersall to move Item 23, and he may speak for up to ten minutes.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): You will see from what the Chairman has already said that it falls to me to only deal with Item 23 and you will note that that relates to a number of words. I have to declare an interest that I have spent my life using a lot of words to earn a lot of money, but there it is. Maybe not a lot of money.

But I should remind the Synod that the purpose of the Standing Orders Committee, or the rules the Standing Orders themselves provide, that the Standing Orders Committee should keep the procedure and Standing Orders of this Synod under review and to submit to the Synod such proposals for amendments as it thinks fit. And it does so by considering representations made by individual members of Synod or by various bodies in Synod.

You will see from our Report how the issue of questions arose. As part of its review of the July group of sessions, the Business Committee believed that it was appropriate to consider various amendments to the Standing Orders relating to questions, and invited the Standing Orders Committee to consider them. And the Standing Orders Committee agreed in two respects.

The first was in relation what was to become Item 25, which we do not need to debate, which is about supplementaries and questions which may be asked of supplementaries, and the second is Item 23. This simple, modest proposal proposes that there should be a word limit of 150 words on an original question, believe it or not with a discretion vested in the chair of the sitting to allow a further number of words if it is thought appropriate. We believe that this is a necessary but a modest step for the Synod to adopt because questions have in the recent past got longer.

Longer questions mean longer answers and what happens with longer questions and longer answers is that you sometimes do not finish question time, which is not what people want. We are vesting power in the chairs to exercise judgment independently and the chair has the discretion to allow a question containing more than 150 words. I have to say that, being an anorak and having been through the questions this time, none of them were longer than 150 words. That was not the case last July, when one question contained 361 words. So we believe that this is a sensible and practical proposal and I move Item 23 standing in my name.

The Chair: I would like to invite David Lamming to move his amendment, Item 46, and also to speak to your amendment, Item 47. I would like to give you no more than 250 words, but I can give you five minutes.

ITEMS 46 AND 47

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you, Chair. I will try and keep this short, because it is somewhat of a prosaic item after this morning's important debates and business later today. But, having said this, this is also an important matter because by the questions we ask at question time we hold the House of Bishops and other officers to account. So I ask the question why is this change necessary? Both Geoffrey Tattersall and I are lawyers, how much money we make from the words we use may be problematic, but we look at evidence and what is the evidence and what is the reasoning for this change? It is very limited.

If members will look at GS 2119, we see in paragraph 1 that this proposal originated from the Business Committee who asked the Standing Orders Committee to impose a 150-word limit, and then on page 2 at paragraph 3, the Committee agreed that there should be a limit of 150 words on original questions, noting that at recent groups of sessions some questions had been unnecessarily long and complex. Is this, in fact, the case? Now, I did some research, as Geoffrey Tattersall obviously has done, on the questions

asked in the two sessions in 2018, and here I have to declare an interest, because the 361-word question that he referred to was one of mine.

Let me just give you the figures. February 2018, and here, of course, the word count on the computer makes the calculation easier: 93 questions, 12 of which were between 100 and 150 words, one of which was 168 words, but it was mine. In July 2018: 83 questions, three of them between 100 and 150 words, three of them 150 words plus, one of which was a question from Jayne Ozanne. Now, what is important is that of the two questions in July which were longer, from me, they referred back to questions in February and needed therefore to set out the background to what was in the end a short question. It was not that a long answer was being asked for. When you think about it, that is not a problem on the floor of this Synod, because all those questions and the answers are in written form and they are not read out, they are taken as read. So where, I ask, is the problem?

The other question is how would this actually work in practice? If you look at the Notice Paper, you will see that the person who is going to be allowed to permit a longer question is the person nominated to be the chair of the sitting at which the question would, if permission be given, be answered. How is that going to work? We put in a question at the moment, if there is a query about it, it gets referred to the Legal Office and it may come back with a suggestion for revision.

Who, and at what stage, is going to vet these questions and decide whether a longer question can be allowed? It is creating, I suggest, extra work unnecessarily. My request to Synod, primarily, is to say reject this amendment proposed by the Standing Orders Committee. But, on the other hand, if there is to be a limit, why 150 words, why any particular number of words, and hence my first amendment to say delete “150” and insert “250”. If we do not pass that then the second alternative is 200 rather than 150, but, overall, I would say to you, members of Synod, we do not need a word limit at all. Thank you.

The Chair: I ask Mr Tattersall to comment.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Well, Mr Lamming and I agree that questions are very important and, indeed, the role of the Standing Orders Committee is very much to hold the ring between those who have authority and those members of Synod who want to ask questions and hold people to account. I am very glad to see, first of all, that Mr Lamming confessed that he was the author of the 361 words. I was not going to say that because I did not want to embarrass him. But, I am equally glad to see that, as a matter of principle, he concedes that there should be some limit. So, in other words, his 361-word question would not, even on his proposal, be allowed, except with the consent of the chair.

250 words is an awful lot of words, if you think about it, and, indeed, if I look at Mr Lamming’s questions in this group of sessions they were 93 words and 96 words, which

probably indicates that there is no problem with the word limit of 150 words, subject, of course, to the power of the chair to extend the number of words. And so, for these reasons, I would ask the Synod to resist this amendment.

The Chair: So, Item 46 is open to debate. I will just take the Bishop of Willesden and Martin Sewell and then we will move to the closure.

Bishop of Willesden (The Rt Revd Pete Broadbent): Three words: democracy, accountability and transparency. Question time is where you get the chance, from people who are not involved in all the things that go on in the powerhouses of Synod, to be able to exercise some democracy. It also allows you to hold people to account. There is an awful lot of wriggling goes on during question time, where people try hard not to answer the question on the paper and certainly try hard to avoid the supplementaries. Transparency is also about saying that we need to have a system whereby this Synod is open in terms of the way it operates.

I do not like people trying to close down debate. I regretted the fact that we had all the answers written out beforehand, because I think that reduces the capacity of members of Synod actually to hold those who have responsibility to account. I think as soon as you start reducing the limits on words at all, you are limiting the power of members to do those three things about being able to hold people to account and to be democratic and to make them able to have some transparency about what they are doing. So, if we are going to have to have a word limit I would go for the biggest one and I would go for the Lamming

amendment. Personally, I do not think we should have limits at all. I think we really do need to preserve the power of what are sometimes called backbenchers, but they are not really in this Synod, and ways in which we prevent them from being able to do that are ways that we should resist in the Synod.

The Chair: Just before I invite Martin to speak, are you for or against the amendment?

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): I want to reject any word limit.

The Chair: So you are against the amendment?

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): No, I want to agree it should be extended if we have one, but I think we should reject the whole idea. I want freedom to ask the questions, that is my position.

The Chair: Okay, go on then. You have got two minutes.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): Do not worry, I was a legal aid lawyer, we did not get paid by the yard, we got fixed fees. Very simply, Geoffrey, a simple question: when you have to refer back to the history of these matters, and there has perhaps been evasion beforehand, it really does make sense, as David rightly says, to tell us in a succinct way where we have come from and what we are now asking, and so I ask Geoffrey if he would address that issue. How are we going to solve that problem if we do not allow us to go

back and explain the context? How are we going to do that and preserve the transparency that Bishop Pete has talked about?

The Chair: Before we do a vote, is there anyone who would like to make a speech for the proposal? In which case I am going to close debate on that, does that have your consent? So now we move to a vote.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): Point of order. Can you please clarify because I think quite a few of us are confused about the word count?

The Chair: Thank you for giving me the opportunity of clarification. We are voting on Item 46, which would insert the words “250”, which would allow people to ask questions up to that length. We have still got to vote on the whole item in a second or third vote in a few minutes. Does that help?

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

The Chair: That has been quite clearly carried. We are going to resume debate on Item 23 as amended by 46. Prebendary Cawdell, you have two minutes.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I do not need it; verbosity is the enemy of clarity. Please vote for the motion.

The Chair: Prudence Dailey, two minutes, and then I will close debate and allow Mr Tattersall the chance to reply.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): Nobody has actually given any reason why we should vote in favour of this amendment that makes sense, because we have been told that having longer questions and longer answers takes more time, but it does not because the questions and the answers are printed. So if I am going to vote in favour of this amendment, I need to be given some convincing reason why we should actually have it.

The Chair: Thank you. I would like to move to a closure on this debate. Has that got your consent? In which case I am going to ask Mr Tattersall to reply to the debate.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Well, if you have a question which is longer and it has, as some people said, a greater degree of context before the very short punchline at the end, the answer will reflect the context too, so the answer is bound to be longer, inevitably. Well, we are at 250 words, and 250 words surely, with a power to the chair to extend the number of words, all it simply does is take out those very, very, very long questions, such as Mr Lamming's last summer - 361 words - which really could have been expressed much more concisely.

You have got to be realistic here. We are spending a huge amount of time here on a number of words. It is very important that we do not stifle questions, but we have got to get realistic. Think about how many words 250 words are. That is 100 words more than

any question asked this session. That is a huge number of words, and you know, it is alright saying “aw”, but there is a lot of words and ample opportunity for anybody to express the question in whatever way they think appropriate in 250 words, with a power to the chairman to extend the number of words. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I put Item 23 to the vote.

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

The Chair: So, now we move on to Item 27 and I am calling on the Archbishop of Canterbury to move that item, and he has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 27

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): At the beginning of this group of sessions, we welcomed two friends and colleagues from the Anglican Communion to join us at the group of sessions. It is truly a pleasure and a privilege to have the Bishop of Jabalpur and Moderator of the Church of North India and the Bishop of Kapsabet with us this week. Their biographies, as set out on the Notice Paper, give some evidence of their immense achievement and personal courage, but I would suggest that these only give a small indication of the challenges that they and their churches face every single day.

As Synod members will remember, the Archbishop of York and I have invited representatives from across the Communion to join us for the last few Synod meetings. I believe it has added to our common life together to be reminded of the worldwide nature of the Anglican Communion and to hear joyful stories as well as very painful stories from our colleagues right across the world.

My moving this change to Standing Orders is an attempt to regularise their ability to be with us and our opportunity, on occasions, to hear from them. As well as hearing something of the joys and challenges face by our friends from other parts of the Anglican Communion, we do I believe need to be reminded of the different circumstances and the pressures faced by many of our Anglican colleagues. The vicissitudes of our own national Church politics, the divisions of British public life, and the pressures of social change on the Church of England and, for that matter, the church in England, are nothing by comparison to the hardships experienced by many in other countries. Many of them are minorities in the place where they live, often they find themselves subject to persecution, extreme poverty and the pain of war and civil unrest, as well as the dramatic environmental depredations caused by climate change.

Since I became Archbishop, and in line with similar initiatives taken by my predecessors, I have made it a priority to visit every province in the Anglican Communion. I have never ceased to be humbled and delighted by how sisters and brothers in the Communion bring the light of Jesus Christ to people all over the world, and we need to remember, of course,

that the average Anglican is a woman probably in her thirties, probably living in sub-Saharan Africa, and probably on income of well below \$4 a day.

Many of our churches right around the world are growing and developing in exciting ways. I think that Synod needs to hear these other voices from around the world. I would like us to hear Anglicans in Nairobi as well as the voice of Anglicans in Norwich or Newcastle. The God of the outer estates in Sheffield is also the God of the slums in Chennai. The God we worship at the General Synod inaugural service in Westminster Abbey is the same God in Christ who is worshipped by Anglicans displaced or refugees in camps in South Sudan and the Middle East.

In hearing these voices, even if we do not always agree with them, we will, I believe, understand more about our faith, our common humanity and we will see deeper into the love and compassion of Christ. And, if we are very brave, we may hear them saying important things to us from their perspective.

The proposals before you are a set of simple, technical changes to our Standing Orders as set out in the First Notice Paper. These changes basically enable the Anglican Communion guests, who have been invited to Synod by myself and the Archbishop of York, to have exactly the same speaking rights as those which currently exist for our ecumenical representatives. I would say to Synod that the Archbishop of York and I are keen to ensure that we invite a range of Anglicans from across the Communion, so over time we do hear from all those who are part of our extraordinary extended family.

This proposal would mean that guests from the Anglican Communion may speak in certain debates, subject to prior arrangement with the chair, but they may not vote, ask questions or move a motion or amendment. Should Synod vote to agree this change, I am sure that our guests will use these rights with the same discretion and judgment that our distinguished ecumenical representatives have habitually employed over the years. Their interventions have always been carefully judged and immensely valuable, and I have certainly appreciated them hugely.

In offering our sisters and brothers from the Communion the same opportunity as our ecumenical partners we honour our wider Anglican family and we live out the value and virtue of hospitality in this body. I hope that you will agree to extend them this hospitality and I beg to move Item 27 standing in my name.

The Chair: Item 27 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Sue Slater (Lincoln): I am delighted to accept this proposal, which seems eminently sensible, and to extend hospitality in this way to representatives of the Anglican Communion is something that I fully support. I was glad that you acknowledged that the typical Anglican is a woman in her thirties from sub-Saharan Africa and I look forward to seeing the typical Anglican representing the Anglican Communion in future.

The Chair: I see no one standing so I am going to move to close the debate. Does that have your consent? Does the Archbishop like to reply?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I entirely agree with Ms Slater.

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

The Chair: Now we move to Item 30 and I am going to invite the Archbishop of York to move. He has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 30

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Dearly beloved in Christ, members of this lovely Synod, this time last year we made to take note of the Report *Discerning in Obedience: A Theological Review of the Crown Nominations Commission*. We continue to be grateful to Professor Oliver O'Donovan and his team for their profound reflections on the workings of the Crown Nominations Commission and for their challenges to us. Many people have shared with me their appreciation of the way in which theology and process were woven together in the Report, and this nature and style is perhaps something we can learn from, where process and theology are never separated.

However, my friends, we have now been charged to bring to life the themes that emerged in the Report. The Bishop of Lichfield has presented a report to the Synod from the group monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of GS Misc 1209. He sets out reflections on the deliberations of the various groups charged with its implementation. I, for one, would like to thank him and his group for this summary of progress. He reminds us of the various parties involved - the central members of the CNC, the Development and Appointments Group and the group reviewing election processes.

I stand here to speak for the central members of the Crown Nominations Commission following its discussion of those proposals from the Professor Oliver O'Donovan Report which require Standing Order changes. Members of Synod will have easy access, I hope, to GS 2120 which provides the background to this. Members will see from this paper that members of the Commission have decided to share with Synod those areas where there was not unanimous agreement on the issue. As one of the Chairs of the CNC, I am happy to present our proposed changes to Standing Orders in the light of our discussions. I am also aware that some central members, if called, would share different perspectives. This will, I dare to suggest, enable Synod to step into the space for discernment identified in the Report and to consider thoughtfully the changes to Standing Orders that need to be made at this particular point in time. Together, as members of the CNC, we have prayerfully explored the issues raised and we now present our proposals to Synod, for you to do exactly the same, and, as we seek to discern in obedience, we are mindful of

the warning in the Report: “In order to reach a discernment, then, it is essential not to try to know the end from the beginning”. We will now start at the beginning.

Item 30, Standing Order 137, the proposal to amend this Standing Order such that central members should be excluded from consideration of a vacancy in the see of their own diocese is one which all central members on the Crown Nominations Commission who were present agreed should not be. All members agreed this. Clarity about this issue within Standing Orders would be much more welcomed as we hope that these proposed amendments will actually be accepted.

Members will note that it has been necessary to make a number of amendments to ensure that deans and clergy who represent universities and TEIs are treated in the same way as proctors in Convocation. Paragraph 8 of our paper draws attention to an anomaly which would be created in relation to members who represent universities and TEIs who would not be eligible to sit on the CNC or the Vacancy in See Committee. We suggest that the group reviewing the electoral processes consider amending the Vacancy in See Committees Regulation to enable university and TEI representatives to serve as of right on the Vacancy in See Committee. Ven. Spiers, I beg to move.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 30 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so we will move straight to a vote.

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

The Chair: That is quite clearly carried. Now we move to Item 31 and again I call upon the Archbishop of York to move Item 31. He has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 31

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): The background for this proposal is set out in paragraphs 9 to 18 in GS 2102. The amendment set out in Item 31 proposes the nomination of the Chair of the CNC for a vacancy in the see of York should rest with the Prime Minister following consultation with such “persons or bodies” as s/he thinks fit and that the person should reside in the Province of York. As we note, the central members do have different perspectives on the involvement of the Prime Minister in the appointment of the Chair. Six were in favour and two were against.

I will spend a little time drawing out the various issues we explored to enable Synod members to take their own view. Again, *Discerning in Obedience* reminds us of the significance of the role of the Prime Minister in appointing the lay Chair for Canterbury, an arrangement which reflects the traditional teaching of the Church of England on church and state. The method of appointment, the Report suggests, is one of a number of interactions which emphasise the role of the Church of England in providing moral and spiritual influence in the nation, and is a link between the Church of England and wider political and public structures. Another way of looking at this might be to say that it is a sign of the partnership between church and state of our vocation to mission to the whole

nation according to which takes us out of our own walls to services in the wider community.

As the role of the Archbishop of York with Canterbury is to step into the public space as a leading voice of the Church, the Report suggests that we explore whether, in the light of this, the appointment of the Chair of the York CNC should also rest with the Prime Minister. On the other hand, and you may well hear voices during the course of debate, it is argued that the current arrangements work well and that nominations for the Chair by the Appointments Committee reflect the kind of relationship between church and state on appointment issues as well.

Following the White Paper - and if you remember I did move it in Synod - *The Governance of Britain*, the Church has taken on more responsibility for its appointment processes. The current Prime Minister has indicated in this spirit that if Synod endorses the proposed change by the members of the Crown Nominations Commission, she would be happy to accept it following consultation with the Church.

In considering the issue of the York Chair, central members felt that it was important to stress that the Chair of the CNC themselves should be a credible representative of the Northern Province. Having explored various options as to how to effect this, a residency requirement provides the clarity of criteria that the Standing Order actually requires. Chair, I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 31 is now open for debate. I see no one standing so we will move to a vote.

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

The Chair: We move to Item 32 and again it is for the Archbishop of York to move.

ITEM 32

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Chair, as I know you from old, I am going to call you Ven. Pete. This proposed revision of the Standing Order was supported unanimously - eight for, none against - by members of the Crown Nominations Commission. I hope that they are self-explanatory and so I will say little at this stage. They seek to re-enforce the relationship between the Archbishop of the Province and his or her bishops. As noted in *Discerning in Obedience*, it would be improper for an Archbishop of York to be nominated without a Northern bishop having a voice. We think this is mirrored in the Canterbury nomination process. Ven. Pete, I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 32 is now open for debate. I see no one standing, so let us move to a vote.

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

The Chair: We move to Item 33 and the Archbishop of York to move that. Again, he has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 33

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Chair, this item is consequential on the disqualification provision in Standing Order 137. Again, I do not propose to speak in detail on this. If a member is disqualified from serving, this ensures there are arrangements in place for someone to take their place. This was supported unanimously by the CNC members. I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 33 is open for debate. I see no one standing, so let us move to a vote.

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

The Chair: Now we move to Item 34 and I call upon His Grace, the Archbishop, once again to move this item. He has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 34

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Ven. Pete, as you see, I have not been using the entire ten minutes, nor will I do on this item. Synod, we now move to a suite of amendments on the voting arrangements within the CNC itself. We will first look at a proposal in relation to the two-thirds majority and then at one relating to the secret ballot.

First, some general reflections on the work of the CNC as it seeks to discern the will of God in relationship to particular candidates for a particular see, at a particular time, working with the Holy Spirit. The Crown Nominations Commission is a body which has the rich diversity of the Church of England actually being fully represented. Their communal discernment rests on a commitment to listen to each other and the creation of an environment in which they can share openly and where differences of opinion can be shared and held respectfully. This does mean that, at times, they will not be able to reach a conclusion in the timescales that we might actually like. Discerning the will of God does not fit neatly into the Prime Minister's Appointments Secretary's timetable.

Representatives from Hereford and Oxford Dioceses will be aware of the challenges this provides for dioceses in interregnum. However, we must think carefully about how we may step into the uncertain space and what God might be saying to us in it.

And so to Item 34, which addresses the issue of a two-thirds majority required under Standing Order 140(6). As set out in my paper, the central members of the CNC decided

to take a different approach to that proposed in *Discerning in Obedience* and concluded that the voting arrangements within the Crown Nominations Commission should mirror those of the General Synod itself. A provision that two-thirds of voting members should support a candidate, that is ten out of the 14 voting members of the CNC, would be replaced by a system which requires two-thirds of members present and voting to vote for the candidate. As some members will be aware, this will also require us to change the current voting process. We will need to provide CNC members with three options: to vote for a candidate (that is yes), to vote against a candidate (that is no) or to abstain from making a vote at all. At the moment, the abstention can be used for two purposes: to vote against a candidate and to abstain from actually making a vote. This makes the voting more complex than it needs to be and this revision will provide more options to individuals as they ponder the candidates before them.

Again, members should be aware that the proposed removal of this requirement was not unanimous. Five voted for it and three voted against the proposed arrangements. Again, members of this Synod should be aware that this was not a unanimous decision within the CNC and there were those who were in favour and those who were against. Synod, in the end, because the majority went for it, I propose this amendment to the Synod that will allow people to do what we do in Synod: those in favour, they vote, those against, they vote and abstentions are recorded; not to use the abstention as a way of either not voting or of actually negating the candidate you do not want to have.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 34 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London): Ven. Chair, as you know, I normally prefer to keep my counsel, so I rise reluctantly to speak about this matter as a former member of the CNC for ten years. My therapy continues. I wish to offer three observations explaining why I am uncomfortable about the proposed change.

First, making it easier to conclude a process does not necessarily make it better. We need to be very careful to remember the context here. It is not simply a question of factual decision-making but a process of discernment as to whom God might be calling to serve as a diocesan bishop in the Church. If very occasionally, and I believe it is only occasionally, the Commission cannot come to a mind on the matter, it may just be that the right thing is to wait upon God a little longer. I am not convinced the Holy Spirit always works to our chosen timetable.

Secondly, if the real issue is ensuring enough support for a second name, which is only very rarely needed, might I suggest that the more appropriate approach would be for the Standing Orders to be amended so that the CNC should seek to identify a second name if practicable, but be relieved of the absolute requirement to do so.

Thirdly, we need to have a care for a balance between the diocese and the national Church. At present, no candidate member may be identified by the Commission that does

not have at least some support from both the central members and the diocesan members. The balance is respected. If the proposed change were to be implemented, it would take only two CNC members to abstain to make it possible for a candidate to be identified who had no support from any of the central members, or, indeed, no support from any of the diocesan members. The balance is not respected and that does not seem right to me.

The proposal fails to mirror the General Synod voting process because in Synod the availability of a vote by Houses exists, and majority support in all three Houses being required. In an ideal world it seems to me that our processes of discernment would aspire to finding consensus in the CNC, so that the *axios* of the Church in recognition of a new episcopal appointment might ring true. We are not in an ideal world and so we have a threshold, and I believe the current threshold is preferable to the reduced threshold now being proposed, so, with reluctance, I shall vote against the proposal before us.

The Chair: Is there anyone standing who would like to speak in favour?

Miss Jane Patterson (Sheffield): Thank you to the Standing Orders Committee and to the Archbishop for his accurate reflection of the discussion at the central members' meeting about this. I wish to suggest that we resist this amendment. Since 2012, I have had the privilege of serving on 18 CNCs. On only one occasion when I was present did we not conclude a nomination and, as the Archbishop has acknowledged, there has been one other occasion. I suggest we need to ask ourselves what level of confidence do we

require of the Crown Nominations Commission in its nomination, considering the awesome task to which diocesan bishops are called and the seriousness of the challenges in the charge the Archbishops give them? Is it really a failure of discernment in which we participate, led by the Holy Spirit, if in one of 20 processes of discernment we do not conclude a nomination?

I wish to challenge the lowering of the threshold from two-thirds of members present to two-thirds of members voting. Currently abstention (that is not voting) is the only way CNC members can express with integrity their lack of support for a particular candidate. There is currently no “no vote”. Voting against candidates seems unnecessarily antagonistic or even adversarial in a Spirit-led process. I sense central members understand and prioritise differently the challenges facing the new bishop and vote, or occasionally abstain as they do, as they discern the potential of the candidates.

I ask Synod to reject this amendment and maintain on your behalf our ability to express with integrity the conclusion of our own discernment in a gracious manner. Occasionally, this means that more patience, prayer, time and expense are needed to yield and secure the necessary good outcome.

Revd Anne Stevens (London): I am here to speak on behalf the national committee of WATCH to which I belong. We were one of the parties that raised many of these concerns with the independent reviewer under Standing Order 141. To put it very simply, we are seeking for the whole culture of the Church of England in all its dealings, internally and

externally, to become much more open, to borrow Bishop Pete's mantra: more democratic, more accountable, more transparent. We would like to speak in favour of all of the changes listed in Items 34 to 38 and trust that the Synod also would like to see these changes in the culture of the Church of England.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): It will not have escaped your notice that Professor O'Donovan's Report concerns itself with the years 2013 to 2017 before the central team changed following the elections in 2017. From 2015 to 2017, it was open to the CNC to appoint women but it only appointed two and, significantly, these appointments were in the first year, 2015. I was on the CNC during those years and Professor O'Donovan has some pretty sharp things to say about our work during that time in paragraph 2.5 of his full Report. He rules out the problems in the lists of possible candidates and using statistical analysis as the context in which the CNC works homes in on the work of the CNC itself.

In paragraph 6.9 which is quoted in full in GS 2120, he describes the situation which could arise when one or more members - and I am quoting - "can find themselves unable to support either of the two final candidates and they do not vote for either, superb though they may be". It may be as many as three or four, which would mean that the remaining ten people would have to coalesce round just one of the two remaining candidates in order for a choice to have been made, and then, of course, everyone voting for one would have to coalesce again around the second candidate in order for the nomination process to be completed. This is quite a convenient way of bringing the whole process to a halt.

Non-voters in General Synod votes, on the other hand, whether requiring a two-thirds majority or not, would count as abstentions. Abstentions are recorded but ignored in the calculation of the two-thirds. In the CNC, the case is stronger than the case in General Synod because the requirement for ten out of 14 is in fact 71%, as Professor O'Donovan explains.

On the case described, the Chair of the Commission finds himself or herself with no alternative but to start again, and the serious losers in all this are those candidates who may well fill all the requirements, may well be brilliant and have gone through so much to get that far and then find themselves apparently unacceptable. It is not an outcome that the Church should stand behind. The simple provision of two-thirds of those present and voting would solve this problem at a stroke.

The Chair: Members of Synod, I would like to close debate on this item, conscious of time. Does that have your consent?

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

The Chair: I call upon the Archbishop to reply to the debate on Item 34.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Members of Synod, I have the greatest respect for my learned friend Aidan Hargreaves-Smith. He served on the Crown Nominations Commission for ten years with great distinction: always fair,

always just. However, I just want to say to Synod - and I am going to be very candid with you - we come to voting and before you get to that, you hear people speak very, very strongly on who should I pick. For example, the Bishop of Liverpool, they go for him and everybody thinks he is wonderful, great, fantastic. Then we come to casting our votes and he gets about four. What has gone on here? Rowan Williams and I were absolutely always taken back by the standing off when everybody had been so positive as they spoke, but once they get into the voting, you find them not actually getting there. Of course, the culture needs to change where there is more trust and transparency.

When we first introduced interviewing candidates, there were some who really resisted this. Now that we have been interviewing people, I hope it will become even more open and the candidates can actually meet and have a bit of a celebration and communion together, because it is discerning. That was resisted but it has produced a more honest way of assessing candidates than before. I see this as another step for us to begin to change the culture. Something has to give. If it does not, friends, you will end up with Hereford and Oxford and a standing off where the Commission could go on locked up in all kinds of stuff. Jane Patterson is a doctor, and she is Mr because she is a surgeon - again, she is on the Crown Nominations Commission. Again, I gave you the figures, and I am not going to say who voted where, but I said the decision was not unanimous within the CNC: six were in favour and two were against. I suggested we deliberated quite a lot and this is important.

To Anne Stevens, I agree with us, we need to be have more of a culture of sheer transparency, openness and Christ-likeness, where we begin to trust one another. As long as you leave the Standing Order as it stands, friends, I can tell you - and I am one of those who very proudly can say, apart from the Bishop of Norwich and the Bishop of Chester among serving bishops, I have been involved in the appointment of all diocesan bishops today - my experience tells me you need to begin to change the culture and the Standing Order will nudge it into a position of being open.

April Alexander, of course, speaks from experience. What I have suggested, which again will have to be looked at, is that members of the CNC will be given three options: to vote for a candidate by saying yes; to vote against a candidate by saying no; to abstain from making a vote at all. Politeness bedevils our Church and sometimes politeness and the fear of saying no has led to some consequences which have not very helpful

We are discerning with the Holy Spirit together praying. We need more transparency, the transparency to be more open and this two-thirds new change, I strongly believe within my own simple prayers, will begin to shift the culture within the CNC. The worries about the diocesan six, I do not think sometimes they are the greatest problem. They need to be helped, they need to be taught, and I am hoping there will be more and more open discussions on how, when we gather together, we discern the mind of Christ and not have entrenched positions.

I urge Synod to vote for this as a first step to begin to look more transparently within the CNC.

The Chair: So we now put Item 34 to the vote.

A speaker: Point of order.

The Chair: Too late, I am afraid, because I have already called for that vote.

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

The Chair: That is lost. We are going to Item 35 and I call upon the Archbishop of York to move Item 35. He has up to ten minutes.

ITEM 35

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Ven. Pete, we turn to the recommendation to remove the requirement that the CNC conduct its voting for candidates under secret ballot. Again, members should be aware that the proposal to remove this requirement was not unanimous. Five voted for it and three voted against it. Again, members should be aware that the proposal to remove this requirement, as I have

said, was not unanimous but, again, I have always believed when you are in a body and a majority votes, it is legitimate to bring it here.

So, Sisters and Brothers, should be well aware that it is a demanding call to make ourselves vulnerable by sharing our views and our concerns and then to reveal how these are reflected as we cast our votes. The CNC provides a particularly intense environment for this as each member brings their own hopes and concerns for the Gospel and for the Church, perhaps anxious to speak faithfully and vote on behalf of a group they might see themselves as representing and concerned at the implications of speaking out

The Report *Discerning in Obedience* speaks of *Pistis*, that is faith. As Christians we are bound together in trust and faith, characteristics of the Christian community which we seek to live as community. If we are unable to be open in sharing how we are voting with those with whom we seek co-operatively to discern the will of God in relationship to a new bishop, are we not failing in our vocation to stand in relation to each other as actually we are with Jesus Christ? I am not saying this will be easy and I suspect it may lead to trickier but, I hope, deeper discussions within the CNC.

Central members did also explore how this provision might be brought into effect if actually it is passed. We are looking at an electronic voting system, not a show of hands, which will enable people to cast their votes privately as we do at the moment in Synod, though the results will be known afterwards. The results then will be shared with the full CNC.

Some who will speak in this debate will share the concerns which were raised by some members of the CNC that the secret ballot is a protection against people being pressurised into voting in a certain way. They may rightly remind us that the secret ballot is a fundamental principle underlying much of our political life in the nation. These are important points and I leave you to weigh up their arguments. Perhaps a gentle reminder, however, that the Synod itself will have taken a vote on this in an open balloting process. I beg to move.

The Chair: Thank you. Item 35 is open for debate. We are up against the clock so the speech limit is going to be two minutes.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark): I too have been a member of the CNC. I did eight years, and I was always surprised by the voting after the discussion, as the Archbishop of York has said. I voted against the last amendment because I did not think that would really achieve what we want to achieve.

I think there does need to be a change of culture and there needs to be an openness. Mutual flourishing demands that kind of honesty and openness and, at present, hiding behind a secret ballot enables people to say one thing and then do another, and that is not right if we are Christian brothers and sisters trusting one another within a process.

We all come with differing views, we know that, and we are very open about that in some situations until it comes to this. I think that the Church needs to grow up. We need to be less secretive about some of these processes and this is an important way in which we can make a big culture change.

Revd John Dunnett (Chelmsford): I also need to declare an interest: I am a member of the central CNC team and I served on the best part of 20 Commissions. The intent of proposals 35 and 36 is laudable, however I want to ask Synod to resist the proposals and for several reasons, this one obviously being 35.

Firstly, I do believe, despite what has already been suggested, there is an out of date assumption behind the proposal. In previous years there has been a discrepancy between conversation and voting at the end of Commissions. However, during the last couple of years, the Archbishops have very helpfully chosen to chair the discussions in a markedly different manner. I do not believe that that phenomenon exists any longer.

Secondly, because I believe that this proposal fails to recognise the reality of group dynamics and how they sway the discernment process. Synod members who have read any psychology will remember the conformity experiments of Solomon Asch in which he asked people to compare the length of a line with several other lines, and who discovered that the answers given by the subject in the experiment were heavily influenced by the answers given by the others. If we want members of CNC to act in keeping with their own assessment of candidates and not group think, the secret ballot needs to be retained.

And, thirdly, because of the need to provide what O'Donovan refers to as "safe space" in the actual voting part of the discernment process. How safe it is it for a member of the diocesan team to vote, as it were, on their own contrary to the other five members? It strains relationships. What about a clergy member of a diocesan team who finds him or herself voting against the dean or the archdeacon? How difficult or challenging can it be for a member to vote against someone who they feel the Archbishops have substantial reservations about?

The only way that we can provide the safe space O'Donovan talks about is to retain the secret ballot. I ask Synod to resist this proposal and the one that follows for these reasons. Thank you.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): A certain amount of what I had noted down has already been said very well by the Dean of Southwark about growing up. I want to speak in favour, picking up on the previous speaker, of group think or, as we might call it and as Professor O'Donovan calls it, shared discernment.

I imagine that the vast majority of you from time to time find yourself on interview panels of one sort or another working with a group of other Christians to discern the will of God for a parish, for a job, for any number of possible posts, and you mull things over together and you strive to reach a common mind, acknowledging that in the end your own personal preference, the details of your own conviction, whichever it is within the vast breadth of

convictions we all hold here, may in fact have to give way for the good of the parish or the deanery or the diocese to which you are seeking to appoint. And so I just speak briefly. Can we not strive, in spite of the great divisions that we know are amongst us, to make decisions together and to be able to be honest about our differences because it is only in honesty that we can truly know how to love one another in our breadth.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I did not know what John Dunnett was going to say, but I am grateful that he did to explain that there has already been the beginnings of a change of culture, but I want to underline what he described as the pressure of group dynamics. We have said or received only in the last few days the principle that we are to pay attention to power and refuse to exploit any perceived or real power.

I have been for nine years a pastoral selector in the BAP processes and one of the questions I ask is whether potential ordinands are aware of the power dynamic in relationships. Within the context of the CNC, which I have never known from the inside obviously, there does seem to me to be considerable scope for unintended power situations and the secret ballot does protect people from being on the wrong side of that sort of pressure. We are learning that in other areas. I think we ought to retain the secret ballot here to continue to learn it here too.

The Chair: After Canon Butler, conscious of time, I will be putting to the Synod that we should close debate.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I will be very brief, Chair. There is an irony that John Dunnett is quoting a psychologist and I am going to quote scripture. St Paul to the Corinthians: “Therefore, since through God’s mercy we have this ministry, we do not lose heart. Rather, we have renounced secret and shameful ways. We do not use deception, nor do we distort the Word of God. On the contrary, by setting forth the truth plainly, we commend ourselves to everyone’s conscience in the sight of God.” If that is good enough for the Apostle, it is good enough for me. I would support the Archbishop in his proposal.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): Point of order. I am slightly puzzled as to what we are actually voting for. From most of the speeches, it sounds to me as if we are voting on one issue, the issue of secrecy in the CNC.

The Chair: Fr Thomas, this sounds like a speech, not a point of order.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): Can we clarify what we are actually voting for?

The Chair: It is Item 35 on your agenda about whether voting on CNC should be by secret ballot or not. Apologies to those who still want to speak, and, conscious of time, I would like to close debate, but I need your permission to do that.

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

The Chair: That has been carried, so I am going to ask the Archbishop of York to reply to the debate.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Members of Synod, Fr Thomas, just to clarify what we are doing, if you look at the Standing Order, a removal of requirement, that is requirement as being mandatory, to vote by secret ballot does not mean that under Standing Order 141(1) a CNC might not choose to use a secret ballot in certain circumstances. We are simply removing the mandatory requirement. That is actually what is being asked.

A particular CNC may find itself in great difficulty and, therefore, when it needs may decide, "We are going to use the secret ballot", but we trying to stop it being mandatory. That is what the Standing Order is about.

Very Revd Andrew Nunn, I could not agree with you more. Secrecy is not the same as confidentiality. I can keep confidences but I choose not to have a secret thing and I have never belonged to a secret society. What worries me is that we are going to give an impression that there is some kind of merit in this.

John Dunnett wants it to be retained because he wants a safe space. May I remind him that actually the only safe space is in Jesus Christ. Other spaces are never safe. *Discerning in Obedience*, that is what we are about. The question has got to be, members of Synod, I have never had a PCC which always voted by secret ballot. It does not happen

in our Church anywhere other than in the CNC, and you think it is a good thing to be done. Would you go back to your PCC and defend such a decision?

To Neil Patterson, shared discernment, you are quite right, it is about shared discernment, needing to trust one another. To David Banting, again about group dynamics, yes I can see this, people can abuse their power, but I have always believed that in Jesus I am free. In Jesus, with my brothers and sisters, we can reach a decision without ever applying group dynamics. Simon Butler, you are quite right, I agree with you in everything that you say.

Members of Synod, again may we be very clear what it is we are voting for. A removal of the requirement to vote by secret ballot does not mean that under Standing Order 141(1), a CNC might not choose to use a secret ballot in certain circumstances. It is the mandatory nature which we are removing.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): Point of order: may we please have a vote by Houses on this motion?

The Chair: Prudence Dailey has called for a vote by Houses. For that to take place I need to see 25 people standing. I do see 25 people standing, therefore we will have a vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 35: In the House of Bishops: those in favour 19, against 14, with 1

recorded abstention. In the House of Clergy: 76 in favour, 66 against, with 4 recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity: 63 in favour, 99 against, with 5 recorded abstentions. The motion was lost on a counted vote by Houses.

The Chair: Now we come to Item 36 and I ask the Archbishop of York if he would like to move Item 36.

ITEM 36

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

The Chair: Archbishop, could you explain why you want to move Item 36.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I am always a very obedient person to the Chair. You asked me to and I have just done that.

The Chair: Archbishop, we are having some debate here. We think 36, 37 and 38 are dependent on 35 being carried and so as 35 has not been carried we are wondering whether you would be willing to withdraw. No?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): I have said I am always obedient to the Chairs of the Synod. What you are asking me is to unmove, so one to

unmove 36, one to unmove 37 and one to unmove 38.

The Chair: So the Archbishop has moved and now withdrawn. That needs the consent of Synod. Are you happy to support the Archbishop's withdrawal?

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

The Chair: That is withdrawn. Thank you very much, members of Synod. That concludes business relating to Standing Orders and now we move to an item called Growing Faith.

THE CHAIR: *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 3.57 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. We now come to debate Item 13 on the agenda, *Growing Faith: Ministry Amongst Children and Young People*. For this item, members may like to have GS 2121 to hand. Synod will note that we have farewells immediately following this item before our debate on Estates Evangelism which must start not later than 5.45. As these farewells must take place today, I ask Synod members to keep an eye on the time, please. Let us work together. I call upon the Bishop of Ely, Stephen Conway, to move Item 13. You have up to ten minutes.

ITEM 13

GROWING FAITH: MINISTRY AMONGST CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (GS 2121)

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Thank you very much, Chair, and it is very good to have this opportunity to present *Growing Faith* in this debate. Someone once said, “And now for something completely different” and, so, now we are going to eschew secrecy and stand for ourselves.

If you would indulge me, would you please stand up. This is partly to see people limber, especially the Bishops here at the front. What I would like you to do, please, is if you came to faith in your 60s or 70s, would you please sit down. Yes, very good that the theologian stands. If you came to faith in your 50s, would you please sit down. If you came to faith in your 40s, would you please sit down. If you came to faith in your 30s, would you please sit down. Just keep looking around. If you came to faith in your 20s, would you please sit down. If you came to faith as a teenager, would you please sit down. If you came to faith between the age of 0 and 11, would you please sit down. I think I have established my point.

A Speaker: She is still standing.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Yes, I do notice.

A Speaker: I was 12.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): You were 12. There is always a statistical anomaly, is there not? I hope that I have made my point though. It is really good and I have to say a very sincere relief to me that the Synod is representative of the rest of the Church of England, because statistics which were released in September 2017 were conducted by ComRes on behalf of the Church of England where the question was asked of all self-identified active Christians in the scheme, “At what age did you come to faith?” 76% said they had done so before the age of 18 with 50% coming to faith before the age of 12. This is a massive proportion of the Christian population saying that they came to faith as children.

Similarly, when respondents who used to be members of a religious group, not just Christians, were asked at what age they stopped considering themselves to be a member of a religious community, the majority said it was between the age of 11 and 24. This morning, Barry Hill said something really important about the power of what we actually witness to in our life as Christians. What we say so often is that we are desperate to celebrate the faith and discipleship of children and young people and, yet, what we actually witness to much of the time are concerns about people who are much older. What do we want to witness to primarily into the future?

The House of Bishops’ vision of *Growing Faith* is simply seeking to help all of us to develop and reprioritise our Church culture to witness to that which we most profoundly believe. It seeks to bring together work across education, evangelism and discipleship

and ministry and *Setting God's People Free* in seeking to see the people of God of all ages living out their faith confidently at home, in school and in church.

This is not some kind of desire somehow only to concentrate on children and young people. This is about concentrating on people of all ages and their coming to faith, but *Setting God's People Free* is as much about children and young people as it is about people of our sort of age. This is a vision for transforming our culture so that ministry with children and young people and by children and young people is woven through the structures of every diocese and forms a central strand of the life and work of every parish, deanery or diocesan mission action plan, of course reflecting the unique character and composition of every diocese but really so that we see everything.

I think there was a tweet from Bishop Rachel earlier on in advance of this gathering to say this is about seeing everything that we do using the discipline of the lens of the impact on children and young people who may not have power in the way that we have been talking about power today, but who may very well already be more powerful witnesses to the Gospel of Jesus Christ than we are.

Growing Faith is not some kind of silver bullet or a simplistic solution to our mission needs. We in the House of Bishops have owned this vision because we are committed to championing this in every diocese so that we see that the growth of disciples is as much about the vocation of prayer captains in schools in the Diocese of Blackburn as it is about how we choose bishops. It is about a dynamic which is not about adult to child but about

a passionate engagement about our faith in Jesus Christ, listening to the accents and colloquial language of any age group.

I was not so long ago challenged by a young person who said, “Either,” she said, “you’re a chav with lots of bling, innit, or you’re a true bearer of the Cross?” Well, that is a fair challenge to receive, is it not? Am I chav with bling, innit, or a bearer of the Cross? Now not many people would dare to say that to me as a Bishop other than a child or young person. This is about how we grow as confident disciples together, able to share our faith with our families and our friends, encouraging people to be converters of the classroom as well as everywhere else.

There is a great and renewed interest in developing a way or rule of life across our communities in our dioceses. *Growing Faith* is simply trying to ensure that we raise the spiritual temperature across the land in church, in school and in households by putting the emphasis on spiritual development where it needs to be, where we need to take these statistics seriously and work hard together at the triangulation that makes this a vivid reality of our being set free together across the generations.

It is nothing new. This is the best of who we are at any time. It is not intended to be a new initiative to burden us, but a long-term commitment to promote greater join-up in ministry with children and young people in churches, schools and homes. We want to see *Growing Faith* acted in every part of our common life.

If you would like to turn on your seats you will find a prayer map. In readiness for *Thy Kingdom Come* this year, 300,000 children across our Church schools in years 4, 5 and 6 will receive this prayer map for *Thy Kingdom Come*. If you would like to hold this up because George should be somewhere, there should be somebody in the gallery prepared to take our photograph. If you could raise these without obscuring your face. Be proud of the map and your face. Looking that way, towards the gantry, please hold up your prayer map.

This is *Thy Kingdom Come*, the prayer map through the Novena for the children in our schools. Have you got the photograph, George? Well done, thank you very much. *Growing Faith* is about parishes, Fresh Expressions, chaplaincies and cathedrals working with schools and colleges; not just with Church of England schools either, but encouraging that our college chaplains, our university chaplains and our schools and colleges will work in partnership with our churches and our households as families to ensure that they weave this vision for *Growing Faith* through every strand of their strategies for ministry and mission.

I am delighted there is so much emphasis on mission and evangelism through this Synod's agenda and encourage Synod to consider the implications for ministry with children and young people at every stage. We had a most marvellous address from Bishop Paul from Kenya at the very beginning of this Synod who reminded us that the passion in Kenya is for working with children and young people and with the elderly to bring a cross-generational approach to mission and evangelism that sets us all free. I

think he said, “The Church has left the building,” has left our traditional places, if necessary, to bring us close to where we can hear the voices of children and young people in our vision, our planning and our decision-making.

I pray that we will consider committing ourselves always in this General Synod to assessing how policy and practice and our priorities are seen through the lens I propose. I commend the House of Bishops’ vision, *Growing Faith*, to you and beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Item 13 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Miss Rosemary Walters (Canterbury): I would just like to offer a reflection after some years of teaching RE and also training RE teachers, as well as working with young people in our Church. I think there are three areas of this Report that need more focus, to be more explicit. First of all, could we focus on the questions that young people are asking? It sometimes does seem as though we have got a package that we want to deliver to or at them without actually listening to their questions.

As a member of the Church of England Group on the Kent Standing Advisory Council for RE, I am very encouraged by the new curriculum programme, *Understanding Christianity*, which starts with looking at concepts, but I think even prior to starting with looking at

concepts is looking at the questions that young people are actually raising. I think that is really very, very important and not just questions about faith but questions about life and everything.

This leads on to my second area which I think needs more focus and that is the area of social action. Last Lent, the young people in our church, without any real prior teaching, in the first session in Lent, just learning that there were 40 days, decided that they would raise enough money to buy 40 sleeping bags for the homeless centre in the city, one for each day of Lent. This project really enthused not only them but the congregation as well.

It was not until after they had thought about the fundraising and raised some money and we were putting up the pictures of each of the sleeping bags that they had managed to buy that we then looked at how this actually linked with Jesus' deliberations on his ministry in the wilderness and the significance of the number 40. Sometimes, I think if you start with social action first and then reflect on the Gospel, that is a way into young people's imagination.

The final emphasis I think is that this Report could be more highlighted on how we engage with children and young people with the text. They are very used in school to the idea of critical thinking. They know how they are going to look at documents relating to history, they understand how they are going to look at English literature and poems and novels and plays, but I think sometimes that we shy away from working with them on the complexities of the texts that we are dealing with.

I have never forgotten when I was teaching year 7 and I did not actually know that a girl in the class, her mother had had a car accident and the family had just imminently received the news that the mother's sight could not be recovered. We were doing the story of blind Bartimaeus and the girl got up at the back of the class and shouted at me, "He didn't heal my mother". I have never forgotten that.

When I prepare sermons as a lay reader, when I used to think about training the teachers to teach RE, we have to be so careful with the complexities of the texts that we are dealing with. Why should we shy away from this with children and young people because, after all, it really is very exciting?

I think this is a very, very good Report but I would just like to see more emphasis on the excitement of engaging with the Christian narrative by asking the young people what they want to ask us first, by actually emphasising action to change the world, which they are all very keen on, and by being fully prepared to work with them on the complexities of the text so that they do not somehow think that they can grow out of just hearing stories.

Mrs Kathryn Tucker (Bath & Wells): Well, I am excited, and I am also a farmer's wife. When I say this, people sometimes groan or they are hugely interested in the life that I lead. I live on a wonderful place in south-west England called Exmoor. It is a beautiful National Park.

My husband and I are hill farmers. We keep Exmoor horned sheep and Devon cattle and, if ever you come there, we will give you a very warm welcome. Actually, the Archbishop of Canterbury came two or three years ago. I do not expect him to remember, but he met with some young farmers and they remember you, I can assure you. I am sorry, in a good way. Bless you.

As part of our extremely rural benefice, we have eight parishes and we have a village school. In fact, there are two village schools but I am involved with one, which is called Exford and that has got 24 children aged between four and nine and what a delight it is to be with these children.

As part of my role, I am a churchwarden and school governor. All the numerous sort of lowly church work that I do, I am able to go in there every week, take assemblies, be involved with church club, involve them with church services, get the families, get the parents involved, get the grandparents involved, because when you have got a community like ours, the farming and the schools, they are all part of this community. What I do, I go in and I sit on the floor with them - it is a great difficulty getting up again with these little four or five year olds sometimes - and I do actually tell them the Bible stories. They love them. They cannot wait to act them with me and I tell them and I tell them the Jesus stories.

We have such a wonderful time and I want folk here to be encouraged by it because if we do not go in there, if we do not have the courage to speak about the love of God to them

- I have one little boy who says, "Well, you know, I don't believe in God, my mummy doesn't believe." And I say, "But God believes in you, God believes in me, you know, I love Him and He loves you", and we just have to keep going like that.

I want you to know that the staff of the school, they need our support because many of them are on a learning curve as well. They do not always know everything about Jesus and the stories, so I feel that we go in there and we are helping them as well. We are helping the homes. The parents will stop me and say, "Oh, you know Sophie or Molly, can they read at the Christmas service? Can they say their prayers? Can they be involved?"

I have so much support and help and I think we have to be encouraged. We have to go forward with this because, if we do not, we will lose it. I do feel we are like a tap. It is drip drip drip. It is not a flow, but it is just gradual and we have to hang on in there. These children are our future.

There are many schools, not Church schools, where they never have any Bible stories or anything. My son-in-law, I am so sorry to say, he is a teacher and he said, "Kathryn, here is the Lion Bible book and here are some stories that go with it because I don't use it at the school". I was heartbroken. I could not say anything to him. I wanted to, but I just took them and I will use them with our children.

Please, be encouraged and support this motion and all the work that I know is going on, particularly in the rural areas.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Right Hon Dr John Sentamu): Madam Chair, I enthusiastically and warmly welcome this Report, GS 2121. I am sure Synod will give its enthusiastic response just as the House of Bishops did when we debated the Report in the House. The question is what are we going to do about it? It is no use if it is all just talk.

On my six-month pilgrimage around the Diocese of York, I spoke to many young people who never go near a church, yet are really interested in God and they want to know more about Jesus Christ. This is a live issue for many of our young people and so I came back determined to help them pursue their quest for knowing more about Jesus.

The reality is, whilst there are many examples of fantastic parishes' ministry alongside and rooted in traditional Church, there are many other places where a local church is not a place young people would ever think of showing up. There are literally thousands of young people who have no contacts with their local church whatsoever.

Many parishes understand this and long to do something more imaginative with young people if they had the resources and the vision to work and pray towards it. Many dioceses see the need and, indeed, the opportunity and they want to include ministry

initiatives with young people to be in their SDF bids for mission and growth. They would value an inter-diocesan support structure to undergird their vision and, indeed, their plans.

Meanwhile, families and local communities are crying out for their young people to find meaning and hope by belonging to something very good. Young people are eager for this engagement too. They want to make a difference. Looking at the work of the Young Leaders Award in school developed by the Archbishop of York Youth Trust, you can see tens of thousands of young people volunteering and serving in their communities each year, displaying a desire to be contacted and connected to their communities to contribute and put love in action.

I am delighted to announce today that a partnership has been formed to make this happen, including the Church Army, the Archbishop of York Youth Trust, my team at Bishopthorpe, working with dioceses and other youth agencies. A new missional church network is emerging and we have appointed Andy Milne to lead it. Andy, working for the Church Army, is currently the leader of Sorted based in Bradford, but as from 1 April he will work full-time creating partnerships and building capacity to launch missional youth churches and you are all invited to take a little leaflet which actually tells you about it and how you can get in touch.

Both adult leaders and new young leaders in these ecclesial communities will join a network for prayer, for support, for training and need resourcing. Missional youth churches are fledgling congregations working in the space between school, community,

family and the local church, led by young people, geared towards young people, but emphatically multigenerational as the time actually goes on. We can start in April thanks to the Church Army and the generous anonymous legacy for which we are immensely grateful to take this work forward.

In five years, we hope to have helped dioceses, parishes, schools and communities launch missional youth congregations. These will be in villages, market towns, suburbs and city centres, a diverse youth church network. We want to build partnerships with parishes, dioceses and mission agencies where there are places ripe for the harvest. Please, get in touch if you want to get involved. See the postcard we have circulated for contact details. I support this motion but I want it to be action not words.

Margaret and I spent two weeks in Kerala on the Maramon Convention. It was just an amazing thing to speak sometimes to 100,000 people seven times a day. What was remarkable was the work they are doing with children and young people and older people actually is the best I have seen anywhere in the world. They spend the whole year praying for their Convention and, when it happens, my goodness, that is the dream of God for our missional youth networks. I support the motion.

The Chair. We are now going to take the amendment standing at paragraph 48, so I invite the Revd Canon Peter Moger to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have to up five minutes.

ITEM 48

Revd Canon Peter Moger (York): I thank the House of Bishops most warmly for the vision set out in *Growing Faith* and the warmth with which this has so far been received in the Synod, but I would like the Synod also to recognise another important context in which children and young people are nurtured in Christian faith.

In all our English cathedrals, boys and now, thank God, girls as well contribute daily to worship as choristers alongside their adult professional or semi-professional counterparts. This means that each cathedral has regular and sustained contact with large numbers of children and young people and also, of course, with their families and so has a wonderful mission opportunity at the heart of its foundation. If we add to the numbers of choristers those other children and young people who are active in our communities, taking active roles in worship and as members of children and young people's groups, we are dealing with considerable numbers indeed.

We recognise also, of course, that cathedrals, many of them, have their own schools. It serves further to underline that cathedrals stand at the frontline of our mission to grow faith amongst the young. I propose, therefore, what I hope will be an uncontroversial amendment that cathedrals be added to the list of those contexts in which Synod

encourages the application of the House of Bishops' vision. Do you want me to move the amendment?

The Chair. Yes, please, that would be great, thank you.

Revd Canon Peter Moger (York): I move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair. Thank you, Peter. I invite Bishop Stephen to comment, please. You also have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): I am very happy to accept the amendment as it stands. Having worked in three cathedrals, it is all that Canon Moger says, but also we are very much aware of the thousands of children who come for cathedral days and who are transformed by their engagement with the cathedral when they come in year 6 and at other times. We are very happy to accept the amendment as it stands.

The Chair. Thank you, Bishop Stephen. Item 48 is now open for debate. You have a speech limit of five minutes, if you really need it.

Mr Tim Hind (Bath & Wells): I do not think I have ever had five minutes of speech, but there we go. I welcome this amendment and I had thought at one stage earlier today that there was another thing that was missing as well. We often forget things when we draft our motions and the one other thing that is forgotten on this piece of paper is deaneries.

There are many rural parishes that do not have many children. There are also many rural parishes that do not have enough people to do something with those children, but quite often a deanery can be a larger area that can provide support across a patch. Without actually asking for an amendment, I would like to ask dioceses to consider when they are building their mission strategies that we include deaneries as a major hub of activity.

The Chair: May I remind everyone to make sure their comments are focused on the amendment.

Ven. Alan Jeans (Salisbury): I fully support the amendment, but I just want to make the point today that there are many other forms of youth chaplaincy which go unnoticed and unrecognised. I do not want to add to the list but, today, 100 years ago, His Majesty King George V granted the Royal Prefix to the Army Chaplains Department. Part of that work of the Royal Army Chaplains Department today is cadet force chaplaincy.

I just want to put a marker down publicly about the work that goes on throughout the year with Sea Cadets, Army Cadets and Air Force Cadets. We have around 130,000 of those cadets and the padre operating in a multi-faith dimension does really play a very significant part to that very large number of young people. Support the motion by all means but just bear a moment in your prayers, especially today, for the cadet force chaplaincy that goes on in so many places right across our country.

The Chair: I see no one indicating that they wish to speak and so we move to vote on Item 48, the amendment standing in Peter Moger's name.

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

The Chair: That means that we are now able to resume debate on Item 13, as just amended by Item 48, *Growing Faith: Ministry Amongst children and Young People*. The speech limit at the moment is still five minutes.

His Eminence Archbishop Angaelos (Ecumenical Representative): I very much thank Synod for such a wonderful and uplifting session over these last two days that focuses much on mission and evangelism. It shows us that, as bleak as people want to depict us as the Church, there is much in the Church that is very much alive and well, so thank you for that.

I also want to welcome the Report from the House of Bishops on *Growing Faith* and to celebrate that vision because we are told in Corinthians that if one member is honoured of this Body of Christ then, we will all rejoice and, today, I am certainly rejoicing with you.

The reason I have asked to speak is that I have been in youth and children's ministry probably for 35 years. As many of my sisters and brothers in the chamber will know, I am still actively involved hands-on and I feel that it is very much part of what we need to do.

For me, it forms a stabilising and grounding part of my ministry and so I believe that Christian education is a core part of what we must be doing.

Just last week in our church we had the feast of the presentation of Christ to the temple and I had a children's ministry where I did my sermon sitting down on the floor surrounded by lots of wonderful children and it was that that takes the Church to them. Last year, the Coptic Orthodox Church celebrated the centenary of its Sunday school movement. That has become very core in everything we do. We are all a product of it and we are all still serving in it.

To show the significance, the founder of the Sunday School Movement, Deacon Habib Girgis, was canonized by our holy Synod to show the importance of that work and the significance of its continuation. Our late Pope Shenouda had a famous saying which is that, "A church without youth is a church without a future". Whilst saying that, at one of our youth gatherings, one of the young people responded, unprovoked, that, "Youth without a church are youth without a future".

That is the work that is between us and among us and we should be doing. It is our understanding within youth ministry and in Sunday school that we are servants not teachers. We are not there to present information or knowledge. We are there to present a way of life.

This comes amongst a disturbing report this morning on the BBC that one in 13 young people suffer PTSD by the age of 18 and any of us who work with young people realise that this is significantly true. With that in mind, we as Church must continue to be very core in society, in the schools, in the streets, in the families, in the homes, and we must do this through action. We found that with young people they are increasingly drawn to issues of social justice, of equality and of feeling equal within the Church. We must be able to channel their activity, their passion and their abilities into what we do.

In connection to what we have spoken about on homelessness, we started a homeless ministry here for young people, our own Coptic Orthodox young people on the streets of Victoria, that has been running for the past 18 years weekly. It continues and it has become a core part of their development and their identity, and we have similar activities in Brighton and in Hounslow.

Referring to the statistics in paragraphs 6 to 8 that 76% of people said they came to faith by the age of 18 and 50% by the age of 12, it shows us that we must focus on our children. The one challenge we are going to have is I pray that safeguarding, and our focus on it, does not become a challenge to us engaging.

One very quick scenario. A child of six, Marina, was amongst those who was a victim of a bus shooting of pilgrims going to a monastery. Her brother shielded her from the bullets by lying on top of her and, when she was rescued, she said, "I tried to tell them that I was

a Christian because they were asking. I put up my hand and showed my cross but they didn't see me". That is the witness of a six-year-old who was formed in those early days.

When we are asked to be ready to give a defence for everyone who is asked to reason for the hope that is in us, our hope is well and truly in our children and our young people. I thank you for this Report and I pray success for every part of it.

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): It is my privilege and honour to chair the Children and Youth Development Group which is one of the groups that has been helping with the whole production of this and I would like to publicly pay deep honour to Mary Hawes for all the work that she does on behalf of us all.

In 2010, Synod endorsed the *Going for Growth* Report in which we called for every child and young person to have a life-enhancing encounter with the Christian faith and the person of Jesus Christ. We led the way because that became adopted as the aim for all people of all ages to have a life-enhancing encounter with Jesus Christ.

I thoroughly welcome this. This is where we have been travelling for the last 25 to 30 years to get home and Church and school working in harmony. Six headings for you.

Tell God's story. The toddler research that we undertook two and a half, three years ago had a very interesting piece of outcome. We have large numbers of toddlers with their parents, their carers, their grandparents and so on. Why do they choose to go to a

Church-based toddler group? Well, because they like us to tell Bible stories. They like us to pray. They like us to talk about God. The biggest critique of our Church based toddler groups was, “You don’t talk about God enough. You don’t tell us how to pray”. So tell God’s story. Talk about Jesus. Explore the Bible together.

Rosemary Walters, thank you. Howard Worsley did some research which was published a few years ago which was around helping parents and children explore the Bible together. One of the key things that Howard pointed out was the need for parents to read the Bible with their children and to be honest about what they did not understand and to explore it together and to discern what God might be saying to all of them as a family. We need to help our schools explore the text of scripture more openly. We need to do it in our churches more openly so that we explore scripture together.

Pray with children and encourage children to pray. Prayer spaces in schools has been one of the biggest success stories in recent years. In the Diocese of Durham, it has utterly transformed many of our schools and some of our state schools. It is creative. It is engaging. It helps people learn to pray. Use the lessons of prayer spaces in schools in local church life. Use the lessons in homes. Use them in old people’s homes, in further education and so forth. Encourage prayer spaces everywhere. Act together.

Children and young people are passionate about social issues. They are concerned about climate change, social justice and so on and so forth. Let us find ways of schools, churches and homes working together on matters of social justice at a local level and

encourage people to engage together and learn together, through that expressing our love for God and His world by caring for those most in need.

Encourage leadership. I am very proud that the Diocese of Durham has a children's council. We were the first to do so. There is one other. I encourage every diocese to consider having a children's council. In the last year, they themselves decided that they wanted to focus on evangelism and to find out better ways of sharing their faith with their peers. Their age range is nine to 13. They got a grant, actually, from Scripture Union for their project, "Mini Missionaries". They have done some very enterprising and exciting things. They did not invite me to the trampolining, I am afraid. I think they risked that I might have broken something.

When they shared this with the diocesan synod, all the adults said, "Goodness me, they're leading the way, aren't they? They are being creative in how we share our faith". Go away together. Residential are massively significant. All the research says that. The Church Pastoral Aid Society is brilliant in developing its new school venture work. Let us find more and more ways of getting children and young people away together to explore faith together.

In conclusion, it has to be generational. There is a place for peer learning and peer work. Cross-generational because we have to help grandparents share their faith with their grandchildren and their grandchildren share their faith with their grandparents. It has to be intergenerational because we have to do this together.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Eleanor Robertshaw (Sheffield): I do wish to speak in support of this motion and I do believe that a lot of us are already doing quite a lot of what is in this paper. I am an ex-teacher and I also sit on our DBE, which has an amazing vision for our Church schools and beyond - and the director of education will pay me later for saying that!

I applied for my current role because the parish had two Church schools. As it turned out, when I arrived the other two non-Church schools, primary schools and the secondary schools, were very welcoming to the vicar coming in as well. When I arrived in my parish, what the parishioners wanted was more families and young people in the church. Which spec does not say that these days? Over five years as a parish, we have come to the understanding that it is unlikely that children and young people are going to attend our morning traditional services on a Sunday. It is at 9.15 am and, to be honest, sometimes I am there because I am paid to be there. It is far too early.

We worked on a strategy that the congregation that were connected to the Church schools would start by going to them. At each school service we have in our church, we serve refreshments beforehand for the parents that come and then our congregation stays on and is part of this school service. We ensure that the services are lively and interactive and that the children take part as much as possible. In both schools, we also have elections for church ambassadors who take on responsibilities around worship.

I hope and pray that, through these children and parents and through the congregation, they all encounter God's spirituality and God's grace. I also hope that they learn to ask big questions and know that they can approach me about them. In five years, we have found that this has had great consequences for us. For my own ego, it is wonderful to arrive at the school and all the children run to the fence and say, "It's Revd Eleanor".

More seriously, when tragedy struck our community and in two consecutive years two children were killed tragically in our secondary school, it gave us the opportunity to go in and to minister to pupils who already know me. The Church is there for those children. They may turn away but I hope that I have planted, along with my congregation, a seed in them that it is a place for them and, by the grace of God, some of them will return knowing they are loved and held by God.

Mr James Lee (Guildford): Thank you, Chair, for calling me to make my maiden speech. I want to speak in favour of the motion and to thank those who have developed the excellent vision outlined in *Growing Faith*. I am particularly encouraged by the emphasis on growing faith in households. As the father of three young children, this is both an issue close to my heart and a daily challenge that I seek to put into practice.

As the Bishop of Oxford said in his recent blog post, we need urgently to recover a sense of the family as a primary agent of catechesis in teaching the faith of the children and young people. As I read the Report, I was amazed to read that in the research only 29%

of Anglican parents surveyed saw it as their responsibility to teach their children about their faith. When the Bible talks about teaching our faith to the next generation, where is the emphasis? For all the absolutely excellent work that they do, which we have been hearing about, it does not talk primarily about Church schools or Church youth and kids' work. The primary and repeated emphasis is on the role and responsibility of parents to pass on to their children the glorious inheritance of the Gospel that was passed down to them and all the other excellent work is in support of this. I really welcome section 13(b) of the Report which wants to change that 29% into 100%. How will this be achieved?

It is great to have more resources to help with this but resources alone will not cut it. There are already many excellent resources available, more than ever before, but what is needed is a heart change and a culture change that considers it to be as important to feed our children and young people's spiritually as it is to feed them physically.

I am glad that this Report recognises this need and calls for the vision of *Growing Faith* to be fully integrated into the life of the Church at all levels. As part of this, I particularly encourage churches to be intentional in communicating this through their regular teaching, through training and support for parents and carers and with those bringing their children for baptism.

As an ordinand, I am particularly encouraged that the Report recommends including this vision in training for ministry in the Church. I was greatly encouraged that, in my first term

at college, all ordinands were required to take a module on children and youth ministry with a particular focus on engaging with families.

To be clear, this is not about guilt-tripping parents into doing something they would rather not do. Not at all. This must be about building confidence in God's word and in their ability to pass it on and encouraging parents to see the value of making space for this in family life.

Ultimately, the way we will see a change in this area is through Christian parents having their hearts and minds so captivated by the Gospel that it would be unimaginable for them not to pass it on to their children. May the words of Psalm 78 be true of all in our Church, "We will tell the next generation the praiseworthy deeds of the Lord, His power and the wonders He has done".

Revd Canon Dr Dagmar Winter (Newcastle): I welcome this Report and I would like to highlight two resources, one of which is mentioned, the other not mentioned explicitly.

The first is "Understanding Christianity". It is a fantastic piece of work. If you follow it up through the footnote in your Report, have a look at it. I think it offers particular opportunities for some joined-up working between schools and congregations.

We are exploring at the moment how we can use this with the congregation as well. I think it can really lend itself as an alternative learning about Christianity, learning about

our faith with the congregation and then linking that with whatever it is we are doing in schools. I would be interested to hear whether anyone else is thinking that, is planning that, or is, indeed, already doing that.

Secondly, *Open the Book*, a Bible Society project. This works wonderfully and I can recommend this. In all the state schools we have in Hexham a wonderful ecumenical opportunity where we have a group of lay people who really feel empowered, have got the vision and are excited about bringing Bible stories to children and young people. The teachers think it is a fantastic way of filling the time for collective worship. They love it. The children, most importantly, really enjoy it and are asking when is it happening again. I commend those two resources in particular.

Sophie Mitchell (Church of England Youth Council): Thank you, Chair, again for calling me to speak. I feel very popular today. I am speaking because it is important, given the title and the subject of this discussion, to actually have the voice of a young person in the debate, remembering that the lived experiences of faith among children and young people should shape how we think and vote on these matters.

I am from a family of, how I would say, I would call them Christmas Christians who do not regularly practice faith in the way that I do now. I came to faith through involvement in my church choir, which I was connected to by my Church of England primary school. After being in the choir for seven years and attending church four times a week, I decided

that at the age of 14 I should probably actually start listening to the homilies and engaging with the prayers, which did take quite a long time.

This decision to engage coincided with a new youth worker being employed at our church. This youth worker was a key figure in my faith developing. As well as this, this youth worker was passionate about bringing youth work into the central life of the church so that all people in the church were made aware of the importance of including young people. This transformed the church into one which makes young people a priority.

Similar stories, I am sure, can be found in many other churches around the country and we should celebrate this. I yearn for a day when all churches in the country think about children and young people in all Church business, remembering that they are the future of this Church and they are the future of this chamber.

I, therefore, support this motion, especially highlighting its call for significant cultural change in how we grow the faiths of children and young people. Recognition of the need for this cultural change is a move in the right direction and for that I am grateful.

Now at university, I would also like to highlight the incredible work that chaplaincies do. After struggling with faith societies at my university, I have found a huge amount of security at the chaplaincy. Here, I have felt able to express and grow in my faith in a safe environment. For this reason, I am grateful that the chaplaincies have been mentioned in this motion.

I am so excited to see how this motion can change the future of our Church through a combination of mission and ministry. As such, I believe we should celebrate this motion and vote in favour of it. I would like to finish by saying that young people want to engage in the Church and they want to be listened to, but it is your responsibility to open your ears and to support them.

Mr James Cary (Bath & Wells): I think, theoretically, this is a maiden speech but sort of not quite. I became a Christian as a child. I was about 11 and this was as a result of a Christian school and Christian teachers who had a biblical faith that was real and regularly and engagingly explained. The Bible was regularly opened and explained.

That is why, although I am a sitcom writer for the BBC - which is a rather implausible job I realise - I work with an organisation called Faith in Kids - Google it, Faith in Kids - and help them with a podcast that is trying to get families looking at the Bible together - although we somehow manage to do that without using the word "catechesis," so I am thrilled about that.

Also, that is why, when I am leading an 11 to 14s group at my church in Yeovil on Sunday morning, with children who are often having their faith battered and ridiculed in their schools by children and teachers, I want to give them what I was given - the Bible. The other Sunday we just read the Bible and we talked about it. We reflected on Genesis 2.

We looked at it. We read it. We read it out loud. We thought: what is it to be made from dust? If I do not do that, who will? If we do not do that and model that, who will?

There is a danger that, in order to attract children into the Church and into our way of life, we distract them from the glorious Gospel we have to proclaim. We know that the Lord Jesus Christ revealed in scripture is endlessly more fascinating, beautiful and compelling than any Christian leader or parent or activity could ever hope to be.

While I commend the Report, I affirm the list in paragraph 18 of GS 2121 and would commend prayer and the use of music and even creative ways to share stories of faith. There is no substitute for having the confidence in the Holy Spirit to do his work through his words. Why would we want to give our children and young people anything else? I commend this motion.

Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham): GS 2121 is a welcome Report on a vital subject and I want to pick up on something Bishop Paul mentioned fleetingly but highlight one word in paragraph 16(a) on page 4, and that word is this, “camps.” When I became an archdeacon, one of the first questions someone offered me was, “Now you are going to stop wasting time with this camps business, aren’t you?”

My question has set me thinking, after all what is the value of taking 24 oiks away - they are technically known as young people - all of whom face disadvantage for one week in a summer? It is a drop in the ocean. It is not strategic. Is it worth the anger and the

violence? Perhaps it is time to leave childish ways behind and do something more important, like chair the DAC. Then I thought about the stories and the individuals into whom faith and effort, love, joy, mistakes, tears, scripture, songs, questions and anger are shared and held over seven days.

Residential summer camps offer relational one to one deep community in ways many of their participants have never experienced. Here is incarnation or mission in its barest form. Here, evangelism is wide and deep. For some, it is the first time a meal is shared round a table. For others, it is seeing the glory of Pembrokeshire - other beauty spots are available. For some, it is cleaning their teeth for the first time on a regular basis. For many, it is the stories of Jesus coming alive and afresh. The Gospel is embodied by young and old together.

I also added up the data from this apparently insignificant one camp once a year for one week. Nearly two and a half thousand young people from some of our neediest communities have joined us and questioned and experienced and discovered the life of Jesus. Some are baptized; some we know; others have moved away; some have tragically died, but all are loved and prayed for.

As one young person said to me, "This is the one place where I find stability and love." Over 400 leaders have been trained and formed. My experience is through Fulton camps but I could be talking about Walsingham or Scripture Union or cathedral camps or other organisations.

Never underestimate the effect of one week a year to open the horizons of possibilities. One residential week equals the same contact time as two years of one hour a week. Ordinary Christians offer real authentic relationships of holy listening and love. Even though my boss is sitting in the chamber, I will continue to waste my time once a week, once a year and see what God is going to do. Why do you not join me in wasting your summer for Christ and just see what God does and then you will truly support the aspiration of *Growing Faith* to be truly intergenerational and growing God's Kingdom.

Mrs Sarah Finch (London): Members of Synod, please forgive me, I cannot fillet my speech but a lot of what I say has already been said by James Lee in his excellent maiden speech. I found this Report very significant and I think we should all welcome it very warmly.

I would like to focus briefly on the role of parents and grandparents in the spiritual lives of their children and grandchildren. I know a family with two children with an age gap of three years. From their infancy, their parents have prayed with them. There was a standard bedtime routine: first, a bedtime story, then a Bible story and then prayer.

When the children were very young, the parents prayed and then, gradually, the children learnt to pray aloud too. The parents would spend time with each child separately so that in the course of ten to 15 minutes each child could talk about anything that was a trouble and anxiety and then that thing could be taken to the Lord in prayer. The father would

usually come home late, so he would take a turn at weekends and the mother looked after the children during the week.

The thing that struck me about this pattern was what an effort it was every evening. I remember the mother telling me that sometimes, when she said goodnight to the younger child and was going to be with the older one, she felt really exhausted and she was under pressure. There was the supper to cook, there were phone calls to make et cetera. But this investment of time and effort has paid off. God's word was being absorbed gradually over the many years of their childhood. The parents' faith was being caught as parent and child prayed together. God moved in the lives of these children. They both came to a genuine personal faith. They were wonderfully well-taught in Sunday school and both married committed Christians. Now their children are being brought up with the same bedtime pattern of story, Bible and prayer. Visits to their grandparents' house provide the opportunity for the very young and the very old to read the Bible and pray together with great delight.

My observation of this family has convinced me that the hard work of bringing up children to know good through reading his Word and teaching them to pray is hugely worthwhile. The fruit is joy.

Mrs Susan Witts (Blackburn): I am a member of the National Society Council. It seems to have been a long time coming but *Growing Faith* is the vision that our children and

families needed. To weave children and families through all our plans and visions can only be a good thing if we are helping our children grow in faith.

I recently retired from the role of children's work adviser in Blackburn and as a member of the adviser network with Mary Hawes, our national adviser, we would regularly ask when will parishes see children's work as the core of what they do rather than an add-on? Our children should be able to explore, experience and encounter God within the Church and have teaching and learning experiences that are equal to what they have in school, if not better.

In Blackburn Diocese, we have had, since 2016, an overarching phrase attached to our vision that says we are prioritising work among children, young people and schools to raise up a new generation for Christ. The outcomes from this have been the involvement of our diocesan children and youth advisers in curate training sessions, and these have been well received. There are visits to clergy who are new to the diocese, helping them to know who's who and what the culture is for children, family and schools, particularly their local school and the links with the parish.

Another outcome has been in the area of resourcing our vast army of volunteers. In Blackburn we have a digital resource called Weekly@ which is a Lectionary-based weekly download. It has ideas for children's work, under-fives and all-age worship. This resource has been well received by volunteers who are often short of time. It also gives church leaders the assurance that materials are well planned and not just downloaded from

random websites on a Saturday night. Other digital resources have been created to support holiday clubs and under-fives work. Blackburn also has approximately 33,250 children worshipping in our Church schools. If you have been in a Church school recently, you may have experienced an act of worship which has been planned and prepared by the children. The worship is exemplary and something our parishes should seek to incorporate in all parts of their all-age worship. I know that as a Synod we do not like to rush into things and we like to consider everything prayerfully, yet time moves on and change can be slow. Some of you may remember in 2009 we had the Year of the Child initiative. A DVD was produced where children said what they wanted from the church, things such as, “We don’t need another new initiative. We need a church that will care for us”, and ended with them saying, “In ten years I will be 15”, or, “In ten years I will be 26”. And here we are ten years later and those children are now ten years older.

Messy Church is 15 years old and yesterday at a fringe meeting by the Church Army we heard from their research, playfully serious, just how successful Messy Church has been for growing faith. Some of those children who attended the early Messy Churches could well be grown up with their own children now. Let us commend *Growing Faith* and embed it in all that we do from today.

Revd Alison Booker (Leicester): Synod, we have heard many times over these last few days the word “hope”, and reading this gave me hope. I see reflected in this vision something of what God has been doing on the ground in my place.

I wanted to share with you some of the stories of young people and children who I have worked with. The revision reminds us of the report *Rooted in the Church* which identified inclusion, equality, leadership and space as being key in keeping young people rooted in their faith. We have seen inclusion where young people are part of the whole church family; an intergenerational approach, as our young people read, lead sung worship, lead us in our intercessions and are encouraged to join all kinds of things, Lent groups is just one example, which are for everybody, not separate ones for children and adults. Most importantly, this inclusion has been on the basis of equality. Our young people who lead are leaders the same as any other.

Perhaps because of this, these young people want to be more involved. We have young people on our PCCs, deanery synods and diocesan synods. I have had young people of 14 and 15 demanding why they have to be 16 to be on the electoral roll. We were creative and as area dean I encouraged our deanery to create observer places for anyone 14-plus who wanted to be part of the deanery synod. I am waiting for the 12 and 13 year-olds to complain. It will come.

Involving them has not been an easy process. There were many who did not really want to and quite a few who actively objected. None of them were young people. They were adults, other clergy mostly, if I am honest. They told me, "If we encourage young people to come to deanery synod they will leave the church and never come back". I think it says more about their deanery synod than about young people, if I am honest.

Our young people's voices have changed us at deanery synod. We have learned from their presence with us. Together we have learned to be the people of God in our places. In our rural deanery we have four primary schools that we work with on a weekly basis and we take them on retreat once a year. I went into school and was met by a rather agitated ten-year-old - we will call her Elizabeth - who said, "Revd Alison!" I said, "Elizabeth, are you okay?" "No, I am not", she said. "It has been a most difficult week. Revd Alison, I need to go on retreat at Launde Abbey". Those days were not just days out; they were transforming times for the young people we took.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I absolutely 100% thank those who have put this Report together, but, you know me: I want action, not words. I want to take you back to the Bishop of Ely, who asked us to stand up, and in that poll we endorsed the findings in here about people who had faith during their primary years. We have heard wonderful reports of things that are going on in our Church schools and other schools, but why, why does it drop off in the teenage years and the early 20s? It has suddenly really struck home to me that perhaps for us as a Church there is an opportunity here for us to focus some more of our work.

We have heard of work with teenagers but, particularly in our area in the north, local authority youth clubs rarely exist any longer. Perhaps when you were growing up, you knew that you had somewhere to go in your teenage years where you could meet up with your friends and be together. They perhaps were not only your church friends but all your

friends. People in this country now do not have that opportunity so often to meet in those vital teenage years. You see them wandering around the streets or sitting in lych-gates and wondering why that is the only place there is a seat for them to sit and chatter. If our Church schools are doing a wonderful job for our primary children, why then when they go to secondary do we provide nothing within that building, supported by the laity, to give them a new lease of life in a place they know, they love and they have been nurtured? I do not know. Can it run? Should it run? I just hope that we will go back and try to explore something like that. Those buildings are standing empty and the young people know them and trust them. Perhaps we could have a revitalisation of something called the Anglican Young People's Association (AYPA). AYPA is very, very close to my heart. It gave me a loving husband. Please can we have some thought about those children and teenagers and give them somewhere to go where they can continue to learn about their faith, somewhere they trust.

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

The Chair: Just before I take that, can I just check, is Debbie Woods around? After we have heard from Debbie Woods with her maiden speech, John Freeman, that would be brilliant for a motion of closure, because, unfortunately, time is against us.

Miss Debbie Woods (Chester): Thank you, Chair, for calling me, especially on this encouraging debate on such a vital issue in the life of the Church. To declare an interest, I am a churchwarden, a volunteer junior church leader for the eights to tens and an

informal encourager of student lawyers in the Lawyers' Christian Fellowship. I am a trustee of an exciting new charity Growing Young Disciples, whose mission is to train, resource and advise churches, parents, youth and children's workers, full time and volunteers. I am not a parent, I am not a school teacher, but I have had the joy and privilege of being involved in the lives of many children and young people as an honorary big sister, an aunt and, let us face it, I am now moving into the realms of honorary granny, and all that through the local church family.

I am delighted and encouraged to read the importance that is being attached in this Report to children and young people being taught and nurtured as part of the whole intergenerational local church wherever possible. I know we will all agree that we need to give them our best. My plea is that we do not underestimate what we need to be teaching our children and young people and what their sponge-like minds can cope with. I hope our children and youth work contains fun and games, hopefully connected to the topics we are teaching them. Yes, let us go bowling and have our "inflatable chaos" nights and certainly the weekends away and weeks, whether it be in Keswick or elsewhere, that are so very helpful, to nurture both good memories and friendships, perhaps among kids who are not natural friends.

We also need to be teaching them the Bible at least in the depth that those children and young people would be studying their maths and science and English at school. By all means, let us tell them the story of Noah, but let us move beyond the animals going into two by two. Yes, let us teach the God of a glorious creation, of Noah obeying the Word

of God, however improbable it sounds. Let us teach them that God judged His creation for its sin and placed the rainbow in the sky, the bow pointing heavenward, piercing the sun in our place. Our children need to understand the whole counsel of God if they are going to fight sin, the world and the devil. They need to keep trusting through the years when they will feel attacked, maybe at school, maybe from friends, maybe even in the household. If we disciple our children and young people as valued and engaged members of the whole body of the Church, they are more likely to be witnesses and evangelists to their friends, peers, teachers and parents.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: motion for closure on Item 13.

The Chair: Thank you, John. 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 ask Bishop Stephen to respond to the debate, please. You have up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Thank you, Synod, very much indeed for the way that you have responded to this debate. Obviously the Archbishops' Council, the House of Bishops and the National Society Council were backing this fully before we even came here, but the endorsement we have had already from the floor is enormously

encouraging. Dave Male (sitting behind) talks about mobilising the million. Of course, do not forget there are one million children we educate in our Church schools every year and we need to be mobilising them and enjoying the wonderful privilege we have of educating so many children.

The Archbishop of York talked about the prospect of youth congregations, but I would also like to commend the Archbishop of York's young leaders' course, which talks about being embedded in the love of Christ; where action counts more than words but where we remember to dream. That is really important for all of us as we remember to be, as Bishop Paul said, generational, cross-generational and intergenerational Christians. We are not just talking about children and young people. We are talking about all those who love them and care for them. With Sarah Finch, it is great to promote the idea of grandparents and parents modelling praying and living with their grandchildren. I was converted to Christ through my Irish Roman Catholic grandmother and it if were not for her, I would not know what it was to love our Lord Jesus Christ.

As a Church, we have to be clear that if we are committed to this and our actions are to speak louder than words, then our money and our diaries need to be sacraments of our seriousness. Susan Witts talked about the importance of the way in which we promote youth ministers and specialist family and children's ministers. We need to be getting on with this and, of course, as we hear from John Spence and from the Archbishops, there is freedom to apply for SCF bids that apply to this kind of work that we are talking about.

I would like to commend the successful Manchester bid to work with children and young people in transition from pre-school through primary into secondary school.

I also want to highlight what Alan Jeans said about the importance of the cadet force and celebrating its chaplaincy with over 130 young people involved. I am glad to say that a padre is on the development group for *Growing Faith*.

The Bishop of Durham raised the point that we have this enormous resource in engaging with toddler groups and pre-school children and their families. It is important to say, if we are going to do this and not cheat the people, that the “wheels on the bus” need to lead to Christ.

Dagmar Winter reminded us about the resource of *Open the Book*, another example of how this is all cross-generational. Most of the people who are working with children and *Open the Book* are people who have retired who have the time and also, I suppose, the loss of inhibition to be ready to engage with the children in this way.

As you can see behind us, Debbie from R&R, Dave Male and others are making it clear that this proposal is something which is joined up. This is about the whole Church of England engaging with this, but, most importantly, it is about how this is taken up in our dioceses.

As Sophie Mitchell reminded us, this is only worthwhile if it is shaped by the lived experience of children and young people. This is not bishops telling people what to do. Far from it. It is in fact celebrating the faith and vocation of young people who are often braver than people like me in the way in which they sustain their faith in difficult circumstances and against the tide of their peer group.

We give thanks for the way in which children and young people can be disruptive cultural leaders in our children's councils that cross the ways in which we meet to make our decisions. Fundamentally, this is rooted in the joy and wonder of the faith of these young people, who have things to teach us about holiness. As Archbishop Angaelos reminded us, when we are with the children, we are servants to them, not just transmitters telling them what to think and to do, and we need to be celebrating the ways in which not only do we model and offer the faith but that we allow children and young people to be bearers of the Word to us and bearers of the cup of gladness to us.

I pray that we can all take this forward and be excited about all the possibilities. As people have said, this is not just about school or about church. This is fundamentally about the home and households. I want to stress as we move into another debate later on today about estates evangelism that this is not just for nice middle-class families who "do this sort of thing". If we really believe this, this is about all families, no matter how they are found, and where we would expect children and young people to be evangelists and disciples with and for their families.

Finally, I would like to announce that as we talked about Understanding Christianity, 5,000 schools are using this, not just Church schools, and we have found a benefactor who is going to fund for us a new app which will take the big stories with which children are familiar in understanding Christianity and allow children themselves, with their families, to use an app to promote and grow in their faith together.

Archbishop Angaelos talked about what was going on in his Church. I think it was true that His Holiness the late Pope Shenouda said that the only way forward for the Coptic Church was to invest in the children, and that is the way forward for us too. I commend this proposal and I beg to move this motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Stephen. We move to vote on Item 13 as amended.

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

The Chair: Thank you everyone for your heartfelt contributions. That concludes this item and we now move to the next item of business, Farewells

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill* took the Chair at 5.20 pm.

ITEM 14 FAREWELLS

The Chair: We come now to Item 14 Farewells, which of course normally occur on the last day, but, as we heard earlier this afternoon, we are taking one item of two items of farewell now because this is a farewell to the Bishop of Norwich and the Bishop of Dover. The Bishop of Norwich is unfortunately not able to be with us tomorrow, so we are taking it now. I invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to give his farewells to our two Bishops.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): They are behind me! I shall start with Bishop Trevor. Trevor is a very good cook. I know that because he told me so. I have also actually had the benefit of eating his food, so I know it for two reasons. He is someone who is aware of himself, both his strengths and his weaknesses, and is someone, moreover, who never stops working. He is one of the hardest-working people I have come across in a House of Bishops of, I am not quite going to say workaholics but certainly people who work exceptionally hard and unceasingly.

I am so pleased to see that Margaret is here as well because the two of them very much have worked together. Margaret and Trevor, you will be missed hugely as you move from Canterbury to Somerset. They have been people of the most profound hospitality. They have used the facilities of their house. They have welcomed people. They have gone to see people. They have travelled around the diocese in a way that is extraordinary.

Trevor, you have taken on many different roles in your ministry and often you have had the difficult conversations that other people did not want to take head on. You have done

in the House of Bishops much of the unseen work in ensuring meetings are planned well and you have been one of those who has concerned yourself with details and governance issues which others were not so concerned about and someone had to take on, and you did.

I know from first-hand experience how much you have done in your role as Bishop of Dover. I thank you very much for being willing to add to your portfolio for the last four and a half to five years caring for the Channel Islands, somewhere you came to know when you were Bishop of Basingstoke. I know from much conversation with them how much they have appreciated your ministry and how much time you have spent there. At least I think so. The great advantage of the Channel Islands is that nobody knows where you are if you say you are in the Channel Islands. It may be a metaphor for the Canary Islands, Madeira, the Balearics, the Falkland Islands - no, that is Bishop Tim! But I do know that you have visited ceaselessly and you have worked with them through many complex and difficult issues.

I do not know whether Trevor would say that being Bishop of Dover is a good job. It is certainly, to my mind, one of the most demanding and difficult jobs, because, basically, you are the diocesan bishop doing all the yukky bits - the difficult conversations, the miserable bits, the administration, the hard work, the grind, the labour and the toil - and then this wretched character breezes in every couple of weeks and suddenly takes all the fun bits and goes to parishes. Trevor has been extraordinarily faithful in that, but I am conscious that when I turn up at Christmas and Easter, or any occasion when there is a

free meal that looks as though it will be good, and when I blunder around causing trouble in the Diocese of Canterbury, that I am treading on paths that Trevor has laid and that I am standing on his shoulders. To do that you need a profound capacity for service and humility. It is not an easy job in any way.

Trevor takes his own prayer and spiritual life seriously and I know that he is someone who feels deeply privileged when he is confirming, taking part in sacraments, speaking at the Maundy Thursday service; all the things that involve sharing with fellow disciples in their faith development. He is, as I say, someone who, with Margaret, has been deeply committed to entertaining and to hospitality.

Added to everything else important about his episcopacy, and what he has done in Canterbury, has made him a bishop whose hands are very much in the kitchen sink, metaphorically and literally. At every installation or event of any sort, the irony is that he almost never eats - he cannot stand grazing, as he would say - but he is always making sure others do, and stays normally for the tidying up. With that way of working, he is both well respected and deeply loved by the laity.

I am not sure how many bishops around the Province cook a hot lunch for their episcopal team meetings at home. The addition of Margaret's delicious desserts, therefore eaten in her absence, make for a team that are well - well-rounded. That is all right, Jo, you have not been there long enough, but you can confirm or deny.

He is also very good at what you might call enculturation. There were four or five Primates in the care of the diocese for a few days and Trevor took them to Margate, where at Holy Trinity they received a delivery of fish and chips and mushy peas. The look on the face of the Primates was memorable, especially as Trevor had talked really passionately about mushy peas.

Things do not always go well despite the best-laid plans. Obviously, in Canterbury Diocese the only place you can go on retreat or on strategy planning or anything like that is Condette in France. It is actually cheaper than anywhere here, even with the fall in the pound. At one of the area deans' retreats in Condette, Trevor took them on a route march where the group got incredibly spread out and those at the back missed a turn and became totally lost. Knowing he was such a stickler for time, they found themselves running back to try and make the start of the next session and missing the rest.

Last year, in Condette on the senior staff retreat he was keen quickly to overcome the glitch in the booking which resulted in everyone arriving on time for the evening meal: the only thing missing being the evening meal! Keen to redeem the moment and impress the newest member who had just joined the team, he generously offered to take everyone out for an evening meal. In a slight glitch in detail, it was to discover that both of the restaurants in the town were closed. They did manage to find a local supermarket open where bread, cheese and wine gave what I am told was a memorable, but I believe was a forgettable start to the residential.

Trevor, I have been grateful for your fellowship and your extremely hard work and that of Margaret, which has been extraordinary and, at times, quite worrying and frightening, but you have done it superbly. I am grateful for your partnership in the Gospel, as a recently retired Bishop of London would have said. You have been a true servant of the Church throughout your ministry in Durham, in Winchester and now in Canterbury Diocese, and have stood out and spoken forth powerfully when you saw the need.

There are many, many refugees around the Jungle of Calais in its different forms who will be deeply grateful not only for your frequent trips but for your profound speaking out on the issue and your setting up of a project jointly with the Diocese of Ajas in order to meet their needs and to show them that, despite the indications of official people on both sides of the Channel, that they were in fact loved and valued by God. That was your work. I think in many ways I wanted to end with that as that signals your heart, your mind, your strategy, your determination.

I pray that you and Margaret will have a really good and fulfilling time in Somerset, no doubt continuing the entertaining but perhaps, I suspect, you will still not be able to stop yourself from making a point or two. May your retirement be as much of a blessing to you as you have been to the Church of England. Thank you.

So we turn to Bishop Graham, who I know enjoys being made conspicuous. To say that Graham is going to be missed by the bishops of the Church of England, indeed the Church

as a whole and especially by the Diocese of Norwich, is not only stating the obvious but is a drastic understatement.

Graham has been a Bishop since 1993, first in his own county of Cornwall. He was born there and will return there with Julie on their retirement. On that note, Julie, it is very good to see you with Graham today. We are so grateful for all that you have done with Graham in your life and ministry together.

After being Bishop of St Germans, he was appointed Bishop of Norwich in 1999. Having been in Norwich for a mission visit quite recently, last November, I know how loved he is there. It is an extraordinary experience. I got a sense of careful and wise leadership with clear vision and profound love for the people. They knew that and that experience of being loved was reciprocated and has led to it being a diocese that is growing in numbers despite the difficulties of 620 historical churches built largely to the glory of the wool merchants. I did grow up in that area.

Care and wisdom and love are two words – three words, sorry - that do come to mind when we think of Graham. Sorry, I am adapting my script as I go through; I am not trying to do an imitation of the Spanish Inquisition. He is someone who chairs bishops' meetings wisely. I can think of several occasions when his summing up of a topic made it absolutely clear that no more words were needed or welcome. Many Synod members will remember the way that Graham handled Questions in Synod, notably ministry questions when he was Chair of the Ministry Council. You could always tell when he felt it was right to be

prompt in his answer – brisk might be another word – and when he felt that Synod had heard enough.

For many years, he has served as the media Bishop. I think he felt at times it was the media Bishop of last resort because if there was a subject that was too difficult for all the other media bishops, who suddenly found that they had inextricable engagements anywhere but in front of a microphone, whatever the time of day or night – it is amazing how many people have senior staff meetings at the same time as the *Today* programme, which is something I will always remember about this – it would always be Graham who ended up in front of the microphone. It is noticeable that he was someone who, if necessary, could make a subject boring. That is not a joke; it is an essential part of dealing with the media that you can make something sound boring when you need to - I have a horrible feeling that may get quoted – and who can make a subject that on the surface looked routine, passionately interesting because he saw into the deepest essence of the work of God in the Church.

He spoke out superbly in the House of Lords and he has been one of the most effective performers in the public square. He has been one of the go-to bishops when we have had difficult or complicated issues to consider and a report or working group needed chairing with that combination of wisdom and care. He has brought to it a profound sense of history that I think we will miss most of anything; that sense of knowing not only what has been reported on in the last 30 years but a deep sense of the flow of the movement and of the work of the Spirit in the life of the Church.

Most recently, the Government have recognised his skills in asking him to Chair the independent inquiry into the issues raised by Paterson, which he is doing with real thought and with a profound compassion to ensure the voice of all those affected is being heard. I was so glad that he agreed to do that, because I knew that those who were the victims of those awful events would find that they experienced, in Graham's chairing, the love of Christ. That is because he is above and beyond and more deeply and more profoundly than anything a disciple of Jesus Christ.

One of the most striking things about Norwich Diocese last November was how, after 20 years, one saw the pleasure he got from the day-to-day ministry of being a bishop in God's Church. Graham and Julie, we will keep you in our prayers as you move on from Norwich. You know how much you are loved by so very many people and we all know how much you will be missed here in the House of Bishops, in your diocese and in so many other ways. I will miss your counsel and your straightforward and wise words, which I have sought on occasions when I was particularly baffled – you were the go-to Bishop for that as well.

It is, of course, true to note that you have a sense of humour: quite dry, but that is something I relish. It is clearly there and you enjoy life. So it would be remiss of me, Graham, not to share with the rest of Synod these scenes of you proving at Norwich Cathedral the peculiar qualities of a non-Newtonian fluid, and custard was the most easily available fluid. Please watch the screen.

(Video played)

Well, if you simply step into custard you sink, let me warn you, but if you keep walking it holds you up. I think that was one of the more memorable pictures of a bishop I have seen – a bishop in a cassock walking on custard. That must be a headline for someone. As Google explains, a non-Newtonian fluid, by the way, is a fluid whose viscosity is variable based on applied stress or force. I am sure you all knew that.

I understand, Graham, when you were at Lambeth as Chaplain, I think, both to Robert Runcie and to George Carey, you were known as the “great dictator” because of the sheer volume of work you got through and the amount of dictation you produced. I hope that, moving into retirement, you will be able to relax and perhaps explore other skills, like the walking on custard, though perhaps you will want to stop a while rather than keep moving.

One of the great phrases that Graham had in his ministry when strange things happened in his diocese was he would just say quietly, “Normal for Norfolk.” Well, they have not had a normal Bishop for Norfolk or for any other diocese. The Church owes you both an enormous debt of gratitude for what you have given and done and been, for your wisdom and, above all, for your care and love and inspiration, for those you served, above all for the Lord Jesus Christ. Thank you Graham and Julie.

The Chair: We now come to the end of this item and we will move directly on to Item 15 on Estates Evangelism.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 5.45 pm.

The Chair: We now move to Item 15. Standing behind the green baize door, as you do, all we could hear was something about custard. We did not know what on earth was going on. It put me in mind of dinner. We have one more item of business to do and that is Estates Evangelism. You need GS 2122 for this and I invite the Bishop of Burnley to move Item 15. You may speak for up to ten minutes.

ITEM 15 ESTATES EVANGELISM (GS 2122)

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North): Now, most people when introducing a Synod motion try to whip up votes in favour. I am going to reverse that custom by asking you to vote against. It would be very easy to nod through a motion on Estates Evangelism because it ticks so many fashionable boxes. In fact, there is something in it for everyone. We have got evangelism for the evangelicals, we have got the social gospel for the liberals, we have got the bias to the poor for the Catholics, all we need is a few loud-mouthed rhetorical speeches to clap, we can click button 1 on our voting machines and head for the bar. Estates Evangelism, it is a shoo-in, is it not?

Well, think again. I want you to vote this motion down and I want you to vote it down decisively if you are not up for the implications. When the early Apostles set out to fulfil their task of growing the Church, they started with the hungry and the widowed and the slaves. When St Francis set about rebuilding the Church in the 12th century, his first move was to go and live with a colony of people with leprosy. When St Vincent de Paul felt his call to renew a tired and corrupt French Church and a deeply hierarchized society, he began with galley slaves and prisoners. I could go on and on and on, but already the lesson is clear. Anyone who is serious about the proclamation of the Gospel starts with the poor.

That is the contention of this motion. The Estates Evangelism Task Group, and it is good to have some members of it behind me here, is not trying to start a competition. We are not saying that the urban estates matter more than the countryside or the suburbs. We are not denigrating any areas of ministry because, of course, we need the Church in every place and for every person. We are not a social policy or a campaigning group. Our interest is evangelism and, as such, we want to remind the Church of a truth which is firmly rooted in the scriptures and the tradition.

If we want to see a nation coming back to Christ, it will begin amongst the poor. And where, today, do we find the places of greatest deprivation? Our urban estates. Now, those estates were built with great optimism and the first generation of residents were overjoyed at what was being provided. In many ways, they are still joyful places to live and to minister. My years working on estates, especially in the north-east, were amongst

the happiest of my ministry. But, today, for many estates' residents, life is hard and getting harder. What must seem like the modern day Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse – universal credit, low-paid work, food poverty and austerity – plague many lives.

Too often services, voluntary organisations and traditional forms of association have been closed down or privatised, and along with them have gone the places that form local leaders. Just as with austerity, the UK's departure from the European Union is likely to have a disproportionate impact on urban estates, especially in the short term, and the Church's response: bit by bit, almost unseen, we have been pulling away, closing churches, withdrawing clergy. We invest far less in ministry on the estates than in any other context. The harvest is rich but the labourers have been redeployed.

So here is the vision. It is a very simple one. It is to have a loving, serving, worshipping Christian community on every significant social housing estate in the nation. It is to plant back on the estates we have abandoned. It is to better support our presence in the places where we are struggling. If we can do that, the impact on Church and nation will be transformative. As Christians, we will be seen to be doing what we are called to do, which is to share good news with the poor. We will release unlikely leaders and evangelists who will speak the Gospel in a language that people can understand. We will develop evangelistic resources and approaches that will work anywhere. We will, for once, be working with the grain of cultural transference, because history shows that, if you start with the poor, eventually the rich catch on.

And do not think this is an impossible pipedream. In recent years, I have been blown away by some of the work taking place on our estates. The evidence is that joyful relationship-based evangelism, rooted in belonging, can grow incredibly precious Christian communities. Some dioceses are committing significant time and effort to this. We should mention, in particular, Manchester, and the Strategic Development Fund has put resource behind imagination.

So the question we need to answer today is a simple one: are you prepared to buy into the vision that lies behind this motion, a Church on the side of the poor, a Christian community on every estate? And, please, I urge you, do not vote yes if you mean no, because there are challenging implications.

Voting yes will impact every single parish, because many parishes contain forgotten estates. Others will want to twin with an estates parish and most will feel financial implications. It will affect every deanery because, all too often, the conclusion of deanery plans has been that the post or parish that should disappear is the one that serves the outer estate. It will affect every diocese because the motion asks dioceses to build estates into their strategic plans and vision.

It will present personal challenges to clergy, because we need our best priests to be spending at least part of their ministry in areas of deprivation. It will affect this Synod, a place where estates' voices are rarely heard, with the consequence that our policy decisions can adversely impact the poor. It will affect those who select and train clergy

and lay ministers, because those from non-professional or unlikely backgrounds have for too long been systematically excluded from leadership in the Church. It will present awkward challenges to those sitting on historic assets, because it will require a spirit of generosity within and between dioceses.

If you are not up for those implications, please just vote no. The paper in front of you lays out as clearly as possible how the Estates Evangelism Task Group is seeking to go about its work. But what brings change is not policy decisions and papers, but transformed hearts. The details of strategy matter less than the big picture.

Because I am utterly convinced of two things. First, that the renewal of Christian life in our nation is not just possible, it is inevitable. I do not know how, I do not know when, but I know it is inevitable because Jesus is Lord. And, because he is Lord, a distracted nation will one day discover anew his beauty and his truth. Second, that renewal will begin, as it always does, with the poor, with the marginalised, with the forgotten and the oppressed and the broken. That is where the Holy Spirit will move and will move with power. The only question left is this: will the Church of England be there to join in?

Chair, I beg to move the motion standing under my name.

The Chair: As you can imagine, a lot of people have put in requests to speak. We are going to begin with five-minute speeches and later on move to three minutes. I call first of all, to make a maiden speech, the Revd David Tolhurst, followed by Jason Roach.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd David Tolhurst (Durham): Thank you very much for calling me to give my maiden speech on something so very, very close to my heart. “You are one of the kids from the estate”. Those were the words that greeted me as a 12 year-old when I attended my first proper church service, as encouraged by my Boys’ Brigade leader. I came from the local housing estate behind the church. Despite somehow being taken off-guard, the coming years saw that church nurture my faith, encourage my discipleship and help me discern my vocation. That was 30 years ago in a Baptist church in the suburbs of Kent.

God has blessed me very greatly since then. I was married. I moved to the north-east of England. I joined the Church of England. My wife and I brought up our son on a social housing estate in Darlington, where we were part of the Anglican parish church’s outreach to the community, and, from then on, I continued my journey towards ordination in this Church. In God’s economy, nothing is clearly wasted, as I now find myself as the Area Dean of Wearmouth, a deanery covering two-thirds of the City of Sunderland. I am the Area Dean of an estates deanery in an estates city. Much deprivation and incredible poverty.

I welcome this motion on a very personal level, but I welcome this motion also on a very biblical and theological level. I welcome this motion on a deanery and a diocesan level. On one of our housing estates, we have a church that has declined over the years. It has

reduced its congregation to a very few on a Sunday morning, but that was until the children from the estate came. They wanted to know why they could not be involved in the midweek Eucharist and, of course, you might imagine the older congregation had lots of reasons why they could not be involved in the midweek Eucharist. Luckily, some great pioneering clergy had other ideas. Now, on a Sunday afternoon, the children have become the church. Many have been baptized. Many receive Communion and serve. This week, as we have been here in Synod, that church has been full every single day of children engaging in holiday club and food poverty activities.

On another housing estate in the deanery, we are developing work that is empowering others, raising up lay leaders from within the estate. This motion calls us to how we look to raise up vocations, both lay and ordained, from estates. But do not just listen to me, here are some voices from Sunderland. Marjorie is one of our estate's churchwardens and she said this: "God is not done with us. We are still here. We are trying to be faithful. We are living. We are learning. We are growing. We are being. We are committed to being here for our community in this place. This is our place because this is God's place and this is home".

Carol said this: "God loves me and I'm actually starting to believe that, and that has changed everything. It was so hard when I felt like I wasn't wanted or welcome or good enough for stuff. You get overlooked and it affects you, but I'm beginning to believe there may be more in life for me, that God wants better and I'm actually okay. I'm not great, but I'm okay. But in Jesus I could be more".

Kayleigh, a younger member, says: “I’ve learnt recently that nobody can do everything but we can all do something. It’s been so good to learn about Jesus and understand that God has an interest in my life and he wants good things for me”.

We must, for the sake of our estates and for all of the Marjories, the Carols, the Kayleighs, for the sake of the Gospel of Christ, support this motion in full and everything that it implies. Commit our time, our prayer and our money, our parishes, to those who Jesus spent the most time with: the poor and the marginalised. This kid, from a social housing estate, gives thanks to God for the Church that welcomed him and told me Jesus loves me, so let us commit this motion to mission through our housing estates. After all, you never know, we might get more estate kids on Synod. Thank you.

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): I have got to declare I sit on the London City Mission ministry reference panel, which is an advisory board. Two weeks ago to the day, and sadly almost to the hour, Lejean Richards was stabbed and killed a few metres from my front door on the council estate where I live. He and his sister were members of the kids’ group and youth group at the London City Mission Centre, where I have the privilege of helping out.

It has been a traumatic and terrifying time. Simon Butler made reference to this on Wednesday and rightly said that our thoughts and prayers are with Lavern, Tiara and all the family. It was for boys like Lejean that six years ago I set up a mentoring and

leadership scheme and partnership with LCM that shared the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ with the people, and, indeed, practical life skills with them and through that whole families have come to faith, often neglected by society, often neglected by churches, have come to faith to point at which half of those attending on a Sunday and professing faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, have never had contact with the Christian faith before.

I do not share this to boast in some way, because this story is not unique on the estates and up and down this country. We should not be surprised that when we take the good news to the poor, they often lap up his promises of beauty out of ashes and joy in place of mourning when we come face-to-face with the Lord Jesus Christ and welcome him in to a community of hope and love.

I wholeheartedly support all that GS 2122 stands for, but my plea is that we would think carefully about how we measure success in this type of context, and do not limit it simply to what we see, numbers that is, on a Sunday service, because behind this positive picture of growth, there is long term, low key, relational mess and sadness. Many of these people cannot make it regularly on a Sunday, there are mental health issues that get in the way, there is childcare as single parents that gets in the way, there are people who find themselves arrested and assaulted and afraid and addicted and stabbed. Nevertheless, a whole heap of people walking on the road towards saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and growing hope in him.

My suggestion is that we count instead the number of bible-open discipleship relationships happening throughout the week, Monday to Sunday, because the disparity between those who are being ministered to throughout the week and not just on a Sunday, I think can be much bigger in this kind of context than it can be elsewhere. Thank you very much.

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): I would like to thank the Chair for calling me and also the work of the Estates Evangelism Task Force, but I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all those who minister on our estates today. Whilst it is a joy and privilege, I know that there is a cost, which Jason very well outlined just a few minutes ago.

I will be supporting this motion but I recognise the call of Bishop Philip to us to vote this down because I would agree that we can only support this motion if we are really open to the possibility to change and to be changed as individuals and as a Church. We will not realise the aspiration of this motion or the papers unless we are willing to be changed and to change: to change the way in which we allocate our resources, both human and financial, to change our processes for vocational discernment and training, and to change how we listen. And if we do all of this we will be changed.

For example, if we are going to encourage vocations of those who are called to estate ministry, the reality is that it is often those from estates who are best able to minister and to serve on them. This will require us to develop not just more flexible pathways for

training but also for different ways of funding these pathways. We need to allow people to discern in a different way, we need to be able to fund educational formation before people enter into the process for selection for training and we will need to change the way in which we teach.

Ministry on estates, as we have heard, is demanding as well as being a joy. We have to take seriously how we resource that ministry, how we enable ministers to be there with their families, not just to enter into estates, but to stay there, because the truth is change really comes about when people remain. How do we seriously support them? But also, how do we fund other sorts of ministry, such as youth workers, evangelists?

I would also commend the Report for encouraging us to hear the voices of those on estates, but if we are going to do that, we have to change the way in which we listen, and yes, even change our synodical processes. Our synodical process is biased to the literate middle classes, those that can afford to be here. How do we really hear the voices of others?

Finally, the motion expresses the desire to have a loving, serving, worshipping presence in every estate, which I of course would support. It enables us to share the love of Christ that we have come to know, the good news that we have found which transforms lives, which I have seen. But, most importantly, it holds the opportunity for us to see the face of Christ in those that we encounter on those estates. I do believe that if we can have a presence in each estate to see the face of Christ there, we will be transformed. Therefore,

the question for this Synod is whether we are willing to open ourselves up to those who live on estates and we ourselves be changed.

The Chair: Emily McDonald for a maiden speech, and then I will be reducing the speech limit to three minutes for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Emily McDonald (Church of England Youth Council): Thank you for calling me Chair. I want to speak 100% for Bishop Philip's proposal. I am from one of the 10% most deprived areas in the country, a place in Doncaster in the north, and actually the one that Bishop Philip came to on the Archbishop of York's Crossroads Mission a few years ago, so I understand his passion for deprived communities.

Woodlands is a former mining community and I realise that the issues of former mining communities and estates are different, but there are some similarities. One is the need for leadership to be nurtured from within these communities. I felt a call to church ministry when I was at my home church and I am currently in the discernment process. I spent a long time looking for options, looking for gap years, looking for programmes, looking for something that would help me to discern my call and I was dismayed to find very few choices for me, and that is not because there are not programmes out there, but because they were not financially viable for me to do at the time. That is why I was very fortunate and grateful to find the Church of England Ministry Experience Scheme because they do financially support the discernment process.

The parish I am in at the moment has two very different churches within the parish, very different socioeconomically. One is a relatively affluent, middle class, resourced church, and one is a deprived church with two estates next to it, currently covered by one incumbent. The deprived church has a minister, it has had a minister of its own in the past but it is not alone in struggling to find a long-term solution so that community can be properly covered, and there is absolutely a need for it, especially in deprived communities because they, as much as anyone if not more, need the hope that faith in Jesus brings. It is not an attractive prospect to give up an incumbency in an affluent suburb to go to a financially struggling part of the country, an area with a reputation for the people being rough or where there is a low level of academic progression.

There are people who minister in these contexts, who have very different backgrounds to the ones they are currently ministering in and they do a fabulous job, but there is a lack of indigenous leaders. It can feel very patronising in a community to ship in a middle-class person who thinks they understand how it is to live the daily lives of the people in this community. And why are ministers being parachuted in when there are people from these communities who understand the issues and who are being called to church leadership, but they are not able to fulfil their God-given call because of the processes, particularly the discernment process, that are designed for an academically inclined person from a certain sort of background? This is why I think there is a lack of indigenous leaders.

Many people are turned away purely because they do not fit in this box. I am grateful not to have yet experienced this bias, but many do and it is frankly shocking that people from different contexts, such as estates, former mining communities, deprived areas, are unable to fulfil their call because they are so underrepresented in all the different levels of leadership in the Church, and it is heart-breaking. There is such a need for this leadership, people that understand the problems of these communities, so I urge you to support this motion so that further conversations can be had about changing the processes currently preventing people from all backgrounds being able to fulfil their God-given calling to minister in their own church contexts.

The Chair: The Archbishop of Canterbury followed by Peter Rouch. Archbishop, it is reduced to three minutes now.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): So I noticed. There is a vacancy for the Deanery of the Falkland Islands!

The Chair: I was going to say you would miss me.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I would. I will, I mean would! Okay, my three minutes starts now. I want to support Bishop Philip entirely and entirely in especially what he said about not voting for this unless we are committed

to its consequences. There was a murmur of amusement, but I do not believe that for one single instant he was joking when he said that and we must not be joking, we must not be vague, we must not be merely optimistic if we vote for this motion.

Bishop Sarah put the points very well and I will not repeat what she said, as did Jason extremely effectively. We will have, if we vote for this, a more successful Church, not bigger successful, but holier successful. It may be bigger but that is not the point. It will not be more sensible but it will be more godly, it will not be more strategic but it will be more obedient. It will not be anything except it will have more discipleship within it. We cannot vote for this motion because it is a good thing to signal our virtue by working on estates, by having a living community on each estate. That is to instrumentalise the estates when we are called to be not people who do things to them or for them but with them. And that is the huge test that we just heard about in that really good speech just now.

If we vote for this motion, we will get a different Church if we follow through that commitment. It will be a different Church in everything from training and discernment through to its use of money. We will be coming back and demanding more money from all over the Church to spend on this. It will be a better Church, it will be a Church for England and with England not just a Church of England.

We will have to look into every part of the Church and every part will end up less tidy, less controlled, less comfortable, but every part will end up more like Jesus, for the work we

do on estates will bleed and leak and move into every single part of the Church, into the suburbs and the rich and the outer cities and the inner cities and the rural areas where that sense of adventure and exploration of letting go of all that is unnecessary will become the reality of a Church of Jesus Christ.

Ven. Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester): It is very tempting after all those speeches simply to say Amen. Amen. But I would like to name a place to which we travel if we say Amen, and it is a place we do not mention much. When I first went to serve in Manchester in a deprived estate area, people said, "You are going to get the Good Friday experience, let's pray for Easter Day". They missed out the place to which I was going to travel; Holy Saturday - Holy Saturday. The spark of resurrection does not play in the energy of Good Friday, but in the still, listless emptiness of Holy Saturday. That is why we can only be a Church with, not a Church for, because we do not ourselves call into life the departed and the struggling.

I would love to talk to you Synod about the growing body of academic research in neuropsychology about the curses beyond the Four Horsemen that Bishop Philip has named, that we visit on those who grow up in severe deprivation. Behavioural characteristics that every practitioner would recognise that had their correlates in the physical formation of bodies and brains, we must attend to those and I would love to see this work gone into as we pursue this road as I pray we must.

But one thing we have not yet mentioned, and I think we should name, is that whilst we must not fall into a paternalistic infantilization of the poor, we must also recognise that much of the depth of this challenge is our doing. As a nation, with our inclinations to economic liberalism, high choice, low tax policies, untempered by communitarian commitments, we have colluded in this marginalisation of the poor. This Report calls on us to engage in the public square and we have not yet named that as one of the crucial commitments. We must do so. Let us own it and knowing where we travel, with our eyes, open, let us take the journey with Christ. Amen.

Mr Christopher Pye (Liverpool): I asked at question time and referred to reports from the mid-1980s and basically nothing has happened. I welcome this Report but have we the time to wait for its conclusions, to wait for its actions, or will parishes like mine, Parr St Peter's in St Helens - I am sorry, we are a hard lot in St Helens, we play a hard game, we are used to being at the top. We are at the top of deprivation scales according to CUF.

We have a vision in our church to serve and evangelize our community, but is that going to be sacrificed in other churches like ours, on the altar of parish share, when time, talents and money are used exclusively to raise the cash and not to spread the Gospel?

We have a vision. We want to help people to be able to find a place of safety, a place where they can meet, for the lonely, for the dementia sufferers, for their carers, for their grandparents with the young children in their care. We want to be able to teach people how to cook with a recipe that does not include the word "ping" in it. In St Helens,

sometimes you see mums pushing a toddler in a pram and they have got a dummy in, not a plastic thing but a 25p sausage roll, because it keeps them quiet. That is where our need is, to teach them to cook. We need to show them the Gospel, its love, the love of Jesus.

If we do not respond, then parishes like mine will go. I am a layman, a reader, I want to be able to help my fellow parishioners. We need help, perhaps not in the diocesan structures, because they are too bureaucratic and too long, how about some of the richer parishes, as part of their missionary giving, looking at the CUF scores and saying "Have you got any projects? Those we will fund". I am not asking for millions; I am asking for a few bob.

The Chair: Izzy McDonald-Booth for a maiden speech, and, out of my sheer graciousness and goodness, you have got five minutes, and then the Bishop of Southwark, back down to three.

Miss Isabella McDonald-Booth (Newcastle): I would like to wholeheartedly support this motion, and I would like to give you an image that inspires my faith every day. In a very deprived area in Newcastle called Byker Wall the small church community on that large estate could not cope with their old Victorian building. Things got so bad they decided to shut up the church and the diocese offered them an old bakery shop unit in the middle of the estate. Elderly members of the congregation were struggling to cope with trying to reach out to hundreds of young people in their midst.

Cut to a few years later, with a priest who has a huge heart for the marginalised and we cannot fit the people in the bakery shop any more. We have so many young people that we have an issue with parents not being around, granted a positive problem to have. We looked at the old church building in a new way, yes it needs some TLC, but all that free space, what great things we could do in there for the community.

We moved in. Due to lack of heating we pitched a giant tent in the middle of the gutted nave. We zipped up the tent and put some heating on and decided, "We are here now, how can we make this work?" Young people kept interrupting our orderly meetings. They said, "We hope you are not deciding what we need without us". Committee members came and went, but the people who never left are the young people who kept on and on at us, "Do not leave us alone. These are the things that we need, can you help us get on with it?"

Byker Wall estate is fairly typical in terms of social housing, lots of dwellings, up there with the worst on the deprivation scale, hungry kids, bored teenagers, young adults with few employment prospects, many refugees and asylum seekers, housing for ex-servicemen and women, the council removed all youth work, reduced social work provision and the police are reluctant to get involved in what they see as petty crime which plagues the neighbourhood. The people here are passionate about their estate but they need hope and we can give them that. These are the places that the Church needs to be

present in, there are manifold issues but if we are serious about our faith, these are exactly the places we need a presence in.

I am saddened to hear in this Report that it is difficult to fill vacancies in parishes on large estates like Byker. We are lucky to have an energetic and passionate priest and the lay team that he has built up is doing amazing work. I am passionate about empowering people to be involved in a say in what Church is for them. I particularly want to support ways to get marginalised and poorer communities to have a voice that is heard and to have a say in what we are doing. We need to be there alongside people. I would like to thank the Bishop of Burnley for this Report and I want to end with what a young person said to me not long ago in Byker, "Please don't leave us".

The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Christopher Chessun): My congratulations to the Bishop of Burnley and to his colleagues for this paper, GS 2122, and for the motion. Archbishop, I will keep my Dean if I may, despite the three-minute limitation imposed on us both.

I want to take a step back to a moment when the marginalisation of social housing estates was not such a ready feature as stated in the preamble to the motion. One of my most distinguished predecessors was Cyril Garbett, who was Bishop of Southwark from 1919 to 1932, before translating first to Winchester and then to York, dying in office aged 80. He was widely respected and made it to the front cover of *Time* magazine. I have to make do with appearing in the caption competition of the *Church Times*.

Garbett regarded his most important achievement as responding to the post-World War I building of estates, private and council. A population shift of some 300,000 was projected in south London, mostly from deprived areas, and Garbett was determined that when these new communities were set up there would be a church building, often at first a consecrated church hall, clergy and staff to meet them. As a new resident put it, "We had three visitors when we first moved in, the agent for the beer house, the bookmaker's tout and the parson, and here the parson always manages to call first".

Of what does this speak? A bygone era certainly, but there was also government willingness to tackle housing need and Church's willingness to respond to pastoral and missional challenges, and not be daunted by them. Garbutt consecrated nothing before 1925 until he had money, personal information and the people to tackle the issues. In the end they built 25 new churches, he and the diocese that supported affirmed dignity in the people they served and encouraged hope in fledgling communities being planted. They went where Christ wanted to go. Above all, those now forgotten clergy, Church Army officers, readers, parish visitors, Sunday school teachers and others exhibited love.

What those people and buildings provided was presence. Of course, in our diocese we have not left these estates, or the ones that have sprung up since, not in Thamesmead or Catford or Eltham or Carshalton or Cheam or Horley. We have an estates action learning group of which our fellow Synod member, the Revd Andrew Moughtin-Mumby, is a part, which is diverse in terms of inner and outer city tradition.

There are lessons to be learned from our recent past about giving the highest priority to estates evangelism as we reimagine mission and ministry today. The passion and energy of our forebears brought pride to these new estates, and we too need to seek out ways to renew that spirit of esteem and value in our own generation. They did it then; let us do it now. I commend this motion wholeheartedly.

The Chair: Jacqueline Stamper for another maiden speech. You get five minutes of joy. Then Mark Murthen and we are back down to three minutes.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): Thank you, Chair, for calling me for my maiden speech to the Synod - at least as myself. I speak in support of this important motion and the resources to carry it out and I am grateful to Bishop Philip and the Task Group for their work. I declare an interest as a member of the Outer Estates Programme Board for the three projects in Blackburn Diocese, funded by SDF, for which huge thanks. My interest is both enthusiastic and committed, not least as a churchwarden of a parish which includes two forgotten contiguous estates in one of the 10% most deprived wards in the country. I also declare an interest, enthusiastic and committed, as a trustee of Jesus Shaped People, which has been developed for and with estates churches, as have other tools, about which I know much less and on which I do not therefore presume to speak.

Like David and Emily, I would like to focus on the leadership strand, raising up a new generation of lay and ordained church leaders from and for the estates, and for new ways

of engaging estates' voices in the governance structures of the Church. I am excited that dioceses such as Leeds, Birmingham, Manchester, Blackburn, among others, are active in estates ministry, and I commend the work of the group, the National Estates Churches Network and other partners. It is wonderful that the SIB, SDF and other funders are facilitating such work around the country and I welcome wholeheartedly the lowest-income communities funding.

But here is the challenge: who is doing the deciding on that spending at the sharp end? Do the boxes to be ticked reflect the realities of working in estates? Where are the voices of those living and ministering in the lowest-income communities being heard? Are we doing to rather than doing with? Should we not give estates' residents a leading role? Should we not be learning from and being changed by them? If we are to get their voices engaged, we need to help them discern, encourage, enable and empower themselves in all the fullness of their God-given potential.

We talk about equipping existing members of our churches to be confident disciples in SGPF and the least we can do is to start building that confidence in the people whom God loves in our estates - and I emphasise "in" and not "on". It can be especially difficult to find people to take on any kind of leadership or otherwise active roles in estates parishes, often because residents fear they do not have the required skills, education or whatever, or they are just busy struggling to find the cost of buying food and balancing that against the cost of fuel for cooking or heating.

How do we set about challenging and changing that misconception? As has already been said, it is precisely those people who are the best leaders for their communities. Look at those whom Jesus chose for his disciples; not theologians or teachers but fishermen, ordinary simple people from the community.

I would like to spend quite a lot of time speaking about MPower, but I am conscious of others wishing to speak and of the two other estates projects in Blackburn Diocese. MPower is an innovative approach to urban mission and to training up urban leaders who have come from those places. It has been particularly successful where we have appointed urban evangelists responsible for tutoring and training these people, who have also assisted in the renewal of church life in estates parishes in Blackburn, in partnership with St Mellitus. There has been so much going on. “Buzzing” is the word that is being used. There are names ready for next year. They have placements with local colleges wanting to get involved and pop-up butty churches in the local library. They are very, very imaginative projects and they are looking at more flexible ways of training.

These are some of the beginnings of developing disciples and leaders in the estates and we need to find innovative new ways of engaging their voices in the governance structures of the Church, getting round some of the constitutional obstacles.

The issue of selection, training and formation has already been covered by Emily and she highlighted that we send people away from where they are. We must find different ways

of bringing them through their present situation into leadership and authorized ministry roles.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Mark Murthen (London): I admit to having some hesitancy in speaking in this debate because I currently minister in an affluent area, in an affluent parish, but I grew up on a council estate in the same borough that I am in now, in Tottenham: not the infamous Broadwater Farm but the Ferry Lane Estate on the very edge of London Diocese. At that time my family were practising Roman Catholics and I remember that for a few years, rather than going up to the parish church St Ignatius, the parish priest came to the estate to hold mass in the community centre. There were not many of us, at most ten, but once that option was taken away from us and rather they sent a van to come and pick us up, even though it was only a mile away, something was lost. A church on the estate meant something for us when it felt like no one cared. Sad to say, we had no contact with the local Church of England worshipping community even though they were much closer.

Fast forward and nine years later after leaving the Ferry Lane Estate and honestly thinking that there was no way I would ever go back to that kind of housing, I found myself moving back to a large housing estate, the wonderfully named World's End in Chelsea. This time I went there with an open willing heart. I was there as a ministry apprentice on a kind of gap-year scheme, although I was there for three years. I was there at St John's Church and there were socioeconomic problems of the like that I grew up with, but this time the

atmosphere on that estate was different because there was not just one worshipping community; there were two.

The core team of St John's, which was a church plant, lived on the estate. Only a few of that core team were originally from the estate, but people - yes, middle-class Christians - made the decision to leave other places to come and be part of that community, to get stuck in, to send their kids to the local schools, to take part in local assemblies. There really was no substitution for living there, for being a presence. It took time for that church to build up relationships. It was a church plant and it was fragile, but we were supported by a wealthy church in partnership with the diocese. The then Bishop of Kensington, now the Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham, was very, very supportive, and we needed that support and commitment from churches and dioceses stronger than us.

It was a wonderful thing to be part of that church but the essence of the Gospel was the same. That church was a wonderful training ground in reading the Bible and not using jargon, where my evangelism skills were tested and honed. If you have an opportunity to send people to work and do evangelism on a council estate, then do so. I commend this Report.

Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool): I welcome this Report on Estates Evangelism and the work of the Archbishops' Evangelism Task Group as a whole. I am grateful for their leadership, energy and passion in this area. What a joy it is to have so much of our time at this Synod dedicated to speaking about evangelism in different ways. I would love

to have time to comment on every paragraph of each of the excellent reports that we have received, but I will not. It is, however, estates evangelism that has captured my heart and about which I wish to speak. Since I was ordained almost 14 years ago, I have served in three urban churches. I am delighted by the four strands the group have chosen to focus on and want to make a brief comment on each one,

First, championing estates ministry. I am so grateful to Bishop Philip for his tireless energy in doing just this. I would encourage all dioceses to look for ways to share the stories of life and hope which can be seen in their most deprived urban communities. These churches are not always the biggest or the richest or the fanciest, but I can tell you there is some incredible Kingdom ministry going on in them. There is life and hope and joy. People are coming to faith in Jesus. Lives are being transformed. These stories are happening; I guarantee it. Please do look for them and rejoice in them and shout about them. I am a member of the national leadership team of New Wine and we seek to do just this every year in our urban forum. We share tough things, of course, but we always celebrate joy and life.

Secondly, theology and the public voice. It is so important that we find ways to share the never-changing good news of Jesus with people in every possible different place and situation in our ever-changing world. At this Synod we are also thinking about the importance of sharing faith with our children and young people. It is also important that we find culturally appropriate ways to minister and share the good news in our most deprived communities. It is vital that we are able appropriately to celebrate success as

we do so, even though in some places it might look different from what we have traditionally considered success to look like.

Thirdly, leadership. If we are missing any particular group, then our Church, our community, our family, our theology and our voice are diminished. We seem to be aware and are seeking to address this lack in many areas, some with more success than others, but we must do this, too, in our urban communities.

Resources, finally. Everyone needs more resources of course and urban estates do not have a monopoly on this, but we need to think seriously about it, about how we encourage clergy to apply for jobs in these areas, about our financial priorities, our materials and the support that we give. Earlier I told a friend that I was hoping to get to speak today about evangelism. “Are you for it or against it?” they quipped. We all know with a question like that there is only one answer and it is never a squirrel; it is always Jesus. I want warmly to commend this work and this Report. It is quite simply what gets me out of bed in the morning.

Revd Canon Professor Martin Gainsborough (Bristol): I spent six years on an estate in inner city Bristol. They were some of the happiest days of my life. Dominant in terms of my memories of those times is how much we laughed. It was tough but we laughed a lot. It was joyful as well.

I do not want to repeat a lot of the good encouraging points that people have made this afternoon. Suffice it to say, we in Bristol Diocese are thinking very hard about how we can support clergy not just to survive on estates but to thrive and flourish so that the whole Church may flourish. We are also thinking hard about how to grow leaders locally, and to offer training that is appropriate for different life experiences and different contexts.

The point I would like to make is one which ties in with what Bishop Philip said at the beginning, "Don't vote for this unless you are up for the implications". I have been wondering, "What would it take for the vision of the Estates Evangelism Group to truly become a reality?" I have a sense that at root it boils down to a willingness to think differently - radically differently - at the point at which we make deployment decisions. In the part of Bristol that I am familiar with the pattern has indeed been one - as Bishop Philip has often drawn attention to - of withdrawal from our estates. Four stipends in the inner city area over about six years have become four half stipends without a comparable retreat from the wealthier parts of the city.

Archdeacons, bishop's staff teams, area deans, as we sit round the table thinking about clergy deployment, are we willing to take those difficult decisions to deploy there rather than here? Are we willing to go out of our way to put resource back into our estates to reverse the decline, even in the face of opposition, which I suspect, and others have alluded to this, is highly likely? That I think is one of the questions we need to consider and if we are up for that, then I would encourage people to vote in favour of this motion.

The Chair: After the next two speakers I might be looking for a friendly motion.

Mrs Heather Black (York): In the February 2016 Synod debate on the Report of the Evangelism Task Group, the Bishop of Burnley said, “A Christian presence in every community’ boasts the Church of England website. Whenever I see that I think of places like Brambles Farm, Mereside or Grange Park where the church has closed down and the clergy have been withdrawn, because it is not true”.

Well, the good news is that things are changing and they are changing on the Brambles Farm and Thorntree estates in Middlesbrough. Synod, I simply want to share a little of this good news. I want to start with prayer. A couple of years ago, as a deanery, we committed to meeting to pray on the estates every day during Lent. The Holy Spirit was stirring many hearts. We were no longer going to accept the situation that tens of thousands of people had no church and no effective Christian presence. Fr Terry, the parish priest in a neighbouring parish, followed this through. He pitched a tent in his church and fasted and prayed. Through quite miraculous provision, a coffee van was provided and ever since he has been out on the estates three times a week sharing coffee - and Jesus. Our parish, which neighbours on the other side, started a weekly youth group, which has grown from strength to strength, working with over 100 young people last year. Another neighbouring parish has started ministry to older people living with dementia and their carers. Committed prayer and the greater imagination of neighbouring parishes, none of which is well resourced, have inspired people and released resources

from elsewhere to help all of this happen. Now we are looking forward to Church Army evangelists joining us soon to build on these foundations of mission.

In the York Diocese our priorities are reach, grow, sustain - reaching people whom we currently do not. I am delighted that as a diocese we have recognised that we have neglected to reach the almost 40% of our population that live in areas of poverty, and I have the privilege of being part of the Working Group seeking to address this in terms of diocesan culture and priorities, and hopefully an SDF bid. A huge thank you to the Estates Evangelism Task Group for all that you have achieved and will achieve. Let us give ourselves to praying, dare I say fasting, and supporting this work and, in some words from this morning's Bible study, commit ourselves to a long obedience in the same direction to seeing a loving, worshipping, serving Christian community on every significant social housing estate in England.

Revd Bill Braviner (Durham): Point of order: Chair, we have a very good quality PA system in this chamber which is there to ensure that members can hear what is being said and, similarly, it enables those watching the video feed in this building and online to hear what being said. Some - perhaps many - cannot hear what is being said without the microphone system. In the interests of helping Synod to be more accessible, would it be in order to request, or preferably require those who raise points of order to use the microphone so that we can all hear what is being said? To assist you, Chair, I propose a motion for closure on Item 15.

The Chair: You are very kind and of course it much easier if we all use the microphones. Thank you for making the point. I will welcome that after we have heard from Rosemarie Mallett.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): I serve in a parish called Angell Town, which is in Brixton, and I have been there for 12 years now. Angell Town is well-known in London, if not other places, for the challenges of social deprivation and, after the events of yesterday evening, for the challenges of youth crime, where we had yet another murder five minutes from the vicarage.

However, it is not that that I wanted to talk about this evening. It is just that I wanted us to remember that we are not alone in this work on estates. I absolutely welcome this Report and would want to commend it, but I also want parish churches to know that we are to work in partnership. We had a report earlier today with regard to our Church schools and our young people. The first thing I would say is the work I have been able to do with young people on the estate has been because I have worked in partnership with our school. The school is the heart of the estate. If we think we must do it by ourselves, we will struggle. We need to find partners in the Gospel and partners in social action. I would say that our school is a significant partner to look to.

In Brixton, in Angell Town, we have been blessed by a lay body of peace and reconciliation, which has moved into the community and works with us with regard to

some of the challenges we find with our young people and also works with us on mentoring. That charity is called CHIPS. We also work with the Church Urban Fund through Together Southwark so that we can put on school meals for young people during the holidays. There are many associations, some of which I chair, in the public square that we can find partnership with to be able to undertake this really important work. For some people, looking out it may seem daunting, but if we find ways to walk with others to be able to share the Gospel and to bring change and transformation to these communities, I urge us to work collaboratively with local organisations, with our council and with other church communities, and especially with our local schools. Thank you, Synod.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order.

The Chair: Point of order, loud and clear.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Using this new-fangled method from my friend over there, a motion for closure on Item 15.

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

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

The Chair: I am going to call on the Bishop of Burnley to respond to the debate. Thank

you for all the contributions and all those maiden speeches. The Archbishop of York has suggested that after Bishop Philip we keep a time of silence before we vote so that we can pray through some of what we have been hearing.

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North): I am incredibly grateful to you all for the quality of this debate. We have heard contributions that have been powerful and first hand and incredibly raw at times. It seems banal to try to sum up the journey we have been on over the last hour. I want to start with Emily McDonald taking us back to the fabulous Crossroads mission that we had in Sheffield, because what I remember of being on those estates was having the most massive laugh. We just had the most fabulous weekend. There is a real joy to estates ministry. Thanks to Kate Wharton and Martin Gainsborough for reminding us of the tremendous joy in this ministry.

On the subject of joy, how lovely to hear from Heather Black about the church returning to the Brambles Farm Estate. That is true also of Mereside and Grange Park. We are coming back as the Church of England to our estates with a message of hope and good news.

Just some themes. We reflected on the need to hear the voices of the unheard. I was struck by David Tolhurst and his story of children taking over the church, an example of the imagination needed to hear voices that we often ignore, a point powerfully hammered home by the Bishop of London. How do we hear the voices of others here in this place, in this Synod? And Jacqueline Stamper: how are the voices of deprived communities

being heard when we spend and commit resource such as LICF? Responding to that will take sacrifice and change.

We have reflected on success and how we measure success in estates. Too many clergy feel beaten up by a Church that measures success in very simplistic terms. We need some real work, I think, in that area. Rosemarie Mallett has talked to us about partnership. We have 400 Church of England schools serving on our estates - 400 - that is a wonderful good news statistic, and of course ecumenical partners, and we have written to them recently to invite them to share with us in this work.

We have come up again and again with the theme of leadership and the crucial importance of raising up local leaders and the need to take risks in doing that. My colleague, the Bishop of Lancaster, talks about the need for us to be like Hilda spotting the Caedmons who can sing the Gospel in a language that people can understand. And Mark Murthen with his powerful reminder of estates as the ideal training ground for all leaders.

There are other important issues that have been raised. Why just estates? We heard Emily McDonald talking about Doncaster. I think this work is relevant to all areas of deprivation because of its central claim, which is the need to start with the poor, the marginalised and those pushed to the edges. We heard of the way we measure an estates parish as one with 500 or more social housing units, which includes the majority

of urban parishes. Of course, there is an important initiative being led by William Nye on coastal communities and the particular challenges faced there.

We have been reminded by Peter Rouch of the need to engage in the public square and not be afraid to speak the language of justice. Of course, we need to be there to do that. The Church is only heard today when it speaks from direct experience. I am hugely grateful for the hard realism of people like Christopher Pye reminding us of issues around finances and leadership. "Is there time?" he asks, "We need help".

There was Izzy McDonald-Booth's incredibly powerful story. Perhaps that is what I will be left with today, that child saying to us, "Please don't leave us". I think we need to hear that child speaking to us as a Synod today, "Please don't leave us". There perhaps is the challenge coming from the voice of a child.

As we come to vote, I would plead with you one last time to be honest and transparent. I would remind you of the powerful speech by the Archbishop of Canterbury. All too often we have said yes with our lips to a bias to the poor but have then failed to match rhetoric with policy. If really deep down we are content to be a Church that is middle-class, comfortable and filled with people like us, then fine: let us just be honest about that and vote down this motion, and we will all know where we stand. However, if we really want to be a Church which proclaims good news not to, not for but with the poor, that will require sacrifice: the letting go of power and the redistribution of resource.

There are deep implications for all of us in being a church with the poor. Only vote yes if you are ready to meet that challenge with which there will be associated personal cost. With that crucial rider, I invite you to reflect on how you intend to vote. I am grateful to the Archbishop of York for suggesting we take 30 seconds to pray on that.

The Chair: I now put Item 15 to the vote.

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

The Chair: Thank you for that courage. That brings to a conclusion the business for today. We now move to worship which will be led by the Revd Graham Hunter.

Revd Graham Hunter led the Synod in an act of worship.

Full Synod: Fourth Day Saturday 23 February 2019

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 9.30 am.

The Chair: Good morning, Synod. I am delighted that the Community of St Anselm, which has been providing our praying presence, is leading our morning worship today.

WORSHIP

The Community of St Anselm led the Synod in an act of worship.

The Chair: Thank you very much to the St Anselm Community. Members of Synod, perhaps it would be nice for us to express our appreciation to them for their worship this morning.

ITEM 16

CENTURIES OF MARGINALISATION, VISIONS OF HOPE: MISSION AND MINISTRY AMONG GYPSY, ROMA AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITIES (GS 2123)

The Chair: Now we come to an important debate entitled *Centuries of Marginalisation, Visions of Hope*. Item 16 is a presentation and I call upon the Bishop of Chelmsford to introduce himself and the speakers who are going to present to us.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Sisters and brothers, it is a great joy to be presenting this item. Before I ask Elizabeth Henry to introduce our three guests who are going to present to us for the next 15 minutes, I want to take this opportunity of also welcoming - and I hope the Synod will give them a very warm welcome - Roma, Gypsy and Traveller Christians who are here in the gallery with us this morning. Thank you so much. We hope and believe our debate this morning will strengthen our solidarity as the one people of God, the Church of Jesus Christ. Elizabeth, do come and introduce our guests.

Dr Elizabeth Henry: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here. It is good to see the chamber almost full. I would like to introduce our three guests this morning who will be doing the majority of the presentation: Revd Martin Burrell, Professor Thomas Acton and Janie Codona, who is just completing her PhD now and is a member of the Traveller community.

Mrs Janie Codona: Good morning, everyone. As you know, my name is Janie Codona. I am a member of the English Gypsy community and I am here today to speak very shortly - I only have three minutes-- about discrimination: discrimination living within the Gypsy Traveller community.

I was brought up living on the side of the road and spent my life travelling, my dad buying various bits of land to try to get a place for us to stop. I only went to school for six months,

so I went in at five and I left before I was six, but I did learn to read and write. It was aged five I first experienced discrimination when a gorgor man, a member of the settled community, shouted at me, "Dirty Gypsy, get off my strawberry row", when I was picking strawberries. Ever since then, as part of my family or since I have been married or as a member of the community as a whole, I have seen, experienced or been part of being a victim of discrimination. We experience discrimination within the Gypsy and Traveller community every day and we have got so we do not even seem to notice it half the time. We do not judge. We do not demand apologies. We do not say, "Don't treat us that way", because we think, "What is the good; it's only going to happen again the next day?"

However, as time went on, I realised that if we did not stand up as a community and start saying, "Enough is enough", it would never end, so I got involved in activism. I got involved in helping children get an education on the side of the road, through my husband, when we bought land and tried to get permission. When you are living within the Gypsy and Traveller community, discrimination never goes away. While we were trying to get permission with another 26 families, the local community got all their rubbish, brought it and tipped it down at our site at the entrance and left it there. It was like, there was this note, "You're dirty stinking Gypsies; have our rubbish". We had done nothing to nobody. All we were trying to do was get permission to live on a piece of land to make a home. We would go into the town and my daughter-in-law, who was expecting her first child, was chased into a shop by a group of youths who said, "Here's that Gypsy that's in the paper. Let's get her. We don't want another Gypsy in this village".

We have never, ever been free of prejudice and discrimination. Until something is done, until we are seen as part of the community, nothing is going to change. I am starting to challenge more. I brought my children up to challenge and I am bringing my grandchildren up to challenge and I am hoping that these children and grandchildren will go forward and at some point the discrimination will end, because I have seen nothing but discrimination. My family before me, my parents, my grandparents, saw nothing but discrimination. My grandchildren are now seeing discrimination, but I am hoping that they may be the last generation of my family that will see and experience discrimination. They go to school. They are educated.

Many Gypsies and Travellers are now becoming educated, but we are still not being welcomed as part of the bigger community. We are still being seen as the other people, the other group. There is always that connotation that “Gypsy” is a dirty word or it brings a sour taste to the mouth just to mention the word Gypsy or Traveller. Well, I am proud. I am proud to be a Gypsy and Traveller. I am proud of my community. I am proud to be here today to share my little time with you about the experiences that I have had, because if it can make a difference, if some sort of change can happen, if some positivity can come out of this, then I have done a good job here today. Thank you.

Professor Thomas Acton: My name is Thomas Acton. I am Emeritus Professor of Romani studies at the University of Greenwich. I got involved with Gypsies when I was 18 years old running the first Gypsy Council caravan summer school. That made a lifelong impression on me. I am speaking here today really about the diversity of Roma,

Gypsy and Traveller life. Although they are a comparatively young people, the Romani language is only about 1,000 years old. Their history across, first of all, central Asia, then Europe and now the world has led to an enormous variety of cultural fusions, of different ethnic subgroups, of different dialects. What have all Gypsies, Travellers and Roma got in common? Really not much but the experience of anti-Gypsyism.

One of the things about diversity is soon after I first met Janie, I realised that she and her husband Cliff were organising groups of English Christian Gypsies from the Light and Life movement to visit asylum seekers in the detention centres. Some Gypsies said, “We don’t need more Gypsies from abroad”, and, indeed, that was the line of the Blair Government and Jack Straw. They did the opposite. They said, “These are our brothers”. They had a completely different way of life. They were not people who had ever lived in caravans or wanted to live in caravans. Some of our Slovak Roma brethren in the gallery are people who have worked in jobs, who have come to this country looking for jobs in factories or whatever, more like the experience of West Indian immigrants to this country in the 1950s than of local Roma or of Roma from other countries.

That enormous diversity has been breached in modern times partly by the Gospel itself and the great revival of Christian faith among Roma and the growth of Roma-led churches. What we are trying to do in the Churches Network is to build bridges between the Roma-led churches, to which Janie belongs, and Roma Gypsies and Travellers in mainstream churches, because we believe we are all one in Jesus Christ.

If you want to know more, I used to run a whole MA course over two years. I cannot get it all in in three minutes. Come to the fringe meeting. There will be a bookstall and exhibitions and I commend this Report to you. Thank you.

Revd Martin Burrell: I am Martin Burrell, Chairman of the Churches Network for Gypsies, Travellers and Roma. Army chaplains, hospital chaplains and school chaplains have long been a vital part of Anglican ministry. A few dioceses have responded to the needs of the Gypsies, Travellers and Roma of our land by appointing dedicated chaplains. I served the Diocese of St Albans in this way for nine years, working in Luton with the Travellers and the growing Romanian Roma community. We are aware of only two such chaplains in the Church of England now.

As we have heard, the need is colossal and growing and covers everything from Travellers desperately searching for somewhere legal to stop to Roma anxious about Brexit. Our vocation as the national Church is to be there not just for the people who look, dress and speak like us, but for every soul in the land. In sending chaplains out to the very edge of society, we follow the pattern of Jesus, whose priority was always those in the greatest need. In appointing chaplains to the Gypsies, Travellers and Roma, we follow the Gospel mandate to bring the love of God to those whom everyone else rejects. When we do the most unpopular thing and stand up for our Gypsies, Travellers and Roma, God pours out His blessing on our churches and they become more fully the Church of Jesus Christ. As Isaiah put it, when we provide the poor with shelter and do

not turn away from our own flesh and blood, the Lord will be our rear guard and when we call on God, he will say, "Here I am".

Bishops, we call on you to search out those in ministry who have a heart for these historically marginalised and oppressed communities and to appoint them to serve as diocesan chaplains, with a clear mandate to build bridges between our Travellers, our parishes and our statutory agencies. These chaplains will be the go-betweeners, the reconcilers and the listening ears, who will be on the front line of building peace and advancing the Kingdom of God in our divided and troubled land. It has been said you can measure the health of the society by the way it treats its Gypsies. Let the measure of the Church of England be just that. Thank you.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Just to conclude the presentation, we thought that it be really wrong of us to have a debate of this sort without actually hearing from Roma, Gypsy and Traveller people and those who minister with them. We wished we could have had more than the 15 minutes that we have had, but I hope that gives you an insight into the rich diversity of this culture and its traditions, its strong Christian faith but also, as we will come on to in the debate in a moment, the many ways in which they are marginalised and excluded.

Perhaps we could show our appreciation to our three guests for being with us. And, as was mentioned, if you want to find out more about Roma, Gypsy and Traveller Christian culture and community, there is a fringe meeting in room 3 at 1 pm, which will not be

somebody giving you a talk; it will be a chance to experience and explore that Christian heritage.

The Chair: Thank you very much. That concludes Item 16. Now we move on to Item 17 and I am going to ask the Bishop of Chelmsford to move that motion. You have up to ten minutes.

ITEM 17

Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Synod, thank you. What a happy and useful coincidence, although it was not mentioned in the prayers, that this debate is taking place on the Feast of St Polycarp. Polycarp was one of the first and great Christian martyrs and his name means “much fruit”. Arrested in the year 155, during one of the great persecutions of the Church, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was given an opportunity to renounce his faith and save his life. He was an old, old man. He chose not to. He said to his persecutors, who invited him to curse Christ and save his life, “I have served Him well for 86 years and He has done me no wrong. How can I blaspheme the King who has saved me?” For this he was burnt at the stake and died with the praise of God upon his lips. If you want some spiritual reading for later today, read the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp.

Here is one of the questions this debate raises: how do we blaspheme Christ today? Where do we deny him? What are the lines we dare not cross, for to do so would be to deny the very faith we have received and which we have been entrusted to share? So much of this Synod is about the faith that we have been entrusted to share. Well, of course, there are several answers, but chief among them must be this: that humanity, in all its rich and glorious diversity, is made in the image of God, and that, in Christ, we witness and experience God's radical hospitality, and the boundaries that seemed to matter so much in the life we had before Christ are reconfigured so that in Him there is no Jew nor Greek, no slave nor free, no Scottish, Irish, Welsh or English, no, if you are staying until the end of the Synod - no, not even this afternoon - Welsh or English. Where are you the Bishop of Willesden? Where are you the Bishop of Burnley? No, not even Spurs or Arsenal. not leave or remain, not Mackem or Tackem, not Roma, not gypsy, not traveller. All are one in Jesus Christ. This is the great radical proclamation of who we have become because of what God has done for us.

Or remembering a more recent hero of the Christian faith, someone who shaped my own evangelistic ministry, Michael Green, it was him, I think, who used to say, "Christ is either Lord of all or he is not Lord at all". This is why all forms of racism are so evil. They are not just a denial of our common humanity. They are an affront to God. They say, by their dividing of humanity into those who are permitted its full dignity and those who are not, that some are less than human. Do not make the liberal error of thinking that equality between the tribes and tongues and peoples and nations of the world is self-evidently correct. It is not. Racism continues to thrive as it has always done and gains a purchase

in the soul whenever we allow ourselves to consider ourselves more important, and therefore more human, than others.

Although the Church still has a long way to go, it is the Christian doctrine of humanity, made in God's image and redeemed in Christ, that has been at the forefront of movements across the world to enable us to rise to our very best and see in each other, both friend and stranger, the face of Jesus Christ.

Dear friends, yes, there is more to do, but I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute first to Elizabeth Henry and others working with her on CMEAC and the work of the Churches Network for Gypsies, Traveller and Roma people, many of whom are represented here today, for keeping this issue before us. We have already heard very movingly from Christian Roma, Gypsy and Traveller people about the abuse and racism they experience. We are alerted by our papers to what Trevor Phillips has so strikingly described as the "last acceptable form of racism". What that means is this: that if one of us in any other situation today or later was to use racist language about some other person or group, it is very likely in today's society that we would, and rightly so, immediately be called out but, tragically and perversely, racism against Travellers and Roma and Gypsies is still tolerated.

I dare not give you examples of some of the things I have heard recently as I have asked people in preparation for this debate what they think about this. The comments have been too distressing and too poisonous to repeat. The Equality and Human Rights

Commission has found that discrimination and racism toward Gypsies and Travellers is common, frequently overt and - and this is the tragedy - seen as justified. The police have said that prejudice against Gypsies and Travellers is endemic in our society and often fuelled by stereotypes in the media. A report by Anglia Ruskin University found that nine out of every ten Gypsy and Traveller children had experienced racial abuse. Gypsies, Roma and Travellers who are teachers, professors and police officers tell us how they have faced discrimination from colleagues simply for declaring their ethnicity. In a study by the Traveller movement itself, 70% of respondents reported that they had experienced discrimination in education. And, sorrowfully, we, the Church of God, are no exception. There are examples in GS 2123 of the racist hostility and exclusion meted out by the churches and by church people.

Friends, this must change and this debate and this motion is a small way of beginning to make that change. This motion may be modest in its scope, but it signals a change of heart and a new direction in our determination to combat racism in all its manifestations, and to be clear that all people are made in the image of God and that Gypsy, Traveller and Roma people deserve particular support, hence the motion's call to the leadership of the Church to speak on these issues, and for every diocese to think about appointing a chaplain. In quite a few this is already happening and some wonderful work is taking place. I applaud what we have already heard about that and the people working in chaplaincy in the gallery.

We must also face the housing issue and the need for provision of sites for nomadic Gypsy and traveller people. The number of authorized sites has decreased in recent years. We have an unsustainable and unjust situation where people are being evicted from unauthorized encampments without any authorized alternative being available. It is probably this more than any other issue that fuels hostility between Travellers and settled communities, but it is our responsibility to put this right, and the Church could play its part in supporting a commission to look into this and to help find new sites.

Let me just give you one statistic. The EHRC estimates that as little as one square mile of land - one square mile - could meet the entire needs of Travellers in this country needing authorized places to stay. Sisters and brothers, let us not let fear and ignorance win the day. I very happily propose this motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Item 17 is now open for debate.

Revd Canon Simon Fisher (Liverpool): I have heard two conversations this week. First, at the Liverpool pre-Synod meeting on Sunday, when we came to this item, the Bishop of Liverpool, who I do not think is in his place (perhaps fortunately) said, “Do we have many of these people in our diocese?” Not perhaps a question that reflected terribly well on him, but then, to our shame, none of the rest of us knew the answer to the question, “Do we have many of these people in our diocese?”

Then on Tuesday I met with Patrick, a member of my congregation. He is from the Czech Republic. He is discerning a vocation to the priesthood. That was what we were talking about. What I did not know before Tuesday was that Patrick himself is a Gypsy. I did not know about his grandfather, who had been in a concentration camp, and I did not know about the abuse that Patrick himself had suffered because of his race.

Patrick made two comments about this motion. First, in part (a) he said that we should give ourselves some credit because - and I know this is not everyone's experience and perhaps he is one of the fortunate ones - he had not experienced in England, or in the Church of England, the hostility that he had experienced in his home country. However, in part (b) he said that our mission and ministry as a Church of England among these communities is done very badly, and he knew, as we know, why we do it badly: because, even with the best will in the world, we are bad at stepping outside our own cultural comfort zone and we need some cultural translation here about how communities work and families work and how time and place and hierarchy are valued. We are bad at that kind of thing when it is not something familiar to us.

Patrick spoke movingly about his desire to spend at least part of his ministry among his own people. I said he was in luck because the Bishop of Chelmsford wanted us to give him a job doing just that. I asked him the question that the Bishop of Liverpool had asked: "Do we have many of these people in our diocese?" The Bishop did not know and I did not know. Patrick, of course, did know. He knew that we do have many of these people in our diocese. He knew where they lived. He knew about the diversity of their different

backgrounds and nationalities and experiences. He knew where the Church was serving them well and where, more frequently, where the Church was serving them badly. I welcome the call for chaplaincy and I hope not simply as a pastoral sticking plaster, but as an opportunity to find the Patricks in every diocese, the Christians from these communities and with deep links in these communities, so that we may learn to do this important work in a way that will be effective. I welcome this motion and hope we will pass it. Thank you.

The Chair: After Jane Charman, I am going to ask Sam Margrave to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name.

Revd Canon Jane Charman (Salisbury): You may think of the Diocese of Salisbury as not very ethnically diverse. In fact, we have a significant minority ethnic population; our Gypsy, Roma and Traveller population. We are the other diocese of the two dioceses with a chaplain to Gypsies, Roma and Travellers, a chaplain to itinerant van-dwellers, as it was called, was first appointed by the then Bishop of Salisbury in the 19th century, and his successor, Revd Jonathan Herbert, was one of the authors of the paper that is before you. I think we may also be one of only one dioceses to have ordained a priest from the Gypsy community.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit a traveller site near Salisbury and also to have conversations with some Romany Gypsies from our diocese and what I want to say to you is what they said to me. What do we mean when we talk about “the last acceptable

form of racism”? We like to think of racism as something practised by other people, unpleasant people, people we disapprove of, but racism against Gypsies and Travellers is practised by nice people, respectable people, religious people, people like us. That is what emboldens the media to write about them in the way they often do.

The *Daily Mail* covered this debate under the headline “Forgive those who trespass”, with four - yes, four - pictures of heaps of rubbish. The take home message was plain, “Gypsies and travellers = dirty trespassers”. Days later, on the front page of *The Telegraph* we read that ministers want to make trespass a criminal offence, a move targeted at Travellers, who, lacking suitable sites, pull up on what used to be common land but is now privately owned. Then there were the comments. Do not look at what is below the line in online articles unless you have a strong stomach. I scrolled down through several dozen, and they made me feel both sick and sad.

Make no mistake, Gypsies and Travellers fear the orchestrated nature, the unspoken purposefulness, the cruel intention underlying all of this. 2,897 is a figure they have by heart. That is the number of Gypsies who perished in Auschwitz on the so-called Night of the Gypsies, 2 August 1944, and that is only part of a much larger statistic. We think as many as half a million people perished in the Romany Holocaust. Travellers understand the terrifying trajectory of racism, in which “You shall not live among us on equal terms” becomes “You shall not live among us” becomes “You shall not live”.

Sometimes, our attitude towards Gypsies and Travellers springs from far more benign but no less misguided motives. Would it not be better if they moved into permanent dwellings and enjoyed the benefits of settled life, healthcare, education? I have heard what some of them have to say about that: “Bricks and mortar are no good for us, we need the two wheels. We need the two wheels”. A young woman who tried to live in a fixed dwelling described to me the negative impact that had had on her mental health. She returned after two years to live on the site where the rest of her family were.

Making space for Gypsies and Travellers is typically presented as a complex and intractable problem, and people are astonished to learn that all of them could be accommodated on as little as one square mile of land. What is lacking is not the means but the will. And here the role of chaplains is vital. If only more chaplains could get to know these communities, earn their trust, understand their way of life and advocate for their needs, not instead of but alongside them. Many Gypsies and Travellers are people of faith, so we have a double duty to them, not just as fellow citizens but as fellow Christians. In this 75th anniversary year of the Night of the Gypsies, I urge us to wholeheartedly support this motion.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I cannot send you to the Falkland Islands for that, but I am happy to take the challenge of three minutes. Dietrich Bonhoeffer argues that the church is a church only when it exists for others, not dominating but helping and serving and I

welcome the Church of England reaching out and standing against racism, seeking to offer love to those who are wrongly condemned by society.

Coming from Coventry and Warwickshire and having been a councillor, I also know too well the divisions within communities, the upset and divisiveness of this issue. I have seen Traveller incursions, I have seen damage be caused and I have seen some of the mess potentially left behind. I have seen a cost for communities. I have seen the cost for local authorities of hundreds of thousands of pounds a year. But, more importantly, I have seen the harm and hurt caused to the Traveller community. Politicians and police have failed to find solutions, blaming each other and not taking responsibility. The inaction of authorities, I believe, has led to threats and violence in my own community and I really worry about how matters have escalated.

The Five Marks of Mission claim we, as a Church, must seek to transform unjust structures in society, and a lack of land for Travellers to stop on, to call home, is an injustice. That is why I am calling for this amendment, for us to look outwardly. For us to not duplicate the role of local councils and of national governments, but to work with them to provide solutions using our vast resources, to foster unity, reconciliation, hope and love. We have relationships that we can bring to bear and my amendment calls for action, action from ourselves and action from others.

We were passionate to find space for the homeless. Let us find the same passion to speak for those whose voice is often ignored in society to ensure they are also given

equal worth. I would ask you support this amendment and I move the amendment standing in my name. I end by saying that St Thomas Aquinas said that fear is such a powerful emotion for humans that when we allow it to take over, it drives compassion right out of our hearts. This amendment is intended to provide compassion in a practical way and I ask that we do this using our resources.

The Chair: Thank you. The Bishop of Chelmsford to respond.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Thank you, Sam. I entirely understand, particularly having now heard you speak, that it is your intention that this amendment is supportive and helpful. However, as currently worded, I cannot accept it, and the reason I cannot accept it is simply because of one phrase “to prevent crime and disorder”, because that one phrase plays into the hands of all the worst stereotypes which fuel misunderstanding and prejudice. I am not one of those Bishops that spends their nights reading standing orders and fully understanding how these things work, but I am simply wondering whether you would be prepared to amend your amendment because I just think that phrase is a hostage to fortune and speaks against all the things that I think you and I are both wanting to achieve.

I think I am asking, and perhaps with the Chair’s permission, if it was not agreed to speak again, to ask whether you could simply amend your amendment so it concludes at “across England”.

The Chair: Do you wish to do that?

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I wish to amend the amendment and also, if possible, add that we speak to the Traveller community because it is very important that we represent

The Chair: Sam, we need to be clear.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I agree.

The Chair: You agree.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I agree.

The Chair: That has my support. Can we just be clear what we are removing?

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): I think what I am suggesting is that if the amendment finished with “make travelling stopping points available across England”, you could include “to develop community cohesion” then the amendment would be entirely supportive.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I so agree.

The Chair: Thank you. That has my support, so it is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon James Allison (Leeds): I am in the unusual position of having been lobbied about this debate by somebody in my congregation who got excited about it because she is doing some work on the experience of children in schools. I want to support this because I think talking to the authorities is one of the things that will make the experience of Roma children in schools better, and that does need to be done through them. I do have a quote from her that she told me I should say, which is that the history of Roma people has been legislation about them, not with them, and so that is one of the reasons why I stand to support your amendment.

Whilst I am here, I would like to just read you a story. This is a story of one of the children that my friend has been working with and I think it will illustrate settled Roma people and their experience of authorities and why they do not always access the things that they need and one of the ways in which we might be able to help them.

This is about Lydia. Imagine Lydia, she is a small girl and her family moved from Slovakia to Bradford in 2017. In their former country they lived in a Roma settlement on the outskirts of a village surrounded by a wall and that was their experience of those in authority and that is why they have problems. The family came to England to find employment and a better life. Lydia lives in a three-bedroom terraced house in Bradford

with her parents, nine brothers and sisters, her sister's husband and their baby. Her father has been working for the landlord, paying for the rent by doing jobs and Lydia's family rely on the school foodbank to provide essential supplies and the school have provided baby equipment, sheets, towels and bedding for the family.

The sad thing is that Lydia's family would be entitled to benefits now that they have lived in the country for two years, but, partly because of her parents' illiteracy, lack of English and their fears of the authorities, they have not claimed any help. And because of this the school does not receive pupil premium either - money for Lydia - and must find money to pay for bilingual support from other places. Lydia's teachers really care about her and her family and provide as much of the food and equipment they can themselves. They have approached Bradford New Communities to ask for support but because of austerity that has been removed. There is only emergency support available.

Now, what I see in your amendment is that that conversation which is essentially about land and provision of places and all those kinds of things that should happen, could also include some discussion about the support that is given to Roma children in schools as well. We talk to people in high places in education, we also have schools as well ourselves, and to make the world a better place for Lydia and her family I think it is really important. In doing what we do and in voting for this amendment, let us make the conversation we have with those in authority, yes, practical about places, but also about support for children in schools from the Roma community particularly.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): It was Archbishop Temple in his classic readings in John's Gospel, who drew my attention to that famous verse, "In my father's house there many rooms". He said the words in the Greek for "rooms", *domatio* I think it is, and it could be translated "stopping places", as in a caravan, and it is such a powerful image of those on a journey.

I want to speak in favour of providing homes for the homeless - that would be relevant from the previous debate - land for those who need land, and, even better, stopping points for those on a journey, those travelling. We are people of the Book, and we know how important land was for the people in the Book. Deep seated, emotional, a visceral commitment to land and all it represented for security, for a sense of belonging, for inheritance. It was both a present need but a sign and symbol of the future, of future security.

I am delighted to hear of a revival amongst Roma and Traveller people. I am hearing news from France, I have not got the details yet, but we have heard allusion to Roma-led churches, I am delighted to hear that because they need not only land but they need the hope of the Gospel, which speaks of an eternal country, a heavenly country, an eternal home. That is why the giving of land, the making of stopping points is such a good thing and such a powerful thing to do for such people. The Church is in a unique position, and it has been in previous generations, to be find land for almshouses land for sheltered accommodation or affordable housing. Surely, in a culture which still is plagued by

NIMBYism - Not In My Back Yard - the Church can find ways to make land available to make stopping points available where they are necessary.

The lovely translation from Psalm 16:5 and 6 in normal translations, “Lord you have assigned me my portion and my cup, you have made my lot secure, the boundary lines have fallen for me in pleasant places, surely I have a delightful inheritance”, says it all, present hope in lands, in boundary posts, and an inheritance for the future. In the Good News Bible, with a sublime disregard for the rules of translation, it goes like this: “You, Lord, are all I have and you have given me all I need; my future is in your hands”. I commend this amendment and its appeal for stopping points and in the main motion, land.

The Chair: Members of Synod I would like to vote on this amendment. I would like to close debate on it. Does that have your consent?

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

ITEM 49

The Chair: So, we move to a vote on Item 49, as amended, so we are removing the words “to prevent crime and disorder and”.

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

The Chair: So now we resume debate on Item 17.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ms Jay Greene (Winchester): When I lived in Whiteparish in Salisbury Diocese, where my partner Marion was the vicar, and this predates, I think, the chaplain that Jane Charman talked about, early one morning there was a knock on the door, and there was a distraught woman standing there. Her grandson had been rushed to the Bristol Royal Infirmary, gravely ill, and her request was simple: would Marion pray for him as God would hear her.

Those words, spoken by a member of the fairground community, a Gypsy community in Whiteparish, chill me to this day. How had that woman been made to feel so inferior that she felt that God would not hear her words? And I think that speaks to something that everybody has been hearing today. In the village, Marion became the sort of family chaplain to those fairground people, where they have winter quarters, and began to do their funerals and their weddings, and, most memorably, a group baptism.

The family organised this. More than 200 people gathered together in a hotel ballroom just off the M5 because that is where you can gather people and you can put your caravans. We were there and we had brought church to share with them. We brought

the Paschal candle and its heavy stand, we brought robes, we brought other bits and pieces and they brought a most wonderful bowl, which was the font, and five children were baptized.

What we did not take were service books. Marion adapted the liturgy, so that all the attendant people needed to say was “we do” or “we will”. People who cannot read easily do not need to have their closeness to God spoiled by having to pretend they are following the words on the page. I am telling you this story to say that actually opportunities to serve people, to serve Gypsies, Romas, Irish Travellers, are there for us all if we only look for them. We certainly do need social action, yes we do, and we need to be brave enough to go along to our parish councils and district councils and stand up when there is discrimination. But I think look out, be alert, for the opportunities you have to serve as well. I thoroughly recommend this Report to you.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): I welcome this opportunity; it is an overdue discussion. I live in the north of Chelmsford Diocese, close to the A12, and I think it is helpful to explain a little bit about the interface of community reaction. Being near to the A12, we found one day one of our two churches, the one nearest the A12, the car park completely full with Travellers. As Chair of Fabric I was rung up, “What are you going to do about it?” “I do not know, I will first of all check on the EIG, the Ecclesiastical Insurance website for advice”. There was not any. I looked on the diocesan advice and I could not find any, so I spoke to someone in EIG, they said, “Ring the police”. I think others had too. Police advice was, “Don’t go there, let us deal with it”.

In the meantime, it meant no services. It was a Friday of a bank holiday. The church was inaccessible because of its configuration; everyone goes through the car park. People wanting to visit their relatives or their families buried in the churchyard could not. There was a lot of upset and there was fear because - I do not look at these statistics - there is a link with a rise in petty crime. I do not know the exact figures but there is a correlation. The police came back and said, "These are travellers, they are travelling, they are not staying and they will bag up. You have got a good group". They know them quite well apparently, which we, of course, do not.

As they said, they did leave, but they left on the Saturday about 3 o'clock, and we had quite a job to clear up. Well, it did not matter clearing up the black bags, but there was the issue of excrement and my husband and I and various others got on our gloves and the Jeyes Fluid because the smell was quite interesting, but they had not done too much damage. "They might be back", said the police, and so we had to put up a temporary bollard and get retrospective faculty and all that kerfuffle.

They then moved around the area to our second church, more in the country. They went round the school, they moved on to private land, which is harder, and eventually they left that too. But that was harder because of all the broken glass and, being a very hot summer, it set fire to the field, and two tenders had to come out. There was a lot of bad feeling, particularly aimed at the two churches because both churches have an outside tap.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are pressed for time, so I am not going to be able to call all those who still want to speak.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Mr Chair, you know I am a GP and therefore nosy by nature, so it is always wonderful to visit people in their different contexts, great mansions - rare in Durham I know - the odd flat, sometimes prisoner cells and student accommodation, sometimes quite similar.

But visiting communities of Travellers has always had that extra value. Our welcome as a GP was often warm and we observed the pride that such folk have in their families and homes. But we knew they might not be there too long because of the nature of their travelling. How to make sure they had their childhood immunisations up to date, their smear tests, blood pressures and so on? The rigidity and systemisation of the NHS does not help people who choose to live in a different way than we think they should live.

Three quick points. First of all, about access. The excellent paper from Elizabeth, GS 2123 at the top of page 3, paragraph 10, tells us problems about GP receptionists. Now, I do not want your comment on GP receptionists because here they are under huge pressure, not least because we do not get now in the practices the sorts of payments we used to get for short-term visitors - short term up to three months. There is no fee and

therefore there is so much pressure on them to deliver a service. They do have a lack of awareness, very often, of the needs and the particular customs, as the paper helpfully points to - access.

Next is flexibility. There was a paper last year - I am sure you will read this paper, it is a journal, the *European Journal of Oncology* in 2018, a paper from Berlin, Smith and Newton. They highlighted one key factor, which was about understanding, about the understanding that these folk from Travelling communities, had about health and about how the system could engage with them. Cancer services were often accessed late; the information was not there for them. The good news was once they were in the system, the paper noted that Gypsies and Travellers generally do not find discrimination against them. That was encouraging, but I suspect there were so many blocks, as we have already heard about - movement, access to appointments and so on - that meant that by the time they came to get into the system, the cancer had moved on. That is some of those terrible statistics, particularly about life expectancy.

Thirdly, illness, understanding of illness. Read the *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, you will see it referred to at the back.

The Chair: Thank you. Sorry about that but we are pressed for time. I am going to take two more speeches and then I am going to ask to move to close the debate.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): As well as commending everyone to vote for this motion I would like to speak particularly for the second paragraph about requesting every diocese to appoint a chaplain to Gypsies, Travellers and Romas. In Bath and Wells we have appointed such a chaplain. He prefers to call himself the Chaplain to Nomads. There is something about being a “chaplain to”, a “chaplain with” or a “chaplain among”, rather than being a chaplain to. He seeks to minister alongside them and among them.

Thomas Seville spoke very passionately in the earlier debate about the different dialects needed, saying that words matter. Martin’s role in our diocese is to help us to understand and to speak in the right dialect and in the right way. And, even more importantly, rather than speaking to listen to the needs of others.

I remember very clearly the very first wedding that I took 39 years ago. It was a wedding for a Gypsy family. It was rich, it was a wonderful wedding. I wish there had been a chaplain in the diocese to help me. It could have been much better. It could have been richer in all sorts of ways. Why do we need chaplains? They are there to help us as a Church, most importantly, understand the needs that have been set out and to help our communities understand those really deep needs of Romany, Gypsy and traveller communities.

What does a chaplain do? In our diocese, Martin has a practical, a pastoral and an evangelistic role. He engages with the communities in the diocese. He has got ideas for

building an outreach and a resource centre for Travellers. He is helping to set up alpha groups amongst Roma and also canal communities. More seriously, he brings to us what is going on worldwide. He has just returned from a barn-building project in Romania. He spent time in the Romany Gypsy ghettos. And, even more seriously, he is helping to set up, with others, safe houses in Albania for Roma children who are risk of being trafficked and being victims of organ harvesting. These are vulnerable people. They need our care.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Synod, for the past ten years it has been my privilege to name Martin, who we met earlier, as a friend and colleague. His work has seen much fruit for the Gospel and has resulted in a congregation and a flourishing and much needed welfare work. The arrival of several thousand Roma in Luton since 2007 has been considerably eased by the work of the Luton Roma Trust. However, let me be honest, that work has not been easy. As a community mediator in Luton and as deanery lay chair, I can testify to the challenges that work has experienced.

The announcement of this item, as we have heard, in the *Daily Mail* graphically demonstrated every possible stereotype our motion calls us to challenge. But, let us be honest and count the cost as we vote for this motion, as I hope we will. As a mediator who seeks to help communities negotiate difficult conversations, we cannot let these stereotypes prevail, yet, at the same time as challenging, we must take people's fears seriously and help them to move past that fear. At the heart, I am convinced that the key is to finally dispel fear and hate and to move to relationship.

If our motion is to lead to progress for the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, it must be accompanied by process. A well-intentioned PCC resolving to do something will be commendable but will need accompaniment as it walks the journey navigating the outpouring of hate it will encounter. I considered an amendment to that end, but I did not want to dilute our motion. I will be voting in favour and encourage you to, but let us also ask the Churches Network, that have presented us with this excellent paper, to provide their distilled wisdom for us as we take this forward.

The Chair: Members of Synod, I would like to close debate on this item. There is no one standing, so I can. I am going to ask the Bishop to respond to that debate. He has up to five minutes.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Sisters and brothers, thank you so much for what has been a very moving and powerful debate in what has been a moving and powerful Synod.

First of all, could I thank James Allison. Yes, there cannot be legislation about people without them. Clearly, the work that we have begun needs to carry on working with and alongside, and the Bishop of Bath & Wells made the same point about “chaplaincy with” not “chaplaincy to”. I want to thank Sam Margrave for his amendment, which I think has now strengthened what we are going to do, and I am glad we cleared up a little bit of local

difficulty which would have unwittingly played into the very hands of those who continue to seek to denigrate the people we are concerned with here.

Where is Mary? Dear Mary, a fellow disciple in the great Diocese of Chelmsford. I am afraid the limits of time on speeches do not let you tell a good story, so let me finish it for you because I know the story. There were great problems in the parish where Mary serves where the church was being vilified for the support it was trying to give to people, and it was Mary and her husband who left the outside tap on when everyone else was pleading for it to be turned off. I think that gives us an image of how we, as a Church, really do need to be in the frontline of saying, "We must do something. We must make land and provision available. We must keep the tap turned on".

Simon Fisher opened the debate with a great question: do we have these people in our diocese? Yes, of course we do. Of course we do. What we must now do is work very hard to make this last so-called "acceptable racism" completely unacceptable. We must work to make provision of land. Where is my other fellow disciple in Chelmsford, David? If you look on my bookshelves, there are two books, apart from the scriptures, which are very well-thumbed. One is *Revelations of Divine Love*, Julian of Norwich; the other is William Temple's *Readings in St John's Gospel*, which I turn to again and again. I just wished I had remembered that passage for my speech, because it is something I often quote in sermons: "In my Father's house, there are many caravans". It is a wonderful, wonderful image for all of us.

Finally, Jane Charman, I thought your speech was incredibly moving and powerful and I think all of us will want to read that again. She said Travellers understand the terrifying trajectory of racism. “You cannot live among us” soon becomes “You cannot live”. It was very powerful and very sobering to receive that speech and to remember where this can lead if we do not make a stand for those things which are most dear to us about the very Gospel itself and what it means to be human.

Peter Adams, the last speaker, thank you for reminding us just how tough it is, but I hope that by passing this motion we will say that we are up for the challenge.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order: given the importance of this issue beyond this House and its importance to the Roma community, will you order a counted vote of the whole Synod?

The Chair: For a count of the whole Synod, we need 25 people standing to do that. There are so we are going to have a counted vote of the whole Synod. This is a count of the whole Synod. We are voting on Item 17 as amended.

The motion was put and carried, 265 voting in favour, 1 against, with no recorded abstentions.

The Chair: Thank you very much, members of Synod. Please stay in the chamber for our next item, Encouraging Youth Evangelism.

THE CHAIR *Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield)* took the Chair at 11 am.

ITEM 18
PRIVATE MEMBER'S MOTION
ENCOURAGING YOUTH EVANGELISM (GS 2124A AND GS 2124B)

The Chair: Synod, we now move to Item 18 on our agenda, Encouraging Youth Evangelism, for which you will need sight of GS 2124A and GS 2124B. I now invite Canon Mark Russell to speak to and move the item standing in his name. You have up to ten minutes.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): Good morning, Synod. From across the north of England a bunch of bishops landed in Durham and, as the mission began, the Archbishop of York said Jesus was all about “bringing the very life to people”. He said that “evangelism is what the Church is about”. As usual, the Archbishop was spot on. Evangelism is not about saving the Church of England from extinction. It is about something much more important. It is about helping everyone to know that God thinks they are fantastic; that he loves them. Evangelism is about bringing the Gospel in word and action. It is about calling people to respond to that Gospel, to follow Jesus and to nurture new disciples. Evangelism leads to changed lives. Changed lives change lives. Changed lives change communities. Changed communities change the world. Because God is the evangelist and God changes lives and God calls all of us to join him in his mission.

The Church Army's Bradford Centre of Mission is a cluster of youth congregations. I went there and played pool. No matter how many years I have been a youth worker, I still cannot play pool and I still cannot do ten pin bowling, but I asked this kid I was playing with, "What does being a Christian mean to you?" He said, "My life changed from black and white to colour. I saw life through new eyes".

I am grateful to the Business Committee for scheduling this debate. In 14 years on General Synod I can never remember us debating youth evangelism. You may know this is something close to my heart, so thank you to all who signed my Private Member's Motion. You have shown you agree with me that this is critical.

Let us be clear, there are lots of good things happening but, let us also be clear, the situation is bleak. Only 880 parishes have more than 25 under-16s in them. That is only 5% of our churches. That means that 95% have fewer than 25 under-16s and the top 65 of those churches have more under-16s than the bottom 65% put together. We estimate that half of our parishes have no teenagers in them. These figures are shocking, but, Synod, I believe with all my heart that if we own these numbers and are prepared to do something about it, we can turn this around, because this is our priority, not just for the future of the Church but for the growth of the Kingdom in this land.

We need to thank those who continually champion youth evangelism. That is why this motion commends the work of diocesan youth officers - and I know there is at least one in the gallery - and thanks them for working with parishes which do youth work. Let us

be frank, many of these posts have been cut, their budgets have been cut and in every restructure they are usually the first to go. I want to thank our DYO's, and Mary Hawes here at our national Church, for resourcing them.

On the Evangelism Task Group, I help lead the youth stream and I am delighted that we now have sitting beside me Jimmy Dale, our first ever youth evangelism officer, and in Bishop Paul Williams we have our first Bishop for evangelism to and with young people.

When Church Army did some research on young adults and evangelism, we found that what they wanted more than anything else was a safe space to be and ask questions, what my friend Brian McLaren would call a "plausibility shelter". I do not believe it is about a few churches doing a few sexy things well. It is not about 100 churches taking 100 steps. It is about 10,000 churches taking one step. It is only if every church and every deanery decides to make young people's evangelism a priority that we can turn this around.

This motion joins up with yesterday's *Growing Faith* initiative but it goes even further and it asks us how do we reach the thousands and millions of young people who have no connection with the Church at all? There are around 800 youth worker posts in the Church of England. Currently one in ten is in vacancy. My motion encourages the Church to employ more youth workers, not to see them as stepping stones to being a real minister or a vicar but as a vocation in their own right. We know and can prove that churches that hire a youth worker grow faster. Often those youth workers are in places where they can

be afforded. We need to make sure that we put youth workers where the Church cannot afford it, which is why I love what we are doing in Sheffield with the Centenary project. It is using our historical reserves to resource youth workers in places such as Goole, Doncaster and Rotherham, where we have not had youth workers before. The diocese is the employer and we network those youth workers into a learning community.

Of course, safeguarding is critical. Everyone must be trained properly and DBS checked. And, friends, we need to change our clergy training. If youth evangelism is an optional module in theological cemeteries - sorry, seminaries, then, we should not be surprised that clergy see youth ministry as an optional extra when they get into full-time ministry. We need to change how we train.

The final part of my motion encourages the Church to dream of fresh ways to reach young people, which is why I was thrilled that Bishop Sentamu talked about the Missional Youth Church Network that we are launching as Church Army with the Archbishop of York, with a vision to plant 30 youth congregations across the north of England in the next five years. I know we will make it happen.

Synod, let us turn to prayer. Speaking of prayer, I want to welcome my friend Tom Clark. Tom is the youth pastor of Holy Trinity Brompton. He and 20 of his young people spent last night awake praying for this debate that we would take young people and youth evangelism seriously. Would you please thank Tom and his team for doing that?

Someone once said that the floor of Heaven is littered with the vision that God wanted to give his church but leaders did not ask for it. Friends, let us ask for it. Let us find new ways to reach young people with the good news of Jesus Christ. Let us find new ways to be church. Let us find ways to welcome them into our church. Because young people are amazing, they are fantastic, they are passionate, they are visionary, they are idealistic and they want to change the world. The Church of England needs their vision and their energy and their enthusiasm and their disruptiveness. The Church can change young people, yes, but young people can and must change the Church.

Synod, with all my heart I believe this is a moment of opportunity. The records of this Synod for the last 50 years are full of moments when we have recognised a significant issue and have done zilch about it. This is now time to make evangelism with young people central to our life as a Church. We must not drop the ball. We must not lose focus. We must not forget this. This is a *kairos* moment and, friends, let us be frank, the numbers are so bad, it would not take a huge amount to turn it around. This is a long-term vision, rooted in prayer, rooted in conviction - conviction that Jesus Christ does change lives - and rooted in a passion that we want more young people to know the God that loves them and gave His life for them. That requires every one of us - every one of us in this chamber - every one of us from north and south and east and west, from every Church tradition, to come together, pray together, invest our resources together, work together, risk together, witness together, to help more young people find faith in Christ, to change our Church, to change our nation and to change the world. I beg to move the motion standing in my name at Item 18.

The Chair: Synod, I am happy to report that Canon Russell's infectious enthusiasm has meant that we have had a lot of requests to speak. We also have an amendment which we will turn to straightaway. The reason I am giving you the heads up on the numbers of speakers who have put in a request is that after a number of maiden speeches, which we will hear, I am going to reduce the speed limit - I mean speech limit but that too - to three minutes. Some of you may like a little time to be shortening your speeches because we would like to hear from as many people as possible.

ITEM 50

The Chair: First, turning to the amendment which is Item 50 in Order Paper VI, in the name of Mrs Sarah Finch, I call on Mrs Finch to come and speak to and move the amendment standing in her name.

Mrs Sarah Finch (London): Members of Synod, I am taking a risk with this amendment. It might be thought that it is trespassing on the ground of the main motion, but I hope that the three reasons I will give you in a moment will persuade you that in fact it is germane to the main motion.

First, I want to emphasise the importance of the parish, mentioned in the last section, as the place where Christian parents can and should be encouraged to reach their own

young people with the good news of Jesus Christ, and to nurture them as Christian disciples. Secondly, I want to point out that children who have been evangelized and disciplined in a Christian home will readily bring their friends to parish youth groups, where those friends may hear the Gospel, the good news of Jesus Christ, perhaps for the first time.

Thirdly, I want to make a bridge between our debate yesterday on *Growing Faith* and this debate. Youth evangelism should be seen not as a separate enterprise but as one that grows out of the evangelising and nurturing of very young children in the Christian home. We have here the opportunity for some joined-up thinking. I move this amendment.

The Chair: I invite Canon Russell to respond. You have up to two minutes.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): I shall not need that, Madam Chair. I am very grateful to Sarah for calling me during the week to talk to me about this and I am very happy to accept this amendment because it nicely joins this motion with the *Growing Faith* agenda that you accepted so enthusiastically yesterday, so I am very happy to accept this very friendly amendment.

The Chair: The debate on the amendment Item 50 is now open.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Simon Friend (Exeter): Chair, I particularly welcome the opportunity to speak to this amendment because I am a Christian parent. I have four boys, all currently at university. They grew up benefiting from children's and youth work that most churches can only dream of. They had wonderful input from the church from toddler age. They loved New Wine and Soul Survivor. But, despite all this, and our best intentions, at university none of them is now interested in joining a church. During the Christmas holidays, we had the most fascinating and interesting family discussion about faith that I think we have ever had.

It became clear in our discussion that one of the reasons they do not currently attend church is due to a lack of a clear message of inclusion of LGBTI+ people. It is a state that they simply cannot comprehend and so they see church as somewhat irrelevant, out of touch and out of step. For my boys, none of whom, as far as I know, identify as LGBT, and if they did I would still love them wholly, unconditionally - what father would not - I have noticed that their LGBTI+ friends are like any friends. This is no question of "them and us", and so they simply cannot comprehend why a church would choose to differentiate in some way.

When talking about evangelism to young people, we cannot ignore this issue. The longer we take to come to a view on the LGBTI+ issue, the more we will alienate many young people. We cannot talk about youth or, frankly, any sort of evangelism as if we are in a cultural vacuum. The thing is Jesus very rarely asked people to believe things. He simply

invited people to follow him. Faith is more about a way of life than a set of beliefs and the funny thing is that I think that my boys are living a more Christ-like life outside of the church than many within.

I love the mission statement that says mission is “expecting to find the waiting Christ in the other”. We are not taking Christ to the world to unchurched young people. Read Matthew 25: Christ is out there already. What I think we need is a deep cultural change. Rather than taking our packages to young people, we should go out expecting to find a waiting Christ in the other, especially in the excluded and marginalised. Who knows, we might even receive ourselves the truly good news of the Gospel.

The Chair: After the next speaker I shall be proposing a motion for closure on the amendment.

Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester): I welcome this amendment and I wish that when I had my own three children that I could have had the help that my daughter-in-law has had through her church through the parenting course. I would love to have added a little bit on the end to say “parents with their children” and also “grandparents with their grandchildren”. I find that, with the permission of my children and their spouses, I have permission to pray with and to read to my grandchildren, and they ask me questions and they have conversations that I could never have had with my own children because they used to say, “Oh mum, you are being boring”, whereas my grandchildren love it. I would love to

see that bit. Thank you, Mark, for bringing the motion and thank you for agreeing to the amendment.

The Chair: Synod, I now propose a motion for closure on the debate on this amendment.

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

The Chair: I now invite Canon Russell to come and respond to the debate. You have up to five minutes.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): I am grateful for this short debate. I am grateful to Simon Friend for a very challenging and very profound speech. Young people often bring us a very prophetic voice on a whole range of issues and we need to hear that. I will absolutely feedback what you have said to the Living in Love and Faith Group, which I think is critically important for us at this time. All our research in the Talking Jesus work that we have done shows that young people respond not to institutions but to people, and they are more likely to respond to a friend than to a programme or a policy. What we have to do critically is equip our young people both at school and when they go to college and work so they are able to share their faith with their friends and answer questions like those which Simon's sons have had. That is really important.

Angela, thank you for your speech. I used to worship in the church where Angela is when I lived in London and I know how much this is close to your heart and I am very grateful for you sharing so personally.

Synod, thank you for the short debate and I hope we can resume the main amended motion and hear some fantastic speeches going forward.

The Chair: We now move to take a vote on the amendment.

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

The Chair: This motion now stands amended. We now move to the debate on the motion as amended. There are a number of maiden speeches and I would like to call Mrs Rachel Bell first and then Canon Chris Tebbutt.

Mrs Rachel Bell (Derby): I found this motion really encouraging and helpful and I will definitely be voting in favour of it. As someone who has twin one year-olds, so is at the beginning of parenting craziness, I also really loved Sarah's addition to it.

I particularly wanted to push on points 10 and 11 in GS 2124A about investing resources in creating more youth ministry posts. I feel if the Church of England really wants to prioritise children and youth ministry, then this needs to follow through into strategically investing financially in both training and employment of youth and children's workers. I

have a Bachelor in Theology for youth and children's ministry and I and all of those who trained alongside me were self-funded. Within my Diocese of Derby, I can think of a bunch of youth and children's workers who are currently working for churches, but they are all funded by the churches themselves rather than by the diocese. That shows me that those individual people paying for the training prioritise ministry to young people and I think that shows me that individual churches prioritise ministering to young people, but not necessarily that the national Church does.

I think not investing financially in things such as employing youth and children's workers both at the training and the employment stage creates a few problems. First, I think it means that people who are employed by churches may not have as much job security because it is dependent on whether the Church can afford them that year compared to perhaps clergy who are employed by the diocese. You end up with people who also really want to be trained more for their role whether they are lay or employed by the church but they just cannot afford to self-fund. It also means there are many people who are doing this job therefore who do not have the training that we would expect those ministering to adults to have.

I want to leave you with a question: why is it that we seem to think that it is worth paying for vicars - and I have to put in a comment my husband is a curate so I love vicars - in order to minister to adults and yet we do not think it is worth training people to properly minister to young people? Do we not see young people as a valued part of the current Church who also need solid Bible teaching just like the rest of us? Kids are not just the

Church of tomorrow. We talk about them so much as the Church of the tomorrow but, I am sorry, they are the Church of today as well. Jesus showed that by saying that the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to them now.

I think it would be wonderful to see this motion go forward and for money to be invested in employing youth and children's workers around our country, to evangelise young people and to equip young people to be evangelistic themselves. I think that is important. I would love there to be a culture of giving people good training in youth and children's ministry. Train up the church workers, train up the clergy, train up the laity, train up the parents and make everyone more equipped at reaching our young people with this wonderful news that Jesus is for them now.

Revd Chris Tebbutt (Salisbury): I want to thank Mark Russell for putting forward this Private Member's Motion. I am indebted to a Mr and Mrs Pearson for welcoming me to their Methodist youth group when I was 16, without any faith whatsoever. Although I was 30 when I came to faith in Jesus, this Report has reminded me that the foundations were laid much earlier by people like them. I am also eternally grateful to Kirsty, our youth leader, who took all three of my kids through their difficult adolescent years and wet damp fields at Soul Survivor. She helped lay similar foundations for them such that they all today have an alive faith in Jesus.

I would like to point us again though to the potential powerhouse of the Church of England: the deanery. Yes, unexpected though this is, in my experience, if we are intentional, we

can use the deanery to see youth work flourish. As a newly appointed rural dean eight years ago, we identified lack of young people in our churches as a key issue, even though we had lots in our Church schools, so number one in our deanery plan CYP - children and young people.

Here are just two examples of what we did to make a small dent in the problem. Paragraph 5 of GS 2124A, the best evangelists to young people are young people. I met with the head teacher of the 1,500-pupil Church senior school in the deanery and I discovered that the weekly visit from the local vicar was not working as chaplain. We gave him back his half day and appointed instead five house chaplains drawn from a pool of youth workers and ministers from the town across all the denominations. Speaking to a school governor following a long-term sickness absence by the school's pastoral care leader he said, "I don't know how we would have coped without the house chaplains. They deserve a medal". There is now a wide presence of Jesus throughout that school.

The next example is our deanery bus project. The *Anecdote to Evidence* Report shows that churches that employ children and youth workers increase engagement with young people. Often, however, parishes cannot afford them. That is where coming together as a deanery can really work. One of our rural parishes had been benefiting from a trust doing youth work from a double decker bus, but the project was closing and so we took over the project, formed a new trust and appointed trustees and helpers from all the rural parishes to provide youth work on different nights throughout the deanery. Five years later the original bus died, but Stagecoach gave us a newer single decker which still does

all that youth work that is also today a base for street pastors in Wimborne Square every Friday and Saturday night. These examples are both incarnational and evangelical, but many children and young people are not only hearing about Jesus but seeing him lived out in the lives of our leaders.

The Report tells us, “Do not be anxious about starting something new”. Church Army research concluded that, “It is not as difficult as you think”, and, “Transformation comes when most of our parishes attempt to do new things to reach young people”. Do not rule out the power of collective ministry through the deanery. If you are intentional much can be achieved. We have the deanery structures. Let us use them. I urge you all to get behind this Report and vote for the motion.

Revd Canon Leah Vasey-Saunders (Leeds): In my more deluded moments, or perhaps depending on which committee meeting I am sitting in, I tend to think of myself as a young person. More on that later. I wanted to start by thanking Mark for bringing a motion that both affirms the good and exciting things that are happening throughout the church and challenges us to go further. I want to urge Synod to take up this opportunity, highlighted yesterday in *Growing Faith* and that Mark has highlighted to us in the motion today, at both a diocesan and parish level, to make more resources available for youth evangelism, and to encourage new initiatives that reach more young people with the good news.

As a canon presenter, I am especially grateful to Mark for the mention of cathedrals in the motion as places where young people are being engaged with in creative ways. I am

also grateful for the supporting paper which sets out many of the initiatives Mark refers to, where good things are happening, and indicates some of the plans that are in place. I find much here that is encouraging and proposals that I and, I am sure, Synod as a whole will want to embrace, and yet this is an easy motion to support. It says all the right things, feels properly challenging and encourages us to make more costly and courageous commitments to youth evangelism. Mark ends his motion by quoting from *Youth Apart*, a visionary report that spoke of a church which takes young people seriously, where young people fully and actively participate in the Church in every level.

In 1996 I was a teenager. I am one of the young people *Youth Apart* is talking about. I have been the youngest person in the room in most church gatherings since I was ordained in 2003. We are still calling for resources to be allocated in the right places. We are still saying that clergy should be trained in youth ministry which is seen as a core area and not an optional extra. We still sit in councils and committees to make decisions about what we will be doing in ten or 20 years' time and we do not blink at there not being anyone there under 50.

The Church of England Youth Council held its first meeting in 2003, one of the good things following *Youth Apart*. Their representatives at Synod have had a huge impact on our debates. They were indeed leading voices in the debates just yesterday on *Growing Faith* and Estates Ministry, but we should be hearing these voices at every level in our churches, in every diocese, in every deanery. How much have we seen the wisdom of

Youth Apart manifested? At best it is patchy and inconsistent. That does not mean that a difference has not been made.

I am here today to a large extent because I am a part of the success of *Youth Apart*. I was not from a church-going family and I went along to church aged 18 because a peer invited me to go. The church I went to, a parish church, was not a church that did student work. They did not have big youth projects. They just had a choir and that is what I do - I sing. Whether they did it consciously or not, they grasped the vision of *Youth Apart*, a church where young people were taken seriously. They took me and my peers seriously and they enabled us to participate not just in music but in worship as a whole, in pastoral ministry and in governance. I found myself becoming a parish representative at a diocesan conference. You can draw a straight line from that church to where I stand today after 16 years of ministry and 22 years as a disciple. You cannot separate youth evangelism and youth empowerment because, ultimately, it is all about taking young people seriously.

I now have teenagers of my own who have grown up with a Church continuing to have debates about how important youth ministry is, about how we really ought to take young people seriously and how youth evangelism is urgent. The young people *Youth Apart* writes about are now no longer young people, and a whole generation, most of my contemporaries, have very little to do with church, so as one of *Youth Apart's* generation as a young person (not young any more) may I echo Mark's words that Synod has said good things before but now is the time to act. Thank you.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I hope not to keep you long, Madam Chair, but what I do want to say is that this is what every type of parish and every type of church. I would never have believed that one of my worries over the last year has been that when the pool table is put up on a Thursday evening in a church where we do not have a church hall and all we have is pews, pews and pews, that we are going to lose the head of our blessed Lady. So something had to be done. Three of the Anglo-Catholic parishes around where I worship came together and asked for some money from this Centenary Project Fund that Mark has already referred to. We were successful, and we got a youth project worker - another Kirsty.

The PCC is now actually taken seriously that we are not going to build a church hall, we are going to take the pews out. Hopefully, the DAC will get on behind us so that when on Thursday all these young people come in, it looks as though they have room. It is also going to help our Tuesday toddlers, because that is where they start, is it not, with all those buggies and things and no room, and the primary Church for Children on a Tuesday.

It is for us all, and I think this is a wonderful opportunity with youth workers to come in to every church. Invite them to speak to your PCC and tell them what they are about and

then perhaps we, not quite so young but young at heart, will help them so that every church can have that youth evangelism which is there to be tapped into.

Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford): I would like to comment in two ways. One is more a matter of language. Our church, I do not think, would talk about youth evangelism, but we do it. I just want to tell you a bit about what we do, even though we do not possibly use the same language as others. Secondly, I would like to echo some of the things Simon Friend said earlier about idealistic teenagers and the perception of injustice.

My worshipping community is in the centre of Guildford, a big local town centre church. We are not evangelical, and we do not use a lot of the language that we have heard, but we do have over 50 under-16-year-olds. I just want to run through some of the things we do. We have choirs - boys' choirs, girls' choirs, adults' choirs. Our director of music goes out to local churches and introduces them to being a chorister, and non-church families come along because their children sing in the choir, so they come along and watch, and some get involved; some do not, obviously.

We have all the traditional stuff - Brownies, Guides, Scouts. Again, my first experience, not being from a church family and going to church, was going to the Brownies on church parade. It brings people in. Not a lot, but it brings people in who would not otherwise go to church. We have all the usual children's groups. We do Godly Play. We have a Tower Club for older children, a coffee club for teenagers.

So there is a lot going on, and there are a lot of ways of reaching out both to non church-going children and their families. They learn not only faith, but I think they value a lot being part of a community, with friends across generations, when they sing together in choir, and from different schools - because we have private schools and state schools. It is good for them to have friends from other backgrounds.

But then they go off to university, and some come back, some do not, and a big issue - and I get told time and time again from these idealistic young people - is the unequal way we treat LGBTI+ people, particularly lesbian and gay relationships. They simply cannot understand it. They tell me that time and again. Like Simon Friend, I have sons. Mine are both in their twenties. One has drifted away. One has just got his ARCO - he is an associate of the Royal College of Organists. He set up his first choir at 16, a second youth choir recently, and he has just given up as director of music at his church for various reasons. I hope he will find another one. But, again, he says he cannot understand this issue.

To draw to a close now, I want to say there are lots of different ways of doing evangelism, lots of ways of bringing people in. It is really important we do it, but we do need to understand that, particularly as teenagers become young people in their early twenties, they see a problem with the Church's treatment of other people.

Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham (Rt Revd Paul Williams): There will be no surprise that I urge the Synod to support this motion. I count it a privilege to have been entrusted by

the Archbishops to be Lead Bishop for Evangelism to and with Younger People and to chair a Task Group to stimulate and oversee this vital Gospel work on behalf of the House and the Synod, working closely, of course, with the national officer, Jimmy Dale.

We are at a decisive moment, I believe, both in terms of the scale of the challenge and the size of the opportunity. I am daunted, like many of you, but I am not at all discouraged, not least because of the quality of youth ministry already being undertaken in a wide range of contexts right across the Church of England. We have many outstanding youth leaders, evangelists and Bible teachers, paid and voluntary, as well as some exceptional young people already exercising significant leadership in these ministries. But we know this valuable work is connecting with such a tiny proportion of the young people that we long to see captivated by a vision of the transforming love of Christ.

Our highest priority, I believe, beyond fervent prayer, for which we can all be involved, is the need to be more purposefully encouraging of those who are best placed to lead us forward, and to resource them well. In 2 Timothy the Apostle Paul writes to his young associate: "I remind you to fan into flame the gift of God that is in you". Earlier in the pastoral letters he had to urge Timothy: "Do not let anyone look down on you because you are young".

The people needed to inspire and lead this work are already given to us. What they need is bold encouragement to fan into flame their calling and, through them, the calling in those around them. With this in mind I want to reference very briefly one personal area

of development in Southwell and Nottingham. It is intended not to be prescriptive but indicative.

I meet every month on a Saturday morning with a truly diverse network of over 70 younger leaders aged 15 to 30. I do that to pray together, to listen, to learn, to be inspired by what God is already doing and to dream of what more could unfold in reaching a new generation. As well as being encouraged to lead now in their local churches and make a difference in their places of study and work, this network helps me to engage on the ground with other colleagues around the diocese, participating in mission and in key strategic meetings of Bishop's Council and senior staff, to do that to prioritise youth evangelism and discipleship. I am doing some of my best learning in that place.

I believe we need to go beyond simply thinking out of the box on this. Let us think free - free from some of the structures and patterns that have become so familiar to us that we do not always notice how much they may be holding good people back. Yet let us also remember, Synod, that our best evangelistic intentions will always be far surpassed by God's searching love for the young people of our nation and His ambitions for the difference that they can make in our increasingly fractured world.

I commend this motion to the House.

The Chair: After our next speaker, the speech limit will be reduced to two minutes.

Mr Nicholas Lebey (Southwark): I support this motion and I thank Canon Russell for his work. I am a Church Army Youth Evangelist and I lead a youth church in Thamesmead. As a youth worker it fills me with joy when I see young people we work with give their lives to Christ, and I get more excited and encouraged when I see the young people beginning to share their faith with their friends with the hope of leading them to Christ.

On Wednesday, His Grace, the Archbishop, in his Presidential address, said, quoting Lesslie Newbigin: “The business of the Church is to tell anybody a story”. Synod, the story of God’s love, his goodness, forgiveness and salvation that we have all experienced is the good news that we are all called to share with the world, and that includes young people participating. Paragraph 5 of GS 2124 states: “Often the best evangelists to young people are young people”. This is true because I see it with our young people at our youth church.

Let me tell a short story about two young girls in our youth church in Thamesmead. Thanks to the National Youth Evangelism Officer, Jimmy Dale, who visited us and filmed their story, the video is actually on the Church of England YouTube channel. The video is about Emma and Abi. Emma became a Christian at the age of 14 and she was involved in our youth church. We taught her how to read the Bible and encouraged her to pray. A year later, Emma invited her friend, Abi, to a youth church and witnessed where Abi became a Christian and a few months later she was baptized. Last September, the Bishop of Woolwich confirmed Abi alongside other young people at our youth church. Today, both Emma and Abi are young leaders serving our youth church. They recently

organised a youth church weekend away trip for other young people, teaching and encouraging them about knowing Jesus Christ. This is just one example of a young person who came to Christ, was encouraged and equipped to share her faith and then led someone else to faith. Is this not the type of evangelism we want to see amongst our young people in our parishes? Yes, the harvest is plenty, but the labourers are few. The labourers needed in our mission today are not just priests and professional evangelists. The task is huge. It requires all of us - and that includes children.

Synod, there is no junior Holy Spirit. The same Holy Spirit resides in all of us and wants to work through these young people. I am reminded of the prophecy of Joel, quoted by Peter: "In the last day it will be, God declares, that I will pour my spirit upon all flesh... Your sons and daughters will prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and old men will dream dreams".

Young people have a place in the Church and an important role to play. Let us do what paragraph 2 of the Report says to help the Church become a place and a home to nurture young people. When this happens, I believe we can do evangelism not only to young people but with them, reaching more young people for the Kingdom of God. I commend this motion to you, Synod.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby): Thank you, Chair, for calling me, and thank you, Mark, for bringing forward this motion. Youth evangelism is something I am very interested in as a former young person myself.

Back in my real life, away from Synod, I work for a tour operator which arranges trips abroad for Scouts and Guides - two fantastic organisations that provide incredible opportunities for young people. It is a great joy to facilitate some of those opportunities. A particular paragraph that gave me great joy in reading in preparation for this debate was paragraph 6 in GS 2124A, which is about the incredible work our network of diocesan youth officers do. Our diocesan youth officers are fantastic, enthusiastic people who are doing incredible work for young people throughout the country. As Mark said in his opening remarks, sadly they are being cut and their resources are being reduced in so many dioceses, which is a travesty.

Derby's diocesan youth officer, Alistair Langton, was my diocesan youth officer when I moved into the diocese aged 11, 16 years ago, and is currently the longest serving diocesan youth officer in the Church of England. I vividly remember at that age, having lived in a vicarage in Derby not more than a few months, an invitation dropping through the door inviting me to attend Murder at the Vicarage. After the initial shock, I was dismayed to learn that this was an invitation from my diocesan youth officer to a weekend away especially for clergy children and not permission to commit murder in my Father's house! This was the start of many residentials that nurtured and groomed my faith - and many others throughout the diocese, where they came to faith and renewed their faith.

Alistair is also responsible for facilitating Youth Council for Derby Diocese, which was where I first had a taste for the wonderful world that could be dubbed 'church politics' and where I learned about General Synod for the first time. I can categorically say it is absolutely his fault that you are listening to me right now in this chamber. I can give contact details for complaints later! I know there is also at least one other person in this chamber currently who is here because of the fantastic work Alistair has done and continues to do.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I am Chair of the Share Foundation, which runs a major programme for young people in care throughout the United Kingdom. I am also the person who worked with MPA to bring community action pages to the Church of England website. Our fringe meeting is at 1.00 pm today in the Robert Runcie room. Do join us.

Young people need two things in particular: a sense of belonging and a sense of purpose. The Church can supply both of these needs, and through them we can introduce them to the love of Christ, but they need meaningful involvement, not just participation in events. A sense of belonging is absolutely key for young people in care, for whom we work in the Share Foundation. Insecurity and instability are the hallmarks of their childhood and for whom yearning for belonging is so deep that often it can lead them into antisocial belonging. Because of the broken state of families today, there are many, many more who yearn for that sense of belonging, for a sense of purpose. There is nothing more meaningful than social action, involvement in real support work for those in need. Many

in their late teens and early twenties would get involved in our work in food banks, in helping the elderly and even in street pastors. I only have two minutes. I will just say those two things. Belonging and involvement in social action are absolutely crucial. Please support the motion. Thank you.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order: after the next speaker can I tempt you with a motion for closure on Item 18?

The Chair: I am going to try to hear a few more speeches, but thank you.

Miss Lucy Gorman (York): Thank you, Mark, for a great motion. I agree that there is indeed an urgency in this matter, but I would like to suggest that we may have missed something rather important, something that a few people have mentioned already, which I am really grateful for.

On Thursday we heard from the Pastoral Advisory Group about the six principles for living well together. I would like to bring your attention back to the second one: speaking into silence. I did hesitate as to whether to bring this up in this debate or whether to let it wash over me as I have done on other occasions. I certainly do not want to become a one-trick pony, but since we are talking about silence I thought it was about time I stood up.

Elizabeth Paver yesterday asked the question: "Why do so many older teens and young adults in their early twenties walk away from church? Why can't we keep hold of them

once they've left primary school?" I believe we need to get better at talking about alcohol, sex, debt, unemployment, gender identity, mental health, dating, social media, racism, the list goes on. The reality is that this is a hard world that we live in.

In 2017, the Office for National Statistics published a report stating that around one in 25 16 to 24-year-olds identifies as lesbian, gay or bisexual, and that is not counting those who are trans, intersex or other gender variant. One in 25, and we have not mentioned them in this motion or in any of the other motions about evangelism. That silence we talked about on Thursday is right in front of us, staring us in the face. On the pastoral principle cards we were encouraged to pick up it says, "If our Church really believes that it wishes to welcome everyone, no matter their personal circumstance, then this welcome must be voiced in the words that come from both head and heart" - and, may I argue, it must be voiced in our reports, motions and presentations.

I know this is not the only reason that a lot of young people disengage. I know there are churches out there that are thriving with young people for all sorts of reasons that I have not mentioned and am probably not aware of. The Living in Love and Faith Group are doing a great job, and I eagerly await the resource, but in the meantime we do not have to press pause. We can change what we are doing to stop that one in 25 walking away. We can change what we are doing to attract those who believe they are not welcome. We can speak into that silence and share God's unfailing love, whoever they are, wherever they are, on their journey to become their true selves.

Ven. Gavin Collins (Portsmouth): Last Sunday I led the main service in one of my churches at which there were 50 people in the congregation and I, as the visiting archdeacon, was by some distance the youngest person present. I have to report that this is sadly not at all an unusual situation for me to find myself in.

While 20 years ago we might perhaps have been complacent about the lack of young people in churches and relied on the fact that many people come back to faith in middle age or later in life, we need to recognise that we are now facing the second, or even the third, generation in our communities who have never engaged in a meaningful way with church in their earlier years and, thus, who have no foundation of church engagement and faith to come back to.

Investing in evangelism to, and with, younger generations will be costly in time, money and in the impact it will have on us. Successful initiatives through each younger generation will be disruptive, awkward, inconvenient, at times maybe even downright annoying. I speak as someone who as an incumbent had to cope with the challenges and strains that came with having Mark Russell as my youth minister! If you think Mark is hyperactively overenthusiastic nowadays, you should have seen what he was like 15 years ago! Effective youth ministry will challenge and disrupt, but such investment and disruption is vital if we are going to reach the emerging generations for Christ.

I have one illustration for you from our current work in Portsmouth Diocese at St Margaret's Church, Southsea. The established church closed two years ago for

worship. A new community, St Margaret's Community Church, is worshipping currently in the church hall with plans, once building works are done, to meet back in the main church. At their first anniversary celebration in September, two women in their 80s were talking and saying, "We don't like this new worship style", but one looked across the room, pointed to a teenager, and said: "Do you see there? That's my granddaughter. She wouldn't engage with church and now she's here every week. I may not like the changes, but I'm so, so glad they've happened".

Synod, the need for us to reach our emerging generation is vital and urgent. It will require substantial investment. This motion stands here as an opportunity for us to show our commitment to that. I strongly urge you to give it your support.

The Chair: Synod, after Andrew Dotchin I shall be proposing a motion for closure and inviting Canon Russell to respond to the debate.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I would like to share some good news on the LGBTI front. I stand in front of you wearing a £500 haircut. Two weeks ago there was even less hair! My hair was shaved by our LGBTI youth group who call themselves Rocky Road, not because they are overrun with teenage angst, like any other teenagers, but simply because they like cake.

How was it that they came to give the vicar a shave to help raise £500 for our local primary academy? It began with the raising of a rainbow flag every Saturday outside St John's

Church and some Twitter posts with the hash-tag #SaturdayRainbow. Knowing we wanted to live up to our “Open to God, open to all” motto, a few of these LGBTI youngsters asked if they could use our meeting room as a safe place to be.

Over a year, the group have grown, and they are now part of Level Two, a Felixstowe charity which provides support and care for young people across our town. Every year at Christmas they put their own version of a crib scene in a window in our church, recognising in the arrangement of the figures that it is love and not the gender or number of parents that make a holy family. They gave up their October half-term to assist at our holiday club for junior school children. They go to church for support as they try to find the words to tell their stories of coming out and exploring identity to their family and friends. They are core members of the theology club at our local high school. They plan to join me in attending Suffolk Pride. At the end of April, they will come to church to help our town and county remember the life of Nick Moore, whose remains rest in our churchyard and who, with two others, one with child, was murdered in the nail bombing at the Admiral Duncan pub in Soho 20 years ago this year. They are wonderful, they are challenging, they are holy.

The Chair: Synod, I now propose a motion for closure on the debate on this item.

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

The Chair: Thank you. That is carried. I now invite Canon Russell to respond to the debate. You have five minutes.

Canon Mark Russell (Sheffield): Thank you so much to everyone who has contributed. Rachel Bell, you are right: we invest lots in training our clergy. We need to invest more in training youth workers and more youth worker posts.

Chris Tebbutt, thank you for speaking so movingly about the investment youth workers made in you. You are right, we have found something the deanery is really important for, and the deanery can work together to make youth work a priority.

Leah Vasey-Saunders, thank you for referencing Youth Apart. You are right, we were committed to change in 1996 and we did nothing about it, and here we are 23 years later. The interesting thing about Youth Apart was Youth Apart spoke to a culture which had walked away from the Church. We are now facing a culture which has never had any engagement with the Church, so the challenge we face is actually way more bleak than Youth Apart imagined.

Liz Paver is right; we must not prioritise pews over people.

Carolyn Graham, thank you for reminding us that language is important. Jimmy, my colleague, has said that the definition he uses for “evangelism” is that people will leave your company knowing more about Jesus Christ than they did when they first met you.

The Bishop of Southwell & Nottingham, you are right. Thank you for saying that we need to purposefully encourage all those who are reaching young people and empower our young people to lead not just tomorrow but now. I will just say, Bishop Paul, thank you for modelling what you talk about. You have a youth cell group that meets in your house and you make this critically central to your ministry.

Nicholas Lebey, I am biased as the CEO of Church Army. I am unbelievably proud of the work that my colleague is doing on a tough estate in south London. He is right: we need to take risks and make church more accessible.

Hannah, I think all of us are former young people. Some of us find that more difficult to admit than others! Thank you for encouraging our DYOs.

Gavin, you are right: young people are passionate, they are idealistic, they are committed to justice. The Gospel is about justice, and we should do more to engage them.

Speaking of justice, Lucy Gorman and Andrew Dotchin, you are right. Thank you. We need to talk more critically about the issues that young people face in their lives. We need to be bold, prophetic, and also ensure that our churches are genuinely loving and genuinely open to young people regardless of where they come from.

I could say a lot about Gavin Collins, but what I will say is that as a youth worker he covered my butt and made sure that the PCC supported what I did. He gave me permission to take risks. He took all the flak from people who were annoyed. I tell you what, if you are a youth worker you could not ask for a better vicar than Gavin. A pint later, please!

Friends, I could say so much more, but we need to own this challenge and we need to say as a Church we are going to work hard under God to turn these numbers around, not to save us from extinction but to build the Kingdom of God in this land and to change the lives of young people.

The psalmist is right: we will tell the next generation the praiseworthy deeds of the Lord; we will make sure that young people's voices are heard. A big shout out to the Youth Council who are here - that is great - but we will make sure that they are heard in every parish and every deanery and every diocese.

The Talking Jesus research tells us that 13% of young people see themselves as active Christians, so there is a harvest that is plentiful. We need to help work out what kind of churches we need to grow to involve these young people who are wanting to be involved - and it is not always going to be 10 o'clock on Sunday.

Friends, if we have courage, if we take risks, if we invest in young people's work, who can know? Who can know how many lives will be changed for ever, for God and for good?

Entire trajectories of young people's lives transformed, injected with the Gospel and the joy of Jesus Christ, raising up the next generation of disciples to live the values of the Kingdom in every area of national life, being the C of E now and tomorrow. As Paul Williams put it, we are daunted, yes, but we are not discouraged. So let us empower our churches to take risks and to do more because, as Leah Vasey-Saunders reminds us, youth evangelism and youth empowerment go together.

Synod, I wish we had so much more to hear all the other contributions you wanted to make. Thank you, Chair, for leading us so well. I encourage you, as Bishop Philip did yesterday, please do not vote for this unless you really mean it and are really prepared to go back to your diocese, your deanery and your parish to pray about this, for what we pray about we care about, and then make evangelism to and with young people central to all that we do as a Church, now and in the years to come. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: With that warning ringing in our ears, we now put Item 18 as amended to the vote.

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

The Chair: The motion is carried. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 12.03 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, everyone. It is the afternoon already. We come now to debate Item 19 on the Agenda: Advertising and Gambling. For this item, members may like to have GS 2125 from the Mission and Public Affairs Council to hand. I call upon the Bishop of St Albans, Alan Smith, to move Item 19. You have up to 10 minutes.

ITEM 19 ADVERTISING AND GAMBLING (GS 2125)

Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): Members of Synod, over the last 15 years a huge and significant social change has taken place in our country and many people have not even noticed it. Before 2005, gambling took place at the races and in a small number of premises on our high streets. Unlike tobacco advertising, gambling advertising was never permitted, the only exceptions latterly being the Lottery, bingo venues and Football Pools. But today our young people live in a totally different world, with the result that 55,000 children are so-called “problem gamblers” on anything from scratch cards to casino-style roulette games.

Imagine being the parent of one of those children who have been endlessly told that gambling is nothing more than harmless fun. Imagine discovering that money has gone from either your bank account or theirs because of online gambling. Now imagine thinking you have nowhere to turn because you do not know where to look for help and, when you

do find the details of the country's one problem gambling clinic, there are no places available, only a waiting list.

More children gamble each week than drink, smoke or take drugs. This generational scandal sees young people immersed in social media and tech platforms where the gambling industry relentlessly promote their products as part of a £1.5 billion annual spend on advertising, including daytime advertising and live sport advertising.

Contrary to what some people claim, advertising is influential. The evidence is available and it is shocking. Gambling advertising is pervasive and is remembered and well understood by young people. I was stunned by the apparent complacency that young people see only three gambling ads a week, not least as some respected researchers argue that the level is far, far higher than that. Gambling adverts should not be seen at all by under 18s, and the rules are in place because gambling adverts lead to gambling.

The times have changed since you would enjoy sport by simply supporting a team or a particular player. Now, younger generations are conditioned to think you enjoy sport only by betting on who is going to score the next goal or which team is going to win. It is in sport where we see gambling adverts at their most pugnacious and pernicious. Football clubs need to remove betting logos from sport shirts. They need to dismantle the wraparound pit-side adverts. A whistle-to-whistle ban is not sufficient. Independent studies demonstrate that more adverts are actually found on highlights programme *Match of the Day* than in live Sky broadcasts of football matches. Medical experts who work

with gambling addicts and survivors have told me that adverts are triggers which make people less likely to end their dependence on gambling.

Many people are concerned that our children are being groomed by gambling adverts online, on pitch and on TV. Children are surrounded by a toxic mix of adverts, addictive games playable online and paid for with a credit card. This day and night, 24/7 business preys on the young and the vulnerable.

Members of Synod, I believe we have a moral duty to support victims. Together, we can press government to act to protect vulnerable and young people and to reduce the quantity and pervasiveness of advertising. As well as government action, churches need to find ways to support and protect the victims of corrosive addictions like gambling, just as we support those suffering from other forms of addiction, which is why we have produced this small card which you will find in your General Synod post with some practical pointers of what we can do. All of us can help by raising the issue locally, removing the stigma of addiction, and signposting problem gamblers to the NHS website and those gambling charities which treat addiction.

Let me address for a moment for those concerned about this motion impacting on Church fêtes and tombolas. This motion is about the effects of the gambling industry's marketing strategy and the prevalence of its advertising. It is not aimed at holding a raffle.

I also need to address head-on the issue of National Lottery grants. Church buildings are a key part of British community life and for 40 years have received support through Government and state aid-funded programmes. Yet now, apart from the scheme which gives grant equivalence to VAT costs for listed places of worship, there is no national ring-fenced funding for repairs and maintenance. Cathedrals alone contribute more than £220 million to the economy and draw in more than 11 million visitors annually. Our historic churches bring in even more visitors. The Church of England is the nation's custodian for 45% of the country's grade 1 listed buildings, and therefore there is a nationwide benefit to Government sharing the responsibility for their maintenance and encouraging a wide sense of ownership amongst the community. Of course, our parishioners pull their weight, financially raising £126 million in 2017 for repairs and maintenance, added to some extent by charitable trusts, yet with the ongoing and significant upkeep requirements there seems little choice but to use all the funding streams available.

The 2018 Taylor Review into the sustainability of church buildings underscores this, speaking of significant external funding for churches in the years up to 2016, recognising that since the establishment of the National Lottery in 1994 it has increasingly become the only source of major funding for church and cathedral building projects. With historic churches and cathedrals facing the ongoing challenge to maintain their buildings whilst ensuring comfort, safety and accessibility for all, many places, including St Albans Abbey, have received money from National Lottery Heritage Funding. I would much prefer that the Church and society should look to a funding model for a sustainable, accessible future

for church buildings which does not raise these questions, for example the proposals which were explored in the self-same 2018 Taylor Review.

I turn to the call in this motion for a mandatory 1% levy. There is just one NHS clinic currently open, with no financial clarity for the long term NHS plan forthcoming from ministers. A levy already facilitated in the 2005 Gambling Act legislation would contribute towards the estimated cost of problem gambling to our health services of between £240 million and £1.2 billion per year falling on taxpayers. It is time for the gambling sector to stop nationalising the costs of their industry but privatising the profits.

Just last week I met with Charles and Liz Ritchie, who lost their son to gambling addictions. Jack Ritchie, the man whose face you are seeing, took his life following a devastating addiction to betting which began when he was just a schoolchild. As a teenager he went into a betting shop and used his dinner money on a bet, thinking it was harmless fun. Within a few years he had taken his own life. Gambling addicts are more likely to kill themselves compared with other addicts and often suffer in silence, whether that is because they are mothers fearful of losing their children or teenagers in over their heads in a world of online betting.

Synod, this motion, which comes from the Diocese of St Albans and is presented by MPA, can help make society a safer and better world for this generation of young people. With the victims of this industry and their families in our minds, I am happy to propose this

debate and hope that we can send out a strong signal and commit ourselves to bring about change for the good of all in our nation.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Bishop Alan. Item 19 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): It was my former manager, a good friend and fellow sports fanatic, Jonathan, who first alerted me about a year ago to the all-pervasive gambling adverts on satellite sports broadcasting. As someone who has only ever gambled on the result of the Grand National and the Eurovision Song Contest - and that over 20 years ago - I had simply not registered just how many of these adverts there are. Interestingly, if you had gambled on the UK winning the Eurovision Song Contest every year, that would not have passed the Ray Winston test of sensible gambling!

The excellent writer Hunter Davies highlighted in his *New Statesman* column last week just how many betting firms have their logos on Premiership football shirts. I had started previously to monitor the amount of gambling adverts during breaks for football and cricket on Sky and in some advert breaks virtually every advert is a gambling one. More concerning, they are often amusing and make gambling seem a harmless, mainstream activity which it is so easy to do online. Well, Synod, it is neither harmless nor amusing when people become addicted and have their lives ruined as a consequence.

The proliferation of gambling companies, some often based offshore, has led to this advertising arms race. I do not support a complete ban, which is why I will not be able to support David Lamming's later amendment, but I do think the amount of adverts should be considerably restricted. If we go for trying to ban them completely, we run the risk of people being able to say, "Oh, that's just the Church because they're completely anti-gambling". I think if we go for the approach shown in the original motion we actually have more chance of getting the result we want.

Remember three years ago when we had the debate on fixed odds betting terminals? We did not try to get rid of them completely but tried to drastically reduce the stakes. Well, that has now come into law and will take effect in April. It is one of the most effective things the General Synod has done in my time on it.

You would not want every advert highlighting cleaning fluid, so why gambling? Looking at the wording of the motion, it is very fair to expect a small amount of the firms' profits to be used to fund education, more robust wordings and treatment of gambling addictions. This would benefit society, as otherwise we all end up paying for the cost of people's addictions, which can lead to crime, serious depression and mental health issues. The amusing, beguiling nature of the adverts is going to appeal to children and make gambling appear natural and normal. Because it is now a matter of clicking on an app on your iPhone or iPad, the risk is heavier than in the past, when people, as the Bishop said, would physically have to wander down to the betting office.

This motion is moderate, sensible and responsible, and we need to pass it emphatically. We are not against all gambling - we are against the ruination of people's lives - and we do want everyone to ensure that people can stop when the fun stops.

The Chair: After Jonathan has given his maiden speech we will move to take the amendment before resuming the main debate.

Mr Jonathan Cryer (Leicester): Before the main point that I wish to make I just wish to ask Bishop Alan to clarify two things in his response. First, I believe that there is already a levy on the gambling industry which is in part applied to research into addictive gambling. I refer to publications by the Senet Group - in which, by the way, I have no interest. Second, I believe that the National Lottery has agreed, or will be agreeing, to reducing or removing its offerings to people aged under 18. I would be grateful for clarification on that if it is known.

I am tempted, but I am not going to, to ask you all to engage in what I think we must now call an Ely exercise, in other words to stand up and sit down if you have never smoked, drunk alcohol, placed a bet or in the last two years purchased a plastic bag. I fear that anyone left standing would be close to sainthood. My point is, though, that we all behave differently.

There are broadly three ways, I think, to reduce the effect of a harmful activity on people. One is to ban it. Think about prohibition or the war on hard drugs. It is not usually very

effective, it is costly to police, and usually leads to violence. Two, you can tell people how harmful the activity they are undertaking is. We tried that for a long time with smoking, but it was never going to work on its own, not least because no promoter of a product wants to tell their consumers that its product is harmful. We also tend to think that it will not harm us but it only harms other people. Three, I suggest you have to regulate, for example by age limiting, and you have to surround the promotion of the product in such a way that people can take control of the way they behave.

Have I ever bought a Lottery ticket? Yes. Do I do it regularly? No. Why not? Because I contemplate the infinitesimal odds of winning against the blandishments of “It could be you”, and because only a small proportion of what I spend goes to the good causes; the bulk goes to the promoter. Is there something else that may please me that I can buy with the money? Yes.

The best modern research - and I am grateful to my youngest son, who is a social researcher, for helping me with this - shows that people must be given information at the time that they are doing or approaching the harmful thing, in this case gambling, and this needs to be varied and extensive so that people can take control of their own behaviour. That is why we do not buy so many plastic bags now. This is what needs to be regulated. So I support the intention behind this motion very much, but it is recognising that the promoters will not willingly do this themselves, so we should be asking our government to concentrate its efforts in the light of the best modern research.

The Chair: Thank you, Jonathan. As I indicated a moment ago, we are now going to take the amendment standing at paragraph 51. I invite David Lamming to speak to and move the amendment standing in his name. You have up to five minutes.

ITEM 51

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Members of Synod, first of all, can I thank Bishop Alan for bringing this motion to Synod? It is timely. I think we also ought to acknowledge that the Bishop of St Albans is a great champion for this issue in the House of Lords.

Clare Foges, in an article in *The Times* just two weeks ago - and some of you may have read it - a comment piece was headlined: "Shield our children from this betting poison". She went on to say: "We need to be radical. Ban gambling advertising, all of it". She concluded: "Some will deride this as moral panic, but when children are being seduced into a lifetime of debt and mental health problems by greedy, rapacious industry, then moral panic seems entirely the right response".

The Church of England *Daily Media Digest* had a link to an article in the *Daily Mail*. Some of you may have looked at it. It gave some of the figures that we also see in this supporting paper for our debate this morning - GS 2125. It gave these figures: in 2018 the profits of the company Bet365 were £682.4 million and it paid its chief executive in

salary and dividends £265 million. This shows, does it not, the power of the gambling lobby when it comes to trying to influence Parliament and influence the advertising of gambling?

60% of teenagers believe that the industry's advertisements make gambling look fun, and in another survey just under half of 1,000 youngsters surveyed by the research consultant Populus reckoned that such advertisements made betting look like a good way to make money. The phrase which is used in, I think it is, paragraph 10 of GS 2125 is that our children are being "groomed to gamble". In another context, we see "grooming" as a serious safeguarding issue. Over Christmas, statistics show that there were 250 gambling adverts - 16 per game - shown on television during live football matches.

Members of Synod, two years ago we had a debate in this chamber about fixed odds betting terminals proposed by Clive Scowen. It was a London diocesan motion. The terms of it were: "To call on Her Majesty's Government as a matter of urgency to bring forward proposals for the amendment of existing legislation to reduce very substantially from £100 the maximum stake that can be wagered on a single game; purpose: to reduce the risk of harm to large numbers of vulnerable people."

That is what we are talking about in this debate this morning: our vulnerable young people in particular. Interestingly, on that occasion it was the Bishop of St Albans who proposed an amendment, which we accepted, to strengthen that motion and to replace the words "to reduce substantially" with "to reduce to £2". As we have been already reminded in

this debate, that change is to come into effect on 1 April. This Synod, I suggest, has been influential in persuading the Government, contrary to all the lobbying of the gambling industry, that that was a change that needed to be made urgently to protect our vulnerable young people.

So, members of Synod, let us today send an equally strong message to government and to do so by agreeing to the amendment that stands in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, David. I invite Bishop Alan to comment, please. You have up to five minutes.

Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): I do not think I need five minutes. Whilst I understand the thinking behind this amendment, the wording of this motion has been very, very carefully worked out after a lot of consultation, a lot of thought and planning, and it is designed so that I and others can work closely with government to try to get significant change and to get it soon.

You are absolutely correct, I did propose an amendment to the FOBT debate, though do note I did not propose that we ought to ban them. As much as I might have thought that was a good idea, I did not do that. I suggested actually that we reduce it very significantly, which is what the main motion wishes to do.

I am going to resist this amendment because I fear if we pass it there may be some people in the chamber, in the Synod, who feel unable to support it and therefore actually the greater good is lost. I believe this will give us a great deal of clout to continue the work that I and others are doing as we are working with government. Members of Synod, there is quite a sea change going on at grass roots across our nation. I believe this will give us what we need. I think to beef it up even more is probably not going to help us, so I resist it.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Alan. As I am sure you remember, in order for the amendment to be debated and voted on, at least 25 members need to indicate that they wish for that to happen. Are there 25 members, please?

The motion was put and lost on a standing count.

The Chair: Therefore the amendment falls. Thank you. We will now resume debating Item 19 then as it stands, obviously without now including paragraph 51.

Revd Zoe Heming (Lichfield): I have a few young people living in my house - three children - and I have noted that so far the industry offering to change the advertising to post watershed would achieve absolutely zero because most of the viewing is done on demand, it is all done at any time of day or night, so you would be seeing adverts irrespective of the watershed.

I also know that the Church does not want to be the killjoy and have people think “Oh, the Church thinks gambling is bad”, therefore perhaps we had not to say that much or we ought to qualify what we say. Normally, I am keen on that kind of mood as well, but we are not dealing with in this issue a question of education and encouraging moral fortitude. We are actually talking about algorithms that are set up to stimulate the dopamine in the brain of the user to form addictive patterns. That equates to effectively slow walking off the edge of a cliff.

I was fortunate enough to be unofficially mentored by the marvellous John Hull, who really gave me a bit of a telling off one day, and he said: “Look, Zoe, you are far too nice. We cannot announce good news without first denouncing the bad”. At this Synod of Evangelism, we are all about the good news on this one, and his words are ringing so loudly in my ears on this. Synod, we must do whatever we can, by all and any means at our disposal, to influence the direction of thinking of the government and the advertising agencies on this because it is very, very bad news indeed, and, together, we must denounce it in order to announce the good news we also have.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): It is very good to follow Zoe because I want to explore a couple of similar areas. First, two things. I think we must, as has already happened, pay great tribute to the Bishop of St Albans for the way that he is championing this work in our national life and having a huge impact. Then a slight crime against the English language over the spelling of programmes in the motion, which I hope can be amended even though I did not spot it in time to put in an amendment.

I did not support the amendment that was offered but I did believe it was pointing to something helpful that we need to be very aware of going forward, which is the digital environment within which most of this gambling takes place. One of the other hats I wear is I sit on behalf of the Lords Spiritual on the House of Lords Select Committee for Communication and we are currently conducting an inquiry into how you might regulate the digital world. This has become a very, very topical issue recently and relates very directly to the pervasiveness of gambling online and its very addictive nature fuelled, as Zoe was telling us, by the addictive nature of the internet environment itself, creating a terrible kind of unvirtuous circle.

Many people say it is impossible to regulate the internet, and I believe at some point this Synod needs to be debating this to add weight to those voices who are saying, "Yes, it can be done but requires great moral and political will". The platforms upon which many of these adverts sit like to tell you, "This has got nothing to do with us; we are just a platform upon which others stand". Increasingly, those who are thinking about how we might regulate the digital environment are saying it is much more helpful for us not to think about them as platforms but to think about them as public spaces; the public space of Facebook, the public space of Twitter, and so on. Like any other public space, therefore there is a duty of care which needs to be observed.

Therefore, what we need as a nation, and indeed as a world, is what is called not rules-based regulation but principles-based regulation. Principles-based regulation is where

you actually say, “In this public space, these are the things which are acceptable and these are the things which are not acceptable”, and that is clearly signposted. If I choose to go to a nightclub later today, I should not be surprised, I know the environment I am entering into, nothing illegal is happening but there may be some things which cause me to raise an eyebrow. If I go to the cinema, there is film classification to guide me as to which sort of film I am seeing and who might I choose to accompany me. We need that same principles-based regulation for the digital environment of this public space. Then we need a regulator who will hold that digital environment to account.

I know this might appear to be going way beyond this motion; it is not. It is precisely these kinds of discussions that are needed in government which does not so much ban this advertising but makes sure that the public spaces which people inhabit, online as well as offline, are public spaces where a duty of care is observed, where there is a clear set of principles and practices which are then enforced. This can be done and by passing this motion, those of us who are involved in this work in government, in the House of Lords, will be given great strength to make the public spaces of our world, both digital and actual, much, much safer places.

I wholeheartedly support this motion. I support the work the Bishop of St Albans is doing and I hope I am also giving a bit of a flag and a signal to a further debate upon how the Church can have a moral and ethical voice in the digital environment maybe next time round - see you in York in July.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Stephen. After Peter Adams has spoken the speech limit will be three minutes, please.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): I am very happy to be standing to support the motion proposed by my Bishop. When we looked at this subject at the diocesan synods in June last year, and I spoke, someone came up to me after the debate, introduced themselves and said I must meet a friend of theirs. I did so. I found they were experts conducting significant research in the sociology of social media and especially in gambling.

What we have just heard from Zoe and from Bishop Stephen does not need repeating, but let me build on it. When you look at your screen, you are not aware of how personalised what you see is. If you were to look at your 13-year-old's screen viewing exactly the same main item as you, it might look entirely different. It would be finely tuned to his or her viewing habits and history, their interests, their demographic, their locality, et cetera. It is very, very, very focused. To be honest, you may not think you see much gambling. It is very possible you do not. The internet companies who sponsor gambling are not wasting their money on you; they pay per view. Do not be deceived. The adverts the 13-year-old next to you will see will be tugging at their most sensitive heartstrings, using every known way to get at them, better even than their annoying little sister, who is a class act at that.

You may not think you see much advertising on TV. Most of it you filter out, to be honest. We have heard about the shirts of football league teams. I am very pleased to come from

a town Luton whose club has said no categorically to that. But a large and growing part of the young population, as we have heard, do not watch TV in that way; they stream from the internet. Those same algorithms that tailor the advertising I have already mentioned, tailor it to them. You will not see it; they will. Make no mistake, the gambling industry know what they are doing. They are there to hook them.

I have just spoken on one aspect of this motion but we need to be wise. I very much welcome Bishop Stephen's call to us to look at this area in the future. We have got to act to restrict this destructive force in our society.

The Chair: After Brian, Carrie Myers, please.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Brian Williams (Lichfield): Thank you, Chair, for calling me for my maiden speech. I am, contrary to my attire, a vicar of a church in Stoke-on-Trent and I have been there 36 years as vicar. When I first moved there, it was the centre of The Potteries, and it still is. When the Bishop of St Albans was our Archdeacon, it still was. At that time, Stoke City Football Ground, which I do not support - I live next door to Port Vale - used to be called Britannia Stadium; it is now called Bet365. Bet 365 therefore advertises all over the city, it is advertised on the football strip. It is the biggest employer in Staffordshire. I used to be very proud that the biggest employer was certainly The Potteries and things around that. Now things have changed.

Now, I say all this because I am ex child and an ex gambler. As a child, my grandmother, Salvation Army, taught me to play Pontoon for money. Some 55 years ago, I can remember finding a pound note - do you remember those - and I changed it for 240 old pence and I went to the local fairground and spent the whole lot on slot machines. That would be about £40 or £50 now. I have never gambled since. I was so shocked at myself.

For that reason, I therefore very, very strongly this motion, but I am concerned about the Church's endorsement of the Lottery Fund. I have never done the Lottery and I have never asked for Lottery funding. In fact, as a result of not asking, I was sent a cheque for £1,000 from a fellow Christian precisely because we did not support gambling. Luckily, I do not have a medieval church to maintain. I do think we have got to be very careful of that. If we speak out about gambling in this motion, there is a danger of being criticised because of our use of the Lottery funding.

Ms Carrie Myers (Southwark): Thank you to the Bishop of St Albans, St Albans Diocese and the Mission and Public Affairs Council for really championing this area of work. I hope that Synod will overwhelmingly support this motion later on

A few years ago, my now husband and I had the shock of being contacted to be told that a close personal friend of his, a much loved member of the church family and pillar of the community, had been arrested, and it transpired that he had defrauded millions from the congregation and was eventually convicted. During the trial it emerged that millions of

pounds had been spent on gambling websites. Over £1 million was spent on one website alone.

I really want to endorse what Bishop Stephen has already said about the regulation of our online space. I am not going to repeat it, but I cannot understand how it could be possible for that amount of money to go through one website without any red flags being raised. I do not have the words to describe the devastation of that church community as this unfolded. Many were financially affected themselves. Emotionally, it was a trauma, as you can imagine, and there was a very real spiritual impact too.

One of those who was directly affected has asked me to highlight a couple of points based on this experience. Like me, they strongly endorse the call for greater regulation of gambling websites. They should be doing more to spot and to act on trends that emerge. They certainly have the technological capability to do so. They also raise that perhaps banks should be doing more to pick up on these when large amounts of money are being transferred to gambling websites.

A final point in relation to point (b) in our motion. They wanted to remind us that gambling problems are an example of a hidden condition often. This had been going on for years and no one in the church community had realised. It may be someone among our own church communities who we least expect. We have had many calls over this Synod to take personal action as a result of the motions that we are voting through. There are some helpful resources highlighted in GS 2125. May I encourage Synod colleagues to

share these more widely to raise awareness and to offer support and to vote overwhelmingly in favour of this motion

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): I also have three teenagers at home and was delighted that they have just received a letter from their building society saying that, as of 11 April this year, they will no longer be able to use their cards for any gambling transactions. They will not be able to use their cards in a casino or a bookmaker on the high street. They will not be able to use their cards in purchasing scratchcards or National Lottery tickets. They will not be able to use their cards in online gambling or any sports betting sites. If they try to gamble online or in the shops, those transactions simply will not go through. I have got nothing but the highest praise for that building society taking a lead.

Please could we urge the government not just to put pressure upon our gambling magnates but also upon our British banks and building societies to take their responsibilities seriously for protecting our young people.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Chair, I very strongly support this motion and if we had had the opportunity I would have voted for David Lamming's amendment as well. Reference has been made to the success of the motion that we carried a couple of years ago no fixed odds betting terminals. I have been delighted to see how what this Synod did actually played into what others were campaigning for and brought fruit from government. We passed a very strong motion and I do not think we should be frightened of passing

strong motions on this sort of subject. Gambling addiction is as lethal as smoking and tobacco addiction can be. The degree to which we are able to say with complete confidence that allowing this advertising to continue will actually cost lives is a very powerful thing to say and others will corroborate that.

Chair, I do want to raise a worry that Brian Williams has done already about how compromised our witness is, partly because we have been so ready to accept Lottery money probably not realising that most of it comes from the poor and often the very poor. The interesting thing with the fixed odds betting terminals is that it is in the poorest boroughs in London where the most fixed odds betting terminals are and the most money is raised. The same is true of the Lottery. It is not as visible but it is true. I really think we ought to examine our consciences about that.

As Bishop Alan said, this motion plainly is not concerned with raffles and tombolas, but if we have got children in our churches – and some of us have children in our churches – and young people, who are being exposed to the temptation to gamble and become addicted, is it really very loving to give them the impression that actually doing a raffle or a tombola is okay and it is just harmless fun? Is it not the beginning of a slippery slope? Again, I want us to say to ourselves in terms of our own practice, are we really making our public demand of the government, which is absolutely right, as credible as we can? Are we consistently seeking to protect children and young people from the pernicious effects of gambling? Synod, I am sorry to be sombre but I do think this is important. I do hope that we will support this motion unanimously.

Dr Nick Land (York): As a child or a young teenager growing up in Herne Bay, I spent many difficult days in the arcades wasting huge amounts of money. I was saved at that point from problem gambling because we moved to a small village in Suffolk where the nearest source of any sort of sin seemed to be many, many miles away. Had I been at that stage now I would not have been saved because it would have been very easy to have accessed that gambling on the internet.

It would be great to stop there, would it not, but I was sensitised to gambling by my childhood experience and on two occasions as a young adult, I have been on the edge of problem gambling where I have wasted a ridiculous amount of money, where I felt dehumanised, guilty by my actions. By the Grace of God that has not happened in the last ten-plus years, but what I can tell you is that does not mean I am not vulnerable and that every time I see an advert I have to struggle with it. When, just a few weeks ago, I was looking at YouTube – I have to say looking at a YouTube video because my tutor for my reader's course had recommended some great ones from St John's – I would like to say that is why I was on YouTube, it may or may not be true but that is what I am saying – I came across a clip which said, "The biggest ever slot machine win", and before I knew it I had clicked on it. Within hours, every single one of my feeds was full of adverts for gambling. They had picked it up and it was now flowing through me at every point.

Now, by the grace of God and the insight that I have been given into my own weakness, for when I search with holiness I know I often fail but on this particular issue God has

given me the grace of God and I did not succumb. I was helped in that, I have to say, by my policy of keeping things very open with my children. It absolutely helped me that my youngest son, who is 21, said, "What rubbish videos have you been watching on YouTube, Dad?" For those of you who struggle with your personal holiness, openness to your family members about what you are looking at on the internet is crucial.

A final comment. Peter says the enemy - the devil - prowls around like a hungry lion waiting for people to devour. Well, he or, with my new gender awareness, she now has great help with the internet. The internet is fantastic, there are many blessings on it, but if we do not get to control that space we are making it very difficult for people like me and, I suspect, many others who have weaknesses or vulnerabilities to be able to maintain the holiness that we would like to maintain. I vigorously support this motion. I wish we could have debated David Lamming's.

The Chair: After Richard Jones, I will be reducing the speech limit to two minutes so we can try to get through the last three people wishing to speak.

Mr Richard Jones (Salisbury): This is my maiden speech. I speak as someone whose father's young life was blighted by his father selling the family home, spending all his money on horses. They ended up living in a hut without main sewerage on top of a hill bringing up five children. They survived by eating stale bread.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd George Newton (Guildford): Hopefully not going off-piste, we are very much wanting to protect children through this legislation which is so important, but I am aware that the focus and often pernicious nature of advertising of gambling targets other vulnerable adult groups. I think it is worth just mentioning that in this really important debate.

A local example: in a town of just over 30,000, we had 7,000 Nepalese move in in one year. They are lovely people, most from a Hindu background. Once a year they would gamble for a few pence. These people had no internet, no television, but as soon as the gambling places in town recognised that, they targeted the men, enticed them in and, just as lives of children upwards are destroyed, so many families were destroyed by this. In this debate if we could just note that other vulnerable adults are also very much targeted and at risk.

Mrs Wendy Coombey (Hereford): I am a member of the Church Buildings Council elected through this Synod and I have been slightly concerned by some of the comments about the Heritage Lottery and receiving Lottery funding. I work with dioceses in Hereford as a community partnership and funding officer, so I work with parishes trying to find funding for any projects that they want to deliver, and some of those projects are in church buildings.

I totally support this motion, but before we start sending a message out to all of those parishes that are struggling so hard, not just to repair their buildings but to make them fit for mission, all the evangelism and mission we have been talking about over the last few days, please do not send the message back to the parishes and the people that I work with that to accept Lottery funding is a bad thing. Yes, we wish there were other sources of funding but until the Taylor Review comes up with some recommendations about how that is going to be, please, please do not send out that message.

When I first started my work, I worked with Bishop Michael Hooper and I said to him, “How do I respond to people who tell me that to accept Lottery funding is wrong?”, because many people did. He said to me, “Wendy, always remember we never knew where the Good Samaritan’s funding came from”, and we do not. If you believe that money can be made good with its activity, I can tell you about the youth work that is carried out with Lottery funding, the meeting places that are created, all of the nurseries that are operated through Lottery funding, all of the architects’ plans that are drawn up with it, £250,000 roof repairs. Please, just be very careful about the message we send back to parishes who are already struggling. They are not struggling just to keep buildings open for the sake of it; they are struggling because they are holy places that are important to their communities.

The Chair: This will be the last speech due to the time.

Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool): Please feel free to tick off I had not planned to speak on your Synod Bingo card and forgive my lack of preparation. Similar to the last speaker, I just wanted to make a point about those churches that do find themselves with recourse to Lottery funding one way or another. I cannot bear the National Lottery. I have never bought a ticket. I have seen the way in which it has negatively impacted so many people's lives in the urban parishes where I have ministered.

But in my last church in one of the poorest parishes in the Church of England, we found ourselves in a dilemma as a Grade I listed building with water literally pouring through the roof. We were designated an "at risk" building by Heritage England. We had to make a decision. In the past, the parish had decided they would not accept any Lottery money. There was a very difficult PCC meeting whereby we decided that we had, if we wanted any hope of keeping the building open, to change that decision. We did not apply directly to the Lottery, but by being involved in Heritage England's listed places of worship scheme, the money is Lottery money. It might not be packaged that way, but it is. We made that decision and it was painful and difficult for lots of us. We then, over the course of the next few years, spent half a million pounds on fixing our roof, 80% of which came from Heritage England. This is in a tiny deprived urban parish with an average Sunday attendance of fewer than 50 people.

So my plea, similar to Wendy's, would be we have to think about alternative ways of funding our buildings. I am fully in favour of this motion but we have to think about other ways in which we can fund some of these important building works.

The Chair: I see no one indicating that they wish to speak so, without further ado, I ask Bishop Alan to respond to the debate, please. You have up to three minutes.

The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): Thank you very much for the many helpful responses that have been made. With 15 responses and I only have three minutes, I do not think I can go through them all other than to raise one or two things.

Firstly, thank you to those who have spoken powerfully from your own experience or knowledge either of your own or experience of a family member who has seen something of this. I got into this simply because a family came to see me whose son had killed himself. I had not realised the huge problem it is. It has led me on a journey which we are still on.

I think it is really important that we are clear what this motion is saying and what it is not saying. This motion is not making a theological statement about the sinfulness or otherwise of gambling. We all have views on that. I have strong views on that myself. I want to point out that what we are particularly trying to get at is a particular form of gambling where it is often impulsive, where there is absolutely no delay, it is often played individually.

I can bear testimony to what some people have said. At one point I put the name of a gambling clinic into my computer, "Gambling addiction help", and ever since then I have

been inundated with things popping up asking me to gamble. It really is about these algorithms that are designed to entice people into gambling. It is part of a much bigger issue, as the Bishop of Chelmsford and others have pointed out, which needs us to look at it urgently. Technology is moving on very, very quickly indeed. In voting for this, we must not lose sight of making the perfect the enemy of the good. This is a way of us trying to move this agenda forward with real focus.

I would ask, please, that you would support it unanimously so that we can now write to government, have meetings with them. We can go back and educate and inform other people about the nature of this issue in our country and we can try and support those whose lives have been blighted by this terrible addiction which, as we have heard, can destroy lives and families and sometimes put people in prison.

Members of Synod, I beg to move the motion standing in the name of the MPA.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop Alan. We move to vote on Item 19.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. Thank you very much for your heartfelt contributions. That concludes this item of business. Please may I remind everyone that we will resume at the slightly earlier time of 2.00 o'clock. It is now time for lunch; enjoy the break.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 2 pm.

ITEM 20

THE STATE OF THE NATION: MOTION FROM THE PRESIDENTS

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod. Thank you for so dutifully returning to the Synod chamber and for resisting the understandable urge, perhaps, to be outside in the glorious day God has given us today. We come now to an important item of business, Item 20, the *State of the Nation*, which is a motion from the Presidents. I call on the Archbishop of Canterbury to move the motion at Item 20. He has up to ten minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Any attempt in ten minutes to talk about the state of the nation is insane, apart from the fact that I feel extremely pompous standing up here - and you are not allowed to agree! It is not the State of the Union, which took an hour and a half this time and I think was a week late. It is what it is. I will not cover everything but, in the time we have, others will make up for my lack and my inadequacies.

We remain - let us be clear and start positively - a nation of great stability compared to many, world influence, generosity in overseas aid, skilled in the exercise of soft power, with a robust and effective democracy, judiciary, and many other aspects which are envied around the world.

Governments often listen; look at the recent, welcome response by the DWP over universal credit.

Many of us - many of us - are among the most privileged people alive in the world today. But not all. Today we see signs of division, perhaps more clearly than for generations in peace time. They concern inequality and injustice and they obscure hope for many. There is exclusion from the sense of common purpose and of equal rights in our society, politically, economically and socially.

Brexit is not the subject of this debate. It is crucially important, a historic moment, and views here will be as divided as across the nation. But one way or another, better or worse, life will go on - and God's mission is not stopped by such events. Rather we are called to rise to the challenge, here and across Europe - in the Diocese in Europe, which is particularly affected - loving and caring in ways that show that, whatever the shocks, we remain confident and active serving the risen Christ in the power of the Spirit. But Brexit has revealed how our politics and society have, for many decades, not paid sufficient attention to the common good: that shared life of a society in which everyone is able to flourish. The pain and exclusion continues in this country. If we do not as a nation pay attention, it will cause greater division and, as the Archbishop of York said recently, ultimately strife.

More than that, for this is not politics and pragmatism - we are not a substitute for Parliament - it is discipleship and obedience to God in Christ, more than that is the command of scripture, Jesus' Sermon on the Plain in Luke, chapter 6:

"Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the Kingdom of God.

"Blessed are you who are hungry now, for you will be filled

"Blessed are you who weep now, for you will laugh ...

"But woe to you who are rich, for you have received your consolation.

"Woe to you who are full now, for you will be hungry.

"Woe to you who are laughing now, for you will mourn and weep".

Funny, it is so much less popular than the Sermon on the Mount.

We hear the prophets tell us that, "Justice must roll down like rivers and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream". The Bible does not do trickle-down economics (a theory long discredited, not least implicitly by Keynes in his General Theory) but it does rolling rivers of justice: the scriptures call us to solidarity with the poor and to the common good.

We spent yesterday evening talking about Estates Evangelism, and what we say now echoes the truth that was so eloquently put to us by Philip and others then.

In most of this Synod our attention has been outward-looking, and when we look round today we see challenges to the nation which must shape our mission - and must define what the nation thinks about us over the next generation. For that is the challenge.

If we pray for our leaders; put the poor and marginalised at the heart of the Church and of the consciousness of the nation; exert every effort in being with them; build reconciliation into our country, and learn how to demonstrate it among ourselves, then there is a future made bright not necessarily by human success for the Church, but by being at the centre of the activity of the Spirit of Jesus.

The reality of exclusion and division is seen in the difficulty of our political system to build a consensus and find a common path forward.

How we recover from and heal these divisions may be the biggest challenge that lies ahead of us - to unify as a country, to have a healthy and functioning democracy, and to have a strong ethically and morally based economy that works for all.

Those who bear the grievous burdens of political leadership, on all sides, by definition are faced with resolving the current crisis. We must not forget that the burdens on them are enormous.

We must pray, as Paul tells Timothy, for “all who are in high positions”. It is easy to stand on the side-lines and judge; we do not have to make the decisions. But we must commit

to pray for them. For those who are close to them, for their wisdom, and their blessing. That does not mean agreeing with them; it means loving, as we have been loved by Christ.

As Christians, we pray not because we are fearful, but because we seek to be faithful to St Paul's encouragement to "pray without ceasing", and, as our MPs say each day in Parliament, "Your Kingdom come and Your name be hallowed".

The Five Marks of Mission of the Anglican Communion, which have been referred to more in this group of sessions than any other I have attended, call us to speak for justice. Supremely, the scriptures authoritatively demand advocacy for and support of the most vulnerable.

The churches are doing much heavy lifting; the Church of England through 33,000 social projects, 4,700 schools, occasional offices, and our plan for renewed presence on estates and many other places.

But action and advocacy go together. They also put us in the place of reconciliation and that is a core part of our vocation and mission. For reconciliation with God through Christ, and then among humans, is the Gospel.

Now is the time for every part of the Church in every place to be a peacemaker; to play our part in uniting our country, and to put the most vulnerable at the centre of national life.

We cannot ignore the warnings that have been proffered about the possible profound impact that the next months may possibly have on the poorest of our society. We must be ready for any difficulties and uncertainties, and not allow any destructive forces to create further divisions in our society. It is true that no predictions on the economy are certain. That is not Project Fear. It is saying that where there are risks it is the strongest, not the weakest, who must bear the weight of the risk. And, in many ways, that is not currently the way we are heading.

That, Synod, brings me to the third point of the motion: to our leaders. Jesus tells us that whoever wishes to be a leader must be a servant. Edmund Burke, in a speech in the House of Commons, spoke of the church, "... which says that their God is love, that the very vital spirit of their institute is a charity; a religion which so much hates oppression that when the God, whom we adore, appeared in human form, he did not appear in a form of greatness and majesty, but in sympathy with the lowest of the people - thereby made it a firm and ruling principle that their welfare was the object of all government". His words still hold true from the 18th century.

Since the arrival of Christianity on these shores, the Christian narrative has responded to the issues and injustices of the age - seen in the stories of Elizabeth Fry and Florence Nightingale, Wilberforce and Wesley, William Booth and William Temple.

We need now to reimagine those values, to respond to modern problems; a narrative that captures the imagination, which gives rise to new and exciting possibilities, and is capable of bringing out the best in us and giving hope to all.

We can help to create a vision for a country that is inspired, abundant with hope and brimming with promise, so that our evenings in this country - this wonderful country - are not passed gazing nostalgically into the dying embers of meagre memories, but imbued with a new global aspiration of a country united in strength and working out of its Christian heritage to lift the poor and vulnerable, and finding its own purpose under God. I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 20 is now open for debate.

The Bishop of London (Rt Hon & Rt Revd Dame Sarah Mullally): Thank you for this motion. Over the last few days many people have said to me how well I look and thank you for that. Why should the Bishop of London not look well? However, my health is in part due to the fact I was on leave last week in Sicily. As we arrived in Sicily, the first thing I was asked was not the purpose of my visit nor where I was staying but, “What about Brexit then?”

We stand at an important moment in not just our nation’s history but also Europe’s history, and we should acknowledge the challenges at this time that face not just us as a nation but also Europe and the Diocese of Europe. There have been few times in our lifetime

where there has been such dramatic polarising and unsettling moments, but of course division is not new. Historically, we have often found ourselves in unbearable and seemingly irreconcilable differences, and there is no doubt we may find ourselves in those places again.

On Monday of this week, I took part at an event at St Paul's Cathedral with the Institute there and with voices from across the City to speak about the report *Democracy and the Common Good* produced last year by the St Paul's Institute. It challenged us on our use of binary narratives. Adrian Pabst in his preface reminds us that following the Brexit Referendum, and the political turmoil in the USA and the UK, and many other European countries, the old opposition of left versus right seems increasingly obsolete. Instead, he says we risk substituting one binary world for another in which the main fault lines are cultural and generational, encapsulated by the networked metropolitan youth versus the old left behind.

The Report calls for politics and a broad public discourse based on a different language, a transcendent conversation; one that can address the deeper discussions around the question of meaning and belonging. However, we all know that this is not easy. Perhaps if it were, we would have done this before now. I believe that our challenge in this time is to not pretend that we are all alike, because we clearly are not, but to recognise, and hopefully learn in some small way, to overcome our intrinsic nature which pushes away others and tries to carve out our own territory. As Christians, we need to walk alongside other people of faith and of goodwill. We are here to serve our communities, to bless

them and to be blessed by them; to carry hope and peace and to demonstrate the love of God to everyone, servants and neighbours, to all around us. I would suggest that, at this time, as a Church, we should be seeking to speak out about the care for the marginalised in our communities, to shape our resources and our mission and ministry around the care of the marginalised and also to bring back attention to many socially neglected issues at a national level.

At this time, as a Church, we should be listening to those in our communities, helping our communities to come together as neighbours and to build a future that they want, which is why, along with Church leaders across London, I am going to be calling for churches in the Diocese of London to come together around the issue of the future; to come together to offer hospitality and prayer around 29 March. This may be something that not only London should be addressing but the wider Church; for us to inspire people to come together for their future.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): Let me carry on from where the Bishop of Oxford finished when he was so rudely interrupted by the bell in the Evangelism and Discipleship debate yesterday, and apologies to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury because that returns us to the Sermon on the Mount. I think he had got up to, “Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for what is right”. Though perhaps we could go back to the first Beatitude: “Blessed are the poor in spirit” - it is the trickiest Beatitude to know what it means. Surely it means blessed are those who know that they need

resources outside of themselves. Blessed are those who know they do not have all the answers. Blessed are those who know that they cannot do it on their own.

I think the first thing that God is saying to us as a nation through all of this is that we need to learn some humility. The rest of the world has a picture of what English people look like, and it is not always a good one. We have a chance here to change.

Let me also try to make some connections that I think need to be made in what for me has been one of the most interesting and challenging and outward-looking General Synods that I can ever remember in the years that I have been in this chamber. I want to take us back now to a meeting of the General Synod in 1979. In 1979, you will be interested to hear that there was a nationwide initiative in evangelism and the then Archdeacon of Canterbury, Bernard Pooley, made a speech, and I am now going to quote from it: "The long-suffering clergy do not wish to be told again and again to reinterpret the Gospel or make it relevant. They want help in doing it and want to hear what the Gospel sounds like and looks like when it has been so treated. There is therefore here a poverty of inspiration which I find a little alarming. It seems to me at this point the whole enterprise betrays its lack of inspiration and its need to be re-orientated in one particular classical direction, that of prophesy".

And here are some words that have been often quoted since that debate in 1979, which cannot be said about a lot of words spoken in General Synod: "If you want to do evangelism, first catch your prophet".

In other words, without a compelling vision, a prophetic vision of what it means to be human and what it means to inhabit this world in ways that are Christ-like and distinctive, our evangelism will always fall short. Synod, before it is too late and we all go home and watch the rugby we have recorded on the telly, can we not see that in this Synod we have not had four debates about evangelism and four others about social issues and now this one on the state of the nation but through these days we have been having one debate about a vision for living in love and faith; a vision about striving for appreciative disagreement; a vision about our stewardship of creation, about our concern for the homeless, our concern for the marginalised. I think being here these last few days, we have actually begun to flesh out precisely what it is that we are called to bring to our national life with great humility.

I am sure I have told this story in Synod before but I will tell it again. This is evangelism actually happening rather than talking about it. I was stopped by a young woman on Paddington station about a year or so ago. She looked me up and down and said, "Are you a priest?". I was dressed like this; it was not my natural aura of holiness which gave me away. I said, "Yes. Why do you ask?" And she said, "What made you be a priest?" I said, "Two things, first of all, God, that is the reason: God". When we Christians say the word "God", we see the person Jesus Christ, because Jesus shows us what being human is supposed to look like. I said, "The second thing is I want to change the world".

When we wake up on 30 March, we will still be brothers and sisters, neighbours and friends, and we have to begin to share this compelling narrative of what it is to be human, the very things we have spent this Synod talking about, and, with the Archbishop's lead, I believe there is a great opportunity for us if we can be positive; if we can stop looking backwards.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): When I read this motion, particularly clause (a), I thought to myself, "I think I have heard that somewhere before" and then I remembered, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has said, it is something the Apostle Paul calls on Timothy to do. In I Timothy: 2, he says, "I urge, then, first of all, that petitions, prayers, intercession and thanksgiving be made for all people, for Kings and all those in authority, that we may live peaceful and quiet lives in all Godliness and holiness". So it seems a no-brainer in some ways this is something we should be doing. We should be doing it anyway.

But I also read this motion thinking, "That is something I can actually do". I do not know about anyone else in the chamber, but sometimes with Synod motions we are "calling on the Government to do" or we are "calling on dioceses" or "encouraging parishes to", and I think that my part in this is very, very small. One vote. Perhaps it is something I will give a report on at PCC and there will be a minute or two. Maybe it is my turn to do the diocesan synod report. Maybe I will be in a meeting and I can vote, I can say something, but it feels very small and very hard to know if it is making a difference.

But this is something I hope, Synod, that we all pray. We can all pray for our MPs, the politicians, members of Government, civil servants. We can do this day by day. We can do it when we walk across Westminster Bridge. I walked past the Houses of Parliament this morning and thought, "I know this is on the agenda. I can send up an arrow prayer right now", walking across Westminster Bridge, for wisdom for those who will be sitting in that Chamber.

My diary tells me that I am due to lead the prayers at church in two weeks' time, so I will commit now I will include a prayer along these lines. I am sure many of us here will be leading prayers maybe tomorrow, maybe next week. If you do the same, it is something that we can each do individually, and I wonder if it is something that we might do as Synod. I know from time to time we follow significant debates in Synod with a short time of prayer. I may be anticipating something that Archbishop Justin already has planned, but perhaps, when this debate is over, we could have a short time of prayer along these lines. I heartily commend this motion to you.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I want to focus on (c) of the motion. Her Majesty the Queen was surely right recently to remind us to "speak well of each other and respect different points of view". The context may have been the Sandringham Women's Institute but has been well noted. Humble occasions are no enemies of wisdom. To speak well, to listen and to respect the views of others.

One particular way of describing the current social divisions we see is that of a divorce, not so much the reflection of a prospective rift with the European Union as a type of internal divorce, as if one way of being English or British is facing a quite different focus and understanding. This theme is well explored in David Goodhart's excellent 2017 book *The Road to Somewhere*. I want to go back to that focus on emotions and feelings in that area of divorce. The psychotherapist Susie Orbach writing in the *Guardian* noted: "Our national debates will get ever more fractious, looking like we are being trapped in a cycle of anger, disbelief and impotence". She likens this to the patterns of divorce, where mediation is essential, otherwise the breakup ends with much hostility and few emerge unscathed. Here she says, "The escaping partner may be buoyed up by the hope of new adventures but the remaining partner is bequeathed with anxiety, insecurity and uncertainty".

Another therapist, Gabrielle Rifkind writing in open Democracy notes that this particular messy divorce has exposed not only a deep political divide, she says, but competing visions of Britain and what they should look like. For her, whatever the political outcome, the referendum has laid bare a fractured country, as I think the Archbishop hinted at. This is a symptom of what is going on - we call it Brexit - where the problems are deeper than the issues of Brexit and speak to nations divided about their identity and future priorities. She goes on to wonder whether in this febrile atmosphere there is a place for what she calls national dialogue - a dialogue that could be used as a preventative tool, to navigate away from our current poisonous atmosphere, she calls it, enshrining dialogue as a part

of the political culture. Perhaps we all assumed that was the case but recently it does not seem to be the case.

Convened in the spirit of reconciliation to which (c) points us, providing an opportunity to breach those deep fault lines and defuse our shrill debate, to go beyond the current political divide to deeper conversations about how we should live, and live well together, our resources should be allocated to those who most need them and what the nature of tolerance and pluralism should look like in this our 21st century. This is very much the spirit and the guidance of (c) calling on our nation's leaders, drawing on Christian hope and reconciliation, working together for that common good at a time, as stated, of division. It is a hopeful direction, not a hopeless dream, and it should be embraced and it should happen.

In supporting this motion, as I hope we will, with its call for Christian hope and reconciliation to be part and parcel of not only the national dialogue between our leaders, but I suspect of our own dialogues wherever we find ourselves. I am too aware of my own faults in this area to feel I can preach to you or to me, but we must start here, contemplating our own resources and responses and contributing to healing divisions and seeking the common good, for if it does not start with me, it will not start at all. Thank you.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): I have to say I was a little bit sceptical when I saw this on the agenda. I thought, how on earth are we going to a useful debate about a

subject which is so huge? But, now that we are in it, I am very glad that we are having it and I am particularly glad that the Archbishop has outlined our work across the country in the way in which we engage with every possible level of community. I think that is something that we can really bring to the conversation.

Thinking about my parish, the other side of the river, I am involved in something called the South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Forum, which is the only organisation really in my parish which brings together the people right at the bottom of the heap, the poor and the marginalised, with the huge multinational organisations which are also there. It creates, if you like, a kind of local citizens' assembly.

We have put together a manifesto called the South Bank and Waterloo Neighbourhood Plan and there is going to be a referendum on it. My heart sinks at the thought of a referendum, but it is a really interesting example of how we can all work together in my parish. I am sure you all have examples which are very similar. I was delighted to hear the Bishop of London's proposal that the churches north of the river will be open and I can give you my word that one church at least south of the river will be open on the same day, so thank you for that.

I wonder if we can offer something in this debate. There have been a lot of conversations recently about the convening of a citizens' assembly or looking at different ways of doing politics alongside the national politics which we are engaged in. I think it is not a secret that local politics has been emasculated, if I am allowed to use that word. We need to

look at alternative ways of doing things, alongside some of the other organisations which are doing this like Citizens UK.

I wonder whether we can offer our unequalled reach and our remarkable experience of working in so many different communities towards those other organisations who are also looking at finding new ways of doing things. I would really emphasise that I think a citizens' assembly could be really helpful for us at the moment in some form.

Revd Canon Andy Salmon (Manchester): I want to particularly draw your attention to (a) the call to prayer for local politicians and speak as somebody who spent ten years as a councillor on Salford City Council and speaking in support of local government, because in communities like mine in Salford we are facing quite a sort of a double whammy really of the whole austerity and Brexit in a situation where, whatever your views on Brexit, there are economic challenges with it and also challenges for community cohesion.

At the same time as we face these challenges, we have a situation where our own local government, our councils, have faced immense cuts. I just want to point out that, in Salford, Salford City Council have faced £211 million of cuts since 2010. Their annual budget now is less than half what it was. That is to serve one of our most complicated and disadvantaged communities. Apparently, these cuts to local government have not been applied universally, so that places like Surrey and Buckinghamshire - apologies if you are from Surrey or Buckinghamshire - now receive more in government support grant than Salford and my suspicion is that the challenges in Salford are somewhat greater.

I am in support of this motion, obviously, as we all are I am sure, but I want to point out that as we speak to our nation's leaders we want to encourage them to ensure that needs are met in our most needy communities. Across this country, we have seen deliberate disinvestment from northern towns and cities. I want to see us investing in those areas and calling on government to take seriously the needs of the poorest in our communities.

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Viv Faull): I have lost count of the number of proud parents and grandparents who have sidled up to me in the course of this Synod and told me of their children and grandchildren who are living in Bristol, because Bristol is becoming the go-to city for those seeking to move out of London. So far, no one has sidled up to me to tell me with great joy about their children and grandchildren in Swindon. That town is also in my diocese, linked to the great city of Bristol by God's wonderful railway.

Just a week ago, we heard the news of the closure of the Honda plant in 2021. There will be a loss of 3,500 jobs directly, many, many thousands more indirectly. Honda itself took over when the train manufacturing industry was closed in the 1980s and Swindon now faces significant loss of skills, community and dignity. That is familiar to any of you living in places of de and post-industrialisation. I want to use what we are now up to in Swindon as a particular example of what might, I believe, be needed. In Swindon this will take a generation.

There are immediate tasks. Graham Archer, acting Archdeacon on loan from CPAS - thank you very much to CPAS - immediately emailed the clergy in Swindon, many of them working in ecumenical contexts, about what they might do practically, knowing perfectly well they too will be feeling overwhelmed.

He suggested, firstly, naming what is going on in public worship. Secondly, personal contact with those personally affected. Thirdly, proactive reconciliation especially when the blame game begins, which it will. Fourthly, longer-term planning for job clubs, perhaps with Church Action on Poverty. Fifthly, some advocacy work with Honda. One of Honda's senior executives was sitting in a service I took in Swindon three weeks ago and he already knew what the news would be and he had to hold that news for the next days. Finally, we need in Swindon to speak of the narrative of an unshakable Kingdom in uncertain days. Graham added there are opportunities now that are needed for people to speak of their anger and of their fears.

The Bishop of Swindon, Lee Rayfield, tweeted that the shock of the news of Honda's closure hit him deep in his gut. That is good Hebrew theology. He was owning his anger, his huge concern and his compassion for the town. We need time to lament. We need time to recognise that Jesus laments with us. It is in the context of lament, crying out to the God who longs to see Shalom but also longs to see us acknowledge the people we are dependent on him, as the Bishop of Chelmsford has mentioned.

We need a new humility. It was in that context of lament that Graham saw the possibility of a new narrative for Swindon for the future. There is the sign of the Pattern Church created in the former pattern store of the locomotive industry in Swindon right at the heart of the old industrial centre. We now need a narrative that honours that great creative work of engineering and moves it on into the present and on into the future, recognising the importance of creativity, ingenuity and skill.

May this be something of a pattern for the whole nation: simple tasks for local churches; space for us all to lament our disappointment and disappointed hopes; and, finally, the beginning of an articulation of a new narrative for our whole nation, including, alongside the poor and the marginalised, those who are often not noticed, those who are left behind, amongst them the people of Swindon.

Dr John Appleby (Newcastle): I sometimes ask people can a politician be really honest? Like quite a few others here, I have been involved in and am involved in politics and I am standing for election in the next few months - a very interesting period. What I mean by that, because they are usually horrified, is to say, well, if you ask a politician or a candidate like myself - I have rarely been elected - how they are going to solve a problem, and they say, "Well, let me explain. It has taken 40 years to reach this point and it will take 30 years to solve", they will accuse you of making excuses.

It is very tempting to give short, snappy answers. Also, because you fear you may be misquoted. I gave a television interview last week and the bit that was actually screened

was one little chunk which I did not think was very representative. You become fearful of giving complicated answers lest they be misreported or misunderstood.

I think the way we have been talking about evangelism and about our faith is actually the guide to what we have to do in politics as well. We have to say, yes, it is complicated but this is what we think we should do first, not this is how we will solve it but this is how we will address it. I think that is probably the answer. I think the current national debate, which I watch in appalled fascination, is vexed by the fact that simple questions were asked and simple answers offered without adequate preparation as to what the implications were. People knowingly misrepresented things and I think that is very, very unfortunate.

As a Church, we have committed ourselves to good disagreement and honesty in the context of sexuality and in the context of other issues like Church decline. I hope we can offer that model in politics too. I try to a little myself. I perhaps should explain that good disagreement in my own personal relationship is such that when my wife was a vicar we used to live in what I called the “bickerage”, which I felt described well how our relationship worked.

In this context, I am up against an opponent who the other day gave a very dismal interview. How should I react to that? It is tempting to be gleeful and to think, a-ha, this improves my chances because my opponent gave a bad interview, but that is the wrong response, because what I want for the north-east of England is the best for the north-east

of England and I want my opponent to do well and, if he does better than me, then he will get elected and I will not. That is how it should be. I have to resist temptation too to take sort of cheap victories of the process.

I hope that what we say at this Synod and what we say we are trying to model in other areas can also be a model to the nation. It is very easy to blame politicians for broken promises or the press for misreporting when we too are tempted by headlines. How many of us have switched on the news and said, "I just want to catch the headlines"? That is feeding the process of soundbites and facile answers.

We need to model what we believe. We need not to blame others. We need to show what can be done in honesty and truth and see if we can help other people to feel involved and then perhaps we will be listened to as well.

Revd Canon Professor Martin Gainsborough (Bristol): Thank you to the Presidents for bringing this motion and thank you for those who have spoken so far. I too am glad that we are having this debate and I support the motion. I wonder if I might try and put some flesh on the bare bones of the motion to try and define the nature of the problem more clearly and to think about the role of the Church in helping lead us out of the difficulties we find ourselves in - so nothing too ambitious.

I recently got sent a book review. It is by a Kent academic, University of Kent, Adrian Pabst. It has the rather enticing title, *The Demons of Liberal Democracy*. Pabst argues,

rightly I think, that, while liberal democracy has delivered many good things, it also has demons, contradictions within itself which can lead it to degenerate. That, he argues, is what we are seeing now. We are seeing the dark side of liberal democracy.

One of the problems we have at the moment - and I do not think we are immune to it in this chamber - is that we struggle to talk about our politics, the situation we find ourselves in, without degenerating into bipartisanship. We fuel the problem rather than speak the healing word. Adrian Pabst's analysis is good because he goes beyond this. Without saying that politicians are all charlatans, which is not helpful, he does say that, whether it is the metropolitan elites or the populists, everyone is behaving in ways which are demeaning to our politics and not helping us solve our problems.

While the solutions needed are many and far-reaching, what we do not need, he says, is more liberal democracy or more populism. Liberal democracy has gone awry - and this is the key point - because of its tendency to put freedom over solidarity, individualism over reciprocity, which I do not think our Gospel values. As Pabst says, and it may surprise us, liberal democracy is perfectly capable of existing alongside oligarchy, demagoguery and, ultimately, chaos. This is very frightening. It should frighten us. We must not think that we cannot lose all that we have very fast.

Can we name the one thing that is missing that we all need to work to recover if we are to stop the decline? What we have lost or seen eroded - and we can argue about how far we have lost it or how far it has been eroded - are the social bonds and civic ties on

which a vibrant and functioning democracy depends. It is easy to be cynical at this point, to caricature any attempt to talk about community and, yet, community, social bonds and civic ties are still the glue which hold it all together. They are what makes trust and co-operation possible without which our democracy cannot function.

What is the message for the Church, which I am sure you would agree works hard at community? I am convinced that the train I have sketched out, reciprocity and solidarity, social bonds and civic ties, is vintage territory for the Church. We can make a huge difference to stem the hollowing out of our democracy, the hollowing out of our communities.

We will not do this - and this is my principal point - unless we first take a hard look at ourselves, what we model to the world. We must take great care in how we speak in this chamber and outside it and we must commit to those with whom we disagree, including our fellow Christians, commit to building a future together in which all of us can flourish.

Canon Zahida Mallard (Leeds): I stand in support of the motion and, in particular, the annex at (b). I stood a couple of days ago talking about labels that we put on others when the voices of the poor and the marginalised need to be at the heart of our concern.

Over the last few days, I have heard lots of people talk about lots of different groups and do lots of “othering”. The “othering” is here in and amongst us. Some of you might recall a couple of years ago when I stood up in the welfare benefits debate saying I stood there

with £10 in my purse to last me the week. That had an impact on me and on others. It spoke volumes.

Our council set its budget this week and our council leader said that they were at breaking point. Since 2011, £262 million has been cut from our council budget. In supporting the motion, I am supporting each of us to put our money and our voices to work alongside each other and build up the people of God.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): When I first read the wording of the motion, I was underwhelmed and I feared it would be an all things to all men type of debate. We began our Synod with Archbishop Justin exhausting us - exhorting us - to put such - oh, what a long day - exhorting us to put such cynicism aside. You are so cynical. Put cynicism aside.

I think that is the theme I want to go along with because are we not here hearing - and, I have listened - fleshing out things beyond our individual political prejudices. We are trying to respond with generosity, breadth of vision and setting aside party politics, whether left, right, Peter or Apollos or Paul. We want people to engage with complex issues, but how they do so without tearing each other apart is a big issue.

It may sometimes seem an impossible one, but I would like to speak of a wonderful historical example within living memory of most of us here, when Godliness in the public debate made a huge lasting difference, and I refer to my hero of adolescence, Dr Martin

Luther King. When he articulated his dream, he did so unembarrassed to set it out in the context of faith. His supporters carried placards talking of the morality of their cause. His rhetoric was full of biblical promise and allusions.

He led a movement that dominated the television screens every bit as much as the Brexit debate has recently. It was on there for years, many of you will remember, and it was profoundly moving because he eschewed cynicism and he put his faith both in God and the profundity of inclusive promises within his country's foundational principles. When he spoke of cashing in the cheque which Lincoln wrote to the African American minority, he uncynically took America and the founder of the Republican Party at their word and he said, effectively, that he was going to give the audacity of hope and make America great again.

In his autobiography, he wrote of sadness because in the north violence broke out and, yet, in the south, under the leadership where the church had such power of influence and moral force, his followers took not a single life, they burnt nobody's home and they looted nobody's business. At the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, they showed the world that victory can be won when you turn the other cheek. That is deeply uncynical. He had opponents but he never called them enemies and, when he was murdered, George Wallace later repented.

Martin Luther King brought his opponents, who some thought were his enemies, he did not accept that and he put them on the path of righteousness. So what went wrong?

Well, in short, cynicism. There was a book written around the same time called *Rules for Radicals*. If you have not seen it, Google it. The playbook inspired a certain breed of campaigning which has now infected across the political spectrum.

The three principles I will give you. Keep the pressure on. If you push a negative hard and deep enough, it will break through. Pick the target. Freeze it, personalise it and polarise it. Such cynicism. Have we ever done that? Do we ever use a single name as a sort of dog whistle call to our tribe, whether that name is Jacob Rees-Mogg or Diane Abbot or Donald Trump or Anna Soubry?

We all do this and that is part of the cynicism we have got to address. We have young people here today, and what I would say is have a look at that history of those times where hope broke through, where Godliness produced good whilst cynicism was tearing people apart. Dr King had a dream. We can still keep that dream.

Revd Anne Stevens (London): Thank you to the Archbishops for this motion. I particularly value everything it says about praying for our elected representatives. I was thinking how good it would be when we get home to write to them, if we have not already done that, to let them know that we are praying.

Perhaps at the same time we might put in a little paragraph under the prophetic heading that the Bishop of Chelmsford was talking about, speaking the truth to power, because what the Archbishop called our effective democracy is in some danger of paralysis at the

moment. This is a time when the Church could urge all our elected parliamentarians to rise above the dramas of party politics and perhaps also above their own fears about reselection and election, to talk together openly and honestly about what the best future of this country might look like and how we might get there together.

I would just like to commend the work that the Second Estates Commissioner is doing in the Houses of Parliament at the moment and to reassure her that our prayers are with her.

Revd Dr James Walters (Universities & TEs): I strongly support this motion and the attention that it is giving to both the causes and symptoms of social division. I just want to highlight one such cause and symptom with which I think we should have particular concern. For some time, our friends in the Muslim community have had to live with and to respond to the appropriation and distortion of their noble faith tradition by extremists who twist it into an ideology of hate and sectarian division.

What I feel we are slow to wake up to is that the same thing is now happening to us. Across Europe and in our own nation, populist movements are using the label of Christianity as the defining feature of national purity. They would have us believe that the Gospel does not teach us to welcome the stranger but to protect ourselves from them. Theirs is not the Pentecost vision of all nations and races united in Jesus Christ. It is an ideology of racism and nationalism cloaked in empty Christian words.

We see this in the rhetoric of Orbán in Hungary, of Le Pen in France and of Salvini in Italy but, increasingly, we are seeing this among those who sow the seeds of division in our own communities, particularly during this time of uncertainty and anxiety. I fear that we are underprepared for the likelihood that this will get worse.

The encouraging news is that the research has shown that the best inoculation against this form of politics in Western Europe is to attend church. Churchgoers hear the radical demands that the love of Christ makes and are better equipped to recognise hatred and division when it masquerades as Christianity, but we may need to do more to distance ourselves from those who distort the Gospel and correct people's understanding of it.

As populism grows, we will need, increasingly, three things. First, we need strong interfaith relations and an increasingly intelligent and sensitive understanding of other faiths. The populist ideology says that we are Christians because they are Muslim and they are our enemy. We say we are Christians because we have been transformed by the love of God, a love that we are called to show and share with all people.

Second, we need a vibrant theological life to resource our understanding and proclamation of the Gospel in this generation and to build our confidence in challenging its distortions. We need to be honest that, through sin, the temptation to demonise others and retreat into tribes is present in our own congregations and, indeed, our own hearts. We need to go deeper and deeper ourselves into the meaning of the Gospel of inclusion.

Third, we need what has been the focus of this Synod, which is a confident and attractive witness to the Christian life that speaks up for social justice and calls people susceptible to sectarian ideology away from their defensiveness and fear to join in the building up of the common good that is the Kingdom of God in this nation.

The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes): I want to offer Synod the words of Fr Daniel Berrigan SJ, a courageous and articulate US campaigner for peace who recently died and who said in his life, “Know where you stand and stand there”. I support the motion and I thank the Presidents for tabling it and I thank the Archbishop of Canterbury for his initial speech and for its strong emphasis on the preferential option for the poor, which echoes so much of what he has consistently said in the public square, not least in his speech to the TUC last September.

We must know that if we affirm this motion we will attract the opprobrium that he attracted there and, frankly, from the same quarters. We will be accused of political naiveté, of abandoning the tower of intelligent nuance for the simplicity of a preferential option. We will not then be seen as the voice of convening calm whose proud boast is that no one knows the political choices we make. We will be seen, instead, as those who take a stand. I hope that we will do so wholeheartedly today.

I strongly agree with the Bishop of Chelmsford that our Gospel is indivisible and with Andy Salmon that the divisions in the nations are sharpening, as in Salford so in Liverpool. In the Diocese of Liverpool, we say that we are asking God for a bigger Church to make a

bigger difference and, we say, more people knowing Jesus more justice in the world. In saying this, we echo the scriptures as we understand them and we echo the emphasis of all the dioceses and of this Synod in this session.

Our Lord made it clear, however, that those who set out to build a tower must count the cost of it. Will we, therefore, count the cost of building this tower, the tower of decision and of making political choices? The tectonic plates of politics are moving rapidly, so the old Anglican nostrum “I am not making a party political point” has lost its meaning and also its power to intimidate.

As Bishop Peter Selby noted years ago in his book *Liberating God*, pastoral care will inevitably imply political solidarity with all the negativity and risk of misunderstanding that that attracts. Our corporate stance is always political. It implies and demands advocacy, advocacy for the preferential option for those on the edge of things.

I am delighted to see that this motion avoids the call for people just to get along, which so often renders us anodyne. It is right to seek the common good and, within that, to establish good disagreement. Of course, it is good for people to get along, but this motion tells us that our own contribution to the common good is to offer a direction with which some may disagree and then for us to disagree well about that.

The question to others is, therefore, since we have a preferential option for the poor, since we will not accept political solutions that make the poor poorer or that accept the abolition

of the rights of poor or erase the place of the poor, since this is where we stand, let us see how can get along.

If that is indeed where we stand, then we should approve this motion and, thereby, choose repeatedly and consistently and unswervingly to defend those on the edge of things. If that is, indeed, where we stand, then please in every conversation, in private and in the public square, let us stand there.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I apologise that this is a little unprepared. Sometimes, you get to see yourselves through the experience of others. Like the Bishop of Southwark, the Archbishop of York and David Porter, I have been in India recently and on one occasion went up to the border with Pakistan where they have this bizarre rally every day.

As we walked back, my partner fell into conversation with a young Indian and he was talking about what our perspectives of the country were. Paul said to him, "You know, this is a country where there is so much going on, but one of the huge questions is between the massive division between those who have and those who do not". This guy said, without a shadow of doubt, "Yes, and I think we can crack that problem in 50 years in this country".

What struck me about that was that India is a country that believes its best days are ahead of it, whereas we I think have a big question about that in our own minds. The challenge

of that, of course, comes down to one of leadership. It is often said that we get the leaders that we deserve. That may be true but, to just interject a moment of controversy into this, if we are going to pray for our leaders not just to manage the economy but to be effective leaders for the good of our nation, we need to pray for our leaders to be better leaders. We need for our leaders to be those with a bigger vision of what this country means to be prosperous than a bottom line, not just to settle with what can be done and how to manage what we think but to offer what I was going to say in another speech earlier in the week was a counter-narrative of hope.

Perhaps, to pick up what the Bishop of Chelmsford said earlier, what this Synod has been doing in some ways is to be articulating a counter-narrative of hope for the future of the Church of England and may that be true. I very nearly voted against the Bishop of Burnley yesterday, not because I do not agree with everything he has said but because I challenged myself as to believe whether the vested interests that I hold and that each one of us hold can be overcome by the action that needs to happen to make that change real in terms of estates evangelism.

What cannot change that resistance in me is more managed change. What can change that in me is a new vision of hope for the future. What we do as parochial clergy, as lay people in our places of work, week in week out through our witness, is to offer a counter-narrative of hope. If we are, like that young man, to start believing that our best days are ahead, we have got to start to hope. Let us pray for our leaders not just to try harder but to do better and to help us to do better too.

Dr Meg Warner (London): This is an important debate and I am grateful to the Presidents for bringing it forward. I would like, however, to sound just one small note of caution. I could not possibly, Chair, vote against either paragraphs (a) or (b). I am, in general, in favour of prayer and of hearing the voices of the poor and the marginalised, but I find paragraph (c) a little more difficult. It seems to me that people who live in glass houses perhaps should be a little careful about calling upon their national leaders to put aside their differences.

Bishop Cottrell, in the beginning of this debate, spoke about this Synod and the extent to which it had looked outwards and was delighted about the fact that that had happened so much more than in recent Synods that he could remember. It would be unfortunate, I think, if any note of a sense of hypocrisy about a Synod which was divided amongst itself were to choose to tell the leaders of our nation to get over their own divisions.

Synod, I do not think that our internal divisions do not mean that we as a Church have anything to contribute. Far from it. If we are able to speak out of our own divisions and woundedness, there is a huge amount of a very practical nature that this Church is able to offer the nation and, in particular, I want to be thinking about Brexit. Nor do we need to reinvent the wheel.

If we take the responses of churches and other faith groups to the recent spate of disasters in this country - the Manchester bombing, the Westminster and London Bridge

attacks and the Grenfell Tower fire, just to name a few - we have a blueprint for what we can do to support our traumatically divided community.

Christians were intimately involved in the response to those disasters. Local churches provided gathering places, distribution centres for donated money and goods, and pastoral support for those affected. Both local churches and cathedrals held liturgies, formal and informal, that helped people to come to terms with what had happened, to gather, to remember, to mourn, to support one another. Some of those liturgies were focused on reclaiming public places for local people.

The power of these responses, I think, took everybody by surprise, not least ourselves, and led to some significant changes in disaster response practice. For the first time, clergy are now being invited into disaster cordons. The archdeacons among you will be aware that churches are being included at the very heart of local disaster response plans instead of being kept at the periphery. The public has started to recognise what we have to offer.

What does all of this have to do with Brexit? Not all, but many of these responses can be offered and are needed around Brexit. On the first day of Synod, I spoke with the Dean of Southwark who was pondering exactly how the disaster response model might help us to think through what we can do to help the nation heal, whether Brexit happens or it does not. Ritual that helps people to move from one place to another and through experiences of pain is our core business.

Anybody who saw the national service of mourning for Grenfell at St Paul's or watched at Borough's Borough Market or when Salisbury Riverbank were reclaimed will know just how powerful they can be. I have offered one example. In fact, we have myriad resources as a Church to offer the nation through Brexit, resources that are liturgical, pastoral, biblical and practical.

We have said a great deal about evangelism and mission in this Synod. Mission has famously been described as getting in the way of what God is doing in the world. Like it or not, one of the things that is currently happening in our world is division around Brexit. We need to be involved and our nation needs to know that we in our division and God, in God's unity, are walking alongside them wherever the road leads.

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

The Chair: That is very kind of you. I am going to try and just squeeze a couple more speakers in, if I may.

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): I do not know whether this speech would have been better said in the debate on youth evangelism, but I offer it here and now because I think it is relevant to the matter that we are discussing.

One of the things that I do in my ministry as a parish priest is to be chaplain to the local squadron of the ATC. On Tuesday, I got them talking about a couple of issues and about whether it was right to obey orders under all circumstances. One group were looking at whether they should obey an order that they believed to be unjust, the other an order that they believed to be illegal.

They started off talking about that but, very quickly, both groups, in a multi-ethnic, multi-faith group of largely secular teenagers, wanted to talk about that Shamima Begum. They had a range of views, some very trenchant, some a bit more nuanced. What I was feeling as we were talking about this was something about trying to help them to understand and to hunger and thirst for what is right. The Sermon on the Mount has been a bit of a theme, has it not?

But, here were young people, young people whose futures in this country are going to go on for much longer than most of the rest of ours. They were passionate about what was right, even if they disagreed about it. They were trying, or I was trying to help them, to learn a bit about nuance, to listen to one another, to hear all voices, but to let that group be a place where we can encourage all people to think deeply about complex issues and narratives that offer hope. I have not yet tried them on Brexit.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Enid Barron (London): I, of course, like everyone else, support all the sentiments in this motion. One could not disagree. It seems to me, as a fairly new member of Synod, I have heard quite a lot debates with wonderful calls to commend and exhort and pray for - and, of course, praying is something we must do.

I always want to say how can we put legs on these and I am just wondering how can we put legs on this wonderful motion, particularly in relation to (b). I am looking for practicalities. What can we do practically at ground level, really in accordance with (b) of the motion, as a practical way of affirming our commitment?

I just want to offer a very few ideas from my own experience. Our local MP, the lovely Rupa Huq, has brought together people from our borough from all sorts of different faith groups to meet together to think how we can solve the problems of our borough. This is a model that we could perhaps use as Church leaders, inviting our MPs and councillors to call such groups together.

At the last meeting we had, we all shared food from our different ethnicities and faith groups. So, here, I am going to make my granny suggestion. At church, I am generally known as the minister of cake. Yesterday, I morphed into the eco-granny, but tomorrow I shall be the minister of cake again. One thing we can do is to share hospitality. This is a very basic thing we can do. It helps to heal divisions. It will not solve the economic problems of Honda and so on, but it will get us talking to people we do not normally talk to. Can I suggest that this is something that as churches we do, try to get our MPs or our

councillors to get groups of people together and to get people to eat together, because that is what Jesus did.

I have just bought a book called *Eating Your Way Through Luke's Gospel*. Perhaps we should all digest that. Many of the debates at this Synod have been about wonderful opportunities to reach out to marginalised communities on estates, the homeless, the Roma community.

Perhaps in the outworking of those within our parishes, we might share good ideas that could be sent out to everybody across the Church of England websites and so on. Here is to the ministry of hospitality and let us help to heal some of the divisions in our nation that way.

The Chair: The Bishop of Coventry, then I shall be testing the Synod's mind on the closure.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): I am glad that, over the Synod, people have been able to get to know a little of my companion link Bishop, Paul Korir, with his question, "Is it well with your soul?" This debate is about the soul of Britain and how not all is well with it. I agree with much - all I think - of the analysis, the symptoms and causes of that, but I contend there is a cause which we should name more clearly lest we mirror the neglect of the national debate.

That is the damage that we have done over recent years to the soul of Europe, of which we are, by history, geography, culture and religion, inextricably part. What love have we shown to our neighbour in Europe? Where in our national debates has been the question not is our exiting or our staying in the EU good for us and for our identity and prosperity, but is it good for our neighbours who live in next door countries? When have we considered that the loss of the British economy to the EU is the equivalent to 20 smaller nations leaving? When do we say that no-deal Brexit is morally indefensible because of the toll it will take on ordinary families across the EU whose livelihood it threatens?

Whether Brexit happens, or history by some strange turn halts it, as Meg Warner reminded us, the wounds of the war of words that has been unleashed in our land and between our land and our land and other partners will need healing. Before the referendum, David Cameron is said to have worried about the demons it would let loose. The demons of demeaning the other, the European other, the British ethnic other, the religious other, the British other with whom we disagree about the EU are running wild.

This summer, one of our children married a wonderful German woman in the ruins of Coventry Cathedral in a sacred space desecrated by war and destroyed by hatred. They vowed in English and German to love each other. As I watched their generation dance the night away, I saw that they had a new challenge. That is to demonstrate that there is a deeper union between the contractual arrangements of our membership of the EU that binds the nations of Europe together in a covenant of common purpose and life.

For the sake of the soul of Europe and the soul of Britain, we need even in these tense times to find a way to key our debate into the chord of generosity and, yes, humility, the Gospel of loving our neighbours as ourselves that unlocks our true calling, to be a Godly nation and a blessing to others.

The Chair. Members of Synod, under the shiny new Standing Order 31(1)(a), I can put to you a motion for the closure on this item.

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

The Chair. I now call upon His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to respond to the debate. Your Grace, you have six minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Thank you so much. I am grateful for the six minutes. We have had 19 speakers, all of whom have spoken extraordinarily during this debate. It has been a wonderful, informative, thoughtful and careful debate. Please forgive me that I cannot go through all of them. I will try and sum up in a moment. I want to pick up one or two themes that seemed to me to come back.

Bishop Sarah spoke of hospitality and that was a theme we kept hearing: hospitality to the other, hospitality and prayer around 29 March. Bishop Stephen Cottrell spoke of a new humility in a really powerful speech. There were many other things. He emphasised

that we have during this group of sessions had one debate not many. I think that is a particularly powerful thought to come away with. Caroline Herbert brought up the importance of prayer. Jamie brought up something that came through later as well, that our own dialogues must show reconciliation.

Giles emphasised the engagement we have at every level of community and spoke of the way in which that could contribute to a citizens' assembly, at least at local levels. I would certainly commend that to the Synod. Andrew Salmon reminded us of the inequality by region across the country which has been ever more visible, the thousands of pounds spent in capital expenditure in the south per capita compared to the few pounds spent in the north per capita in every year.

Viv Faull reminded us with immense pathos and power of the issue of one example of Swindon. Let us remember to pray for them. I trust people will look back at her speech. She gave us the things that they are doing which seemed to me spoke so powerfully. They were liturgical. They were spiritual. They were practical. They were in every way prophetic. John Appleby called us to a generosity of spirit. Martin Gainsborough again reminded us that we needed to look at ourselves.

There was a theme that kept coming through. Zahida Mallard spoke about local government at breaking point. That came from a number of speakers. I wonder what we can do about that to speak up as advocates for local government. Martin Sewell reminded me that I am exhausting. I am deeply grateful. My family would agree entirely. They

may well send you something to say how much they do. More importantly perhaps, at least in the long term, he spoke of Dr King, that extraordinary powerful example of the absence of cynicism that changed a nation and, indeed, a world.

I am so glad that Anne Stevens commended the Second Church Estates Commissioner. I do hope you will pray especially for her. She has faced such bitter attack and she has been so heroic. We have someone there we can truly be proud represents this Church. Jim spoke of the danger of the phrase “Christian” or “Christianity” being kidnapped, being abducted and turned into a symptom of nationalist xenophobia and he said much else as well, but I think he spoke particularly about the confident and attractive witness to the Christian life.

Bishop Paul, know where you stand and stand there. Thank you for those words. Simon Butler, the importance of a counter-narrative of hope. Meg Warner, thank you for your points about part (c). I think if we were to stand there and say, “We have got it right, now you chaps just get together over there”, I would agree entirely with her; but, I hope, picking up that theme of none of humility, that we can speak as I have seen in my own family someone in recovery from alcoholism speaking, which is not to say I know how to be good speaking to another alcoholic; it is to say, “I have been there. I continue to struggle. I will stand with you and support you”. I hope that is what paragraph (c) is saying.

Priscilla White, the need to hunger and thirst for what is right. Enid Barron, we need to put legs on the motion. I agree so much. Bishop Christopher, that vivid picture of

Coventry, what a place, the place that has influenced me as much as anywhere. The damage to Europe, the wounds of the war of words, the need for a covenant of common purpose of life.

Therefore, in my last minus 12 seconds or something like that I just want to list the words that came to mind. Love for others. Prayer. That we will be judged on our response to the present crisis as a Church. Live and share the Gospel. Love the poor. Speak truth. We can do what is needed if we do not seek the credit for it. Humility, hospitality, change in ourselves and, above all, hope. Thank you, Synod.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of order: Chair, this motion calls for action far beyond this place. I wonder if I could call for an accurate count of the Synod. Could you order a count of the Synod, please?

The Chair: I am happy to order a count of the whole Synod but, before we move to a vote, I am going to invite the Archbishop of York to lead us in prayer. Your Grace.

The Archbishop of York led the Synod in prayer.

The Chair: I now order a count of the whole Synod.

The motion was put and carried, 240 voting in favour, none against, with 1 recorded abstention.

The Chair. Thank you very much, Synod. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR: *Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 3.38 pm.

ITEM 21 FAREWELLS

The Chair. Synod, we come now to Item 21, some more farewells. I call upon the Archbishop of York to give the farewell to Stephen Slack, the Chief Legal Adviser.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Do not go on like that or I will start getting a handkerchief out of my pocket. Members of Synod, Stephen Slack became Chief Legal Adviser to the National Institutions of the Church of England in 2001.

As Chief Legal Adviser for 18 years, he has led a small team advising both Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners. Stephen actually brought together the legal functions in Church House into a single legal team working together to support all the National Church Institutions.

Whilst Synod members will recognise Stephen mostly from being Registrar to the General Synod, from Questions and from legislative Steering and Revision Committees, in fact,

the great bulk of his work has taken place outside Synod. He brought great legal wisdom to the framing of the Civil Partnerships Act.

Stephen also worked extensively with the Government in 2006 and 2010 on equality legislation to ensure that freedom of belief was protected within the new legal framework for equalities. Eventually, the Church and the Government were able to agree appropriate protections for churches and other religious bodies in legislation on same sex marriage.

During Stephen's time in office, he has been responsible for some very significant legislation that now forms part of the law of the land, notably including the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 and the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure, which for the first time reformed the essential medieval concept of persons' freehold. Then came the Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure.

Together with other key documents like the House of Bishops' Declaration, to which he contributed so much, this paved the way for women to be consecrated Bishops, whilst the Five Guiding Principles ensured a way forward that afforded space within the Church of England for those with different theological convictions on this matter. Stephen's contribution to this settlement was immense and Stephen's grasp of complexity and his alertness to the dangers of unintended consequences are second to none.

Though highly represented by all Bishops, senior Church officials and by significant legal and political figures in Parliament, Stephen wears his authority lightly. Whilst he and his

advice are held in the highest regard, he is not the kind of lawyer who often gives rise to fear and trepidation. In my view, this is a strength. He is, surely, the human face of ecclesiastical law. His advice is always careful, courteous and conscientious and his heart is in the service of Christ.

I, personally, have found Stephen always a pleasure to work with. I am not alone here. The Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament has regularly commended the quality of the material, including much Church legislation, which is brought to them by the team that Stephen leads. His drafting and the help on the legislation that we send has always been commended on. I wish the other two places had such great advice.

Despite appearances to the contrary, I understand that Stephen does have a life outside Church House. Retirement will see him spending more time enjoying the great outdoors with his family, visiting famous historic gardens, their flowers, plants and monuments. Now that Stephen has moved from Devon to Oxfordshire, in future we shall be able to find him there at Charlbury village fete, running his parish church book stall, wearing his famous off duty red trousers. Ask him for an off the record legal opinion, if you dare.

Stephen, we owe you a great debt of gratitude for all you have done in the service of Christ here. May God give you and your wife, Georgiana, and your family great joy and blessing as you go into retirement. Thank you. All I can say to you are these words: for all that has been, thanks; for all that shall be, yes; may God richly continue to bless you. Thank you.

The Chair. Thank you, your Grace. I now call upon the Archbishop of Canterbury to give the farewell to Jonathan Spencer in his role as the Chair of the Church of England's Pensions Board.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Synod, Jonathan Spencer has been an exemplary, indeed extraordinary, Chair of the Pensions Board for over ten years. He took on the role in 2009 following the global financial crisis. His approach has been one which has been calm and reassuring, but he is not afraid to challenge as circumstances have dictated. He has used the skills of diplomacy, tact and a strategic vision, honed during his working life as a senior civil servant, to great effect to assist and further the Church's ministry and mission.

As this Synod may recall, Jonathan was due to step down last year but, following the sudden death of the Board's CEO, he stepped in to work with the executive team and provide support and leadership during a very difficult and painful time. This amounted to giving an additional day each week, often coming into Church House for a nine-month period. This was on top of the day each week that he had given the Pensions Board for ten years, all in an entirely voluntary capacity.

Under his leadership, the Board has grown, not only in the amount of money it has under management but also in the number of customers and stakeholders it seeks to serve. It has become more diverse in all senses and more complex and has been at the forefront

of ethical and responsible investment, including leading on climate change, as will have been noticed in the constant references to it or to the Church of England, and it has been the Pensions Board and the Church Commissioners who have led on this over the last few years.

Climate change has been something deeply in Jonathan's heart and he has done much to change the world investing community's attitude to it. He has not shied away from the difficult and complicated decisions at the heart of the Pensions Board's ministry, ensuring that retirement housing for clergy, for example, is soundly financed and that the interests of the 40,000 customers of the Board are looked after and protected.

In addition to serving the Pensions Board, Jonathan has found the time and energy over recent years to chair the Gibraltar Financial Services Commission, Deputy Chair of East Kent Hospitals University Foundation Trust, serve on his local PCC and as a member of the Canterbury Diocesan Discernment Panel.

Jonathan, you and your wife, Caroline, go with our prayers and with our thanks and gratitude for your service to the Church, not only in this place but in Canterbury Diocese. You will be deeply missed by the Board, the staff and by the members of Synod. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, your Grace. That now concludes Item 21 on the agenda. We move directly to Item 22, the Prorogation.

ITEM 22 PROROGATION

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Before I prorogue, I am just going to say a word of prayer for Fr Paul Benfield who was taken to hospital during the lunch break today.

The Archbishop of Canterbury led the Synod in prayer.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Before the final blessing, a lengthy item. In accordance with Standard Order 45, I prorogue this group of sessions.

The Archbishop of Canterbury prorogued the Synod.

INDEX

- abuse 192–3
by clergy 114, 194
and power 377, 378–9
see also IICSA; safeguarding
- accountability:
and Questions 493
and safeguarding 193
- addiction:
and homelessness 357, 363
to gambling 688, 690, 691–3, 699,
700, 707, 713–14
- Additional Curates Society 131
- advertising and gambling, debate 686–
714
- Advisory Council on Relations between
Bishops and Religious
Communities 289
- Advisory Council of the Religious Life
274, 276–7
- Affirmation of Baptismal Faith* 111–12,
149, 152–6, 158–75
- ageism 200
- agreements, non-disclosure 185–6,
197–9
- Amending Canon No. 38 214–16
- Anglican Church of Kenya 53–60, 532–
3
- Anglican Communion:
and climate change 423, 431, 438
and evangelism and discipleship
45–61
guests of Synod 4, 45–61, 497–501
and same-sex marriage 186–7
- Anglican Young People's Association
565
- Anglican-Roman Catholic International
Commission (ARCIC) 340–41
- Annual Parochial Church Meeting, and
deanery synod representatives
201, 225, 240, 251, 258–9
- Appointments Committee 505
- apportionment 129–30, 134
- Apprenticeship Levy 78–9
- Archbishop of Canterbury, Presidential
Address 61–9
- Archbishop of York, and Crown
Nominations Commission 504–7
- Archbishops' Council:
appointment of new members 71–6
budget 85
and climate change 420–22, 423,
432–3
questions to 125–48
and register of clergy and lay
ministers 301
term limits 203
World Mission and Anglican
Communion Panel 101
- Article 7 business 4, 214
- Association of English Cathedrals 120
- asylum seekers, Roma heritage people
622
- banking, investment in 114–15
- banks and building societies, and
gambling 706
- baptism:
C of E teaching 169–72
common baptismal certificate 343
see also *Affirmation of Baptismal
Faith*
- BBC, and religious broadcasting 126–7
- benefices, multi-parish 245–6, 247,
250, 269–70
- betting, fixed odds 692, 696, 706–7
- Bishop Bell case 114–15, 189–90
- Bishop for Urban Life and Faith 100
- bishops, in House of Lords 578, 695,
700, 701
- Bishops' Advisers for the Ministry of
Deliverance 197
- Bishops' Advisory Panels 83, 179–80,
185
- Bishops' Councils, and DACs 308–9
- Bishops' Mission Orders 275–6, 285–6
- Bishops and Priests (Consecration and
Ordination of Women) Measure
760
- Brexit:
and the common good 716, 721–2,
729, 731
impact on urban estates 583
and liturgical resources 110–11
and need for reconciliation 6, 73,
98–9, 111, 718–19, 728–9,
735, 748–50, 754, 756

[Type here]

- and Roma 623
- Briden Report 113–14, 189–90, 195
- Bridge Report 202
- building societies, and gambling 706
- Buildings Support Group 123
- Business Committee:
 - report 5–18
 - and Standing Orders 211–12
 - variation in order of business 350–51
- cadet forces 543, 569, 751
- Canon Law:
 - B 5 110, 111
 - B 30 151, 273
 - B 43 339–40, 344–5
 - C 4.5 178–80
 - C 8 271
 - E 4 187
 - F 12 291
 - G 1 - G 6 295
- Canterbury see Archbishop of Canterbury
- carbon emissions:
 - reduction 119, 411–12, 417, 429
 - zero 419
- carbon footprint, measuring 412, 420–21
- Care of Cathedrals Measure 2011 290
- Carlile Report 13, 114, 189, 195, 196
- cathedrals:
 - building on disused burial grounds 290–91
 - value to economy 689
 - and young people 541–4, 665
- Cathedrals Administration and Finance Association (CAFA) 120
- Cathedrals Measure 120–21
- Cathedrals Support Group 120
- Cathedrals Working Group 120–21
- cell groups, in Kenya 58
- Centrepoint 354
- Centuries of Marginalisation, Visions of Hope* 618–50
- change, cultural:
 - and Crown Nominations Commission 513, 516, 519–20, 522, 526–9
 - and gambling 686
 - and ministry with children and young people 555
 - and youth evangelism 659
 - see also culture
- chaplaincy:
 - cadet force 543, 569, 751
 - school 56, 664
 - to Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 623–4, 628, 631, 633, 641, 646–7
 - university 555
- Charities Act 2011 121
- Charity Commission:
 - and cathedrals 121–2
 - and safeguarding allegations 198–9
 - and term limits for charity trustees 203
- Charity Finance Group 210
- Charity Governance Code 203–4
- children:
 - abuse of, see abuse; safeguarding
 - and church attendance 205–6
 - and estates evangelism 587
 - evangelism with 6, 55, 527–71
 - and gambling 686–8, 695, 698, 704, 707–10
- Children and Youth Development Group 547
- children's workers 662–4
- Church Action on Poverty 733
- Church in Action survey 366
- Church Army 308
 - and estates evangelism 611
 - and homelessness 360
 - and youth congregations 539–40, 652, 654, 665, 673–4, 683
- church buildings, sustainability 689
- Church Buildings Council:
 - and DACs 291, 292, 307–8, 310, 316
 - and Lottery funding 710–711
 - questions to 207–12
- Church Buildings Division 315
- Church Commissioners:
 - and affordable housing 116–18
 - and cathedrals 120–21
 - clergy eligibility as 112–13
 - House of Laity elections to 199–200
 - investments 115–16, 431

[Type here]

- and mission 117–18
- and payment of legal costs 114–15
- questions to 112–25
- Church Commissioners Measure 1947 113, 116, 292
- Church of England:
 - attendance by children and young people 205–6
 - carbon footprint 412, 420–21, 425
 - membership 239
- Church of England Environment Programme (CoEEP) 101–2
- Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure 2018 290
- Church of England Pensions Regulations 1997 70
- Church of England Youth Council (CEYC) 38, 73, 75, 666, 684
- Church House, Communications Office 126–7
- Church Minister Apprenticeship 78–9
- Church of North India 45–6, 51–2
- Church Pastoral Aid Society 549, 733
- church planting 67, 140, 606
- Church Representation and Ministers Measure 7, 245–68, 216–44
- Church Representation Rules 201–3, 218–68, 295
 - and secondary legislation 242–3
- church schools:
 - academies 204–5
 - and evangelism 568, 612, 615
 - and exclusions 99–100
 - in Kenya 56, 532–3
 - and links with parishes 550–51, 553–4
 - prayer captains 530
 - rural 536–8
 - and *Thy Kingdom Come* 205
 - and worship prepared by children 562
- Church of Scotland, and pastoral services 330
- Church and State 504–6
 - The State of the Nation* 715–58
- Church Urban Fund 134, 613
- A Church Near You* 126
- churches, historic, and government support 689
- Churches Network for Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 622–3, 627, 658
- Churches Together in England Enabling Group 341–2
- churchwardens:
 - number 125–6
 - term limit 201, 219, 223
- Churchwardens Measure 223
- citizens' assembly 731–2, 756
- Civil Partnerships Act 560
- clergy:
 - as abusers 114, 194
 - eligibility as Church Commissioners 112–13
 - and evangelism 459, 470–71
 - house-for-duty 84
 - in Kenya 57–8
 - leaving ministry 93–4
 - National Register 289–90, 299–302
 - pensions 763
 - response to major disasters 749
 - retirement 129, 132, 763
 - in same-sex relationships 149–50
 - self-supporting 84
 - taking days off 95–6
 - training for youth ministry 654, 662–3, 666, 682
 - trans 174–5
 - wellbeing 91–3, 96
 - working in urban estates 584, 587, 593, 600–601, 608–610
 - see also *Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing*
- Clergy Discipline Commission 191
- Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 190–91, 199, 760
- Clerk to the Synod, questions to 199–204
- Climate Action + initiative 19
- climate change 50, 410–39, 498
 - and investment 119, 430–31, 763
 - and measurement of carbon footprint 412, 420–21
- Code of Conduct (Synod) 10–11, 155, 213–14
- Code of Practice on co-operation by the Church of England and other churches 177–8, 339–49

[Type here]

- College of Deans 120
- College of Evangelists 441, 464
- Committee for Minority Ethnic Anglican Concerns 627
- common good 716–17, 721–2, 729, 731, 744–5
- Common Worship: Festivals* 110
- Common Worship: Pastoral Services* 197
- Common Worship: Times and Seasons* 110
- Community Land Trusts 116–17
- Community of St Anselm 2, 38, 181, 212, 618
- complementarian views on women 188–9
- Consumer Price Index 322, 331–2
- Continuing Ministerial Development 95
- continuous praying presence 1, 2, 38, 181, 212, 618
- conversion, religious 48–9, 450
- conversion therapy 399
- Coptic Orthodox Church 544–6, 571
- Corporation of the Church House 130
- Council for Christian Unity 177–8
- Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing 91–3
- CPAS see Church Pastoral Aid Society
- crematoria, funerals at 323, 326–7, 333, 336
- Crisis (charity) 355
- Crown Nominations Commission:
 - and disqualification provision 503, 507
 - questions to 102–9
 - secret ballot 517–26
 - and See of York 504–7
 - and Standing Orders 501–27
 - two-thirds majority requirement 508–17
- culture, and evangelism 451–2, 473–4, 478, 607
- curacies:
 - number 131–2, 181
 - and title posts 270
- cynicism 729–41, 757
- Data Protection Act 220–21
- deaf people:
 - and evangelism 480–81
 - representation 262–3, 267
- deaneries:
 - and work with children and young people 542–3, 663–4, 682
 - and work in urban estates 584, 610
- deanery synods:
 - as electoral college 223, 229, 231
 - Model Rules 224–5, 257, 264
 - term limits 14, 201–2, 218–20, 222–37, 239–41, 249, 251–4, 256–8, 261, 264
 - young members 563–4
- declarations of interest 213–14, 235, 237
- Democracy and the Common Good* (St Paul's Institute) 722
- Development and Appointments Group 184, 502
- digital evangelism 444
- diocesan advisory committees (DACs):
 - and bishops' councils 308–9
 - and Church Buildings Council 291, 292, 307–8, 310, 316
 - and diocesan synods 292, 307–8, 311–13, 316
 - and term limits 292, 307–316
- diocesan boards of finance 146, 290, 297
- and diocesan synods 292, 307–8, 311–12
- and funeral fees 326, 331, 335
- Diocesan Synod Motions:
 - London and Truro 409–439
 - St Albans 686–714
- diocesan synods:
 - and appointments to DACs 292, 307–8, 311–13, 316
 - elections to 243
 - term limits 201–2
- diocesan youth officers 652–3, 675–6, 683
- Diocese in Europe, and Brexit 716, 721
- dioceses:
 - and academy schools 204–5
 - apportionment 129–30, 134
 - and children's councils 549, 570

[Type here]

- environmental programmes 411, 435
- and Lowest Income Communities funding 124, 128, 130–31, 134, 182
- and mutual flourishing 182–4
- and mutual support 130–31, 134–5, 144
- Dioceses Commission, House of Laity elections to 200
- disability:
 - disabled ordinands 81–3
 - and representation 262–3, 267
- disasters, church responses to 749–50
- Discerning in Obedience* 501–3, 504, 506, 509, 518, 524
- discipleship:
 - Anglican Communion perspectives 45–52, 55–60
 - and evangelism 62, 439–86
 - and identity 395–6
 - intentional 56, 552
- discrimination, and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities 619–21, 628, 642
- divorce, and remarriage 178–9
- Draft Amending Canon No. 39 4, 245, 248, 269–72
- Draft Amending Canon No. 40 272–87
- Draft Amending Canon No. 41 288, 293, 294–6, 319
- Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No. 2) Measure 288–319
- Draft Church Representation and Ministers Measure:
 - Final Approval stage 245–68, 7, 216–44
 - Final Drafting stage 216–44
- Draft Parochial Fees and Scheduled Matters Amending Order 2019 141, 320–38
- Draft Representation Measure 6–7
- Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament 259–60, 761
- Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018 291, 292, 294
- Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1963 295
- Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure 760
- Eco Church awards 208, 417, 423, 427
- EcoDiocese awards 208, 417
- Ecumenical Relations Measure 2018 339–40, 349–50
- ecumenism:
 - and Code of Practice 177–8, 339–49
 - guests of General Synod 64
 - and homelessness 343, 369
 - and ministry with children and young people 554, 615
 - representatives at General Synod 177, 341–2, 344–5, 348, 499–500
 - and transgender issues 177–8
- education:
 - for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children 619–21, 637–8
 - theological 85–90, 455, 461–3, 483, 590–91, 609, 654
- elections, electronic 7, 221, 227, 241, 243–4, 250, 253, 266
- Elections Review Group 220, 234, 240, 252, 256–62, 266
- electoral rolls 220–21, 263, 266
- Elizabeth, HM Queen 727
- Elliott report 196
- Embracing Change* 143
- Encouraging Youth Evangelism 651–85
- Endowments and Glebe Measure 1976 141–3
- Environment Working Group 102, 208, 411–12, 422, 431, 434
- environmental officers 208, 415, 423, 435
- environmental programmes 101, 409–39
- episcopate, women in 188–9
- Equality Act 2010 200
- Equality and Human Rights Commission 627–8
- Estate Churches Group 67
- estates evangelism 25, 67, 140, 444, 581–617

[Type here]

- and children and young people 587, 599
- and clergy 584, 587, 593, 600–601, 608–610
- and deprivation 582–612, 614, 615
- and hope 579–601, 614, 747
- and leadership 587, 592–4, 602–4, 608–9, 615
- Estates Evangelism Task Group 582, 585, 590, 602, 606, 609, 611
- Europe, harm done to 721, 754–5, 758
- evangelism:
 - Anglican Communion perspectives 45–9, 50–52, 54–60
 - with children and young people 6, 55, 527–71, 651–85
 - and culture 451–2, 473–4, 478
 - digital 444
 - and discipleship 62, 439–86
 - intentional 55–6, 552
 - and meaning of humanity 452–3, 725–6
 - and prayer 446, 448–9, 479, 482, 727
 - and prophecy 725
 - and theology 462–3
 - see also estates evangelism; mission; witness
- Evangelism and Discipleship Team 454–5
- Evangelism Task Group 441, 445, 446–7, 451, 454–5, 610, 653
- evangelists, as gift 463–4
- exclusion:
 - and the common good 716, 718, 743–4
 - and crime 99–100
 - from schools 99–100
 - of Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 624, 628
- exorcisms 197–8
- Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, and Rule Committee 9–10, 16, 207
- Faith in Action* video series 126
- Faith in the City* 133
- Faith in Kids 556
- families:
 - and gender transition 159, 167
 - and *Growing Faith* 148, 150–51, 538–40, 542, 544, 547, 551–2, 553, 556, 559–60, 570, 656–7
 - homeless 361
 - interchurch 348
 - work with 58, 62, 278
 - and youth evangelism 656–60
- Farewells 571–80, 759–63
- fear, and sexuality and gender 378
- fees, exemption or remission 290, 296, 297
- Fees Advisory Commission 290
- Fees Measure 2013 327
- Fees Order 2019 141, 321–38
- Finance Act 1994 210
- Finance Committee, question to 78–9
- Finland, and social care 355, 362
- Five Guiding Principles 182–3, 760
- fossil fuels, and climate change 119
- From Anecdote to Evidence* 206, 664
- fundamentalism, religious 51
- funerals:
 - authorized ministers 290
 - fees 323–34, 336
 - as mission opportunities 320–21, 323–4, 330–33, 335–6
- gambling:
 - and advertising 686–714
 - call for levy 690, 693
 - clinic 687, 690, 713
 - fixed odds 692, 696, 697, 706–7
 - online 686, 688, 690, 700, 705–6, 708–9
 - and sport 687–8, 691, 696, 702–3, 706
- Gambling Act 2005 690
- gender:
 - complementarian view 188–9
 - recent research 153–4
 - and sexuality 153–4, 160, 176, 379, 397
 - see also transgender issues
- General Synod:
 - accessibility 7–8, 18, 21–42
 - Code of Conduct 10–11, 16, 424
 - continuous praying presence 2, 38, 181, 212

[Type here]

- ecumenical representatives 177, 342, 344–5, 348, 499–500, 544–7
- elections to 7, 221, 227, 241, 253
- Environment Group 411
- fringe meetings 8
- guests 4, 619
- Legislative Committee 259
- new app 7, 12, 214
- new members 3–4
- November sessions 21–2, 24, 25, 43
- pattern of meetings 18–44
- religious community representation 277
- term limits 201–3, 233, 241, 261
- Gibb Report 13, 196, 289
- giving, contactless payment 146–7
- glebe land, and electricity storage 415
- Going for Growth* 547
- ‘good disagreement’:
 - and Brexit 98–9, 725, 735–6, 745
 - and Living in Love and Faith project 386–7
- The Governance of Britain* (White Paper) 505
- government:
 - and climate change 416, 425
 - and gambling 688, 694, 696–9, 701, 706–7, 714
 - and homelessness 353–4, 358–9
 - and Listed Places of Worship Scheme 209, 210, 689
 - local 730–31, 734–6, 739
 - prayer for 727, 731–2, 741, 747
 - and support for church buildings 689
 - see also Parliament
- grandparents see families
- Growing Faith* 148, 150–51, 527–71, 653, 656–7, 665
- Growing Young Disciples 566
- Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy 94–5
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities 6, 618–50
 - and authorized sites 620, 629, 632–6, 639–40, 649–50
 - chaplaincy to 623–4, 628, 631, 633, 641, 646–7
 - and discrimination 619–21, 628
 - and diversity of cultures 621–2, 624, 630–31
 - presentation 618–25
- health, and Gypsies, Travellers and Roma 644–5
- Heritage Lottery Fund 210–211, 689–90, 704, 707, 710–712
- The Historic Resources of the Church of England* 133
- holiness 63–6, 151, 477, 570
- Holocaust, and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities 630, 632
- homelessness 352–73, 546
 - charities 354–6, 368, 370–71
 - ecumenical approaches to 343, 369
 - Homeless Task Force 350, 354–73
- Homelessness Reduction Act 353
- homophobia 11
- hope 63–9, 442, 723
 - and climate change 429–30, 433
 - and estates evangelism 597–601, 614, 747
 - and evangelism 442, 446, 460
 - and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities 639–40
 - and homelessness 357, 371–2
 - and Living in Love and Faith 387–8
 - and national divisions 728–9, 747, 757–8
- hospitality 752–3, 755, 758
- House of Bishops:
 - and authorized forms of worship 293
 - Declaration 183, 760
 - Delegation Committee 165, 170, 175
 - Pastoral Guidance 23, 111–12, 149, 152–75
 - questions to 149–98
 - and safeguarding 196–7
 - and same-sex marriage 149–50, 187
 - and sexuality report 22–3
 - teaching document see Living in Love and Faith

[Type here]

- see *also* Advisory Council on Relations between Bishops and Religious Communities; Five Guiding Principles
- House of Clergy, representation in Synod 33–4
- House of Laity:
 - elections to 289
 - elections to Church Commissioners 199–200
 - elections to General Synod 243–4
- House of Lords, bishops in 578, 695, 700, 701
- household see families
- housing:
 - affordable 355–6, 363, 368, 599
 - community-led 116–18
 - and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities 629, 633, 637–8
- Housing Justice 354–5
- humanity, true meaning 452–3, 725–6;
see *also* image of God
- hypocrisy, and sexuality and gender 378, 407
- identity, and discipleship 395–6
- ignorance, and sexuality and gender 377
- IICSA (Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse) enquiry 123, 17, 25, 190, 198
- image of God, creation in 385, 461, 626–8
- Implementation and Dialogue Group 23, 182–4
- inclusion:
 - and evangelism 51, 67–8, 678
 - and national life 743
- Insurance Premium Tax 209–210
- Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum 141
- interfaith dialogue:
 - in Britain 743, 752
 - in India 50–51
- internet, regulation 700–701, 705
- investment:
 - and climate change 119, 430–31, 763
 - in fossil fuels 119
- Islam:
 - distortion by extremists 742
 - and populism 743
- Issues in Human Sexuality* 151, 185, 187
- Iwerne project 192–3
- justice:
 - and Five Marks of Mission 634, 719
 - and national life 744
- Kenya Anglican Men Association 57–8
- knife crime 99–100
- laity, and witness 447, 454, 471, 554;
see *also* leadership, lay
- Lambeth Conference 2020 62–3, 101, 124–5, 423, 438
- lament, need for 733–4
- language, gender-neutral 295
- lay ministry:
 - and funerals 290
 - and national register 289, 299–303
 - see *also* Readers
- leadership, lay:
 - by young people 671–4, 683
 - in deanery synods 201–2, 218–20, 222–37
 - in estates evangelism 587, 592–4, 602–4, 608–9, 615
 - in Kenya 57
- leadership, political 747–8
- Legal Office 121, 170, 191, 194, 196, 491, 759
- legislative business:
 - Amending Canon No. 38 214–16
 - Draft Amending Canon No. 39 4, 245, 248, 269–72
 - Draft Amending Canon No. 40 272–87
 - Draft Amending Canon No. 41 288, 293, 294–6, 319
 - Draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) (No.2) Measure 288–319
 - Draft Representation and Ministers Measure 7, 245–68, 216–44
- Legislative Reform Committee 14–15
- lessons learnt reviews 192–3, 197
- levy, on gambling industry 690, 693

[Type here]

LGBTI Christians:

and Living in Love and Faith 376–9,
389

as ordinands 185, 407

and young people 658–9, 670, 678,
680–81

liberal democracy, problems with 737–8

Life Events Ministry 321

Light and Life movement 622

Listed Places of Worship Grants
Scheme 209, 210, 689

Liturgical Commission 165, 175

questions to 109–112

liturgy:

and pastoral practice 404

and transitioning 153–75

Living in Love and Faith project 9, 16,
62, 157, 351

and *Affirmation of Baptismal Faith*
152–6, 158, 160, 167–8, 176–
7

and ‘good disagreement’ 386–7

and history 390, 391, 393, 402

learning outcomes 382–3, 393,
403–4, 405

learning resources 385–8, 391–2,
400, 403, 405–6

and Pastoral Advisory Group 373–
408

and Pastoral Principles 11, 376–7,
379–80, 387, 393

and science 388–9, 396–7, 398

and scripture 397–8, 401, 406–7

six pervading evils 377–9, 407

and theology 400–401, 403–4

and young people 660, 678

local ecumenical co-operative schemes
340, 345, 346–7

local government 730–31, 734–6, 739,
756

London City Mission Centre 588–9

London diocese, synod motion 409–
439

love 63–8

Lowest Income Communities Funding
124, 128, 130–31, 134, 182, 615

Marks of Mission:

and the environment 101–2, 412,
422, 425, 434

and evangelism 462

and justice 634, 719

marriage:

after divorce 178–9

same-sex 149–50, 186–7, 296,
305–6, 379, 760

teaching document see Living in
Love and Faith

Messy Church 562

Methodist Anglican Panel for Mission in
Unity (MAPUM) 177

Ministerial Development Review (MDR)
94–5

ministry:

with children and young people

527–71, 661–2, 666, 671, 679

funding 182

statistics 84

Ministry Council, questions to 79–90

Ministry Experience scheme 592–3

mission:

among Gypsy, Roma and Traveller
communities 618–50

and Church Commissioners 117–
18

and ecumenism 554

and environment 101–2, 412

in families 148, 150–51, 551–2,
656–7

Five Marks 101–2, 422, 425, 434,
462, 634, 719

missional youth churches 539–40,
568, 652, 654, 673–4

and parochial fees 320–21, 323–4,
330–33, 336

Mission and Pastoral etc. (Amendment)
Measure 122–4, 221, 250

Mission and Public Affairs Council:
and environmental programmes
411

questions to 96–102

Mission Theology Advisory Group 99
moon landing, commemoration 109–
110

Morning and Evening Prayer 269–70

Mothers’ Union, in Kenya 56

[Type here]

multi-academy trusts (MATs) 204–5
mutual flourishing 182–4, 519

National Church Institutions:

and Insurance Premium Tax 209–
210
staff 137–8

National Clergy Register 289–90, 299–
301

National Deaneries Network 235, 258,
261

National Estates Churches Network
603

National Institutions Measure 1998 72

National Investing Bodies (NIBs):

and carbon emissions reduction
119

climate change and investment 430

National Lottery 210–211, 689–90,
693–4, 704, 707, 710–712

National Safeguarding Steering Group
189–90, 192, 195–7

National Safeguarding Team 95, 114,
190, 191, 193, 195–7

National Society Council 560, 567
questions to 204–7

nationalism, and populism 742–3, 757

NHS:

and gambling addiction 688

general practice 644–5

and Gypsies, Travellers and Roma
644–5

non-disclosure agreements 185–6,
197–9

Open the Book 554, 569

ordinands:

disabled 81–3

funding 129–30

increasing numbers 67, 85, 129–
30, 132

LGBTI 185, 407

and marriage after divorce 178–9

and mission and evangelism training
455, 461–3, 483, 552–3, 604–
5

on residential or part-time courses
85–90

support for women having a baby
79–81

parents *see* families

Paris Climate Agreement 119, 418, 423

parish church councils (PCCs):

electoral rolls 220–21, 263, 266

and funerals 323

and joint councils 247, 248

model rules of governance 246–7

and quinquennial inspections 291

and safeguarding 12, 13

parish share 311, 597

parishes, rural:

administrators 329

and church schools 536–8

and deanery synod membership
223, 233–4, 237

and joint councils 247, 251

mission 249

morning and evening prayer in 269–
70

and work with children and young
people 543, 664–5

see also benefices, multi-parish

Parliament:

Ecclesiastical Committee 259–60,
761

Second Estates Commissioner 742

see also government

Parochial Fees Order 2014 322, 325,
329

Parochial Registers and Records
Measure 1978 291–2

Past Cases Review 196

Pastoral Advisory Group 149–51, 165,
167, 175

and Living in Love and Faith 373–
408

Pastoral Principles 11, 266–7, 379–
80, 387, 393, 677–8

Patronage (Benefices) Measure 1998
347

Pensions Board:

appointment of Chair 69–71

investments 431, 763

retirement of Chair 762–3

persecution 47–8, 498

Persians, ministry to 96–8

[Type here]

politics:

- and cynicism 729–41, 757
- and need for reconciliation 6, 73, 98–9, 111, 718–19, 728–9, 733–7, 745, 748–50, 756

populism 737, 742–3, 757

poverty:

- and climate change 419, 430
- and gambling 707
- and impact of austerity 731–4

and impact of Brexit 720, 730, 731–2

and parochial fees 324, 330, 333

preferential option for the poor 744–6

in urban estates 582–612, 615–17

power:

- and abuse 377, 378–9
- inequalities 378–9

Practical Guidance for Safeguarding 94

prayer:

continuous praying presence 1, 2, 38, 181, 212, 618

and evangelism 446, 448–9, 479, 482, 610–611, 727

in families 559–60, 568

for politicians 727, 731–2, 741, 747, 756

in schools 548

and youth evangelism 654–5, 671

prejudice, and sexuality and gender 379

Presence and Engagement 97

presentations 374–88

Presidential Address 61–9

Presidential Motion 715–58

Prime Minister, and vacancy in See of York 504–6

Prime Minister's Appointments Secretary 508

Private Members' Motions:

Encouraging Youth Evangelism 651–85

Homeless Task Force 35, 350, 354–73

prophecy:

- and evangelism 725
- and politics 741–2

Prorogation 764

Questions 76–212

and Code of Conduct 10–11, 16

length 489–97

and SO 117 13, 17

quinquennial inspections 291

racism 626–8, 630, 632, 634, 649, 742

Readers:

remarriage after divorce 180

and same-sex marriage 187

reconciliation, and British politics 6, 73, 98–9, 111, 718–19, 728–9, 733–7, 745, 748–50, 756

records, electronic 291–2, 295–6

regulation, principles-based 700–701

religious communities 273–87

ordination of members 289

Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee (RACSC) 80–81, 90–96, 336, 338

Renewal and Reform 15, 122, 128, 131, 132, 148, 331

Resource Churches 135, 138–40

Resourcing Ministerial Education 85, 88–90

A Response to the House of Bishops' Guidance on Transgender Welcome 166

Retail Price Index 322

Roma heritage people:

as asylum seekers 622

mission and ministry among 618–50

Rooted in the Church 206, 563

Rules Committee 9–10, 207

safeguarding:

at parish level 12, 13

and DBS checks 654

and historic or posthumous allegations 189–90, 195–6

and mission 546

as regular agenda item 11–12, 13, 16–17, 25

review 192

and youth work 654

St Mungo's (charity) 355

[Type here]

- SDF see Strategic Development Fund
- Seal of the Confessional Working Group 187–8
- Second Estates Commissioner 742, 757
- Secretary General, questions to 198–9
- servanthood, and discipleship 49–50
- Setting God's People Free* 29, 148, 236, 444, 447, 454–5, 470, 483, 530, 603
- sexuality:
and culture 384
and gender 153–4, 160, 176, 379, 397
teaching document see Living in Love and Faith
- Share Foundation 676
- Shared Conversations 23
- Shelter 354
- silence, and sexuality and gender 377–8
- simplification 122–3, 141, 307
- Simplification Task Group 245, 269
- singleness, and Living in Love and Faith project 393–4
- Singleton Review 196
- social action:
and Gypsy, Traveller and Roma Communities 642
and young people 534, 535, 546, 548–9, 676–7
- social media, and gambling 687
- Some Issues in Human Sexuality* 160
- Songs of Praise* 126–7
- sport, and gambling 687–8, 691, 696, 702–3, 706
- spouse, definition 294, 305–6
- Standing Orders 217
changes 11, 31
SO 15(6) 396
SO 21(3) 410
SO 31 347, 755
SO 37 268, 271
SO 40(5) 487
SO 45 764
SO 56 201
SO 57(6) 277, 293
SO 58(4) 282, 297, 319
SO 59 283, 298
- SO 61 226, 240
SO 64 271
SO 68 215
SO 71(2) 346
SO 116 180, 211
SO 117 13, 17
SO 132(6) 200, 507
SO 133(1) 200
SO 137 503
SO 140(6) 508–9
SO 141 51, 524, 5252–3
- Standing Orders Committee report 487–97
and Anglican Communion guests 497–501
and Crown Nominations Commission 501–527
and length of questions 489–97
- The State of the Nation* 715–58
- Statistics for Mission 206
- Strategic Church Buildings Support Group 123
- Strategic Development Fund (SDF) 128, 135–40, 181–2, 184–5, 539, 568
and estates evangelism 584, 602–3, 611
- Strategic Investment Board (SIB) 135–6, 603
- Synodical Government in the Church of England* 202
- Synodical Government Measure 1969 242–3
- Table of Fees 140–41
- Talking Jesus 478, 484, 660, 684
- Taylor Review 211, 689–90, 711
- Team and Group Ministries Measure 253
- TEC (The Episcopal Church), and same-sex marriage 186
- theology:
and evangelism 462–3
public 58
- Thy Kingdom Come* 441, 444, 447–9, 482
prayer map 148, 532
- title posts 270
- toddler groups 555, 569

[Type here]

- tolerance, religious 50–51
- TPI see Transition Pathway Initiative
- transgender people 50
 - and Bishops' Guidance 111–12, 149, 152–75
 - and ecumenism 177–8
 - and Living in Love and Faith 394
 - in Synod 10
 - trans clergy 174–5
- Transition Pathway Initiative (TPI) 119, 411, 423
- transparency:
 - and Crown Nominations Commission 513, 515, 516–17
 - and Questions 493, 495
 - and safeguarding 193
- transphobia 11, 159
- Traveller heritage people, mission and ministry among 618–50
- Triennium Funding Working Group 122, 124–5, 127–33, 144, 181, 185
- Truro diocese, synod motion 409–39
- Understanding Christianity* 205, 533, 553–4, 571
- unity, visible 344
- Vacancy in See Committees Regulation 503
- Valuing All God's Children* 29
- voting:
 - by Houses 241–2, 268, 271–2, 511, 535–6
 - by whole Synod 35, 40, 71, 76, 216, 238, 242, 338, 349, 373, 439, 650, 758
 - electronic 7, 221, 227, 241, 243–4, 245, 253, 266, 518
- Walking Together on the Way* 340
- WATCH (Women and The Church) 512–13
- weddings:
 - fees 323–4, 333
 - as mission opportunities 320–21, 323–4, 333, 335
- welcomes:
 - to Anglican Communion guests 4
 - to new members 3–4
- The Whole People of God* 444, 446
- witness 441–83, 744
 - eight marks 66
 - and ordination training 455, 461–2
 - to children and young people 529–30, 567
 - and worship 62–3, 443, 456–7, 465–7, 474
- women:
 - consecration 188–9
 - ordination 80
- Working Group on Clergy Wellbeing 92
- Working Group on the Seal of the Confessional 187–8
- World Mission and Anglican Communion Panel 101
- worship, and witness 62–3, 443, 456–7, 465–7, 474
- Young Leaders Award 539, 568
- young people:
 - and camps 557–9
 - and church attendance 205–6
 - and deanery synods 227–8, 232
 - and the environment 414, 416, 418, 423, 425–7
 - and estates evangelism 599, 612
 - evangelism among 6, 527–71
 - and gambling 686–8, 690, 696–7, 698–9, 702–3, 706–8
 - as General Synod members 34, 38–44
 - homeless 360, 363, 546
 - and knife crime 99–100
 - and social action 534, 535, 546, 548–9, 676–7
 - see also cadet forces
- Youth Apart* 666–7, 682
- youth churches 539–40, 568, 652, 654, 673–4
- Youth Council (CEYC) 38, 73, 75, 666, 684
- youth evangelism, encouraging 651–85
- youth workers 653–4, 661–4, 668–9, 673, 682, 684

Index created by Meg Davies