

Report of Proceedings 2019

**General Synod
July Group of Sessions**

Volume 50, No. 2

Officers of the General Synod

Presidents

The Archbishop of Canterbury

The Archbishop of York

Prolocutors of the Lower Houses of the Convocations

Canterbury

The Revd Canon Simon Butler

York

The Ven. Cherry Vann

The House of Laity

Chair

Canon Dr James Harrison

Vice-Chair

Canon Elizabeth Paver

Secretary General

Mr William Nye LVO

Clerk to the Synod

Dr Jacqui Philips

Chief Legal Adviser & Registrar

The Revd Alexander McGregor

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

Secretary to the House of Laity

Ms Jenny Jacobs

Officers of the Convocations

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of Canterbury

Revd Stephen Trott

Registrar

The Revd Alexander McGregor

Synodical Secretary of the Convocation of York

The Revd Paul Benfield

Transcribed by
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
ADDRESS FROM THE ECUMENICAL GUEST	2
REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2130)	5
PRESENTATION FROM THE MOTHERS' UNION WORLDWIDE PRESIDENT	12
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 39 (GS 2047DD)	21
CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2104B) AND AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2105B)	22
DIOCESAN BOARD OF EDUCATION MEASURE (GS 2131)	33
LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH AND PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP	40
QUESTIONS	46
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS	110
RESPONDING TO SERIOUS YOUTH VIOLENCE (GS 2132)	117
CLERGY WELLBEING (GS 2133)	142
QUESTIONS	160
SAFEGUARDING (GS 2134)	176
MISSION AND MINISTRY IN COVENANT (GS 2135 AND GS 2086)	194
REFUGEE PROFESSIONALS (GS 2126A and GS 2126B)	226
DRAFT CATHEDRALS MEASURE (GS 2136)	238
FACULTY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) RULES (GS 2137)	257
AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103B)	265
PRESENTATION ON THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT (GS 2138)	271
APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL (GS 2139)	277
TRIENNIAL FUNDING WORKING GROUP (GS 2140)	280
ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL BUDGET AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT FOR 2020 (GS 2141)	297
CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2104B) AND DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2015B)	313
MISSION-SHAPED CHURCH 15 YEARS ON	322
55 TH REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDER COMMITTEE (GS 2143)	343
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2144)	343
SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE (GS 2145).....	352
LEGISLATIVE REFORM (PATRONAGE OF BENEFICES) ORDER 2019 (GS 2128A)	372
CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 2019 (2146).....	382
ANNA CHAPLAINCY.....	386
FAREWELLS	401
PROROGATION.....	406

Full Synod: First Day

Friday 5 July 2019

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

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod. It is a joy to welcome you to this wonderful city of York for this July group of sessions. As we gather, it is right that we submit ourselves humbly to God, who loves us and cares for us, and I invite, therefore, the Synod Chaplain, Michael Gisbourne, to lead us in our opening worship.

WORSHIP

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

ITEM 1

INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOMES

The Chair: Thank you very much. Brothers and sisters in Christ, as we gather I hope we will all have in our minds the Social Media Guidelines and Charter that the Church of England published earlier this week, which the Archbishop of Canterbury and I have endorsed. Over these few days, as we tweet and upload posts, as well as speak from the podiums and debate vigorously, may we do so with respect and kindness towards one another, and with honesty and a gracious heart, whether we are agreeing with each other or not. For all those we interact, with including the staff here at this university, may each of us model the behaviour of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

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

The new members are: the Rt Revd Graham Usher, Bishop of Norwich, replacing the Rt Revd Graham James; the Revd Nancy Goodrich, Diocese of Blackburn, replacing the Revd Fleur Green; the Rt Revd David Williams, Bishop of Basingstoke, replacing the Rt Revd Jonathan Frost; the Ven. Elizabeth Snowden, Diocese of Chelmsford, replacing the Revd Sally Lodge; the Revd Louise Williams, Diocese of Chelmsford, replacing the Rt Revd John Perumbalath; the Revd David Hague, Diocese of Chelmsford, replacing the Ven. Revd Canon Jenny Tomlinson; Ms Mary Talbot, Diocese of Europe, replacing Mrs Madeleine Ratcliff Holmes; the Revd Valerie Plumb, Diocese of Oxford, replacing the Revd Sam Allberry; the Revd Dr Anderson Jeremiah, Universities and TEs, replacing the Rt Revd Dr Emma Ineson; the Revd Charlotte Cook, Archbishops' Council, replacing the

Revd Canon Dr Rosalyn Murphy; Mr Joseph Diwakar, Archbishops' Council, replacing Mrs Rebecca Salter; Mr Clive Mather, Chair of the Pensions Board, replacing Sir Jonathan Spencer; the Ven. James Ridge, Chaplain of Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service. May we greet them all, please.

Thank you very much. I would like also to welcome the following ecumenical representatives who are attending for the first time. Again, will they stand and keep standing so that we can welcome them at the end: Mrs Susan Howdle, representing the Methodist Church; the Revd Dr David Coulter, representing the Church of Scotland; the Revd Sarah Moore, representing the United Reform Church; Fr Stephen Platt, representing the Russian Orthodox Church.

We have two ecumenical guests attending as well: Mr Ken Gibson, representing the Church of Ireland; the Rt Revd Elof Westergaard, Bishop of Ribe, from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark, within the Porvoo Communion of Churches. For you I can say, "Prees de Heer. Mensen dank". For those who do not speak Dutch, "Praise the Lord", and, "Thank you very much".

And, finally, three Anglican Communion guests: the Revd Dr Joseph Bilal, representing the Episcopal Church of South Sudan; Archbishop Julio Thompson, Primate of Iglesia Anglicana de la Region Central de America; and Mrs Sheran Harper, Worldwide President of the Mothers' Union. Will you please greet them and welcome them? That concludes this item of business. We now move to Item 2 where we have a chance to hear from one of our ecumenical guests.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 2.58 am.

ITEM 2

ADDRESS FROM THE ECUMENICAL GUEST

The Chair: We come to Item number 2 on our agenda, an address from one of our ecumenical guests, the Rt Revd Elof Westergaard, Bishop of Ribe, whom the Archbishop of York has just introduced and welcomed. Bishop, over to you. Please come to the main platform.

The Bishop of Ribe, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark (Rt Revd Elof Westergaard): Your Graces, Chair, members of Synod. It is a great honour to participate in the General Synod. I am extremely grateful to have been invited as a representative of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Denmark. I am looking forward to listening to the discussions in the next few days. I hope to be inspired by your work and develop friendships within our churches.

I am the Bishop of the Diocese of Ribe in the Danish *Folkerkirke*, the national church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark, and I have promised to bring the regards of all the Danish bishops.

Common to all the Nordic countries is the high degree of membership among the people. Just about 75% of the Danish population are members of the Danish national church. Also, in Finland, Norway and Iceland the degree of membership is about 70%. In Sweden well over 60% of people are members of the Swedish Church.

On the one hand, we experience both a gradual decline in the sense of belonging and the challenges of integrating into the Danish national church the growing numbers of Christian congregations made up of people from migrant communities.

On the other hand, it is a joy to see that at the same time the church locally has increasing engagement with and is experiencing a rise in interest from the wider community. In Danish society the national church is generally expected to be a part of society and must play an active role. Several institutions, citizens' organisations and unions are ready to co-operate with the church. Over the last years, particularly, there has been interest from the local government in forming various kinds of partnerships. The church's diaconal work is currently being strengthened, I think, and this benefits all citizens in an area. In many places churches and schools are working together in exemplary ways and various types of co-operations are developing and deepening the interchange between the different worlds of school and church.

The connection between state and church is close. The Danish national church is mentioned in the state's constitutional law but, nevertheless, it is characteristically a church of the people and not a church of the state. It is important that we make a distinction between being a state church and being a people's church. Membership of the Church comes with baptism. As part of the cabinet, the Prime Minister appoints a Minister for the Church. By tradition, the Minister for the Church is expected to act with great discernment and discretion - and she does. This means that the Minister does not interfere needlessly in the internal affairs of the church.

When it comes to finance, 81% of the income of the national church is from tax, which is paid only by its members. The tax is recovered locally by the local government and most of the money stays in the area.

We are a small country, but the Danish national church consists of about 2,200 parishes and each congregation has a high degree of freedom. We do have a hierarchy of deacons and bishops, but each parish has the power to appoint their vicar, which is key for the church's breadth and diversity. The strength of this is the high degree of local rootness and ownership it achieves. In the national church, we aim to be open and at the same time engage in the task of preaching the Gospel to the society of our times.

Obviously, we think deeply about how to be the Church of Christ and how to express genuine Christianity today. We seek, on the one hand, to avoid descending into an amorphous religiosity and, on the other hand, letting the church spin off into isolation. Theologically, I would argue that the incarnation of Christ simultaneously demands the frequent celebration of the sacraments and a church that is conscious of its cultural engagement in everyday life.

Compared to other church traditions, the Danish national church may appear quite liberal. More than half of its vicars today are women and only very few vicars refuse to marry people who are divorced. Since 2014 marriage of same sex-couples has been a legal option within the church.

First and foremost, we are engaged with heart, mouth and hands to thank and praise God, and doing this in tune with the people among whom the church exists, aiming to be a church both of width and of incisive witness.

I would lastly like to share with you two recent initiatives in the Danish national church. The first is hymn-singing with infants, a proposal that a lot of young parents like to take up. A mother or father with a child comes to church one morning on a weekday and sings hymns and plays or dances to the hymns with their child. We have done this actively for almost 20 years and it has become a great success. Hymn-singing with infants gives the child an initial familiarity and confidence with church and opens an opportunity for the parents to consider and discuss the baptism of their child, while getting to know, and maybe even like, core hymns.

Secondly, there is something that goes under the name of drop-in baptism. I do not know if you have that. In several large cities the congregations and their vicar offer drop-in baptism at a certain published time. Anybody may come straight off the street, speak with the vicar for some time and get baptized. The numbers who choose to get baptized at a drop-in arrangement revealed that some people have considered baptism but found it difficult to find out how to go about it. An invitation to the people in a parish that on a certain day at a certain time you can come and get baptized after a talk with the vicar has appealed to many.

To conclude, thank you for your kind invitation for me to participate in your General Synod here in York. I cannot but fail to remark that it is of great importance for us to have strong ties between Denmark and Great Britain. With Brexit in the years to come we will miss you as partners in the everyday politics of Europe. In Denmark we feel a close relationship with the British people. We entered the European Union in the same year - I remember as a child a football match – and, despite our differences, we have a political culture that has been formed by similar ideas. Even if you eventually leave the European Union you do not leave your neighbours. Thank you for listening.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. That concludes Item 2.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 10.58 am.

ITEM 3

REPORT BY THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE (GS 2130)

The Chair: We come to Item 3, which is the report of the Business Committee and for this you will need GS 2130. This is an opportunity for members to make brief points about the agenda and any other matters addressed in the Report from the Business Committee. I am going to ask Revd Canon Sue Booy, Chair of the Business Committee, to come and move the motion. She has up to 10 minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Good afternoon, Synod. It is very good to be here again. York is always a place for us to reconnect with our friends and to pursue the friendships that we are privileged to make across geographical and theological boundaries. It is good to welcome our visitors from other churches and to note that this Synod is the first at which our Anglican Communion representatives have speaking rights. There are a number of items on the agenda where their wisdom and that of the ecumenical representatives will be invaluable.

In this centenary year of the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, we will be fulfilling all the functions set out for us. There is a significant amount of legislative business set out in Special Agenda I and spread across the group of sessions. All these are important because, like the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules, they govern the ways in which we operate on the ground in our parishes. Amongst them, the reform of the patronage of benefices is the first Measure to reach us via the simplification process enabled by the Legislative Reform Measure.

If you would like to understand these aspects of our work better, may I commend to you the new Chief Legal Officer's fringe meeting on Saturday evening and, in doing so, may I congratulate Alex McGregor and welcome him in his new role.

We have important debates on Serious Youth Violence and on Mission and Ministry in Covenant. The first takes seriously our role in combatting a growing evil in our society and the second takes forward decades of work to restore and renew our relationship with the Methodist Church.

A further pair of debates focuses on the implementation of significant reports: *Setting God's People Free* and the proposed Act of Synod for clergy wellbeing.

Saturday afternoon offers a further opportunity to engage with the work of Living *in Love* and Faith and the Pastoral Advisory Group. It would be most helpful if you could sign up for the seminars you would like to attend on the table near the information desk.

For those of you who would wish, the Women's World Cup play-offs - very disappointed that it is not the finals - will also be screened in the Central Hall at 4 o'clock.

We are all aware of the IICSA hearings taking place at present. Most importantly, I want to assure survivors and all those affected of our prayers as these continue next week. The timing of the hearings has placed some pressure on our staff and I am grateful for your help and patience in dealing with the earlier Questions deadline. We should also thank Bishop Peter and members of the Safeguarding Team who will be here on Sunday afternoon. Questions relating to safeguarding, numbers 92 onwards, will be answered then.

The Business Committee is committed to helping bring safeguarding issues to the Synod in a timely and effective way and, to this end, we have scheduled the item on Sunday afternoon comprising a presentation that will include the voice of a survivor and an opportunity for your questions following that presentation.

One of the opportunities of the Synod of York is that worship marks out our time together and we are grateful to the Synod Chaplain, Michael Gisbourne, and those who will be assisting, particularly the Revd Dr Isabelle Hamley, who will lead a Bible Study in the Central Hall on Monday morning.

I am also advised that there will be a GoodPlate at York Minister on Sunday morning. We have had one of these in my church. They are the opportunity to tap and pay and are really great fun and a good fund-raiser, so please make sure you have your contactless cards at the ready.

I am sure that the Synod will wish to congratulate Adrian Harris and his team on the launch of the Digital Charter this week, and for taking a lead in putting down a national marker for something that has concerned us in this chamber. He tells me that 1,450 churches, cathedrals, individuals and institutions representing tens of thousands of individuals have already signed up, and I hope we will take the opportunity to lead by example this weekend.

On a related note, I was saddened to hear a recent report that this Synod has something of a reputation amongst York Conference staff for our lack of respect and civility in comparison with other conferences. I am sure we would all prefer to be remembered for opposite reasons.

Finally, four important practical housekeeping notices. The Synod App can now receive your requests to speak via the contact button on the bottom left, as well as providing speedy access to all the papers for the group of sessions. Can I please ask you to ensure that you have read the security Notice Paper to save me repeating its contents here and now and encourage you to visit the fringe stands in the Exhibition Centre.

The six officers of the Synod have advised that there is no need to hold a group of sessions in November 2019.

Finally, you will have noticed that we prayed for Jacqui Phillips, who is not with us since she is currently on sick leave. I spoke to her yesterday afternoon; she is doing well and sends warm greetings to you all. I am always grateful to the staff for their support for us, and in these circumstances our thanks, especially to Jeremy Worthen and Jenny Jacobs and Denese Chikwendu, the new Head of Events, should be all the more warmly expressed.

I beg to move GS 2130 standing in my name.

The Chair: Members of Synod, may I remind you that amendments to this motion are not in order and there are no other motions arising out of the Report either. Please, if you are called to speak, confine your speeches to the shape and content of the agenda, and if you wish to speak to speak about something that is not on the agenda and you think it should be then please do not get into the substantive material on that particular item. The matter is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford): I am going to ask the Business Committee to make a bit more time for another issue. The issue I am going to ask the Business Committee to consider making more time for is an actual debate on current safeguarding issues, and not simply questions on a progress report.

The reason is we have the current child sex abuse inquiry going on, we have current news about people who lost their PTO two years ago but it has only just become public, and I think it is important that Synod gets a chance to discuss this while it is fresh in the mind and not simply a year or two down the line when reports have been written and people have had a chance to consider it.

I am not going to go into details but the two issues that have flagged it up for me are hearing in the evidence this week of a bishop who is not entirely sure somebody should be disqualified from life for having thousands and thousands of very bad photographs of children, and, secondly, somebody having their PTO removed two years ago but this only

becoming public knowledge now, meaning that people for the last two years have not known it was possibly safe to come forward, because they did not know about this, and schools could call individuals to speak, but not knowing that he has no longer got a PTO.

I do not want to go into the details, but these are the issues that have brought this to my attention, and I think it is something that Synod should discuss now while it is fresh in the memory, fresh in the heart and fresh in the news, and not sometime down the line when reports have been written and it has all got a bit overtaken by later news.

We have made time in the past for late arising things, such as Brexit or important football matches, so I would ask that time be given for an actual debate for Synod to make its mind known rather than simply questions on a progress report.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): Thank you, Business Committee, for the Report and the hard work that lay behind it. Just a brief plea. One of the growth industries in recent years in Synod has been the number of motions that have asked PCCs and parishes to consider and make a priority, discuss during the next 12, 18 months, and we have a number before us over this group of sessions. I have been involved in writing one or two of them, I have nothing against them, it is exactly what should happen in the Church's frontline, that is the local church not just the gathered national bodies.

Also, as a team rector with four PCCs, even in my keenness for Synod, I am not sure that we have discussed all the things at the length that has been asked of us. I wonder if either through Standing Orders or ideally just informally with encouragement, the Business Committee might be able to work with the communications team, that anyone who brings a motion asking the local church councils to discuss a particular area, might it also be incumbent on them just to provide a no more than two-page summary, and preferably not videos, because many of our PCCs have not that facility, just a two page summary, a couple of pertinent questions. That is something that could be done in ten, 15 minutes, and hopefully then maybe there will be more time for more of the important issues which we ask church councils to look at. For those that would like, they can then find the full 90 pages, no doubt. I just worry that even amongst the keenness of synodical members, maybe not everything is flowing through to the local church as much as we might hope.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Synod, the proceedings of the IICSA inquiry this last week, as well as the interim report published in May and the SCIE reports, need our strongest possible response. Like the previous but one speaker, I would add my call for an urgent debate on this. This has been a week when our failures in creating a community where all are welcome, all are cared for and all can know the redeeming, restorative, liberating, reconciling love of Christ has once again been paraded before the public.

I welcome our progress paper, the response of the Safeguarding Steering Group, the opportunity for questions and further questions for the leading Bishop, and, indeed, to hear from a survivor. However, what we have to date is an overwhelmingly structural reform-focused set of responses. All of this is necessary, I am not a cynic and I tend to want to believe the best of the plans laid out for us by the House of Bishops and Archbishops. However, I will not be alone in Synod, I believe, in wanting to hear the House of Bishops speaking from their heart, to be leading us in mission in this issue and in pastoral care. Currently, the world out there is seriously wondering whether we do care. My friends have told me this during the last week, most strongly, and I know many of our survivors are long past wondering if we care.

The letter by senior clergy in Blackburn Diocese gives us just that message. Can I ask again that the motion submitted to you, I believe, and backed by several members of Synod be put on the agenda? The proposed motion welcomes the victim-centred Blackburn letter as a suitable model for transforming the entire culture of the Church and developing reconciliation for those who have been wronged by our sins of omission and commission. Thank you for your consideration.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): Referring to paragraph 38 of the Business Committee Report about the Synod App. First of all, to – if I dare do so – correct the Chair of the Business Committee – she is glaring at me – that the request to speak form is at the bottom right, not the bottom left of the screen, or it is on mine, anyway.

More to the point, I spoke at a recent Synod about the blue request to speak form, saying it was a bit confusing, and you may recall that there are two questions you have to answer when you are filling in the request to speak form. I am really pleased that they have changed it, but I have to say I am not terribly pleased with the way it has been changed because I still do not understand the two questions.

If you have it on your App, or if you look at the blue form, the first box says, “request summary” and then it says, “enter a brief summary of your request if you are called upon to speak”. I am not quite sure what that means. But then it goes on in the second box, “request reason: briefly note why you wish to speak”. Now, I can understand the second box, “I wish to speak about subject X because I am the world’s expert on it or I have got strong views on it”. That is fine. I do not understand what it is meant by “enter a brief summary of your request if you are called upon to speak”. Does it mean give your speech in six words, or what? I am sure we will go through this Synod with it happily, but perhaps it could be looked at again for future Synods. Thank you.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I am very conscious and have some sympathy with the request for time to be spent on a debate on safeguarding. The previous speaker, Peter Adams, spoke of do we speak from the heart,

how do we know when bishops are speaking from the heart? When I gave evidence, the summer before last or last summer, I cannot remember, I broke down during that and continue to be close to that every time I speak, and that is the normal response within the House of Bishops. Let me tell you, we speak from the heart every time.

We have to have processes and procedures, there is no magic wand. We have to have rules, there are no shortcuts, but we do that because we are so grievously ashamed of what has happened in this Church over the years. We do that because it comes from the heart and we do that because we seek to change the culture. And every time the Archbishop of York or I see another case where there is a falling short of our response, it is a knife in our soul. There are many survivors here in the Synod, some known, some who have never felt they wanted to or were able to speak. There are many survivors among the bishops, they speak from the heart and from grief.

There are, despite my deep sympathy for this, three key reasons why I do not think it is appropriate at this Synod. First, that we are halfway through the IICSA hearings on the Church of England, they go on all through the next week. It was published today that the Archbishop of York and I will give evidence this coming week. Synod, IICSA is very, very conscious of its prerogatives. I think many would feel that we were trying to distract attention from the grilling we will quite rightly get this week and the criticism we will quite rightly face. I would not like to trample on their prerogatives, they are a judicial inquiry, they have rights. They are specialists, they are fervent, they are determined, and they are tough.

I commended to the House of Bishops most strongly, as did the Archbishop of York, to read their interim report and I commend it again to every member of Synod, but do not read it when you need to be in a good frame of mind. It is just pain, and deservedly so.

The second reason is many dioceses, not just Blackburn, are working very, very hard on this. I commend what they are doing, but we need to hear the response of survivors. Many of them are in London listening to the hearings, and rightly. We need to give them time to prepare because we must hear their voice.

And, lastly, I think we need to wait for the report and to engage with that because it will give us some very, very hard questions which we will need to think about very carefully and be open to receiving as we have the interim report. I am sorry I have slightly overshot my time.

The Chair: After the next speaker, I will test the mind of Synod on closure.

Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester): Can I say, may I speak with an honest and gracious heart as I try to speak truth to power. I hear what you say, your Grace, and I fully understand

and respect that you cannot speak. But, with respect, this motion is not about you speaking; it is about you listening, and I know you listen a lot. One of the problems that we have had historically over the years, as many will know, is that this place has not been a place where the voice of the Church has really spoken loudly and clearly on this difficult and painful subject.

The Blackburn letter is a lovely letter, because it is a Gospel-based letter. It is about repentance, about humility, it is about lifting the broken. And the only practical thing it actually asks for is exactly what your Grace has said: read the reports. The difficulty we have if we do not do this at this stage, with all respect, is the way it will be heard outside.

I need to briefly read you what a couple of the lawyers said as they opened the case against us at IICSA. Richard Scorer: “The Church is now saying that proposals for change will be put before Synod in mid-2020, another year away, so what survivors see here is a lack of urgency about change. They see the Church dragging its feet, plodding through the Church’s bureaucratic governance structures, but with no real vigour or clarity or urgency behind change”.

And David Greenwood says: “The NSG uses vague words, such as agreeing to develop and analyse options, develop proposals, consider findings, commission a working group and undertake an analysis”. This, he says, is deliberate behaviour, “The Church is trying to buy time until IICSA goes away”. Now, those are not my words, this is the indictment. It seems to me that when we have carefully brought this Blackburn letter, which has much to commend it, we say all of us, please, let the conversation begin, because only through our conversation will the culture change. Let us engage with this.

You cannot speak much, and I know that, your Grace, but can we not begin to listen so the victims can hear that this body, which has done so much to let things pass in the past, is ready to have its cultural change. I have had to make this up, I had another speech, but that is probably all I can tell you.

The Chair: Members of Synod, I would like to move a motion for the closure.
The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee to respond to the debate. You have up to three minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Thank you. How generous. I would like to begin by addressing the points made by Carolyn Graham, Peter Adams and Martin Sewell. I could not agree more that the IICSA Reports make sobering reading. Like many of you, I suspect, I have sat down with a sinking heart and screwed up my courage to read what is on the computer, and, like many of you, I have been without words.

You will have heard Archbishop Justin and I can only reassure you that the Business Committee is doing its utmost, as I said in my speech, to bring this business to the floor of the Synod in a timely and appropriate way, and we will continue to do that, I promise you.

Barry Hill, thank you so much for this point. Here is a confession: as a team rector, who is Chair of the Business Committee with 12 PCCs, I can assure you that not all of my PCCs have discussed all the things we think they ought to have done. This is a vexed question which has been discussed from time to time, but I think your advice is useful. Thank you very much, and we will look into it.

And, finally, Stephen Lynas. My husband never allows me to navigate, and now you know why. You are absolutely right, the button in question is on the bottom right-hand side of the screen, and we will look again at the request to speak form. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Members of Synod, we need to take note of the Business Committee Report.
The motion was put and carried on a show of hands.

The Chair: That concludes the debate on Item 3. Please stay in the chamber for the President of the Worldwide Mothers' Union.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson* took the Chair at 3.24 pm.

ITEM 4 PRESENTATION FROM THE MOTHERS' UNION WORLDWIDE PRESIDENT

The Chair: Good afternoon, members of Synod, ecumenical friends and visitors. We come to Item 4 on the agenda, which is a presentation from the Mothers' Union Worldwide President, Mrs Sharen Harper. After the presentation there will be an opportunity for questions, so I thought I would flag that up at this point. I am delighted to invite Sharen Harper to speak to us.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): Your Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, your Grace the Archbishop of York, members of the head table, special guests, members of General Synod, good afternoon. It is indeed an honour and a privilege for me to stand here as an Anglican Communion representative to address the General Synod of the Church of England. This is a dream come true as I have attended diocesan synod in Guyana, both as the Recording Secretary and the Mothers' Union

representative for a total of 12 years and I had hoped that one day I could experience another kind of Synod, so here I am.

I extend my sincere thanks to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for their ongoing relationship with the Mothers' Union and for giving us this amazing opportunity to be here, the first ever in the history of Mothers' Union and in the life of General Synod. Your Graces, on behalf of Mothers' Union, I thank you.

I am Sharen Harper, the first Worldwide President of Mothers' Union from outside the British Isles. At my commissioning in February at Southwark Cathedral, the Archbishop of Canterbury challenged me to make Mothers' Union known. He said no longer must Mothers' Union be the best kept secret of the Anglican Communion and today I confidently stand at General Synod and take on this challenge to ensure that Mothers' Union is visible throughout the length and breadth of the Anglican Communion and beyond that, and that our stories of impact, which bring hope life and a future, are shared widely so that others could be inspired.

I am sure you will agree with me when I say that the gift of Mothers' Union is one of the greatest assets of the Anglican Communion. We are still existing even after 142 years, with a vast network like no other, strategically placed in the heart of every community, well positioned in 84 countries around the world, with a membership of four million, making us the number one oldest and largest women's movement in the world.

All actively concerned with lasting transformation of individuals and communities and working with people of all faiths or none, I believe our success is due to members being driven by a love for God and all humanity. As part of my long and fulfilling journey of serving the Anglican Church and Mothers' Union for over 32 years, I was blessed to visit over 20 countries as the lead of a key area of Mothers' Union work – the parenting programme. Through this, I was able to gain significant knowledge of the issues and challenges faced by the Church and an understanding for the context and culture within which Mothers' Union operates across the world.

I have experienced first-hand the benefits of Mothers' Union and the Church working together with one vision in mission and ministry. I have seen the capacity of indigenous clergy and church leaders in very remote communities strengthened through Mothers' Union programmes, not only in building the Church but also encouraging in transformation through women's empowerment. Gloria, in the Amazon, experienced domestic violence in the home for many years and now, helped by our programmes, she is a village councillor and has a say in the way government finances are spent in her village. She also ensures that the wellbeing of the family is a priority on every agenda.

From 2012-2014 it was Mothers' Union that led the process for the development of the first code of ethics and child protection policy for the Church in my home diocese, Guyana. This was necessary as parenting groups were reporting activities that warranted the establishment of such a policy. The document was completed and accepted by Synod in 2014. In keeping with the continuing focus on safeguarding, I am happy to report just two weeks ago diocesan synod in Guyana passed a resolution that the code of ethics and the child protection policy would be revised and updated for use with immediate effect. Such are the benefits of us working together as one in the Body of Christ. Indeed, Mothers' Union globally reaffirmed this need for creating safe spaces at our recently concluded Worldwide Council in Rwanda.

The opportunities to know Christ and make him known are numerous wherever we are placed, and the Mothers' Union is like the fertile soil that accepts us just the way we are. It nourishes us and helps us to grow and discover gifts and talents we never knew existed and, even better, uses them for the furtherance of God's Kingdom. It is on my Mothers' Union journey that I have encountered Jesus countless times, so I know that he is real and that he is alive in our Anglican Church. In fact, he is real and alive everywhere.

As a member, I felt like a true missionary when I took off my shoes, rolled up my sleeves and worked hand in hand with God's people in several countries, with bishops and members alike, reaching remote, inaccessible communities just by the grace of God, bringing the Gospel alive. I remember working deep in the Dry Chaco of Argentina, and it was a bishop originally from England who was my co-facilitator and translator. Because he and his wife chose to walk the journey with us, they continued to encourage unity in the midst of conflict and peace and reconciliation among four indigenous tribes.

It was only last month that I met and embraced Mama Elizabeth, the provincial President of South Sudan, who has lived through ongoing ethnic conflict since 2013 with senseless killings that continue to destroy so many innocent lives, leaving children orphaned and vulnerable to diseases, starvation and, finally, a heart-breaking demise. Mama Elizabeth, a strong advocate for peace and reconciliation, has played a key role in keeping the Mothers' Union and the Church together amidst this turmoil. It was Mama Elizabeth who led a delegation of 160 Mothers' Union leaders from South Sudan, including Archbishops' wives and bishops' wives, to a gathering in northern Uganda in February, their first gathering in 10 years. They were women from warring tribes not speaking to each other but, by the conclusion of their time together, they left healed and inspired, singing and dancing and exchanging phone numbers. Such, my friends, is the power of forgiveness and the joy of walking in the light. Just this morning, Father Joseph, who is here with us, said, "Thank you for organising the gathering of women. The dioceses are now speaking to each other again. To God be the glory".

Many of us here will never have experienced the extremes of South Sudan, but I am sure you can identify with a little town in England where Mothers' Union and the Church have been working together. This town is facing challenges due to isolation and deprivation with few employment opportunities. Mothers' Union has been providing a safe space in a school where parents can gather for coffee and with our members making themselves available to listen and lend support. This initiative is only a year old, but one success story so far is that, in addressing loneliness through this simple yet profound initiative, the result has been an adult baptism held in that school.

As Mothers' Union members, we do so much more than just serve tea, coffee and cake. It is tea, coffee and cake with a mission. Nicky Gumbel said: "Nothing comes close to the bonds of friendship that are built while breaking bread together". A few weeks ago, I visited the ministry of cake at a hospital in Chichester Diocese. There were pieces of cake, lovingly baked, wrapped and placed in a little basket, but it was the ministry that went with the cake that moved me to tears. The chaplain and Mothers' Union members said, "We not only pray and support the parents of babies of the special needs unit who might not make it, but even the doctors and nurses come to us in the chapel to be comforted, especially after losing a baby that they have been caring for". I saw and I touched the angel pockets which are knitted prayerfully by the hands of our members for babies who do not make it, giving the parents a last chance to hold their precious little one just for a moment longer. Such dignity I have not experienced anywhere else on my travels.

My friends, Mothers' Union is alive in England. I have witnessed it over the past six months as Worldwide President. Now, after existing for over 142 years, like little old ladies, you can well imagine how tired we were feeling – me too! So, two years ago, the Holy Spirit gave Mothers' Union a vision. We became very excited and, typical of us as women, we prayed and went straight for it, some of us giving our husbands no choice but to join us on the journey. Over the past two years we have been engaged in global conversations, listening to over 200,000 members around the world so we can really understand our purpose in a modern society and, in addition, look at ways we can make a difference in the future.

This process culminated at our Worldwide Council in Rwanda last month. Seventy-two global leaders representing 30 provinces gathered. By the end of our week together, the voices of our members were very clear in recognising just how united we are despite our diversity. Wherever we are in the world, the core of Mothers' Union remains the same. We are so sure that we want to make changes in gender, justice, peace, safety and helping people to help themselves. We recognise that very deeply rooted in our heart is a strong urge to restore relationships with God, ourselves, each other and the environment. Our members feel strongly the need to connect and reconnect with the

Church and to building relationships that will enable us to work together for the furtherance of God's Kingdom.

I am delighted to report that our global leaders left Rwanda feeling refreshed and revitalised in their identity and with renewed confidence to reach out even more to others outside the Church. Already they are starting to do things differently. For example, in South Africa members have changed their way of working with street children. They have moved from just feeding them each day to partnering with the relevant authorities to reintegrate them into communities. Members have also said, "We have learned from each other's dioceses and provinces in recognising the importance of working with and through the Church. We have recognised that our own behaviours have not always been helpful. We regret this and are now ready to listen and engage in the right way and in a way that is beneficial to all".

For example, an exciting project which is developing with the Church here in the UK is called Metamorphosis. Metamorphosis is Mothers' Union facilitating a process alongside the leadership of the clergy. It is based on participatory Bible study which enables the laity and clergy alike to reflect on their calling, recognise the resources they already have and gain the confidence to reach out effectively in the community. I think the results so far are exciting. For example, Sally gained the confidence to reach out to other churches and ran a service on the village green which attracted many, including dogwalkers from the community. John commented on how reflecting on the story of the woman touching the cloak of Jesus has helped parents in a primary school to open up and share their own stories of loneliness and isolation. They also recognised that God knew them, loved them and accepted them too.

If you would like to find out more about this new and inspiring initiative, then I invite you to attend our fringe event on Saturday – tomorrow – at 7 pm. Members in the UK would love to explore with you how Mothers' Union can work in this and other areas of your mission.

In closing, and as I reflect, I am amazed at the way we are aligned to God's plan and God's purpose for unity in the Church and the wider community. Recently, a wonderful bishop here in England asked me if I had a choice what one thing would I like help with to make it a reality, how can he help to make it a reality? My response was I have experienced the immeasurable benefits of close working relationships between the clergy and Mothers' Union, so my greatest desire would be to see even closer working relationships and partnerships between the clergy and Mothers' Union at parish, diocesan and provincial levels, because I strongly believe that together we can move mountains and achieve above and beyond all we can ever ask or imagine.

I pray that we resist the temptation to be distracted by the challenges that face us. Instead, let us remain focused on the prize before us and work together to ensure lives are filled with purpose and meaning and, at the same time, bring more and more people to Christ. Knowing Christ and making him known brings a peace that surpasses all understanding and releases joy everlasting. May God bless the General Synod of the Church of England. I thank you. I am pleased to field any questions which may arise from the floor.

The Chair: Thank you very much indeed for that. That was most interesting, enlightening and encouraging. As you have just said, we will take some questions. I am happy to take a couple at a time.

Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn): Can I just say what a privilege it was at Southwark to be hosting your beginning as Worldwide President and what a pride it is for me that we have got such a vibrant branch at the Cathedral of the Mothers' Union. In a few days' time, I will be in Zimbabwe, in that benighted country, but where I know the Mothers' Union will be looking after me from beginning to end making it a wonderful experience. I just wondered what your hopes for Lambeth 2020 might be.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): That is a very good question. The time has really come for us to unite as a body. It is time for us as a Church, as a body, as a world, to remain true to all that God created and wanted us to be as a Church and as a family and as a community. It is my hope that as we gather for Lambeth 2020 that everybody who is supposed to attend will attend by the grace of God and that we will unite and discuss what needs to be discussed and come up with decisions that can only move our Church forward. I hope that answers you.

Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Thank you, Mama. I am fortunate that I was ordained in southern Africa and I know well that you cannot do the work of God without the Mothers' Union. In my parish, in the wrong end of Johannesburg, the Mothers' Union did all the AIDS counselling, all the funeral visiting, all the pastoral care, besides any of the other normal tasks that you find ma mfundizis running around doing.

My question for you, and maybe encouragement, is to follow up on your suggestion that we do not leave the Mothers' Union behind here in England. How can the Mothers' Union here in England, and in our parishes, encourage greater participation in setting their ministry free? I have always seen the Mothers' Union as a vowed community where every member has made a promise to commit their life to home and family. Too often, I do not see that in public, I do not see members enrolled in public worship, I see them hidden away late on a Tuesday afternoon and their gifts wasted. Please give us some words of encouragement.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): Yes, certainly. Thank you for your question. For decades, I have been coming to England and I have been involved in Mothers' Union work in Exeter, in Blackburn and more recently in five dioceses in Canterbury Province. Believe me when I say to you that hearing that Mothers' Union is dead and is not doing anything much could not be further from the truth. The Mothers' Union is alive in England. The Mothers' Union is alive in the UK, but they are working quietly and diligently in the background, you would not believe it. I saw it with my own eyes.

As I said earlier, in this triennium, and maybe even beyond, I am taking on the challenge to make this work visible and known throughout the length and breadth of the United Kingdom because it is really good work that is going on. In addition, we have learnt from projects and programmes that have been working very well overseas over the past 10 years and we have adapted those programmes and brought them here to the UK. There is one such programme that we are piloting in Ely Diocese and I can tell you that it is bringing the Mothers' Union out of the Church, out of the parish hall and into the community to work and engage with communities to strengthen families where needed. What is happening? It is building the Church as well, increasing the membership.

As much as Mothers' Union might be quiet in the background, they are working very hard and we are going to get it out there. We are just going to get our stories right out there so everybody can be aware of it.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): I am one of three Deaf Anglicans Together reps. I have a question but, first, I want to applaud you. I found your talk fascinating and I was very interested. In the Deaf Church, we have somebody who comes along who is in the Mothers' Union and they come not because they are deaf but because their husband is deafened and so has a strong affiliation with us. Sometimes this person is hearing from the Mothers' Union, just to be clear.

My question is you mentioned that you had a gathering in Rwanda and there were 72 global leaders coming together and it left me thinking. In all that work that has been going on globally, do you know of any one or any who are working with deaf people, who are working for deaf people, involving deaf people in church where there are deaf people present or in any capacity? I would love to hear about that.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): What an awesome question. I would really like to answer that from my very own experience. Indeed, our members are working with people who are challenged in all sorts of ways in different countries. I remember one of my very first parenting groups that I was going to. It was in the Blind Society and what they did was they held a group in their own area and there were dumb, deaf and visually impaired participants in that group. I walked into the room,

it was 6 pm in the evening and it was dark. I was thinking to myself, “Well, where am I going?” but the person was leading me through very confidently and I followed. I got into a room that was very dim and it was then I realised that this did not matter to anyone who was challenged; they had come there for the parenting programme. For 12 weeks I sat with those people and had the most wonderful experience. We do work with people who are challenged in different ways. For us, they are not challenged at all; they are gifts given to us by God.

The Chair: After Mike Booker, the Bishop of Salisbury and hopefully that will bring us to the end. If we can have succinct questions and answers, please. Thank you, that would be great.

Revd Canon Mike Booker (Ely): I am a convert to the work of the Mothers’ Union. When I was a small boy my mother did not join because she said it was boring and full of old ladies. I am a convert because I have seen first-hand the amazing work in Wisbech which you have described and the way in which both the Mothers’ Union as a network to support the work of the school on the estate and also as a brand that really speaks to families in a way that is quite remarkable and has added so much value to what we are doing there. My question is: how can we help change the perception of many people like me who might misjudge the impact that the Mothers’ Union can make?

Worldwide President of Mothers’ Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): How could we change perceptions? I think you just have to see the work of the Mothers’ Union globally as well as in Britain and Ireland. It is tremendous. I could not begin to tell you the impact that we are making worldwide, and, of course, in Britain and Ireland. I would love to chat with you about it outside of Synod. It will take a day. I have so many slides of the way lives have been changed, communities transformed, and I know that you are beginning to see that in Wisbech. I can tell you just work along with us, come to our fringe session tomorrow at 7 pm and certainly you will hear about the work that we are doing, and we will also give you a chance to let us know, to engage with us, let us know, partner with us in ways that we can work with you and your mission and ministry in the Church.

The Bishop of Salisbury (Rt Revd Nicholas Holtam): I just want to respond to your challenge about making the work of the Mothers’ Union more visible. I am doing so with the president of our diocesan Mothers’ Union somewhere in my head or on my shoulder. I feel I would be remiss if I did not say that the Mothers’ Union is the largest membership organisation by far in the Diocese of Salisbury with over 1,300 members. They are involved in running holiday projects for people who otherwise would not have holidays. They are the organisation in the diocese that has picked up the Clewer Initiative working with modern slavery. They also run a court café that would have closed in the Salisbury courts, which means that everybody in the court system, but particularly those appearing

in front of the judges, find themselves catered for and listened to. They do an amazing amount of work is what I want to say.

They are also quite elderly, they are the grandmothers' union, and the more I have thought about that the more I have realised that has been an issue in relation to the Mothers' Union all my life. Then I looked at that marvellous postcard of the ladies in Old Alresford who founded the Mothers' Union and I realised that it has always been so, with the grandmothers worrying about their children's children and supporting their daughters as they became mothers of their own families. So, I think my question is how do we encourage the Mothers' Union to be both the grandmothers' union and to generate that younger Mothers' Union that they so long for?

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): Thank you, Bishop. I like that question. When I became a member of the Mothers' Union I was 25 years old and everybody in my branch was either double or triple my age, so I used to call them (quietly without them hearing) the "Golden Age Girls", but it was from these Golden Age Girls that I am where I am today. They nurtured me and they brought me up, encouraged me to bring my family up in the faith and the life of the Church. First of all, let me say there is space for the elderly ladies and the younger ladies. We have been talking about bringing in a newer and younger membership for a long time now. We have just come out of our Worldwide Council meeting, and, indeed, that is high on the agenda.

The ways in which we hope to engage younger women is to meet them where they are. Many young women are facing the challenges of a career and a young family. Many of them do not have the support of parents or friends or extended families like we used to have decades ago. We have to meet these ladies, these young mothers and young women wherever they are, and not expect them to attend every meeting at 5 pm in the afternoon or at 1 pm during the day, but to meet them where they are and engage them in the kinds of projects and programmes and work that will also excite and inspire them. That is the way we are going to get younger women to take over from our older women when the time comes.

I always use myself as the example because many times I could have run away when my own friends said, "What are you doing there in the Mothers' Union? What are you doing with the old ladies?" and I always said, "Those old ladies that you are talking about are my friends and they have my wellbeing at heart". They are the kind of role models we need for younger women. Our hope is to engage younger women with the programmes and the work and inspire them with what they need in their lives and what they see as important in their communities.

The Chair: With regret, we are going to have to call it a day now. These ladies are going to be around over the weekend. Please make a point of having conversations with them so we can continue all these lovely thoughts and ideas that we have been hearing and thinking about and reflecting upon this afternoon.

We would like to wish you God's blessing as you continue in your presidential role. That concludes this item of business. We will move to the next item on the agenda in a moment. Thank you very much for your contributions.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 4.08 pm.

ITEM 500
SPECIAL AGENDA I
LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 30 (GS 20477DD)

The Chair: We now come to Item 500. Amending Canon No. 39 received Final Approval from the Synod at the February 2019 group of sessions. I have to report to the Synod that Royal Assent and Licence has been given in respect of the Amending Canon. Under Standing Order 68 once an Instrument of Enactment for the Canon has been read in Synod, the motion appearing on your Order Paper will be put to Synod and voted on without debate. I therefore 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. 39, which received Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence on the 24th day of June 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. 39. And in testimony of such our consent, we have hereunto subscribed our names as hereafter follows, dated this 5th day of July, in the year of our Lord 2019 and in the 68th year of the reign of our sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth II".

The Chair: Item 500, "That the Canon entitled, 'Amending Canon No. 39' be made, promulgated and executed. All in favour, please show. Thank you."

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 now will be sent for proclamation in the dioceses and synods in the usual way. That completes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 4.12 pm.

ITEM 501

DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2104B)

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2105B)

REPORT BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE (GS 2104Z/2105X)

The Chair: Synod, we now come to the Final Drafting stages for the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous) Provisions Measure and draft Amending Canon No. 41. There are various things you will need. The draft Measure GS 2104B, the draft Canon GS 2105B and the Report of the Steering Group GS 2104Z/2105Z. I also want to draw your attention to paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Fifth Notice Paper because there are financial implications, although, in fact, there will be no further intervention on that point. I simply draw your attention to those paragraphs in the Notice Paper.

First of all, we deal with the Report and I call upon the Archdeacon of Knowsley and Sefton to move Item 501: “that the Synod do take note of this report”. He has up to 10 minutes.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much Chair. The Synod is due to consider the Measure and Canon on the Final Approval Stage on Monday. This afternoon we are simply concerned with Final drafting amendments to put the Measure and Canon into their final shape. As the Steering Committee’s Report explains, there are two types of amendment that could be proposed at the Final Drafting stage. There are drafting amendments and special amendments. Drafting amendments clarify any remaining uncertainties of meaning or improve the drafting. They are automatically approved if the Synod passes the take-note motion on the Report.

Special amendments are amendments that go beyond drafting but which the Steering Committee considers are necessary or desirable. Special amendments have to be voted on by the Synod and are only made if the Synod approves them.

The Steering Committee has agreed various drafting amendments to the Measure and the Canon. These are shown in bold text in the drafts and the explanations for these drafting amendments are set out in Annex A of our Report. As they are quite straightforward, I do not propose to say any more about them. However, the Steering Committee is also proposing some special amendments to the Measure and these are set out in Annex B of the Report. Again, I am not going to speak to the special amendments at this point. Once the take-note motion is passed, which I hope it will be, I will address the special amendments in turn when moving them.

On that basis, Chair, if any debate on the special amendments takes place when we get to them then I will respond. I beg to move that Synod do take note of this Report.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Item 501 is now open for debate.

Ms Christina Baron (Bath & Wells): Speaking on behalf of the Luddite tendency about the first three or four paragraphs of Amending Canon No. 41, I just want to make Synod aware that sometimes technology becomes obsolete and if Synod in the future approves the maintenance of church registers only in electronic form it is possible that in 150 years' time our successors will not be able to read the registers. Who now remembers the BBC computer? Who now has the technology to read floppy disks? You probably still can but it will not be much longer. Who now is completely confident that Radio 4's *Test Match Special* will be on longwave in 25 years' time? Probably not because the parts for the transmitter are not being made. Can I just beg Synod for the future to not invest all your hopes - and I speak as somebody who used to lecture in history - for record keeping for the future in electronics.

The Chair: Are there any other contributions to the debate? It appears not, I think, in which case I call upon the Archdeacon to reply.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): With pleasure. As an Archdeacon, one of my responsibilities is to check the written records that parishes currently keep. They are not that hot either really, and so we have to make sure that they comply. Of course, the obvious thing to say is that it will be an option for the local church to decide how they keep the registers. The principle is they should keep accurate registers however they so decide.

The Chair: Following that reply, I put Item 501 to the vote. All those in favour, please show. All those against, please show.

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

The Chair: I think that is quite clearly carried. Thank you very much.

ITEM 512

The Chair: We now move on to Item 512. The Steering Committee proposes a number of special amendments to the draft Measure. They are all set out in the Order Paper at Items 512 and 513. We are going to deal with 512 first. Item 512 covers four special amendments, all of which are concerned with the definition of “spouse” in clause 6 of the Measure. I call upon the Archdeacon of Knowsley and Sefton to move Item 512.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): As has already been explained, Item 512 contains amendments to the text of clause 6 of the Measure. To remind you, clause 6 permits the building on a disused cathedral burial ground to take place subject to certain conditions being met. One of those conditions is that there is no objection to the building proposals from a relative of any person whose remains were buried in the land in question in the last 50 years.

At the Revision stage in February, Synod agreed amendments to define “relative” for the purpose of building on disused burial grounds belonging to cathedrals and to churches. The definition agreed by the Synod covers a deceased spouse, civil partner, parent, grandparent, child or grandchild and certain other more distant relations. During the debate on the Revision Committee’s Report the Prolocutor for the Convocation of Canterbury asked whether the term “spouse” included in the definition of relative meant a spouse only as the Church of England understands the term or whether it would also include those who were spouses under the civil law.

The answer given by the Chair of the Revision Committee was that the term “spouse” contained in the definition of “relative” would not include a same-sex spouse under the civil law. Very shortly after that in the debate on the clauses of the Measure, Prebendary Simon Cawdell raised concerns about the answer that had been given about the meaning of spouse. I would like to quote part of his speech. He said,

“... 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 when 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”.

He went on to say,

“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”.

My reply to Prebendary Cawdell was that the Steering Committee would look at this point and would bring back an amendment to the Synod at this group of sessions when the Synod could vote on it. It would be for the Synod to decide whether it wished to make such an amendment, and that is what is being proposed to you now. The Steering Committee has brought forward an amendment so that the definition of a deceased relative can include a spouse of the same sex.

We do not consider that our proposed amendment has any implications for the Church’s teaching about the nature of holy matrimony. The inclusion of a same-sex spouse is only for the purpose of this specific definition, that is who counts as a relative when it is proposed to build over the grave of a person who died within the past 50 years.

The consequences of not including same-sex spouses as relatives in this specific narrow context could have very serious consequences. The Steering Committee has therefore brought this amendment forward for the Synod’s consideration. I therefore move the special amendment under Item 512.

The Chair: Item 512 is consequently now open for debate.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): I rise to oppose this amendment not because I disagree with its objective - it is entirely reasonable - but because the language in which it is expressed compromises the Church’s doctrine of marriage as expressed in Canon B 30. I accept that given that civil partners are already within the definition of a relative who is entitled to object to building on a disused burial ground it would be absurd and unjust if those who had entered into a marriage within the Marriage (Same Sex) Couples Act 2013 were not included in it. However, in providing that “spouse” even only in this context includes a spouse of the same sex this amendment implies that the Church accepts that a spouse can be of the same sex when Canon B 30 clearly states that that is not possible. It says that according to our Lord’s teaching marriage is in its nature a union of one man with one woman. We should take the utmost care to ensure that the language of our legislation, however obscure the provision may be, does not undermine the doctrine expressed in our Canons. I am aware that the 2018 Pensions Measure already includes a definition of marriage for the purpose of that legislation which also carries implications contrary to Canon B 30. However, the fact we have already made one mistake of that sort is no reason for continuing to do so. On the contrary, it makes it even more important that we take care now not to compound the error. It would be possible, instead of redefining “spouse” as the special amendment seeks to do, to add a separate category of persons as relatives who had entered into a civil marriage in accordance with section

1 of the 2013 Act. And had this been any other sort of amendment I would have brought an amendment to that effect.

However, Standing Orders do not allow amendments to a special amendment, and so the only option at this stage is to speak and vote against it.

But this is also Article 7 business and so the House of Bishops could come to our rescue if they were so minded because they are entitled to amend the text of the Measure further before it comes back for Final Approval later in this group of sessions. They will have the opportunity when they meet to insert a better form of words which achieves the desired objective which Canon Cawdell sought back in February without implicitly compromising our doctrine of marriage. With regret, I invite Synod to vote against this amendment in the hope that something better will emerge from the House of Bishops.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): The joy of General Synod debates is listening to those who are just preceding you and therefore having to think fairly rapidly how to respond. I hear what my friend and colleague Clive Scowen has just said and whilst I warm to his idea that the House of Bishops might help us with the wording, which I would agree with him is not ideal, I think a better way of doing that might well be to put in a plea that we put through this amendment in principle now and look to the House of Bishops to improve it.

I want to support the amendment in principle for three reasons. I do not think that it is threatening a change to the Marriage Canon. Indeed, if I did, I could not in good conscience support it. But I want to support them firstly as a matter of wording because the amendments are clearly being presented as an exception to a principle for a particular purpose. That is clear. If anything, the need to make such an exception probably actually reinforces that the principle of marriage is one between a man and woman as expressed in our Canons. The only reason that we need to add these clauses as a clear definition in this instance is a pastoral necessity, arising from the fact that we are providing for exceptions to an Act of Parliament where indeed the definition would have been different.

That brings me to the second issue, which is one of history. The Disused Burial Grounds Act 1884 was part of the great Victorian realignment between the Church and civil parish councils in the responsibility we hold for the burial of the dead. Part of the ethos of those acts was toleration, so that those of other faiths and none could be buried in churchyards and part was the enlightened view that disused churchyards and cemeteries could, in time, become open, public spaces and parks for the benefit of the whole of society. These amendments we are making are in the spirit of that original generosity in that they make reasonable provision, indeed provision that would be expected of the Church in relation to a grieving family for those who may have taken a different view of life and faith to those which the Church does indeed lay down in its Canons.

That brings me to a third point. However conservative our views on the Marriage Canon, and I do hold a conservative viewpoint in this regard, I cannot see how what would be an accidental exclusion from reasonable consultation at a time of pastoral stress of a same-sex spouse, in a marriage legally recognised in civil society, could possibly display the truth and welcome of the Gospel to any who might be searching for the truth, rather it would be seen as a scandal which discredited the Church. This is not a moment to be earning Pharisee points.

I believe that we should pass these amendments without fear and in self, in principle, not affecting our understanding of the Canon, but holding it in its proper pastoral context, for the sake of our mission, and the truth of the Gospel, which I remain proud to proclaim. But, in the light of Mr Scowen's speech, I might like the House of Bishops just to take a look at the wording to see if they might improve it.

Miss Debbie Buggs (London): We have got agreement on what we want to achieve in principle, there is no problem with that. We have got an understanding from the Chair of the Steering Committee that this does pose an issue for some of us who have a conservative approach to marriage and want to uphold the historical and orthodox understanding of marriage.

Thirdly, we have got a set of fine legal brains at Church House. I think we can do better than this, I think we can find a solution that works to achieve the objective but also maintains the Church's historic understanding of marriage without making it an issue for some of us in this chamber. I would plead to the Bishops and to the Steering Group to come up with a better form of words, please, thank you.

Rt Hon Canon Sir Tony Baldry (Oxford): I just want to really make a comment. We allow people of other faiths and no faiths to be buried in our churchyards, and at some point in the future I can see a Second Church Estates Commissioner having to answer questions in the House as to why a particular parson has not been able to make an objection because they are deemed not to come within a particular Church of England definition of "spouse".

I just want to say to Synod, it fell to me, on behalf of the Church of England, to represent the views of the Church of England in the debates in the House on same sex marriage, and I hope that I managed to reflect the sort of collective views of the Church on that, but one of the things that struck me was how fast on this issue Parliament has moved in the 30 years I was a member of the House. I think over the next ten, 20 years, it will move even further. So, I would not wish to be the Second Church Estates Commissioner in 10 or 20 years' time, if this amendment does not go through, who has to explain within the

particular narrow context of this amendment why a particular objection is not able to be heard and why a particular category of person is not deemed to be a spouse.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): I think the discussion here is around consistency in our legislation. We are all very clear that we need a really good and clear and proper pastoral response to pastoral need, and it is how we do that by remaining consistent across the board in what we are doing. We do have a sort of cold war kind of mentality of sometimes having a battle about one thing when it is actually a battle about something else. This is a point at which I think that we need to look towards finding wording that will very clearly stay consistent with where we are now.

How we do that I think would be best done with a little bit of a further look at the wording of the amendment and I suspect that while it is almost certainly likely to go through, a few people voting with me and Clive against it would give the Bishops a clear nod in the direction that more than just what people have said, but the way that they have voted would help them, perhaps, to choose to have a look at it. And to, therefore, vote against it seems to me to be something that actually in this context might be quite helpful to achieve the pastoral aim of consistency, which we all want.

Finally, I would just say, Chair, that this points up a point that one might have made in the debate on the Report of the Business Committee, of the necessity of Synod to give a real close eye to detail. We sometimes look at the big things that we have to say and do, and then we all get a bit bored about the boring stuff that excites archdeacons and others. It does seem to me that sometimes we need to dig deeply into these things and give it that time and energy that it needs without the pressure of somebody saying, "Tut-tut-tut, we wish you would all shut up because we have got really important things to say", because actually some of this stuff is really important to people's lives at a point of really important pastoral need and if we get it wrong then we do a real disservice to those whom we attempt to serve in the name of Christ.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): I had not prepared to speak in this debate. I have stood because I have heard my brothers and sisters speak eloquently and make some very important points. It occurs to me that if were to vote against this we may cause deep pain and hurt to some people who may get the wrong impression. If we were to vote for it, we may send the wrong signal about Church teaching. I just wonder whether it might be possible to defer this item or to move to next business so that the Bishops could go and prayerfully reflect on the wording, but we will have not, as a Synod, made a decision one way or the other, because in the public realm the decisions we make here are reported upon and I would hate for us to give the wrong message to those outside this Synod.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): I am just rising and starting by confessing the failure of my memory, because I may be corrected by others if I am remembering this wrong, but I

want to explain for those who are not aware that we have partly got ourselves into this situation. The reason we are in this situation is because there is provision in the 2013 Act that reflects the way in which that Act does, or rather does not, impact on the Church of England.

I was on Synod in 2013, I was very new and, as I say, I may not remember all the debates, but it has since come into the public domain - I can explain somewhere else how – that at the time our then Secretary General, assisted by members of the Legal Office went and assisted with the drafting. They made sure all the right clauses were there. They made sure the Submission of the Clergy Act was referred to. They made sure that a specific reference went in, which is what has brought us to where we are now, that all references to “marriage” and “spouse” within all Measures of the Church of England shall be those as if the Act had not taken effect.

I understand why that was done, I understand that it kept the peace and prevented us tearing our hair out about it, but I do not remember that we ever heard that it was happening, or we ever knew that on our behalf the Act was being asked to be drafted in that way. So, as we move forward with the inevitable contradictions that now exist between the law of the land and the law of the church in this respect, I just want us not to forget that somehow we put ourselves in this position and we are eventually, however unpleasant and difficult it is going to be, going to have to get ourselves out of it.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I think I take responsibility for getting us into this mess in the first place. I just want to say something about process. It is inevitable, and I think this is the first time that we have had to do this, that the distinction between marriage as the Church of England understands it and marriage as the State understands it are now, according to some, different. Well, let us accept that is the case for the purpose of this argument.

We are going to have to come across this from time to time, moving forward from here, and this happens to be a very narrow form of that particular expression. This is not to make a point about same sex marriage. You will notice that Prebendary Cawdell and I are united on this, despite our different views on that matter, it is not a point about same sex marriage, but rather than inviting a response of the House of Bishops in the next few days to this particular conundrum, I would be wary of doing that whilst there might be a whole set of potential other issues down the line that we have not foreseen.

And to, as it were, saving their Graces' presence, to make it up on the back of a cigarette packet just to get us out of this particular moment would be a rather unfortunate thing. Debbie Buggs said a little while ago, you know, we have got the finest legal minds in Church House, surely we can do better. The finest legal minds in Church House are

saying that this amendment has no bearing on the Canons of the Church of England and its teaching on marriage.

With that advice, my thinking is that we should proceed, we should not worry about the contradiction. Clive Scowen has acknowledged that there is already something in the pensions legislation about it. Let us just get on with it and then perhaps the lawyers, as I have asked of the legal team, could think about this in the longer term so that every time it comes up we do not end up doing this again.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I want to respond to the suggestion that was being made by Sam Margrave that we might adjourn consideration of this item to enable further consideration to be given to the precise wording. I should like, therefore, to move, pursuant to Standing Order 34, the adjournment of the debate on this item until Monday morning. It will not, therefore, be ruled out of consideration and Final Approval at this Synod but will give the opportunity for the wording of the special amendments to be looked at again without Synod having to express a view one way or the other this afternoon, which I think is the objection, or the point that Sam Margrave was trying to make for us. That is my motion: to adjourn until Monday morning.

The Chair: David Lamming has now moved a motion that the debate be now adjourned and resumed on Monday. If the motion for the adjournment of debate is carried the debate will be adjourned and resumed in accordance with the motion. If the motion is lost, the motion for the adjournment of debate may not be moved again except with the Chair's permission. David Lamming has already given his speech in favour of the motion that he has proposed so I call upon Pete Spiers to reply. He has two minutes.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): With respect, I am going to oppose David Lamming's suggestion. It would be pointless. Nothing will change between now and Monday morning if we were to do that. In fact, what is very interesting is that it is for the House of Bishops, and several speakers have referred to them, for them to make to an amendment, because it is Article 7 business, and they have 15 minutes in which to do that because the deadline is 5 o'clock today. If we were to adjourn to Monday morning, nothing will have changed, and it is very likely we will not be able to complete the whole process and the Miscellaneous Provisions Measure will have to be held over for a further period. I am going to ask Synod to resist it and simply go for a vote, yes or no to this special amendment. We can decide now, so let us decide now.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): Point of order. I wonder if we could have some clarity as to what the archdeacon has just said with regard to the House of Bishops making an amendment. Is it correct that they would have to get the amendment in by 5 o'clock or do they have the right to make the amendment when they meet on Monday morning, I think?

The Chair: Thank you, I do not know the answer to that, I need to take advice. My uncertainty is shared. I am not going to comment on the proceedings of the House of Bishops. I am not in a position to do so. What the Archdeacon has said is correct and we move on from there, I think. We now have a vote on the motion that the debate be now adjourned until Monday.

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

The Chair: There is a clear majority in favour of continuing today, as it were, without adjournment. I think at this stage we have heard most of the people that wanted to speak, so I will call upon the Archdeacon to reply to the debate we have had to this point.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Well, I think, Synod, we have had a good airing of the views on this particular amendment. Suffice to say, we are very grateful to Clive Scowen, who indicated earlier on in the week about his concerns, so that gave the Steering Committee an opportunity to discuss amongst ourselves the drafting of this special amendment, and we decided to leave it as it is for two reasons and just very briefly to reiterate that.

First, we do not consider this changes the Church of England's doctrine on marriage; it simply clarifies the definition of "relative" and "spouse" for the purpose of legislation for building on burial grounds. The Church's doctrine is contained in the Canons, the Book of Common Prayer and the church's historic formularies. The doctrine of the Church of England is not contained in this particular Miscellaneous Provisions Measure.

Secondly, as has already been alluded to, the Church of England's Pension Measure 2018 already contains a definition of "spouse" which applies for the specific purposes of pensions law and defines spouse as including a person married to somebody of the same sex. Acknowledgement of the civil law's definition of spouse has been accommodated by our pensions legislation since 2014, so we did not regard, as a Steering Committee, that this particular special amendment was breaking new ground and proposing anything radical, rather, pastorally and missionally, it was a helpful amendment in the instance where someone could be excluded from consultation when it came to erecting a building on a burial ground.

Those were the two reasons that weighed heavily with the Steering Committee. We offer it to you and now it is up to you to please vote for or against and we hope that you will vote for it.

The Chair: So now I put Item 512 to the vote. This refers to the definitions in clause 6 on your Order Paper.

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

The Chair: Thank you. I call upon the Archdeacon now to move Item 513, which is a new clause.

ITEM 513

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): I can see people leaving. that is a good start isn't it! Item 513 inserts a new clause into this Measure, that clause in turn inserts a new subsection in section 11 of the Church of England's Pensions Measure 2018. The inserted provision does not make a substantive change to the 2018 Measure, but clarifies the relationship between section 11 and section 10 of that Measure. The need for clarification arises from recent correspondence between the Church of England's Pensions Board and the Pensions Regulator.

And so the Board, with the agreement of the Church Commissioners, have asked for the interrelationship of these two sections to be clarified and the proposed amendment shares that. The new clause also revokes the Pensions (Pre-Consolidation) Order of 2018, which is now contained in the Church of England's Pensions Measure 2018. I therefore move the special amendment at 513.

The Chair: Item 513 is open for debate. I see no one standing and so I put Item 513 to the vote.

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

The Chair: The draft Church of England Miscellaneous Provisions Measure and draft Amending Canon No. 41, being Article 7 Business, now stand committed to the House of Bishops.

I have one further thing to say, that the Chair of the Business Committee wishes to move a variation of business, so I call upon the Chair of the Business Committee.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Friends, in our wisdom, and in order to ensure proper time for both the Living in Love and Faith presentation and questions, we placed some rubrics in the agenda. I am going to ask you to consent to moving those forward so that the rubric before Item 5 reads "not later than 5.25 pm" and that at Item 6 "not later than 5.55 pm". It would be extremely helpful to deal with Item 507 before we finish this evening, indeed, and it may well be that quarter of an hour will be much more than we need, but it would be of enormous help to us if you could ask the Synod Chair to move that variation.

The Chair: That variation of business has my consent. May I test the mind of Synod on this?

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

The Chair: We move now to the next item of business on the agenda.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 4.57 pm.

ITEM 507

DRAFT DIOCESAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION MEASURE (GS 2131)

The Chair: Brothers and sisters, we now come to Item 507, the Draft Diocesan Boards of Education Measure, which is before the Synod for first consideration. For this, members will need the draft Measure GS 2131 and Explanatory Memorandum GS 2131X. Members' attention is drawn to the potential financial implications of this legislation. A note by the Chair of the Finance Committee may be found in Order Paper V.

We are under time pressure, and thank you for helping us with this, but I really hope we will come to be able to have a debate and to vote on this important piece of potential legislation. I now call upon the Bishop of Ely to move Item 507 and I hope that he will speak for not more than 10 minutes, and perhaps considerably less.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Thank you for the guidance, Chair. The Diocesan Board of Education Measure 1991 provides the legal framework within which the Church of England's dioceses engage in work with Church schools. Since it was last updated, there have been significant changes to the education landscape in which Diocesan Boards of Education are operating. Therefore, the Education Office, supported by the National Society Council, decided to update the 1991 Measure so that DBEs have the range of functions and powers they need to play their part in supporting and promoting the development of Church schools now and in the future.

The Education Office adopted three guiding principles when updating the 1991 Measure. The first, simplification of processes and procedures where possible, including a power for the Archbishops' Council to update the Measure to reflect changes in parliamentary requirements of DBEs, following enactment of relevant legislation. The second function was minimal changes only, where possible, to how DBEs operate in practice where DBEs consider their current arrangements are working well. The third consideration is modernisation, so that the draft Measure reflects the educational environment in which DBEs operate now to enable them to do so more effectively.

In terms of key changes, the most significant changes made by the draft Measure relate to the options for how a DBE can be constituted. The Education Office consulted those involved with DBEs and Diocesan Boards of Finance during the summer and autumn of 2018 on the proposed choices of structural options for DBEs going forward. The three options provided in the draft Measure reflect the responses received to this consultation.

The 1991 Measure requires DBEs to be incorporated or unincorporated. Whilst some DBEs are currently incorporated as companies limited by guarantee and are registered with the Charity Commission, many of the unincorporated DBEs interpreted the option to be unincorporated more widely than had been anticipated and are operating in practice as a committee of their DBF.

The draft Measure seeks to regularise this committee structure for those DBEs which wish to continue operating in this way by introducing a new third option for DBEs to be constituted as a statutory committee of their DBF. The draft Measure also clarifies how the two current options for how DBEs can be constituted, being either incorporated or unincorporated, should operate.

The draft Measure requires all diocesan synods to make a scheme designating either an incorporated or unincorporated entity which is a registered charity or the DBF as a DBE of that diocese. I hope you are keeping up with this. Where the scheme designates the DBF as the DBE for the diocese, the DBF must set up a committee to be called the DBE to carry out its functions as a DBE on behalf of the DBF. This is serious business. The diocesan scheme which designates an entity as the DBE must be proposed by the diocesan bishop and have the consent of the DBE. Once made, the diocesan scheme would also need to be sent to the Secretary of State.

This proposed system is a simplification of the current one which requires the Secretary of State to approve changes to a DBE's constitution on receipt of a proposal from the diocesan synod supported by the diocesan bishop. The draft Measure makes express provision for joint DBEs across more than one diocese so there can be one DBE for two or more dioceses which are not explicitly provided for in the 1991 Measure.

There is already one joint DBE in existence and it is considered important for the draft Measure to provide for how joint DBEs can be set up, structured and, if necessary, unwound. It is hoped that these new provisions will make it easier for more joint DBEs to be set up in the future, enabling greater inter-diocesan co-operation.

The draft Measure reflects the current educational environment in which DBEs operate by making specific provision in relation to academies and multi-academy trusts. In particular, the draft Measure updates the provisions in the 1991 Measure relating to the

DBE providing advice, consent and directions to school governing bodies so that these provisions specifically relate to academies and multi-academy trusts too.

The draft Measure includes a new requirement for the members of a DBE to have due regard to the House of Bishops' Safeguarding Guidance. In particular, this may be needed where diocesan synods exercise their power to confer functions on a DBE in connection with education or with other work of the Church of England in relation to children and young people.

Requiring DBE members to have due regard to House of Bishops' Safeguarding Guidance would also bring DBEs within the new House of Bishops' Safeguarding Serious Incident Reporting Guidance approved by the Charity Commission. This will remove an anomaly whereby, without this requirement on all DBE members, the National Safeguarding Team would only receive copies of safeguarding serious incident reports relating to DBEs submitted to the Charity Commission by DBFs because the DBE is a statutory committee of that DBF.

By including this requirement for all DBE members, those DBEs which are independent charities will also have to send copies of any serious incident reports to the National Safeguarding Team. This will mean that the National Database of Safeguarding Serious Incidents being compiled by the National Safeguarding Team will include those incidents reported by all DBEs, however they are constituted.

In addition to the consultation last year on the choices of structural options for DBEs, the Education Office consulted the diocesan directors of education on early versions of the draft Measure and their views are reflected clearly in this draft Measure. At their business meeting in February 2019, the directors of education indicated that they were supportive of the proposals in this draft Measure. The education officers also consulted both the Charity Commission and the Department for Education on the draft Measure and has considered their respective comments too.

There do remain a number of areas under discussion with both the Department for Education and the Charity Commission and so revisions to the draft Measure may need to be proposed to the Revision Committee as a result of these ongoing discussions. There are no doubt improvements and refinements to the draft Measure which members of Synod can offer.

In the hope that the Synod is content that the draft Measure does proceed to revision, I would encourage members to submit their proposals to the Clerk so that they may be considered by the Revision Committee.

The Chair. Thank you, Bishop Stephen. The motion is now open for debate. I remind members that, under Standing Order 51, speeches must be directed to the general sense of the Measure rather than to points of detail. This item is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn): First, I must declare an interest as I am a member of the National Society Council. I shall be very brief because Bishop Stephen has explained it all very well, and the incorporated and the unincorporated I will not go down that road. First, as Bishop Stephen has said, the educational landscape has changed enormously since 1991. In fact, it has changed hugely even since 2010.

With the huge expansion in academies and multi-academy trusts and the diminished role of the local authority, review is needed. As has already been mentioned in paragraph 2 of GS 2131X, the Measure seeks to provide better for the place of DBEs in the country's educational system as it develops. Some of the key points refer to the way in which the DBE can be constituted. There has been lengthy consultation with DBEs and DBFs and it has been decided that there will be three options instead of the current two. These proposals seem to me eminently sensible. Please support this.

Canon Elizabeth Renshaw (Chester): I am pleased to support this revision to the DBE Measure. I am a long-serving DBE member myself and currently Chair of our diocesan multi-academy trust. I am also a member of the DBE Measure Steering Committee. I recently looked back at my copy of the Report "A DBE for the Future" published in 2013. In the introduction by the then Bishop of Oxford, it states, "Church of England schools are a key part of the Church's mission to the nation and enable the Church to continue to work tirelessly for the Common Good of society".

As has just been said, the education climate has considerably changed. It is important that this is reflected in the DBE Measure and that it is clear in this key piece of synodical legislation how DBEs will continue to interact Church schools that become or are established from the outset as academies. In particular, the Measure underpins the cohesiveness of diocesan families of schools but also supports cross-diocesan working and provides a rethinking of current diocesan structures to ensure we are working together in partnership to deliver mission and outreach.

As diocesan MATs and academies continue to grow, and some Church schools still fail to meet Ofsted's exacting and constantly changing criteria, there is an ever-increasing responsibility on dioceses, DBEs, diocesan MATs and academies to work in partnership to ensure our schools are effective as well as distinctive and inclusive and to lead the work of mission that meets the needs of all our children and young people. To meet these key objectives, there needs to be greater flexibility and engagement that brings about a

cohesive approach. This DBE Measure encourages engagement across diocesan structures whilst retaining the individuality of DBFs and DBEs.

Revd Canon Robert Cotton (Guildford): I particularly want to endorse paragraph 2 of the draft Measure which sets out the duties and the purpose of DBEs and what they can achieve, especially in the light of the *Growing Faith* initiative which will force churches and schools, parishes and dioceses and the National Education Office to work more closely together with families and households.

I want to also emphasise the importance of choice in paragraph 3 of the Measure. I am not sure that I fully understand it, but I will express this by underlining the anxiety that boards of education could be forced to become a sub-committee of boards of finance. There was something in the explanatory memo that seemed to indicate there would be a desire to tidy up the way dioceses do it. My anxiety is about boards of finance having the power, if boards of education were a sub-committee, of directing education policy for the dioceses.

Just to illustrate how wrong that feels, what would it feel like if it was the other way round that boards of finance were a sub-committee of boards of education? We recognise the importance of Church development plans being closely aligned with school development plans, but my experience is that the process and rigour and effectiveness of school development plans far surpasses how we are doing Church development plans at the moment.

There is something about Church culture learning from school culture and school culture not being subordinate to Church culture. The Measure in paragraph 3 gives us this choice and all I want to underline is the importance of maintaining that choice when the Measure comes for Final Approval.

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): I do welcome this draft Measure. There is a lot that is good within it. From my own position - I am looking at governance for Lincoln Diocese - the reduction in the minimum allowable size of a DBE is to be particularly welcomed. It seems to get unwieldy at times. I also welcome that the dioceses have been listened to, and DBEs, in putting forward three alternative structures, recognising the reality. In doing so, I would wish, as the Bishop of Ely consults with other bodies, to receive some assurance that the rigour of governance that emerges from all three models is going to be adequate for our needs.

Mrs Gillian de Berry (Salisbury): I am here on behalf of our director of education who has encouraged me to speak in this debate. First of all, we at Salisbury would like to thank Nigel Genders and his team for all their hard work. We particularly value the consultation

that has taken place. I would like to mention, of course, with the rise of MATs - the multi-academy trusts - that the climate has changed greatly in our school education system.

I want to quote two examples, just bringing them out from the Measure. In s.7(1), this will ensure the DBE are right to act where a church school's deeply Christian education is compromised, and we feel this is important. Again, clause 11, Engagement, 36 and 38, this is where a MAT straddles two dioceses and it is very difficult then to govern unless you have got a united approach to this.

Those are the things we would like to particularly note. 75% of the schools in our dioceses are small with less than 210 children, while 25% of our schools have less than 100 children in them on the roll. We feel this Measure is vital to protect these vulnerable schools and I ask Synod that you would support the Measure.

Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester): I am speaking sort of on behalf of our board of education, which is an unincorporated board. Broadly speaking, the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education supports the draft Measure but it is of some concern that paragraphs 15(1) to 15(7) include provisions for DBEs to have due regard to advice from the Archbishops' Council.

While it is helpful to have a national view on some issues, it is possible that this has the potential to layer additional unhelpful complexity. Already, DBEs consider advice from the CEE0 and then respond in the light of their context and views of their respective diocesan bishops. If the principle of subsidiarity is a starting point, this could place additional constraints on particular dioceses should they disagree with the advice provided. DBEs have raised that it would be helpful to know how the Archbishops' Council will have formulated their advice.

The Chair: I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 507 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 507.

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

The Chair: I now call upon the Bishop of Ely to reply.

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway): Thank you very much, Synod, for the response to the draft so far. A number of speakers like Rosemary, Betty and others and Gill have mentioned about the changing climate of education and Betty quoting, I think, my predecessor in our recognising the importance of the draft Measure in helping us be more effective in each of our dioceses in offering this particularly large distillation of the Church of England service of the Common Good and affecting the lives of a million children in any one year.

Obviously, a lot has changed in the landscape since 1991, and I am very grateful for what Robert Cotton had to say about reminding us that this is also about making DBEs more fit for purpose in co-operation with other bodies within the dioceses to make *Growing Faith* really embed in the life of our churches, our schools and families and households. I think that the concerns in the three models about being run by the DBF, well, technically speaking, already a number of unincorporated boards are run by the DBF, but with a statutory committee all authority in relation to schools would need to be delegated.

The idea that the DBF is going to ride roughshod over the educational needs of children in our schools is a fear not to be pursued. The question about rigour and about governance is really important in relation to every part of the life of a DBE but particularly in relation to engagement with issues around safeguarding, as I have said, and the engagement of the Archbishops' Council. Of course, the Archbishops' Council's engagement would be in relation to, as I said, what we would all be affected by if there were parliamentary changes and new legislation enacted.

Taking due regard, as I understand, means that you do not have to slavishly follow but you do have to record and take advice about why you would disagree with taking due regard in any particular area and what your obligations would be. A lot of these things I hope that people will raise with the Revision Committee and we look forward to coming back to Synod with an even better draft Measure for your consideration and look forward to your continued close involvement in the coming months.

The Chair. Thank you, Bishop Stephen. I now put Item 507 to the vote.

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

The Chair. The draft Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the Agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod to reach her no later than 5.30 pm on Friday 9 August. That completes this item of business. Thank you very much indeed, brothers and sisters.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 5.24 pm.

The Chair. Members of Synod, whilst the technology fires up for the next item, may I welcome those who are following the proceedings of the Synod from beyond this chamber. I know from The Revd Deacon Christine Saccali that that extends at least as far as the Diocese in Europe chaplaincy in Greece. If members will forgive me a quasi-Eurovision moment, may I say, "Kalispera Athens". I will move on swiftly before anyone tries to give us their voting preferences on the Synod's performance.

ITEM 5

LIVING IN LOVE AND FAITH AND THE PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP (GS Misc 1217)

The Chair. We come now to Item 5. This relates to the Living in Love and Faith project and the work of the Pastoral Advisory Group and, in particular, to the seminars tomorrow afternoon. This is a presentation under Standing Order 107. In a moment, I will invite the Bishop of Coventry to introduce the item, together with Dr Eeva John, the enabling officer for the *Living in Love and Faith* project, and the Bishop of Newcastle.

It is hoped that there will be a short time for questions in the half hour allotted to this business. Members should be aware that any questions must be for the purposes of clarification of the presentation or the practical arrangements for the seminars, not about the substance of the wider issues. I now invite the Bishop of Coventry to introduce this item.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Chair. That is a relief about the questions. I had not quite realised we would get off that easily. Just a little update of what we have been getting up to over the last year or so. Well, over the last six months, certainly, our attention has been very much on the main volume, as it were, that we are producing. There are loads of other things that are going on as well. We have been working on a whole lot of root papers, as we have called them, that will feed into the book and to the other resources. That is where our attention has been over the last six months. We have been working on the first three of five sections to that main volume. We have produced two drafts so far. We have a whole lot more to go. It will be a busy summer for a number of people, a whole lot of people actually, as we try to get the third draft together for the College of Bishops' meeting in September.

Running alongside that drafting work, there have been a number of the wider participation meetings happening with individuals and with Church communities, 50 face-to-face conversations and about 100 written responses as well. There has been a lot of engagement with the wider Anglican Communion through meeting with individuals and trying to get along to key gatherings, the ACC, Bishops in Dialogue, new bishops and seminarians, conferences and we have tried to take the advantage of meeting Primates when they are here as well.

There has been a lot of work going on, but it is not all about tasks. We have got something to show you now. We are getting into film. Amy, are you able to press the button? I probably cannot be relied on to do that.

(Video played)

Dr Eeva John: There is nothing easy about the Living in Love and Faith project! But let me start with a true story.

Some years ago, an ordinand student of mine was on a summer placement at a historic church that was a major tourist attraction. She placed a large book full of blank pages near the entrance to the church and invited tourists to handwrite just one verse of John's Gospel into the beautifully decorated book. The student recounted how many found their allotted verse to be strangely meaningful. Others passed by and then returned later to write a verse - mysteriously compelled by the invitation. Verse by verse, the good news of Jesus Christ unfolded in a motley range of handwritings representing a vast diverse array of lived experiences, knowledge and beliefs. This simple and imaginative initiative speaks to me about the work of the Living in Love and Faith project.

Although we are producing a range of resources, and you have just seen a film, there is no getting away from the fact that Living and Love in Faith is essentially a writing project. There are about 40 people directly involved and countless others less directly. So we are faced with a challenge: how can we write collaboratively? Who can be trusted to hold the pen? Or how can we pass the pen around and produce something that is coherent? How do we ensure the full range of voices and perspectives are empathetically and faithfully articulated?

Of course, the question, "Who holds the pen?" could be another way of asking "Who holds the power?" And that is a very real question. How do we acknowledge, defuse or let go of the power that is held in different ways by different people in this process? How do we even see or admit to the power that we might inadvertently be exercising or exuding? There is the power of the bishops, the power of the marginalised, the power of the majority, the power of a process, the power of lived experience, the power of campaigners. How do we divest ourselves of power in order to be freed to talk with one another rather than about one another?

In the Living in Love and Faith project we are trying to do this - but we are not perfect! Old habits die hard, but - with your help - we are trying to notice them and find better ways of relating to one another honestly, openly and sensitively. Our membership is itself diverse and, as you have just heard, we have engaged one-on-one with over 100 people and we plan for our draft resources to be read by yet other people who bring diverse lived experience as well as others who bring different academic expertise.

But we have yet another potential spoiler. In the face of either change or lack of change - whichever it is that you fear - how do we resist the temptation of politicking or the temptation to manoeuvre the Church towards one outcome or another? How do we stick to our commitment to really listen to one another with a humility that is open to learning

that reaches beyond our rational selves to our affections and spirit? Allowing, as Jessica said in the film, God to give us a hand?

And so how do we hold fast to a process that is too slow for some and too fast for others? How do we stay open and transparent, making ourselves vulnerable or being misunderstood and misrepresented? How do we keep at bay our impatience to find an answer - the answer - in favour of deeper learning, deeper loving, so that when the answer comes we are ready to embrace both the answer and one another?

All this requires patience - and patience would not be patience if it was not hard – and, yes, it is much harder for some than others. And it is not just about being patient with each other or even with the structures and systems of the Church, but with God who seems to be so slow in revealing himself to those with whom we disagree.

Patience and pain go together. Our subject matter - being and relating as human beings created in the image of God - is inherently glorious and joyful, but it is also and often the root of deep, personal pain - pain that is unevenly distributed among us and so a potential source of tension, rancour and conflict. But, as if that wasn't difficult enough, the work of Living in Love and Faith also invites us all to enter into pain. It calls us to become more sensitised to the divisions that we have allowed our differences to create between us. And as the work progresses and relationships deepen, this pain becomes more acute – and perhaps so it should.

We persevere because there is a promise - the promise that we will be known to be disciples of Jesus by our love for one another. We, of all people, the followers of the crucified and risen Jesus Christ, know that such love for one another is costly and painful. There is nothing easy about living in love and faith. But through the life of Jesus, the suffering of Jesus, the resurrection of Jesus and the gift of the Spirit, new creation comes. So perhaps - perhaps - God is doing a new thing among us.

The pen is being shared around, power is being acknowledged, politics is being put in its place, and we are involved in a process of doing things in a new way - a way that requires hope and holds out promise - a promise, were it to be fulfilled that would speak powerfully to a nation that seems to be gorging on polarisations and divisions.

When the Living in Love and Faith resources are published next summer, parishes, deaneries and dioceses will be exhorted to engage with them. That is when your work begins. They will be encouraged to form groups to learn together and to wrestle with the questions that are asked of us as God's Church in 21st century England. And, as we do, the Bishops will be listening - listening and praying as they seek to discern God's voice in and through us, his people, as together we wrestle with the Word and call upon the Spirit. Surely that in itself is a new thing, a new way of enabling us to live in love and faith.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you very much, Eeva. Just a little bit about tomorrow. Again, we are very grateful for the time the Synod is giving to the LLF work tomorrow. There will be a number of things for you to, I hope, enjoy and really engage with. There is going to be what we call “Encounters on the way”. It is an invitation to just drop in and engage with Scripture and some of the lived experience stories that we have been gathering. It is a sort of self-service arrangement. There will not be anyone there to lead it. You just turn up and get going. There will be a booklet there to help you with that. It is just a reflective space that we are trying to provide that helps you to engage with some of these themes and deep matters in a more personal and prayerful mode.

You will see that the biblical reflections are making use of the Emmaus story, which we found helpful, and we are sort of experimenting with the Emmaus story as a way of helping us to frame the work we are doing. What I found particularly helpful about the Emmaus story is the way it begins pretty much with a question: what are you discussing together as you walk along? I found that helpful for cutting through a bit of a clash of method. Do we begin with foundational theological convictions or do we begin with human experience? The way we have been approaching it is that sort of question approach. The other three seminar options which we want you to take part in are on the three sections of the book. The first one: Where are we? That is rather resonant with the question God asks, “Where are you?” in the Garden of Eden? Who are we? is the second section. What are human beings that you are mindful of them, mortals that you care for them and then, “How do we hear God?” That is the third section. Where does wisdom come from?

There will be a chance for you to listen in on the work that has been happening to engage with the drafters, to hear about some of the wrestling that we found ourselves involved in. There will be a chance, as it were, to hold the pen by coming and sharing your own reflections, views and impressions of the sort of work that we are doing. Please come along to those and enjoy them. There are no great moral dilemmas involved for us. We do not need to choose whether to watch the World Cup or the Wimbledon Final tomorrow. Just come along and enjoy what is on offer. There are a whole lot of people who are ready to work with you on that summer’s afternoon. I think I am going hand over to the Bishop of Newcastle now who has one thing to share with us. Thank you again and I look forward to seeing you tomorrow afternoon.

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman): Brothers and sisters, I am going to impose a less than two-minute speech limit on myself. One of the workshops tomorrow is run by the Pastoral Advisory Group. We are really proud of the *Pastoral Principles for Living Well Together*, but if they remain just rather beautifully designed packs of cards we might as well not have bothered. They now need to come to life. We need to live them.

I warmly encourage you to come along to the workshop and we will be having an experiential working with how to work with the principles, challenging ourselves about our prejudice, the silence we sometimes keep, our ignorance, our fear, our hypocrisy, our abuse of power, in which we are all caught up. Come along and help us all to discover a way in which we can learn to treat ourselves and one another with the loving dignity and respect that each one of us deserves. We are meeting in James Hall tomorrow.

The Chair: Members of Synod, you will have heard that tomorrow afternoon is the time to engage with those most closely involved in this project. If there are questions, short focused questions of clarification about the presentation or about the practical arrangements, we can take a couple of those now.

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Thank you for the work you are doing. I am not sure how much one can enjoy what is on offer when one is talking about one's own future and hopes. My question to both of you, if I may, is given that so much is already written, how will the input from Synod be included and how will that then affect churches that have already made up their mind on this issue to actually engage with these resources?

Dr Eeva John: Thank you, Jayne, for your question.

The Chair: We will take two questions at once and then go to the answers.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): This is really to pick up from the tail-end of what Bishop Christopher said, but I am sure Eeva will want to comment as well. In the method that you have been using so far have you been explicit in what methods of theological reflection the groups have been using, and, particularly, have you been using methods of theological reflection which identify whose voices are heard and whose voices are not heard in the process?

Dr Eeva John: Thank you, Jayne, for your question and for your reproof or reprimand. I am sure that was appropriate, so thank you for pointing that out. On the input from Synod, we have means of gathering your feedback and your responses to what will be presented tomorrow afternoon at the seminars. We will be inviting people to literally write stuff and we will include that.

I would also say that is just one component, one stage of the feedback. When the resources reach the next stage next year you will have another opportunity. These resources are about learning, so the work begins once they have been published and you will have further opportunities to learn from them, to discuss them, and those responses are what I was talking about in relation to the Church listening to those responses. I guess I would like to move from a language of responses to a language of learning and of exploring together, if that makes sense.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): May I apologise to Jayne if I came across rather flippantly there. Eeva is absolutely right about the pain. This is a painful process and for some it will be more painful than others. On that last note, Eeva, I really believe in the promise of learning, and I find myself getting quite excited about the opportunities for learning together and asking questions together. Though deep and painful in all sorts of ways, that can be something that somehow brings a deeper understanding and perhaps even an experience of joy.

Dr Eeva John: Jayne, you talked about churches that have made up their minds and I have met with quite a number of exactly those churches and I think there are churches on all sides of the conversation which seemingly have made up their minds, but I guess my deepest hope is that everyone recognises that we still have things to learn about what is a very complex subject, the nature of human identity and relating as sexual human beings.

Charles, thank you for your question about methods of theological reflection, a subject that is very close to my heart. Again, the methodology of theological reflection is a developing area of practical theology, and one of the things that we will be tackling over this summer is how to weave in the different voices that we have been carefully recording and writing about, and how we weave those in in a way that is sensitive to the possibilities of disparities of power as well as other aspects. I do not believe that we will follow just one particular theological reflection method. I think there will be various ways in which we will make sure that we engage with and respond to the lived experiences and stories that we have been listening to and will continue to.

The Chair: We may have time for two more questions if they are brief and focused.

Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn): Thank you for all the work you are doing on this issue. I suppose my hope when this started was that one way or another we would come to a conclusion about where we stand as a Church. From what I am seeing, it seems that we are trying to hold together still a variety of positions, which makes the way forward on the matter rather difficult. Do you envisage coming to some sort of conclusion about where we stand as a Church or do you envisage it rather being left unresolved and trying to hold the varieties of views together?

Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield): I am slightly surprised to hear that you are hoping God might help you in all of this. I was rather hoping that this might be God's piece of work that we were looking into rather than something that we were driving and that we might let God into if we feel like it.

Dr Eeva John: That is definitely one for the Bishops.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Alistair, thank you for your question. What we are engaged in is a learning exercise together. We are trying to ask those questions together. We are trying to draw close to the Lord and dig deeply into Scripture and learn from each other. This is not an exercise that is trying to come, I think, to the sorts of conclusions that you are hoping we will. It is a process by which we learn together so that, at the right time, those sorts of conclusions will be able to be made. This is not an exercise in, as it were, trying to hold a lot of views together, but it is an exercise in trying to understand what those views are, to allow them to be articulated and understood and done so clearly. I do think that we can come to some very clear conclusions about fundamentally who we are as human beings, and so I think there will be a whole lot of things that we can say together.

On the last question, yes, who are we as human beings? We are God's piece of work, so it is all about trying to listen to the God in whose image we are made. It is not about inviting God in. It is about trying to allow Christ to walk alongside us and to hear the definition of reality that comes to us from the Word of God who became flesh in Christ.

The Chair: I am afraid we have now reached the point at which we have timed business. Thank you to those who have made the presentation. That concludes this item of business. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 5.54 pm.

ITEM 6 QUESTIONS

The Chair: We now move to the last show of the day, Questions, Item 6. Can I just remind you what the Chair of the Business Committee told us earlier, that in fact we are doing questions in two batches, so we are now going to be going through to Question 91 and then from 92 onwards we will be picking those up when we are looking at Safeguarding as a whole. If we do not complete all of the questions before us we do not complete all of these questions before us. We will not start from where we leave off this evening, we will start from Question 92, just so you are clear about that.

Those who want to ask a supplementary, if you can go to one of the lecterns please. That will be really helpful so that we can hear what you are asking. St Alcuin of York was the first person really to use the question mark. In these hallowed grounds of York, where the question mark was developed, I will be listening for one in what you say, and if I do not hear a question mark, I have my bell. It is not for you to ask anybody's opinion about anything. You are here to ask a question. Is that all right? We will start then. Questions 1 to 11 are to the Secretary General and William Nye is responding.

1. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Secretary General: Please supply the numbers of members in, respectively, the House of Clergy and the House of Laity who were born in the years 1935-1939; 1940-1944, 1945-1949 et cetera up to 2001.

Mr William Nye replied as the Secretary General: The Secretariat has records of the year of birth of 80% of all Synod members easily available which totals 380 members. Of these, the breakdown of the years of birth for the House of Clergy and Laity is as follows:

Year	House of Clergy	House of Laity
1930 – 34		1
1935 – 39		4
1940 – 44	1	15
1945 – 49	2	30
1950 – 54	2	36
1955 – 59	47	22
1960 – 64	46	24
1965 – 69	21	31
1970 – 74	20	12
1975 – 79	17	4
1980 – 84	4	8
1985 – 89		6
1990 – 94		4
1995 – 99		2

Mr Adrian Greenwood: Thank you for the information. It is noteworthy that there is a much greater range of ages for lay people compared to clergy and the bishops. Given that clergy and bishops are subject to rules about compulsory requirement from Synod, what process would the Secretary General recommend for considering the introduction of an upper limit for members the House of Laity in General Synod?

Mr William Nye: Thank you very much for your supplementary. I do not think it is for me to recommend a process for capping the experience that members of the House of Laity bring to the General Synod, but members will have seen the range of ages and will no doubt bear that in mind in talking to members of deanery synods next summer and next autumn.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): I was horrified to find I am amongst the five oldest members of the House of Clergy, but I am not able to determine how that relates to the House of Bishops. Is there a reason why the House of Bishops figures are not included?

Mr William Nye: Yes, there is a very good question which is that Mr Greenwood did not ask us about the House of Bishops.

2. *Revd Charlie Skrine (London)* asked the Secretary General: In the light of the alarming findings from the 2017 Statistics for Mission Returns referred to in GS 2124B, showing that only 30 (0.28%) of our churches had more than 100 u16s, only 170 (1.61%) of our churches had more than 50 u16s, and only 680 (6.45%) of our churches have more than 25 u16s, would you please publish (on the website and the noticeboard) the names of those 680 churches (perhaps alphabetically within each of the three different bands used in GS 2124B)?

Mr William Nye replied as the Secretary General: A document containing three tables, one for each of the different bands used in GS 2124B, and listing churches alphabetically has been published. This will be displayed on the Questions noticeboard near the information desk at General Synod and, in due course, will be uploaded to the Synod website. There is variation in the information provided by churches year by year. Therefore, the churches included in these lists are of churches that reported child (aged under 16) attendance of 26-50, 51-100, and 101 or over in all three of the years 2015 to 2017. These lists do not include churches for which an estimate of child attendance was made in any of the years 2015-17 due to the church not completing a Statistics for Mission return. Also, the lists do not include those churches for which their Statistics for Mission annual return included more than one church unless the average number of children reported per church included in the return met these totals.

Churches that reported child (aged under 16) attendance of 101 or over in all three of the years 2015 to 2017

Abingdon: Christ Church	Harrogate: St Mark	Oxford: St Andrew
Ashted: St George's Christian Centre	Holy Trinity Brompton	Oxford: St Ebbe
Bishopsgate: St Helen	Howell Hill: St Paul	Reigate: St Mary Magdalene
Brighton: St Peter	Jesmond: Clayton Memorial Church	Rusholme: Holy Trinity
Cambridge: St Andrew the Great	Lancaster: St Thomas	Sevenoaks: St Nicholas
Cheltenham: Holy Trinity	Langham Place: All Souls	Stratford: St John the Evangelist
Crookes: St Thomas	Leamington Priors: St Paul	Tonge-cum-Alkington: St Michael
Fulwood: Christ Church	Longfleet: St Mary	Wandsworth: St Michael & All Angels, Southfields
Halliwell: St Peter	Maidenhead: St Andrew & St Mary Magdalene	Warfield: St Michael the Archangel

Harborne: St John the Baptist	Muswell Hill: St James	West Ealing: St Paul
Harpenden: St Nicholas	Oxford: St Aldate	Woodside Park: St Barnabas

Churches that reported child (aged under 16) attendance of 51-100 in all three of the years 2015 to 2017

Aldridge: St Mary the Virgin	Harold Wood: St Peter	Solihull: St Alphege
Ashton-upon-Mersey: St Mary Magdalene	Harwood: Christ's Church	South Croydon: Emmanuel
Blackheath: St John the Evangelist	Hazlemere: Holy Trinity	South Wimbledon: Holy Trinity & St Peter
Bournemouth: St Swithun	High Crompton: St Mary	Southampton (Highfield) Portswood: Christ Church
Broxbourne: St Augustine	High Harrogate: Christ Church	Southwark Cathedral
Brussels	High Harrogate: St Peter	St Albans: St Paul
Buckhurst Hill: St John the Baptist	Highbury Grove: Christ Church	St Margarets, Twickenham: All Souls
Buckingham: St Peter & St Paul	Highgate: St Michael	St Marylebone
Busbridge: St John the Baptist	Horsham: St Mary the Virgin	Stamford: St George
Cambridge: Holy Trinity	Ipswich: St John the Baptist	Stoke Gifford: St Michael
Cambridge: St Barnabas	Kensington: St Mary Abbots	Stoughton: Emmanuel
Cambridge: St Matthew	Kettering: Christ the King	Sunninghill: St Michael & All Angels
Chelsea: St Luke	Laleham: All Saints	Teddington: St Mary
Chesham: St Mary the Virgin	Leeds: St George	Tewkesbury: Holy Trinity
Childwall: All Saints	Leicester: Holy Trinity w St John the Divine	Thamesmead: St Paul's Ecumenical Centre
Chorleywood: Christ Church	Leyland: St Andrew	Thornham: St James
Churchdown: St Andrew	Lincoln: St Peter-in-Eastgate	Twickenham: St Stephen
Claygate: Holy Trinity	Lindfield: All Saints	Upper Sunbury: St Saviour's
Clifton: Christ Church	Loughton: St Mary the Virgin	Walmley: St John the Evangelist
Cockfosters: Christ Church	Lyonsdown: Holy Trinity	Walthamstow: St Mary
Cullompton: St Andrew	Marble Arch: The Annunciation	Walton-on-Thames: St Mary
Dulwich: St Barnabas	Marlow: All Saints	Ware: Christ Church
Eastbourne: All Souls	Much Woolton: St Peter	Warwick Avenue: St Saviour
Eastrop: St Mary	Nantwich: St Mary	West Bridgford: St Giles

Ecclesall: All Saints	New Malden: Christ Church	West Derby: St Mary
Exeter: St Leonard	New Town, Chesham: Emmanuel	Weston-super-Mare: St Paul
Fisherton Anger: St Paul	North Farnborough: St Peter	Wimbledon: St Mary
Fulham: All Saints	Northwood: Emmanuel	Winchester: Christ Church
Gordon Hill: St Michael	Plymouth: St Andrew	Winchmore Hill: St Paul
Hammersmith: St Paul	Reading: Greyfriars	Woking: Christ Church
Hampstead: Emmanuel	Redhill: Holy Trinity	Woodford Wells: All Saints
Hampton Wick: St John the Baptist	Seasalter: St Alphege	York: St Michael-le-Belfrey

Churches that reported child (aged under 16) attendance of 26-50 in all three of the years 2015 to 2017

Acton: St Mary	Bournemouth: St Saviour	Chippenham: St Paul
Addiscombe: St Mildred	Bournville: St Francis	Chipstead: St Margaret
Addison Road: St Barnabas	Bowdon: St Mary the Virgin	Chislehurst: St Nicholas
Aigburth: St Anne	Bracknell: Holy Trinity	Chorleywood: St Andrew
Ainsworth: Christ Church	Brampton: St Thomas	Christchurch: Holy Trinity
Aldershot: Holy Trinity	Branksome Park: All Saints	Clapham Common: St Barnabas
Allerton: All Hallows	Bream: St James	Cliff Park Community Church
Alperton: St James	Brentford: St Paul	Clitheroe: St James
Alverstoke: St Mary	Brentwood: St Thomas	Cogges: St Mary
Angell Town: St John the Evangelist	Bridlington Quay: Christ Church	Colchester: St John the Evangelist
Angmering: St Margaret	Bryanston Square: St Mary's	Collier Row: The Good Shepherd
Ashby-de-la-Zouch: Holy Trinity	Burgess Hill: St Andrew	Combe Down: Holy Trinity
Ashton-in-Makerfield: St Thomas	Burscough Bridge: St John	Coulsdon: St John the Evangelist
Ashton-on-Ribble: St Andrew	Bursledon: St Paul	Coventry: Holy Trinity
Aughton: Christ Church	Camberley: St Paul	Cranham Park: St Luke
Banbury: St Paul	Cambourne	Cricklewood: St Gabriel
Barkham: St James	Cambridge: St Andrew the Less	Crofton: Holy Rood
Barking: St Margaret	Cambridge: St John	Crofton: St Paul
Barley Hill Church	Cambridge: St Mary the Great	Cromer: St Peter & St Paul
Barnet: Christ Church	Canterbury, Bredin: St Mary	Croydon: St John the Baptist (CROYDON MINSTER)

Barton Seagrave: St Botolph	Castle Bromwich: St Mary & St Margaret	Dagenham: St Peter & St Paul
Basle	Catford: St John the Baptist	Deal: St George the Martyr
Bath, Weston: All Saints	Chadderton: St Matthew	Deptford: St John
Bath: St Peter & St Paul (Bath Abbey)	Chadkirk (or Romiley): St Chad	Derby: St Alkmund
Battersea: St Luke	Chadwell Heath: St Chad	Dorking: St Paul
Bebington: St Andrew	Chalfont: St Peter	Dorridge: St Philip
Becontree: St George	Charlton Kings: Holy Apostles	Downend: Christ Church
Bedford: Christ Church	Chelsea Old Church	Durham: St Nicholas
Beverley: St Mary	Cheltenham: St Paul	Ealing: St Mary
Bilton: St John the Evangelist	Chequerbent: St Thomas	East Acton: St Dunstan
Blackheath: All Saints	Chester Square: St Michael	East Crompton: St James
Bletchley: St Mary	Chester-le-Street: St Mary & St Cuthbert	East Dulwich: St John
Blundellsands: St Nicholas	Chesterton: The Good Shepherd	Eastbourne: St Mary
Bosham: Holy Trinity	Chevening: St Botolph	Eastcote: St Lawrence
Bourne: St Thomas-on-the-Bourne	Chingford: St Peter & St Paul	Eaton Square: St Peter
Edmonton: All Saints	Great Stanmore: St John the Evangelist	Ifield: St Margaret
Egham: St John the Baptist	Greenfield: St Mary	Ilkley: All Saints
Eindhoven	Greenford Magna: Holy Cross	Ilkley: St Margaret
Elvetham: The Church on the Heath	Guildford: Holy Trinity	Ingleby Barwick: St Francis
Ely: St Mary	Hackney: St Luke	Ipswich: St Augustine of Hippo
Emmanuel Church Bicester	Hailsham: St Mary	Ipswich: St Margaret
Enfield, Forty Hill: Jesus Church	Hale: St Peter	Ipswich: St Matthew
Enfield: St Andrew	Hammersmith: St Peter	Isleworth: All Saints
Erith: Christ Church	Hampstead: Christ Church	Isleworth: St John the Baptist
Esher: Christ Church	Hampstead: St John	Jesmond: Holy Trinity
Exeter Holy Trinity	Hampton	Kennington Cross: St Anselm
Eynsham: St Leonard	Hanwell: St Mary	Kennington: St John the Divine w St James the Apostle
Failsworth: St John	Harlesden: All Souls	Kensal Rise: St Martin
Fair Oak: St Thomas	Harpurhey: Christ Church	Kew: St Anne

Felsted: Holy Cross	Hartford: St John the Baptist	Kilburn, Priory Road: St Mary
Ferndown: St Mary	Hartley Wintney w Elvetham: St John the Evangelist	Kingston Hill: St Paul
Finchampstead: St James	Hastings: Holy Trinity	Kirk Ella: St Andrew
Finchley: St Mary	Heath Town: Holy Trinity	Knighton: St John the Baptist
Finsbury Park: St Thomas	Henleaze: St Peter	Knowle: St John the Baptist & St Laurence & St Anne
Forest Gate: St Mark	Hensingham: St John	Lancaster: St Mary (The Priory)
Freezywater: St George	Hesketh w Beconsall: All Saints	Lancaster: St Paul, Scotforth
Frogmore: Holy Trinity	Heswall: St Peter	Leamington Priors: St Mary
Fulham: Christ Church	Highfield: St Matthew	Lee: St Mildred
Fulham: St Matthew	Hinckley: St John the Evangelist	Leesfield: St Thomas
Furnace Green: St Andrew	Histon: St Andrew	Leicester: The Martyrs
Gamston: St Luke	Holbeck: St Luke the Evangelist	Leighton Buzzard: All Saints
Gidea Park: St Michael & All Angels	Hoole: All Saints	Leipzig
Gillingham: St Mark	Hornchurch: St Andrew	Letchworth: St Paul
Gipsy Hill: Christ Church	Horsham: St Mark	Lever Bridge: St Stephen & All Martyrs
Goudhurst: St Mary the Virgin	Hounslow: Holy Trinity	Lewes: St John the Baptist
Grassendale: St Mary the Virgin	Hove: Bishop Hannington Memorial Church	Lincoln: St Swithin
Grays: St Peter & St Paul	Hove: St Andrew (Old Church)	Little Shelford: All Saints
Great Baddow: St Mary the Virgin	Hoxton: St John the Baptist	Liverpool: All Saints
Great Crosby: St Luke	Hull, Newland: St John	Long Benton: St Bartholomew
Great Malvern: St Mary & St Michael	Idle: Holy Trinity	Long Lane: St Paul
Loose: All Saints	Penn: St Bartholomew	Shooters Hill: Christ Church
Lostock: St Thomas & St John	Pinner: St John	Sidcup: Christ Church
Loudwater: St Peter	Plas Newton: St Michael	Sittingbourne: Holy Trinity
Loughborough: Emmanuel	Plumstead: St John	Slough: St Paul
Loughton: St John the Baptist	Preston: All Saints	Smithills Hall Chapel

Luton, Lewsey: St Hugh	Preston: St Cuthbert	South Tottenham: St Ann
Luton: St Mary	Preston-on-Tees: All Saints	South Weald: St Peter
Meole Brace: Holy Trinity	Primrose Hill: St Mary	Southall Green: St John
Mereworth: St Lawrence	Pudsey: St Lawrence & St Paul	Southborough: St Matthew
Milton: All Saints	Putney: All Saints	Southsea: St Jude
Moorside: St Thomas	Putney: St Mary	Southwell: Holy Trinity
Moseley: St Mary	Pyrford: Church of the Good Shepherd	Spalding: St Mary & St Nicolas
Mossley Hill: St Matthew & St James	Quinton Road West: St Boniface	Spring Grove: St Mary
Mottram-in- Longdendale: St Michael	Quinton: Christ Church	Springfield: St Christopher
Moulton: St Peter & St Paul	Ramsgate: St Luke	St Albans: St Peter
New Shoreham: St Mary de Haura	Reading: St Laurence	St Kea: All Hallows
Newbury: St Nicolas	Redbourn: St Mary	St Thomas, Philadelphia
Newton-in-Makerfield: St Peter	Redcliffe: St Mary the Virgin	Stalybridge: Holy Trinity & Christ Church
Norbury: St Philip	Redland	Stapleford: St Helen
Normanton-by-Derby: St Giles	Richmond: Holy Trinity	Stockton Parish Church
Northampton: St Giles	Ripon: Holy Trinity	Stoke Bishop: St Mary Magdalene
Northfield: St Laurence	Roby: St Bartholomew	Stoke-next-Guildford: St John the Evangelist
Northolt: St Joseph the Worker	Rockley Road: St Simon	Stonebridge: St Michael
Northwood: Holy Trinity	Romford: St Edward the Confessor	Streatham: Immanuel and Saint Andrew
Nottingham (Mapperley): St Jude	Romsey: St Mary & St Ethelflaeda	Styvechale: St James
Orpington: Christ Church	Rothley: St Mary the Virgin & St John Baptist	Surbiton Hill: Christ Church
Oswestry: Holy Trinity	Royton: St Anne, Longsight	Surbiton: St Matthew
Oundle: St Peter	Ruislip: St Martin	Swinton: St Peter
Owlerton: St John the Baptist	Ruskin Park: St Saviour	Talbot Village: St Mark
Paddington Green: St Mary	Salisbury: St Francis	Tervuren
Paddington: St James	Selby: St James	Tewkesbury: St Mary the Virgin (Tewkesbury Abbey)
Padiham: St Leonard	Shadwell: St Paul	The Hague
Pannal: St Robert of Knaresborough	Shenfield: St Mary the Virgin	Throop: St Paul
Parkstone: St Luke	Shildon: St John	Thurnby: St Luke

Peckham: St Mary Magdalene	Shirley: St James	Tonbridge: St Peter & St Paul
Tonbridge: St Stephen	Wallington: St Patrick	Wickersley: St Alban
Tonge Moor: St Augustine	Walthamstow: St John	Willesden: St Matthew
Tooting Graveney: St Nicholas	Walton: Holy Trinity	Woking: St John the Baptist
Tottenham: St Mary the Virgin	Wanstead: Christ Church	Woking: St Mary of Bethany
Trull: All Saints	Watford: St Luke	Wokingham: All Saints
Tulse Hill: Holy Trinity & St Matthias	Welwyn Garden City: St Francis of Assisi	Wolverhampton: St Peter
Tunbridge Wells: Holy Trinity w Christ Church	Werrington: Emmanuel	Wonersh: St John the Baptist
Tunbridge Wells: St James	West Dulwich: All Saints	Woodbridge: St John the Evangelist
Turnham Green: Christ Church	West Ealing: St John	Woodhouses Mission Church
Twickenham: Holy Trinity	West Ealing: St Stephen	Woodley: Emmanuel Church
Twickenham: St Mary the Virgin	West Harrow: St Peter	Woodthorpe: St Mark
Ulverston: St Mary w Holy Trinity	West Kilburn: St Luke	Worcester: St Nicholas & All Saints
Upton (or Overchurch): St Mary	Westwood: St John The Baptist	Worthing: St Matthew
Uxbridge: St Margaret	Wetherby: St James	Yateley: St Peter
Vevey	Whitfield: St James	Yaxley: St Peter
Virginia Water: Christ Church	Whittle-le-Woods: St John the Evangelist	Yeovil: St John the Baptist – LEP
Wallington: Holy Trinity	Whitton: St Augustine of Canterbury	York: St Paul

Revd Charlie Skrine: Thank you, Secretary General, for your reply and for making the list available. It is a deep sadness that 40% of the children and young people in the Church are in just those 680 churches. It is also an opportunity for high-quality research into why people do and do not go to church. Thank you for the list in answer to Question 2. Would you consider adding a particular focus on those 11 to 18 and on the model of youth work employed?

Mr William Nye: I think the information that has come out in this question is very interesting for the whole Church to reflect on and it will be part of the *Growing Faith* process which the Synod endorsed in February; to think very hard about what is successful in the way of engagement of children and young people, not just in churches but in churches and as they relate to schools and families, which of course is the thrust

of *Growing Faith*. We will be doing some research both on children's work and young people to see what we can learn from this and also what can be done for those other churches which are not in the 680 in which there are not many children in the churches but there are, of course, millions of children in those parishes.

3. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Secretary General: From GS 2124B, paragraph 1: "30 churches have more than 100 u16s and 170 churches have more than 50 u16s. Anecdotally, this has been attributed to factors such as staffing (including level of appointment and training), church tradition, service patterns, presence of church schools, schools work, location/context, and prayer meetings specifically for the youth work". Has any research been done, or is any such research planned, to identify common factors present in these churches, so that good practice can be shared?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: *Growing Faith* will bring together learning from parish clusters in trailblazer dioceses so that we can disseminate good practice. As part of the analysis described in the answer to Question 13, we are analysing data for churches with 25 or more children aged 0-16, looking at a five-year pattern of growth or decline in comparison with wider congregation numbers. This research will consider, for each church: size; location; employment of a youth, children's or family worker; tradition; connection with Church schools; connection with organisations or youth projects (e.g. Boys' Brigades, Girls' Brigades, Church Lads, Church Girls and Messy Church). Working with the Strategic Development Unit, this will be turned into a report which we hope to have available later in the year.

Mrs Caroline Herbert: Thank you for your answer. It is great to hear that this research is going to take place. What plans are there for publicising and then disseminating the report? Who will actually have responsibility for taking any such recommendations forward?

Mr William Nye: I am looking at the Bishop of Ely in front of me, but any research which we generate will certainly be published and disseminated and made as available as possible to all parishes – not just to this 680 but to all other parishes – to see what they can do, learning from this to be more effective in mission amongst children and young people.

Mr Clive Scowen (London): The answer includes "connection with organisations or youth projects (e.g. Boys' Brigades, Girls' Brigades, Church Lads, Church Girls and Messy Church)". Will it also take account of things like "youth congregations", other Fresh Expressions, that actually seek to target young people for evangelism, or are we just talking about well-established, rather safe organisations?

Mr William Nye: We will be wanting to do research into all possible aspects of children and youth ministry. Whether we are able to cover all those elements in the research pointed to here, which we are hoping to produce by the end of the year, I am not sure, but we will certainly want to look as widely as we can into all the different areas. For example, we produced some research earlier this year with the Church Army on the effectiveness of Messy Church, and that is cited here. We will look at all possible forms of ministry for children and young people.

4. *Revd Canon Wyn Beynon (Worcester)* asked the Secretary General: Can the Secretary General tell Synod if the communication and publicity policy has ever been reviewed from a theological perspective?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Communications Department takes theological direction and oversight from a group of bishops (Manchester, Repton, Chelmsford, Norwich, Worcester) who oversee the strategy, style and approach. Through regular formal and informal dialogue they are able to influence the activities of the Department from a theological perspective.

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell): As the convenor of this group, and for the record, would the Secretary General like to confirm that the Bishop of Leeds, the Bishop of Gloucester and the Bishop of Ripon are also part of this group?

Mr William Nye: Yes, I am happy to confirm that. I am unable to say why they were omitted, but I am very grateful to have the opportunity to show what a wide and diverse group it is in fact.

5. *Mrs Enid Barron (London)* asked the Secretary General: Following the Environmental Programmes motion which was passed in February, has the Archbishops' Council now received a framework plan from the Environmental Working Group, and what are its expectations in terms of tracking progress on that plan?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Archbishops' Council strongly supported Synod's desire to see additional resources allocated to environmental work and it has taken a great deal of staff work to incorporate this expenditure in the 2020 budget which awaits Synod's approval later in this group of sessions. Once we are assured of the budget, we can make the necessary appointments to progress the work, including prioritising the EWG's work programme which was shared with Synod in February. Meanwhile, work has continued in collaboration with Research and Statistics to design a workable and affordable National Carbon Footprint Tool. We have made a great deal of progress on this but, despite using existing data capture processes as far as possible, it will still be costly and we are exploring sources of external funding. A full

report will be made to the Archbishops' Council when we are in a position to demonstrate further concrete progress.

Mrs Enid Barron: My question falls into two parts. I do not know if that is one question mark or two. I would like to thank you first for the reply and all the effort you have put into finding extra resources. I just want clarification on two points. My question was specifically about the Environmental Working Group's framework plan. You refer in the answer to a programme which we saw in February. I am just wondering if you have actually seen the framework plan at the Archbishops' Council. I think it is on the website. It is a three-year plan. It is very long and detailed. My question was whether that has now been seen by the Archbishops' Council.

Mr William Nye: I do not believe it has yet been taken by the Archbishops' Council formally, but we will make sure it is on the agenda for the Archbishops' Council to examine.

Mrs Enid Barron: The second part of the question is regarding the Carbon Footprint Tool. Again, could I seek clarification if you are able to update us?

The Chair: Sorry, you cannot have two supplementaries.

Mrs Enid Barron: Sorry. Well, can I have some clarification? How far has it actually got, because I think it is going to be demonstrated on Sunday afternoon, and it has been developed quite well, at low cost?

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs Enid Barron: Is that a question? I would quite like an answer.

The Chair: We have heard it anyway.

Mr William Nye: I was going to answer by telling the Synod that the tool is making good progress and is going to be demonstrated at a fringe meeting on Sunday afternoon. I encourage everybody with an interest to go and find out about it at the fringe meeting.

6. *Revd Canon Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Secretary General: In 2017, the re-launched website of the Church of England removed Synodical and other official documents prior to 2011, which were previously accessible and searchable on the old website. May Synod be updated on the progress to restore the electronic accessibility of previously available public documents as well as efforts to improve the functionality of the website, at least to the standard of its predecessor?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The new Church of England website launched in November 2017. Following extensive research, a decision was taken to put far more emphasis on helping people exploring faith to go further on their Christian journey. In 2018 new functionality was deployed to categorise General Synod and other papers on the site. The Synod Office expected to upload the 2011-2006 papers onto the website over the summer of 2018. However, given resource constraints in the Synod Office this has not been possible. Bulk automatic upload functionality for large numbers of documents will be implemented this year. In the meantime, a transparent process, which is also detailed on the website, has been put in place by the Synod Office to enable members to access all previous papers: 2011 to 2006, to email synod@churchofengland.org; 2005 and older, to contact the Church of England Records Centre.

7. *Mrs Christina Baron (Bath & Wells)* asked the Secretary General: As the abolition of tithe has removed any differences in entitlement to such income as between rectors and vicars, what legislation would be required to remove all references to rectors and style all incumbents vicars?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: Legislation by Measure would be required. In addition to making general provision for all rectories to become vicarages, specific amendments would need to be made to a number of existing enactments.

Mrs Christina Baron: Given that most of the British public do not know the difference between a vicar, a rector and a priest-in-charge, is there any possibility of reconsidering the labelling of these offices?

Mr William Nye: As indicated, we could indeed legislate to do so if the Synod felt that it was an important priority.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): Could or would such legislation, if Synod willed it, be very short and to the point?

The Chair: Like that question.

Mr William Nye: I do not know the answer to that question. I would have to ask my learned friends as to how many different places we would have to look at and how much is required. I am sorry, I cannot give you a clearer answer than that at the moment.

8. *Revd Preb. Sarah Schofield (Lichfield)* asked the Secretary General: Given the attention paid in this quinquennium to individuals and communities currently under-represented in the leadership of the Church of England, is the Secretary General aware

of any strategies under development at national or diocesan level to encourage a more varied range of people to stand in the 2020 elections to General Synod?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Communications Department is starting to prepare a programme of work to encourage diverse candidates to stand for election for General Synod. It is anticipated that this wide-reaching marketing campaign will use adverts and social media to engage with the next generation.

Revd Preb. Sarah Schofield: Thank you, William, for your answer. To ensure the best use of the resources that are commissioned, could dioceses be asked to identify and support – I am not wedded to this unpaid job title – a Synod elections engagement champion whose effectiveness could then be reviewed by a temporary amendment to the governance section of the Diocesan Peer Review section? Governance is important, and we have a chance to change the governance of our Church in 2020.

Mr William Nye: That would be, I would have thought, very welcome because certainly, in putting together this campaign, we will need to work with dioceses and appropriate people in dioceses to find ways of producing the material, with suitable people who can contribute. We need, of course, to make sure that any campaign we put together is entirely neutral as regards individuals who wish to stand, and we will be careful about that, but certainly having some champions for engagement in the Synod across dioceses will be really helpful. Thank you.

Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry): I have been a member of Synod for some time, and I was on it in my 20s. I noticed at the last Synod, a number of young people actually did not re-stand for election. According to the figures we were given earlier, 24 people are under 39. How can we work to best support those members who are currently on Synod and ensure that we encourage and support them to re-stand, because often young people do not re-stand?

Mr William Nye: That is a slightly different issue, although I can understand your concern about it. Speaking as the Secretary General, I have to be rather careful about doing anything around Synod elections. We, as the Secretariat, cannot be seen to try to support the successful candidature of particular candidates, however well merited those candidates may be, through age or indeed other criteria. All we can do is support in the abstract the desirability of having a diversity of candidates coming forward. It may be that some younger members of Synod who have had to step down for very good reasons, moving from one diocese to another, or simply their professional responsibilities make it impossible for them to stay on Synod, would be good people to contribute to this campaign to encourage further diversity. But what we cannot do is say: “Vote for these people. They’re young. They’re great”.

9. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Secretary General: Is the Church of England logo copyright?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: Steps are being taken by the Archbishops' Council to ascertain what legally enforceable intellectual property rights it has in the Church of England logo.

Revd Preb. Stephen Lynas (Bath & Wells): The logo which we see up there before us has been in use for some 20 years. It was once hijacked by the Evangelical Group EGGs. I think it was the E or the G; I cannot remember which. In recent times it has been used by another pressure group. Is it really the case that there has been no copyright carefulness about it for 20 years and that we are only now just ascertaining what the rules are?

Mr William Nye: I am afraid we are now just ascertaining what the rules are. Whether we have formally registered something, we still have rights and it is intellectual property.

10. *Dr John Appleby (Newcastle)* asked the Secretary General: I welcome report GS Misc 1218 on speeches and questions by members at the February sessions. Totalling the figures provided shows that 117 men made 190 contributions and 71 women made 100 contributions. I also note that contributions per head were similar if those speaking five or more times are discounted. How do these statistics compare with the balance of membership on Synod?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The current split of Synod by sex is 36% women and 64% men, this equates to 169 women and 303 men. The current membership of Synod is 472. The speaking contributions show that 42% of women spoke and 39% of men spoke.

11. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Secretary General: What criteria are there for judging the success or otherwise of the 2014 arrangements to promote "mutual flourishing"?

Mr William Nye replied as Secretary General: The Implementation and Dialogue Group of the House of Bishops was established in February 2018 to consider what has been done to inform and educate the Church about the House of Bishops' Declaration and the Five Guiding Principles. Part of its work has been to establish what successful mutual flourishing means in practice based on engagement dioceses. Alongside the work with dioceses, there will be a theological seminar which is taking place on 10 and 11 July to consider the theology behind living with difference and encouraging the flourishing of those that you might disagree with. It is hoped that there will be further theological seminars on this subject in future. The Group is aiming to report back to Synod in 2020,

and it will expect to report on how successful the arrangements from the 2014 settlement have been. Further information on the work of the Group to date can be found in GS Misc 1231.

The Chair. Thank you. Questions 12 to 16 are to the National Society Council, and responding is the Bishop of Ely.

NATIONAL SOCIETY COUNCIL

12. *Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: The Bishop of Ely stated in July 2018 that *Valuing All God's Children* "was published to help schools eradicate homophobic and transphobic bullying" (Q70). Will the Council affirm that this policy also protects teaching staff and school governors who question the legal and scientific accuracy of some material being used for training and education in schools?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: *Valuing All God's Children* was published specifically and only for the purpose of eradicating homophobic and transphobic bullying. It was never intended as a contribution to the debate about the theology, science, or sociology of issues of human sexuality as that is rightly being considered as part of Living in Love and Faith. Every school will have a range of policies which set out the expectation for the way staff and governors carry out their roles and function and how they are to be treated with the dignity and respect they deserve.

Revd Graham Hamilton: If the Council will not affirm that the policy protects teachers and governors, is it the Council's advice to schools and boards to show respect and not to require students, governors or staff members to affirm or uphold a position on which the Church itself has not yet reached a common mind with the Living in Love and Faith process?

The Bishop of Ely: I think, as we all understand, faith is a protected characteristic under equalities legislation, and all schools are bound to make sure that students, staff and governors are all safeguarded and not to be undermined if they take a particular view from a Christian perspective. There is no way in which the National Society can monitor it too closely, but all schools are bound to provide this protection for every member of the community.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): Following on from that, *Valuing All God's Children* was published specifically and only for the purpose of eradicating homophobic and transphobic bullying, and in line with your mentioning, Bishop, the protection of religious freedom, do you have in mind also the Court of Appeal ruling this week in the

case of a social worker, Felix Ngole, where Sheffield University – and this is what was written about it in the judgment ...

The Chair. Can we just get to the question, please?

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: Yes, but I have to set it up. “The University wrongly confused the expression of religious views with the notion of discrimination...” This is a very important point.

The Chair. I am sorry, you cannot ask for an opinion on a question of law.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: “The mere expression of views on theological grounds... does not necessarily connote that the person expressing such views will discriminate on such grounds. In the present case, there was positive evidence to suggest that...”

The Chair. Thank you.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: “...(Felix Ngole) had never discriminated...” Can a clear legal memorandum be sent to schools showing the position of the Court of Appeal in law upholding this grievance? Can a legal memorandum be sent to schools setting out the position in law?

The Chair. We have got the gist, thank you.

13. *Revd Canon Mike Booker (Ely)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: What evaluations have been made by the Church of England of the impact of the 1996 *Youth a Part* report, in particular assessing the effectiveness of the work of full-time Christian youth workers who have been trained in response to recommendation 11.5 of that report?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: Reviewing the recommendations of *Youth a Part* and other Church of England reports on children’s and youth ministry led to the further research carried out in *Rooted in the Church* and the subsequent development of *Growing Faith*. The Evangelism and Discipleship team is currently working with the Research and Statistics Department, carrying out an extensive review of the data to determine how many churches employ a youth or children’s worker and the impact this has with regards to the growth or decline of their attendance figures of those aged 0-16. We hope this work will be completed in next few months.

Revd Canon Mike Booker. Given the inappropriateness of the zero to 16 age range in assessing youth work, will there be rigorous and statistical work undertaken to assess the

impact of youth workers on the 11 to 18 age range, or will we still have to use inappropriate data and depend upon quality of assessment in understanding our impact in the youth work area?

The Bishop of Ely: I think I have given you my answer, Mike. The Evangelism and Discipleship Team is currently working and doing some research. I think that the idea of moving up to 18, rather than just to 16, is something we need to take note of. I think the other thing I would observe – and this relates to the way in which dioceses commend licensed lay ministry – it may be that a greater impact would happen if youth ministers were licensed and more at the heart of life of the ministry teams of their parishes.

14. *Mr Ben Hodson-Franks (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: Has the Council considered issuing guidance to DBEs and Church Schools, promoting the use of Inclusion and Diversity programmes, such as “Jigsaw” and “No Outsiders”?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: It is the role and practice of the DBE to offer guidance to Church schools in the diocese on such matters. The Education Office is developing resources that will provide DBEs and schools with a framework, based on our vision for education, to help them develop their policy on relationships education and relationships and sex education and offer a useful lens through which they can assess the resources and approach of external programmes and providers. We hope to have these resources available in the autumn.

15. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: In view of the complexity relating to gender dysphoria and the need for school policies to be informed by good science and the latest medical research, when might there be an update to the list of Additional Resources at the end of *Valuing All God’s Children*?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: As explained in the introduction to the list of resources available to schools seeking additional help in the provision of anti-bullying training: “They are suggested rather than recommended, and the choice of resources is a decision to be made by the school that knows its unique context best... Please check they have a proven track record, come recommended by someone you trust and are sensitive to the ethos of Church schools”. Given that some still interpret these resources as a list of “recommended” organisations or viewpoints on issues beyond the scope of VAGC, we have removed these pages from the publication and will await the publication of the Living in Love and Faith resources before considering next steps.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): You have withdrawn the “list of ‘recommended’ organisations or viewpoints on issues beyond the scope”. Please can you give some

steer to head teachers and governing bodies, Chairs of governing bodies, as to what they are supposed to do in the interim because the situations which arise do keep arising, and if you withdraw the recommendations these head teachers do not have time, so what are they supposed to do?

The Chair. Thank you. We have got the question.

The Bishop of Ely. Thank you. I think the important thing to say, Mary, is that the National Society was not recommending any of these providers but only providing a picture of what resources might be available. It is for local schools and their governing bodies to determine which, if any, provider they would choose to use. It is a very fast-changing environment. Of course, we are intending to produce guidance around the RSE materials, and this, I think, will provide some framework which teachers and head teachers can rely on.

16. *Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham)* asked the Chair of the National Society Council: What assessment has been undertaken by the Education Department nationally, or any Diocesan Board of Education, of the material used in schools by Mermaids or Stonewall in order to ascertain whether it is consonant with Church of England teaching on marriage and sexuality, and with what outcome?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council: The Education Office carried out a survey in May to evaluate the impact of *Valuing All God's Children* and understand which external providers are being used in relation to the prevention of bullying. A summary of results is available (<https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2019-06/VAGC%20survey%20two%20sided%20summary.pdf>).

There is an increasing number of organisations offering resources in this area and the reason we specifically did not recommend or endorse any organisation or resource is because we do not have the capacity to assess or monitor such a prolific range of resources or the way different organisations are developing their thinking in this fast-changing area of debate. Instead we are developing a helpful framework, based on the Church of England vision for education, through which schools will be able to assess any resource or organisation they choose to engage with.

Revd Dr Ian Paul: Given the really serious criticisms and problems that have been raised about some of the guidance available in schools, including errors of fact, the ignorance of science, and even in some of the material recommendations that actually breach good Safeguarding practice, at what point might the Education Office actually offer more direct and positive guidance in what for many schools is a really complex and important area, but an area in which people feel very fearful about making decisions?

The Bishop of Ely: I fully understand, Ian, the fact that people feel nervous about this. That was one of the reasons why *Valuing All God's Children* was produced in the first place to help schools decide how they should make sure that school is a safe place against bullying. I think we are relying upon the LLF materials to help us move forward with this and make sure that schools are fully aware of all those materials, and both the book and the media options. But also, as I have just said to Mary, the work we are doing around a framework around the RSE developments I think will also provide clearer guidance and support for schools.

The Chair: Questions 17 to 25 are to the Church Buildings Council. Sir Tony Baldry is responding.

CHURCH BUILDINGS COUNCIL

17. *Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Would the Chair of the Church Buildings Council please give a report on the progress of the pilot projects which emerged from the Taylor Review of church building sustainability?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The pilot projects in Suffolk and Manchester are now at their mid-point and will finish in March 2020. A mid-point review was attended by the Director of Churches and Cathedrals. The results are promising: a high level of engagement with the pilot, with nearly 300 churches involved. Unsurprisingly there has been high demand for the minor repairs fund, run by Historic England, with nearly £400,000 allocated so far. Professional evaluation is being carried out as the pilots run and will provide us with robust evidence of the successes of the scheme, and areas which could be improved.

The Department for Culture, Digital, Media and Sport remains very engaged, and CBC officers have regular meetings with them. The importance of churches remaining open is at the heart of the pilots, and they are demonstrating that the targeted support and funding proposed by the Taylor Review makes a substantial difference to parishes.

18. *Revd Christopher Newlands (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The fire at the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris showed the wide appeal of historic churches to those of all faiths and none. Would the Chair of the Church Buildings Council please update Synod on discussions to secure funding that meets the widely known need for money to pay for basic repairs and maintenance, in order to keep our churches safe and secure?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The need for funding for basic repairs and maintenance was affirmed by the Taylor Review of Church Building Sustainability, which said:

“The reasons for Government’s interest and investment in historic churches are manifold: it is recognised that listed status has been placed upon buildings which are not primarily owned and seen as ‘heritage’ buildings, but rather as places of worship and community hubs. The continued investment of sequential Governments is testament to the recognition of this importance”.

The Government-funded pilot projects are giving us the evidence of how local investment can make a difference and allow churches to maintain and open their buildings. We hope these pilots will lead to further sustained funding. CBC officers regularly meet with representatives of the major philanthropic funding bodies, including the Lottery funders, to ensure churches are recognised and in the best position to benefit from these funds.

Revd Christopher Newlands: Clergy wellbeing is rightly receiving due attention at this Synod. One particular burden on clergy relates to the care of the churches that they are responsible for, especially if they are large listed buildings. What is the Cathedrals and Church Buildings Division doing to ensure that clergy and parishes have the right skills, capacity and training to access funding and to care for their churches in a way that reduces this burden on the clergy?

Sir Tony Baldry: My brief only extends to churches. I would hope that the Church Buildings Council is continuously helping, advising incumbents, parochial church councils and others as to how they can access funding for the repair and restoration, renovation and reordering of churches, most of which comes from local communities, charitable bodies and philanthropic bodies. That is a continuous process with conferences such as the Major Churches Conference and the AC conferences. It is a continuously ongoing process otherwise the money that we all spend on the Cathedrals and Churches Division would not be well spent – and I hope it is well spent.

19. *Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: On the basis of the data available within the NCIs, for each diocese what is the expenditure by PCCs to repair and maintain their church buildings showing, in tabular form for (1) listed and (2) unlisted buildings: (a) the average annual expenditure per church building; (b) the average annual expenditure per worshipping community member; (c) the average annual expenditure per parishioner?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Precise answers to this question are not possible; we do not centrally collect this information. Below are relevant facts we do know:

- Since 1999 a total of £2.6 billion has been invested in CofE buildings; £1.74 billion into repairs and £856 million in new build projects.

- The majority of this comes, as it always has, from local people supporting their church, and also from philanthropists and charitable bodies.
- Of this total, over the same time period, public money via Government and lottery sources has provided just over £810 million.

It is not reasonable to average this out per year or per church as episodic costs and repair funds skew the figures.

The CBC is aware that the loss of the Grants for Places of Worship scheme in 2017 was a cruel blow. We are actively working on ways to compensate this loss, including through the Taylor Review pilot projects.

20. *Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Would the Chair of the Church Buildings Council please inform Synod how the Council is improving support for the 300 plus “major churches” identified by Historic England?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Professor Hill is correct to say that there is a new group of churches called Major Churches, which was agreed between the CBC and Historic England. The CBC is open to applications from parishes or dioceses for churches which may meet the criteria, which are stated on our website. We have created a new Cathedral and Major Churches Officer post, looking at synergies, for example in project support and guidance on managing and caring for complex historic buildings. Many Major Churches have received enhanced support from the CBC: for example, in Leeds Diocese, Leeds Minster and Kirkburton All Hallows. The CBC is also supporting the new Major Churches Network, which recently replaced the Greater Churches Network, set up to give these churches a voice and peer support. The CBC will host seminars for the MCN every alternate year between their conferences.

21. *Mrs Wendy Coombey (Hereford)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Would the Chair of the Church Buildings Council please update Synod on work that has been done to date, and that is ongoing, to support small rural churches in extending community use of their buildings, including through the Festival Churches initiative?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Festival Churches were a key recommendation of the Church Buildings Review endorsed by Synod in 2016, and I am pleased to report that there has been a great deal of activity since then. Following the amendment by Synod of Canon B 14A, an Association of Festival Churches has been formed, of which I am Chair. Research shows that, when asked, a third of churches in rural areas see themselves as potential Festival Churches.

There are rural-focused projects in Exeter, Ely and Hereford, and we are working with several other dioceses to test new governance and funding models. We are working to help provide the resources they need to get communities truly engaged with the life of their church. We also support innovative use of leases so communities can make more use of rural church buildings, alongside worship, and are looking at legislative changes to simplify this.

22. *Revd Canon Gavin Kirk (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Would the Chair of the Church Buildings Council please update Synod what progress has been made on the Bats in Churches project, and how those afflicted by bats may find out more about it?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The project partners, including the CBC, were successful in gaining a substantial Lottery Fund grant towards this project and it has been running since the beginning of the year. A total of 102 churches will benefit from support over the five-year span of the project, and the first 20 projects are already happening. New techniques for excluding or restricting bats within churches are being tested, making use of a new class of Bat Licences which Natural England has introduced. A number of projects involve volunteers from the community in managing and even exploiting the presence of bats, for school projects and the like. Bats might even prove to be a tool for mission, if we can get them to behave politely. The Bats in Churches team have set up a website and will be issuing regular newsletters to report on progress.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Can you confirm whether the National Council of Bell Ringers has been a partner in this project? Are the Bats in Churches team aware that it would be deeply damaging to the nation's affectionate view of our eccentricity if we no longer had bats in our belfries?

Sir Tony Baldry: We all joke about bats, but they are part of God's creation. There are 18 different types of bats in the UK. The whole point of this project is to try to encourage bats to move and roost in the churchyards, rather than poop in the churches, but we actually know very little about the lifecycle of bats. I think this project, which is being funded by English Heritage and the Lottery Fund and over 100 churches have benefited, will mean at the end of it that we will have a situation where the bats are very happily in our churchyards and not interfering with the bell ringers.

23. *Revd Canon Ruth Newton (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Given concern about species decline and loss of biodiversity, in what ways are PCCs being encouraged to manage their churchyards to maximise biodiversity, including by recording and sustaining the biodiversity present?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Plants and animals are essential for sustaining the ecosystems that give us food, fuel, health and wealth. As Christians we are called to care for our God-given creation. Churches and their churchyards are an important part of the diverse natural habitat of England. We estimate that 10,000 of our 16,000 churches have churchyards: the area of a small national park. It is a precious resource which can make a huge difference to the biodiversity of the UK.

The CBC has extensive guidance on encouraging biodiversity in churchyards, and on ways to engage local people in caring for them (<https://www.churchofengland.org/more/church-resources/churchcare/advice-and-guidance-church-buildings/biodiversity>).

Caring for God's Acre is an excellent independent resource nationally to support groups and individuals to investigate, care for, and enjoy burial grounds.

The EcoChurch scheme includes large sections on biodiversity. All churches and dioceses are encouraged to work towards achieving Eco Status. 1000 churches and 17 dioceses are currently signed up.

24. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: Are the National Church Institutions aware of the £1.6 million Security Fund launched by HM Government to tackle hate or other crime in Churches and Mosques through the funding of equipment such as CCTV, security lights, alarms, et cetera; and can you tell this Synod what work has been done to promote applications to this fund and if known, its take up so far?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The National Church Institutions have promoted funding for prevention of hate crime through communications to dioceses and locations on the advice of police. The NCIs are working with the Home Office during the development of the 2019 funding scheme, which is expected to launch in July. We have also been in dialogue over the delivery of the hate-crime awareness training that was announced.

Proposals before Synod on Monday for changes in the faculty rules will assist churches installing security equipment as they allow Archdeacons to authorise some security equipment, including CCTV.

The funding is specifically for hate crime. A positive development of the present fund is that fear of hate crime is sufficient to apply, not evidence of a crime. This will allow those under greatest threat to be protected.

Mr Samuel Margrave: To support clergy and parishes to apply to this fund, I wonder if the National Church Institutions would consider developing training via either an online video or webinar to support clergy to present an application using some of the case studies that already exist.

Sir Tony Baldry: I have some up-to-date news for Synod. The Home Office has this afternoon announced the fourth round of the Places of Worship Protective Security Funding Scheme. It is open for applications until midnight on 31 August. This is a scheme to award grants to install things such as protective alarms, security lighting and access controls. They have made some changes to the fourth round. It is no longer going to be necessary to show that your church has experienced hate crime. Instead, the test is simply going to be vulnerability to hate crime. The scheme is open not only to places of worship but also to community centres run by a place of worship or near a place of worship. I will put all this information on the ChurchCare website. But there is money to be had there from the Home Office and it is quite a straightforward application process, so if you think you have a church, a church hall or anything that might be at risk from hate crime then it is certainly worth applying.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): Are the National Church Institutions in conversation with the police and other authorities to ensure that the way that churches and other buildings are to be defended against hate crime, terrorism and other actions is not going to interfere with our ability to be open to the general public at all times?

Sir Tony Baldry: I think the Church Buildings Council – and I hope the whole Church – has a general principle that it is far better for churches to be open all the time. Indeed, whether it be anything like this, like lead theft or so on, all statistics show that it is far, far better to have open churches, open for prayer, but also that it is far greater security for those church buildings.

25. *Mrs Jay Greene (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The newly-amended Electronic Communications Code (December 2017) is having a notable impact on parishes with electronic communications equipment on their property, many of whom are facing a significant loss of income and are tied into keeping this equipment with the associated costs and challenges to maintenance but now with no financial benefits. What is the Church of England doing to protect the interests of parish churches who are affected by this change in legislation?

Sir Tony Baldry replied as Chair of the Church Buildings Council: The Accord between the Government and the Church of England was signed in February 2018, to support access to mobile phone connectivity in areas of poor provision and particularly in rural areas. The Accord followed the introduction of the new Electronic Communications Code

in December 2017. We understand that it is taking some time for the ramifications of the new Code to be worked through.

We are currently working towards a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with some of the major mobile network operators, which sets out a consensual agreement on the terms and processes that will apply for church sites to host telecommunications infrastructure under the Code.

In addition we have developed new expert guidance for parishes, including information on available grants and on how to work with providers (<https://www.churchofengland.org/connectivity>).

Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds): As well as this advice to churches considering new installations, which is not really the question that was asked, what is the Church doing at national level to help those with existing installations where at rent review telecoms companies are offering derisory rents, many less than 20% of existing, and in one case I know trying to reduce rent from £10,000 per year to £5 – that is £5, not £5,000 – which threatens the mission initiatives and even the very viability of some churches? What will the CBC be doing about this?

Sir Tony Baldry: I think all of this has introduced some quite useful money for churches, but it has also thrown up a number of issues. The Church Buildings Council has instructed a specialist legal firm that is going to produce a template licence agreement which hopefully will solve some of the problems, such as the one just mentioned, but actually the one behind this question related to a supposed charge of £55,000 from a broadband firm to relocate mobile telephone network infrastructure on a church which was doing repairs to its church spire. It is clearly bonkers that they were being asked to pay money for structures on their own building. Hopefully, specialist lawyers will be able to sort out all these problems and enter into a new licence agreement with the providers.

The Chair: Questions 26 to 32 are to the Ministry Council. The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich is responding.

MINISTRY COUNCIL

26. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Recognising that we are at the beginning of a 10-15 year projected increase in the absolute number of deaths as the baby boom generation ages, the missional importance of funeral ministry amongst the unchurched, and the need for consistent and resilient training for this ministry, what training in bereavement care and the leading of funeral services is given by theological education institutions, dioceses and DDOs during IME 4-7, and dioceses as part of Continual Ministerial Education?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The House of Bishops Formation Criteria for IME1 and IME2 refer to the need for ordinands and curates to understand the theology and contextual expression of liturgy including the pastoral offices, such as the funeral service, and to be able to offer Christian pastoral care in a wide range of circumstances to individuals according to their need.

TEIs and dioceses will vary in their approach to ensuring that ordinands and curates develop this knowledge and these skills, but all will engage in doing so. The key training in practice happens in the title post, and here we are reliant on the training incumbents, and diocesan IME2 programmes.

There has been significant opportunity in recent years for ministers to develop their funeral practice through the work of Revd Canon Dr Sandra Millar, Head of Life Events, including an annual Funerals Conference, *GraveTalk*, and material on the Church Support Hub.

Revd Andrew Dotchin: Bearing in mind the good training and Ofsted-approved qualifications obtained by civil celebrants and the resilience provided by the new Celebrancy Council, is there anything to prevent the Ministry Division asking Churches' Funerals Group to work with Life Events, TEIs and dioceses to provide resilience training for those who offer hope to the dying and bereaved?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: No.

27. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: Does the Church of England provide national guidelines or policies for parishes and other expressions of Church that describe the role of "interns" and what is expected of those who undertake internships?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Guidance is offered in the case of the Ministry Experience Scheme (MES) providing best practice guidelines on a range of issues for participating dioceses. For instance, guidance on the best practice around supervision or recruitment. These guidelines are often updated in the light of new experience and feedback that local schemes provide. The young adults who do an MES year are referred to as "participants" not "interns".

Canon Jenny Humphreys: Bishop, thank you for this assurance regarding the Ministry Experience Scheme. However, bearing in mind that a brief Google search brings up references to internships in such examples as the Diocese in Europe, CPAS, several Church of England parishes, a Church of England website advert for a research intern for

work with the Council for Christian Unity and the Faith and Order Commission, and the *Church Times* article on the exploitation of young volunteer interns, please could consideration be given to producing Church of England guidelines on good practice regarding internships to prevent any difficult situations, as has happened with such areas as the media, NGOs, the fashion industry, et cetera?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Yes.

28. *Mr Clive Scowen (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: In the light of the fact that clergy may now hold licensed posts on common tenure beyond the age of 70 indefinitely, with the consent of the bishop and PCC, what progress has been made since I last asked towards enabling licensed lay ministers/readers to continue to be licensed beyond the age of 70, rather than having mere permissions to officiate?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: It is House of Bishops policy, as expressed in the Bishops' Regulations for Reader Ministry, that Readers over the age of 70 should be authorized to exercise their office by way of written permission and on a temporary basis. In some dioceses the routine granting of PTO for Readers reaching the age of 70 has been abolished, and in such cases Readers continue to be granted full licences for shorter periods at the discretion of the Diocesan Bishop. The Central Readers Council has removed the upper age limit from its new constitution so that licensed Readers can maintain their membership regardless of age.

Mr Clive Scowen: Since clergy can now continue in licensed office without limit of time, and since the Bishop has disclosed in his answer that a number of dioceses are no longer complying with the House of Bishops' policy expressed in its Regulations for Reader Ministry, will the House now reconsider that policy so that all dioceses can be encouraged to allow Readers to continue to hold licences beyond the age of 70, subject, of course, to the discretion of the Bishop on the basis of the suitability of individual persons of that age?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I cannot answer for the House, but I can say that we will take that to Ministry Council.

Mr Clive Scowen: That would be a start. Thank you.

29. *Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: To what extent will the Resourcing Ministerial Education Review Group, established since the February Group of Sessions, be required and enabled to explore the impact of the RME changes on the long-term viability of the three different training pathways (full-time residential, full-time non-residential, part-time)?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: The Terms of Reference of the Review, which have been made available, demonstrate that the Review is required to consider the sustainability of TEIs as key partners of the Church of England and in doing so will explore the impact of the both funding changes and training choices made in partnership between ordinands, DDOs and Sponsoring Bishops.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming: Thank you, Bishop Martin, for the clarification that the Review will consider the long-term sustainability of TEIs and, therefore, the different pathways available for the flourishing training of students for long-term mission. Given that the tasks listed in the Review’s Terms of Reference do not at present include engagement with TEIs on their long-term viability, both in terms of recruitment and the costs, will the Bishop confirm that such an engagement will in fact take place?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: Yes. I am sorry if the Terms of Reference give the impression that they would not be engaged with them. It would be far from our thought not to engage. There are three TEI Principals on the panel, so there will be active engagement by membership of the panel, but of course there will be wide consultation.

30. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many ordinands began training in September 2018? Please provide a numerical breakdown for each diocese, with each diocese divided into numbers on each Training Pathway.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council:

2018 Ordinand Starters

Diocese	Residential	Full-Time Non-Res	Regional Course	Grand Total
Bath and Wells	10	3	12	25
Birmingham	6	1	2	9
Blackburn	2	2	7	11
Bristol	6	3	6	15
Canterbury	3	3	2	8
Carlisle			5	5
Chelmsford	9	9	14	32
Chester		11	10	21
Chichester	7	7	5	19
Coventry	2	1	2	5
Derby	1		6	7
Durham	5		2	7
Ely	3	1	7	11
Europe	7	1	7	15

Exeter	3	4	3	10
Gloucester	2	2	5	9
Guildford	7	5	7	19
Hereford	2		3	5
Leeds	6	2	3	11
Leicester	1	7	2	10
Lichfield	2		6	8
Lincoln		3	8	11
Liverpool	8	4	12	24
London	26	29	12	67
Manchester	7	6	6	19
Newcastle	2		4	6
Norwich	2	2	3	7
Oxford	9	1	19	29
Peterborough	5	2	3	10
Portsmouth	2	2	2	6
Rochester	3	2	9	14
Salisbury	4	2	7	13
Sheffield	3	1	8	12
Sodor and Man			1	1
Southwark	11	5	7	23
Southwell	1	4	3	8
St Albans	3	6	5	14
St Edmundsbury & Ipswich	4	1		5
Truro	2	4	3	9
Winchester	3	4	15	22
Worcester	4	1	4	9
York	6		10	16
Grand Total	189	141	257	587

Mr Graham Caskie: Thank you to the Bishop for the figures published. What response would the Ministry Council make to the fact that out of 587 ordinand starters in 2018 only 32% were studying in a residential context?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: That is part of the review. At the moment, we cannot say what the reasons are why that proportion is where it is and where it has ended up. You can draw conclusions that it may have something to do with RME, you can draw conclusions that it may have something to do with the fact that mixed mode, context-based training has emerged in a very strong way in various parts of the country, but we need to look at that more carefully. When we use a word like “sustainability” in relation to the whole sector, it is those sorts of questions that we have in mind.

31. *Mr Graham Caskie (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: How many ordinands will begin training in September 2019? Please provide a numerical breakdown for the four age bands (under 29, 30-39, 40-55 and over 55) with each age band divided into numbers of men and women.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: We are unable to provide these figures as they will not be available until after ordinands begin training. Since candidates are still attending Bishops' Advisory Panels, we also do not have complete figures for those who have been recommended to start training in September 2019.

Mr Graham Caskie: Please could you give a brief explanation as to why you are able to give a full answer to an identical question in June 2018 about September 2018 ordinand starters but are unable to do so for this year?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I have not a clue. I am assuming the reason we cannot give a full answer now is because not all of the BAPs have gone through and we do not know the full figures. I am surprised we were able to give a full answer previously when it presumably was based on some imagination.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Do you think it is okay that, in July, we do not actually know who is coming to train in September? How are TEIs or other people providing top-quality education supposed to plan for this financial year? I speak as a member of House of Laity Council. I do not think it is acceptable, but I would be interested to know what you think.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: We have lived with this situation. I was a TEI principal. I did not know until probably late August how many people were coming. Because of the way in which people go through the process of discernment and the timings of that process, to start to impose an earlier cut-off would actually be postponing for people who have to make all sorts of decisions about employment, a family move and so forth. They would then have to postpone all of that for another year. At the moment, we live with it. It is an unsatisfactory situation, but it is probably more satisfactory than the alternatives. You may recall that a few years ago there were attempts to put some earlier deadlines in and they did not work.

32. *Revd Anne Stevens (London)* asked the Chair of the Ministry Council: What steps is the Ministry Division taking to address the shortfall of women staff (especially at the most senior level) in the Church of England's Theological Education Institutions?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied as Chair of the Ministry Council: Until 2018 there were six women in senior leadership in the Church of

England's 22 Theological Education Institutions. Since that time two female TEI principals have become bishops.

Ministry Council has taken steps to increase the number of women with the qualifications to be theological educators by encouraging TEIs to put more women forward for research degrees. In 2018 the Research Degrees Panel received an equal number of applications from men and women.

Ministry Council has also established an explicit focus on increasing the number of young women ordinands, which one might expect in due course to lead to more women becoming theological educators.

Ministry Council would wish to encourage diversity among the staff of its partner TEIs and can draw attention to a lack of diversity in the Period External Review process. However, the TEIs are independently run charities whose councils and boards take responsibility for recruitment and staffing.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): Member of the staff team at the Eastern Region Ministry Course. Given that we can generally only make appointments to TEI staffs from those who actually seek to apply for the jobs, does the Ministry Council have any wisdom as to how we could encourage more women to apply, since in all the appointments I have been party to making, the number of male applicants has outnumbered the number of female applicants?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: I am not quite sure how to answer that. I think I need to think about that. Various things come to mind but it would be superficial for me to respond briskly. It is an area that we obviously have concern about. I was interested to discover that in the university departments of theology and religious studies, the percentage of women in those departments is much lower than in the other arts and languages departments, so there is an issue there that would be worth looking at. I will take that question away with me.

The Chair: Questions 33 and 34 to the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee. The Bishop of Portsmouth is responding.

REMUNERATION AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE COMMITTEE

33. *Revd Andrew Dotchin (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: What support for the cost of a funeral and/or life insurance for stipendiary clergy, their spouses and civil partners is offered by dioceses: when there is a death in service; and when there is a death in retirement?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: We do not hold any information nationally about the level of support provided for the cost of the funeral of a cleric or clergy spouse, such as offering a grant towards the cost, and do not have details about dioceses contributing to the cost of life insurance. It is for the diocesan bishop, not the centre, to determine the level of support here. The DBF and PCC might agree to waive the parochial fee in particular cases where there was financial hardship. In the case of death in service, the clergy pension scheme provides a lump sum payment (of three times the previous year's National Minimum Stipend, tax free) as well as pension payments to a surviving spouse or civil partner.

Revd Andrew Dotchin: Would the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee be happy to look at ways in which stipendiary clergy might be encouraged through something like payroll giving to invest in funeral plans?

The Bishop of Portsmouth: I am aware that you understand some of the complexity and risks of prepaid funeral plans, and this is a very sensitive and difficult area. As I have indicated in my answer to your original question, these responsibilities and discretions properly rest in the dioceses. At the moment, RACSC does not believe that it is appropriate for national guidelines to be issued, but I will, of course, bring this to them at the next meeting.

Revd Andrew Dotchin: A further supplementary, Chair, please. In which case ...

The Chair: You can only have one, I think. Yes, that is correct. I am sorry about that.

Revd Andrew Dotchin: I will talk to him later.

34. *Mr Chris Gill (Lichfield)* asked the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: It has recently been reported that a Church of England Bishop has, on more than one occasion, told groups of clergy that if they disagree with the approach the diocese is taking on matters of human sexuality, they should follow their consciences and leave. Without dwelling on that particular situation could the Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee explain whether there are any circumstances in which a member of the clergy, who sadly felt that they had no other alternative than to follow advice of that kind, might be entitled to financial compensation for loss of office?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied as Chair of the Remuneration and Conditions of Service Committee: If clergy choose to resign their office for any reason, there is no legal entitlement to compensation. Any legal entitlement

to compensation on grounds of conscience would require the Synod and Parliament to approve the necessary legislation.

Mr Chris Gill: Thank you very much for your answer but I am slightly confused, particularly in the light of Question 88 pertaining to non-disclosure agreements. My understanding of non-disclosure agreements is that more often than not these would be part of a package, including compensation. If compensation is allowed to be paid under a non-disclosure agreement, who can authorise such payment?

The Bishop of Portsmouth: The answer I have given to you relates as to the national arrangements which Synod and Parliament have or have not agreed. I am unaware and unable to answer if there are any circumstances – if there have been – in which dioceses have made individual arrangements.

The Chair: Questions 35 through to 45 are to the Mission and Public Affairs Council and Mark Sheard is responding. Questions 35 from Stephen Hogg and 36 from Sean Doherty are being taken together.

MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

35. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: In February 2019 Synod passed a PMM on setting up a Homelessness Task Force. What progress has been made?

36. *Revd Dr Sean Doherty (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What progress has been made towards the establishment of a Task Force on homelessness, following Synod's call in February this year for the Archbishops' Council to do so?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: With permission, Chair, I would like to take questions 35 and 36 together.

I am pleased to say that, thanks in great part to the work that the mover of the motion, Andrew Grey, has put in personally, there has been very good progress. A round table meeting with representatives of major homelessness charities will have taken place by the time Synod meets and will have helped us identify shared priorities of the future and we have collected and collated a considerable amount of material about what dioceses are doing already in this field. Synod urged haste in this work, and so the MPA Council itself, which includes bishops, clergy and laity as specified in the motion, is convening as the Task Group for part of each of its meetings. This circumvents the lengthy process of appointing from all three houses and harnesses the Council's enthusiasm for the work.

Mrs Heather Black (York): Are you aware of the appointment of John Kuhrt, former CEO of the West London Mission, as Government adviser focusing on how faith groups are addressing rough sleeping and, if so, is the Task Group working collaboratively with that piece of work?

Mr Mark Sheard: I am tempted to give an answer like the Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich: yes and yes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Mark, could you just update us on the meeting you had?

Mr Mark Sheard: I would be delighted to, Simon. Thank you. What a friendly question! We had an incredibly positive meeting last Friday with senior leaders from quite a number of major charities working in this sector. It was very positive. The willingness and openness and humility, frankly, amongst those agencies delighted us and their welcome for the Church of England, both convening and getting involved in this issue, was really remarkable.

They valued enormously two things from us. One, the compassionate heart that we have as a Church and our willingness to exercise that Matthew 25 ministry, and, secondly, our presence in every community, our ability to spot what is happening on the ground and make powerful interventions. We are now working on a programme with them looking at very particular ways in which we might facilitate more constructive activity to both prevent homelessness and to cure it when it does arise.

37. *Mr Carl Fender (Lincoln)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Has the Mission and Public Affairs Council done any work or had any involvement with public bodies or Parliament about the impact of legal aid cuts?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: As the post of Home Affairs Adviser has been vacant since January, we have not had the staff resources to initiate work in this area. We hope to have a new adviser in post in September, or soon after, and will consider carefully whether any form of intervention by MPA would be effective at that point.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Given that our judges are frequently expressing their concern about the lack of legal aid, the fact that litigants in person are increasingly appearing before them, given our mandate from Micah 6 to “act justly and love mercy”, can the Mission and Public Affairs Council please make a priority the consideration of intervention with Government on this issue? Will you also urge General Synod members to sign Carl’s Private Member’s Motion so that this matter can be debated on the floor of Synod?

Mr Mark Sheard: I think you have done a good job on that second point, and I am sure Synod will take note of that. On the first point, we will do our best both to act justly and to walk humbly bringing this immediately to our next Mission and Public Affairs Council meeting.

38. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What progress has been made (by the NCIs) since the motion *Valuing People with Down's Syndrome* was passed by General Synod in February 2018?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Representatives of MPA, Ministry Division, Education, Communications and Lambeth Palace along with the Bishop of Carlisle met with representatives of Mencap and other organisations to discuss the best ways of putting *Valuing People with Down's Syndrome* into practice. A "toolkit" for use by parishes and schools is being prepared for a digital launch late 2019/early 2020. The MPA policy adviser and the Bishop of Carlisle met with the Under-Secretary of State for Health to discuss issues surrounding non-invasive pre-natal testing, and are working with Mencap and others in promoting provision of balanced information by Public Health England and better care guidelines by the Institute of Health Visitors and the Royal College of Gynaecologists.

Ms Josile Munro: Can I ask the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council whether this toolkit can also be sent to the health visitors and the gynaecologists?

Mr Mark Sheard: I believe it can be made available to them. Whether that is in a physical form or whether it is via an online facility and sent in that way, I do not know, but I think that is a very helpful addition. Thank you, Josile.

39. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: How did the Church of England respond to the Government's consultation on "Reform of the legal requirements of divorce"?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The MPA Council made a very full submission to this consultation last year. Following Synod's decision in 1994, we agreed that "irretrievable breakdown" should remain the sole ground for divorce. However, we criticised the concept of "no fault" divorce as, we believe, all marital breakdown involves some human fault, although not necessarily on one side only. We argued that the Government's proposal to introduce a simple notification process fell down on a number of points, notably: it did nothing to encourage reflection and re-examination of the situation, did nothing to support the resilience of marriages, and removed the important element of consent. The consultation raised many other questions of detailed process. While we share the Government's objective of

reducing family conflict, we were not persuaded that the proposals on divorce had been sufficiently thought through.

The Chair: Questions 40 and 41 from Priscilla White are being taken together.

40. *Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Given the imminent changes (December 2019) to the way in which marriages will be registered and their implications for clergy conducting weddings and storing registers, what discussions have taken place at a national level on these changes?

41. *Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Given the imminent changes (December 2019) to the way in which marriages will be registered and their implications for clergy conducting weddings and storing registers, what steps are being taken to ensure that clergy are well-informed about this change and ready for action on 1 January 2020?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: With permission, Chair, I will take questions 40 and 41 together.

Senior staff at Church House have met officials from the General Register Office (GRO) on a number of occasions this year. No commencement date for the changes has yet been announced by the Government. Staff have impressed upon the GRO that they must provide the clergy with adequate information and training to prepare them for the changes referred to. Staff have in particular emphasised to GRO officials the need for a programme of clergy training to be carried out and completed by the GRO before the changes are brought into operation.

Revd Canon Priscilla White: Can I have one and a half supplementaries seeing as I had two questions put together? Are you aware that at least one registry office has already sent out information and requests to clergy beginning, "As you will be aware, all these changes are happening on 1 January?" If you are aware of that, what is going to be done to help the clergy who have that landing on their doorsteps with absolutely no idea of what is going on?

Mr Mark Sheard: Yes, I am aware of at least one. I believe Nuneaton were first off the mark. We have raised this issue with GRO and we understand two things: first, no formal implementation date has been publicly agreed on and notified; secondly, they are now contacting all registry offices to make sure no erroneous information is supplied to clergy. Obviously, if anyone else does receive one, then we would very much like to know about it and will raise it appropriately.

42. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What steps, if any, is the Council taking to ensure that the parish statistics

dashboards produced by the Research and Statistics Team in Church House for every parish within the Church of England are made more widely available to the man or woman in the pew, to enable them to monitor trends in church attendance at a local level?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: Each year the Research and Statistics team produce two dashboards for every parish in the country – one based on statistics for mission information, and one of their return of parish finance. These are sent to each diocese for onward dissemination to their parishes.

Several dioceses have indicated that they wish all contact with their parishes to be via the diocese, so we are unable to directly contact parishes ourselves. Some dioceses have taken up Research and Statistics on their offer to send dashboards to specified parish contacts. Others publish all their dashboards on their diocesan website. In one or two dioceses, the dashboards are not disseminated further than the diocesan offices. There is no national/diocesan agreement that the information provided by churches and parishes is in the public domain, so this information is not publicly released at church level.

43. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The motion on Environmental Programmes passed at the February 2019 group of sessions called on every diocese to have a designated member of the bishop's staff team to lead and advocate for its environment programme. How many dioceses have implemented this policy?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: One bishop has a professor of environmental issues as her chaplain who also serves as DEO.

The 14 DEOs who are paid members of the diocesan staff, and most if not all the volunteer DEOs, are expected to report to their bishops.

Because of different arrangements across dioceses, it seems sensible not to be too prescriptive about the precise definition of the bishop's "staff team".

Revd Andrew Yates: Thank you, Mark, for your hard work on both the questions I put. Given our experience in Truro where, once we got an archdeacon chairing our environmental core group, we really took great strides, could the MPA reconsider revisiting this question so that the Bishop's senior staff are encouraged to have a representative leading environment programmes – not just a staff member; senior staff.

Mr Mark Sheard: I think that is a very good point. Obviously, dioceses interpret this in different ways. It was very helpful to have you raise that. Yes, certainly MPA would want to encourage exactly what you say, and we would also encourage members of diocesan

synod to raise it in the appropriate circles there, so there is a bit of a push and a pull going on.

44. *Revd Andrew Yates (Truro)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: How many dioceses have a full-time or part-time diocesan environment officer?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: DEOs have always included a large number of volunteers often from the ranks of the retired. A retired volunteer could in some cases be effectively a full-time DEO.

Currently, we have 14 DEOs who are diocesan staff and have diocesan email addresses although less than half are employed as full-time DEOs. Eight DEOs are members of the clergy. Of the part-time and volunteer DEOs, a number are in full-time environmental jobs.

There are currently 10 DEO vacancies, at least two of which were formerly full-time positions.

At least one diocese prefers to have an environment group rather than an individual DEO.

Revd Andrew Yates: Thank you for your hard work in collating that information. Is there any chance that you will be able to publicise or at least share with relevant groups the results? Where we saw the gaps, there might be some opportunity for cross-partnership between dioceses. In the south-west we particularly have a good story to tell about working regionally and maybe knowing where things are or are not happening, perhaps that could promote a bit more co-operation on that sub-regional level, perhaps.

Mr Mark Sheard: I think that is a very interesting idea and I will look into that if I may.

45. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: What plans are in place to help ensure that every part of the Church of England achieves the Government's national target of being carbon neutral by 2050?

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio) replied as Chair of the Mission and Public Affairs Council: The Church's current target is to cut its carbon footprint by 80% by 2050.

The Environmental Working Group will discuss HMG's more ambitious target at its next meeting. The Church has a long way to go: we are a large, complex organisation, most churches have limited funding and are managed by volunteers, and it is not easy to make many heritage buildings energy efficient.

However:

- Thousands of churches have moved to green energy through Parish Buying and the

Green Journey.

- 17 Dioceses have signed up as “Eco Dioceses” – 5 have “bronze” status.
- The R&S team are building an “energy calculator” tool to be piloted next year.
- The Transition Pathway Initiative brings our influence as a major investor to bear, supported by investors managing over £10b assets.
- Many dioceses are installing renewable energy.
- Many churches are undertaking Energy audits.
- Two church schools are included in the Eco Schools Hall of Fame.

The Chair: Question 46 is the Appointments Committee. The Bishop of Blackburn is responding.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

46. *Revd Preb. Cate Edmonds (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the Appointments Committee: Will the Appointments Committee consider enlarging the membership of the Steering Committee for the draft Cathedrals Measure to include a current clergy member of a cathedral chapter?

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Julian Henderson) replied on behalf of the Chair of the Appointments Committee: I am glad to confirm that the Ven. Jo Kelly-Moore, Archdeacon of Canterbury – one of the members of this Committee – is a residentiary canon and a member of the Canterbury Cathedral Chapter. So, there is no need to enlarge the membership of the Committee to take account of your concern.

Revd Preb. Cate Edmonds: I asked the question with the thoughts of our endeavour to have a lived experience and I just wonder, although the appointment of the Ven. Jo Kelly-Moore is now a member of the Steering Committee for the draft Cathedrals Measure, the membership of the group does not appear to be on the website at the moment or updated. Would it be possible, please, for an updated membership to be listed and to be easily accessible?

The Bishop of Blackburn: I am sure the answer to that is yes.

A Speaker: Point of order. Would it be possible to have the microphone on our left adjusted, so we can hear?

The Chair: There we go. Your wish. Questions 47 to 50 are to the Business Committee. Sue Booy is responding.

BUSINESS COMMITTEE

47. *Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: What is the intended purpose or purposes of the collation and publication of statistics on the number of times individual members of Synod speak in a group of sessions (as provided in GS Misc 1218)?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford) replied as the Chair of the Business Committee: The statistical summary of speakers from the last Synod is intended primarily to assist those on the Panel of Chairs to assist them in their task of balancing contributions from members. The publication of the data in this form is made available to all for the sake of transparency, and for the interest of members.

Mrs Caroline Herbert: I note that on page 7 of the Business Committee Report it says that you have asked staff to use the electronic submission of requests to speak to track more closely those who put in requests to speak in debate but were not called. This seems excellent to me. Am I right in inferring you would therefore much prefer Synod members to use the electronic request to speak so that the data collated would be an accurate reflection?

Revd Canon Sue Booy: There are all kinds of reasons why we would much prefer members of Synod to use the electronic form of requests to speak and that would be one of them.

48. *Revd Dr Patrick Richmond* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: MACSAS (Minister and Clergy Sexual Abuse Survivors) said in response to the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) 2019 report that the Church's General Synod must be allowed proper time to debate these findings – preferably at an extraordinary meeting at which survivors can contribute their expertise, as recommended by the report. What plans are there for such debate?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford) replied as the Chair of the Business Committee: There are currently no plans to hold an extraordinary meeting of Synod.

The Business Committee has committed to ensuring that Safeguarding is given time on the Synod Agenda, as illustrated by the separate item on Safeguarding Questions and the Safeguarding Update on the afternoon of Sunday 7 July.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): The question asked for Synod to be given proper time to debate the various findings. Your answer refers to Safeguarding being given time on the agenda, but that does not include any opportunity for a debate. Can you please inform Synod when we will be given the opportunity to debate the various

Safeguarding Reports, such as Carlile and Elliot, and indeed, in due time the IICSA Report, on the floor of Synod?

Revd Canon Sue Booy: I cannot give you any precise answer. I can reiterate the commitment of the Business Committee to bring business about Safeguarding in an expeditious manner to the floor of the Synod and that will include debate at an appropriate time.

49. *Mrs Enid Barron (London)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: In the light of the provisions of the Environmental Programmes motion passed by Synod in February, has the Business Committee made provision for a progress report from the Environmental Working Group to be on the agenda every three years?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford) replied as the Chair of the Business Committee: The Business Committee only considers requests for business which relate to the next group of sessions and makes a provisional forecast of business for the next group of sessions in each agenda. The Business Committee is not in a position to be able to guarantee that provision can be made for a progress report from the Environmental Working Group on the Synod agenda every three years.

It would be for the EWG or their successors to ensure that a timely request was made to the Business Committee to schedule time for an appropriate report to the Synod in 2021.

50. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Chair of the Business Committee: Since the launch of the Anglican Alliance some years ago at Synod we have heard nothing directly of its work. Would it be possible to have a presentation to Synod on the impact of the Anglican Alliance before Lambeth 2020, and in particular to hear how the Anglican Alliance has “added value” to both Companion Links, the work of the mission agencies and others to the benefit of communities across the world?

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford) replied as the Chair of the Business Committee: If the Business Committee received a request for future Synod business on this item, it would be considered alongside other requests the Committee has received.

Revd Will Gibbs (St Albans): Which bodies make requests to the Business Committee and, if the Anglican Alliance cannot do so directly, which body would most appropriately make a request for its work to be the subject of future Synod business?

Revd Canon Sue Booy: I believe it would be perfectly possible for the Anglican Alliance to make a bid to us, but I will make sure that I have checked that and discussed it with the Revd Rachel Carnegie. If not, I am fairly certain that they would find the MPA open to a suggestion that we could be approached through them.

The Chair: Question 51 is for the Clergy Discipline Commission, being responded to by Jamie Harrison.

CLERGY DISCIPLINE COMMISSION

51. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the Clergy Discipline Commission: From a recent letter from an Archdeacon to the clergy of a diocese in the province of York: “*Stephen Slack, Head of the Church of England Legal Office and Chief Legal Adviser to the Archbishops and General Synod, has written to advise that “a large number of dioceses” have received warnings that official complaints are to be made against particular clergy for alleged non-compliance with national Safeguarding policy as expressed in the National Safeguarding Handbook (2018) which can be viewed on the Church of England website”.*

Will the Archbishops’ Council give consideration to whether it is an appropriate use of the Clergy Discipline Measure to trawl parish websites and to make CDM complaints against the clergy of those parishes where it is considered that PCC websites should be updated?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham) replied on behalf of the Clergy Discipline Commission: It is the role of the Clergy Discipline Commission, rather than the Archbishops’ Council, to monitor how the Clergy Discipline Measure is used. The Commission is aware of complaints made under the Measure in respect of parish websites. The Commission does not, however, comment on the merits of individual cases, but all complaints made will be dealt with appropriately in accordance with the provisions of the Measure. The first stage under the Measure is a preliminary scrutiny of the complaint when a view is formed as to whether the person making the complaint has a proper interest in doing so, and whether there is sufficient substance in the complaint to justify proceeding with it.

Revd Stephen Trott: Thank you for your answer, but we need some opportunity to revise and to review the CDM itself. How soon will the Archbishops’ Council consider giving the Synod this opportunity because the CDM is being used as a facility with which to bully clergy and to subject them to vexatious complaints, which was not the intention of the Revision Committee that produced the Measure, but it is the way in which it is being used.

The Chair: You must not make an imputation, I am told.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison: As you know, Stephen, the Synod makes decisions in relation to changes to the Measure and, therefore, the process will be the typical one for a synodical change. As you are aware, both IICSA and also the House of Bishops in their report of their summary positions, make note of potential or other changes to the CDM. I

think we just have to go through the normal processes and therefore I cannot really comment on the timescale, but I know people will hear your question.

Revd Stephen Trott: The initiative needs to come from the Archbishops' Council.

The Chair: Thank you.

The Chair: Question 52 to the Crown Nominations Commission. The Archbishop of York is responding.

CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION

52. *Mrs April Alexander (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: Having regard to the first of the guiding principles contained in the House of Bishops' Declaration on the Ministry of Bishops and Priests to the fact that all orders of ministry will be open to all without reference to gender, and given that the Crown Nominations Commission has members who do not support the consecration of women, how can the Chair of the Commission ensure that women are not discriminated against as candidates for appointment as diocesan bishops?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu) replied as Vice-Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission: The Archbishop of Canterbury and I as Chairs of the Crown Nominations Commission take the importance of ensuring that candidates are not unfairly discriminated against very seriously.

The process itself is key in this: the preparation of the role specification, the candidates' papers, references, interviews, and psychometric reports all provide evidence for the CNC members to weigh up and consider prayerfully.

The members of the CNC have committed to work within the Five Guiding Principles. The House of Bishops' Declaration states that the Five Guiding Principles "need to be read one with the other and held together in tension". The CNC members experience and work with this tension as they discern nominations for diocesan sees.

Mrs April Alexander: Professor O'Donovan and his group were not very happy with the outcomes of the CNC's work during 2015-17. What can the Chair do if he thinks that there has been or might have been discrimination in reaching a less than optimum conclusion?

The Archbishop of York: I am not so sure, having sat on it since 2005, that women rarely have been appointed. As you know, already a third of diocesan vacancies since

November 2014 suggests that the Commission may have had some appointed. That is not really discriminating against women. We have now got five diocesans in the House of Lords out of 26 and they were only consecrated in 2014. The recent one to come through was the Bishop of Derby. I am not so sure whether that actually was happening. Of course, prejudice is always around but the truth is you have got five diocesans that have gone through in a very short period of time.

Revd James Dudley-Smith (Bath & Wells): Does the Archbishop's written reply intend to suggest that the CNC upholds the Five Guiding Principles actually all the better precisely because it includes a variety of views on the consecration of women?

The Archbishop of York: Well, all the members of the Crown Nominations Commission have committed to working with the Five Guiding Principles. Again, I want to remind you that the Five Guiding Principles and mission flourishing was a commitment that the Synod entered into in faith and the CNC actually works within it.

The Chair: Questions 53 to 59 are to the Church Commissioners. Question 53 is being responded to by Eve Poole.

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

53. *Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich)* asked the Church Commissioners: What consideration have the Commissioners given to the recommendation in the Report of the Dioceses Commission in its Review of the Sees of Beverley, Ebbsfleet, Maidstone and Richborough that they give urgent consideration to increasing their support for those sees to allow each post holder to employ a senior chaplain who could share in the administrative load, particularly in relation to parish visits and clergy appointments and that their support should explicitly include reasonable assistance with driving, and what are the conclusions from such consideration?

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio) replied as Third Church Estates Commissioner: The Acting Chair of the Dioceses Commission wrote to me about this matter on 7 May and I have placed it on the agenda for our next Bishops & Cathedrals Committee meeting on 10 July. The request came in too late to be considered as part of the work of the Triennium Funding Working Group, but I note the pressure the Provincial Episcopal Visitors are under and will ensure the Committee sees the Dioceses Commission's letter at our meeting next week. I cannot of course pre-judge the Committee's discussion.

The Chair: Questions 54 to 59 are responded to by Loretta Minghella.

54. *Mr Bill Seddon (St Albans)* asked the Church Commissioners: The Church Commissioners have established an enviable long-term record of delivering on their

objectives of maintaining the real value of their assets whilst managing them in a responsible and ethical way. What consideration has been given to ways of increasing exposure to investments with a positive social impact theme that are not only compatible with continuing to deliver financial performance, but also contribute to the Common Good?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: We aim to achieve this in two ways:

In terms of our own investment portfolio, we have committed £40 million to “impact” investments via two funds (one a waste stream opportunities fund and the other an impact private equity fund). We continue to look for other opportunities to make these investments which deliver strong financial returns in line with our fiduciary duty but make particular contributions to the Common Good. We have hired an additional member of staff to help us find those opportunities.

Secondly, the Commissioners were asked at their AGM on 26 June to allocate £20 million to the Archbishops’ Council as seed funding for a revolving social impact investment programme. This will enable the Church to invest in a way which contributes directly to the alleviation of social, financial and environmental challenges without needing to secure market-rate financial returns.

Dr John Appleby (Newcastle): I notified this to Loretta. I hope she managed to pick it up in time, but, if not, so be it. Given that hundreds of new coal-fired power stations are being built at the moment in less economically developed countries because the upfront cost of renewable generation is higher, what steps are the NIBs taking, or could they take if none as yet, to provide finance for renewables in these countries, especially as the overall cost of electricity from renewables is lower than from coal?

Loretta Minghella: Thank you very much for your question and for your kindness in giving me advance notice of it this afternoon. I cannot speak definitively for all the NIBs, but I can say for the Commissioners that we love a win-win investment, so if it makes the financial returns that we are obliged to make but also does some direct social and environmental good we are really pleased to back it. We do have some investments in renewable power in Latin America. This year, we have hired an additional person to help us find these win-win investments and we hope to increase that in the future.

55. *Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark)* asked the Church Commissioners: What measurable policy changes can be identified as a result of the Transition Pathway engagement with fossil fuel extraction companies, particularly in terms of Scope 3 emissions?

Loretta Minghella replied as the First Church Estates Commissioner: The most notable progress in the National Investing Bodies’ engagement with fossil fuel companies in

recent months has been made with Shell, Glencore and BP.

In December, Shell agreed to set short-term targets linked to executive remuneration to implement its ambition to halve its net carbon footprint by 2050. In February, Glencore agreed to cap its global coal production capacity at current levels. And in May a shareholder resolution was passed with 99% support at BP's AGM requiring the company to provide annual assurance of the consistency of its capital expenditure with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Revd Andrew Yates (Truro): Giles cannot be here. He asked me to say thank you for your response. To follow on, as we look to 2023 and possible divestment, have you started to consider any ideas for the criteria you might be using to assess whether we might be disinvesting, other than just not aligning to the Paris Agreement? Is there any thought yet as to how we might have those criteria?

Loretta Minghella: Thank you so much to Giles for his question and to you for your supplementary. Yes, absolutely we have got our minds on the criteria because, of course, that is what the Transitions Pathway Initiative has been all about. It is about being able to help us assess the management readiness and the emissions performance of the companies that we invest in to see whether it looks like they are indeed aligning themselves with the goals of the Paris Agreement. We have seen companies this year make those commitments but the importance of the tool, which now has \$14 billion of assets behind it in the coalition, is that it will help us assess that objectively.

56. *Ven. Malcolm Chamberlain (Sheffield)* asked the Church Commissioners: The recent news that the Church of England has been ranked second globally in an industry survey of responsible investors is to be welcomed and celebrated, with due thanks and appreciation given to the Church Commissioners and the Church of England Pensions Board. The policy of engaging creatively with the fossil fuel industry is bearing fruit. However, the Exxon Board blocked the well-supported resolution from the Church Commissioners to substantially reduce its greenhouse gas emissions from being considered at its 2019 AGM. In view of this intransigence, are further steps being considered by the NIBs in relation to Exxon, or is it time to disinvest?

Loretta Minghella replied as the First Church Estates Commissioner: Following their AGM, Exxon are crystal clear about the dissatisfaction of the Commissioners and the many other investors with whom we are working about the company's current approach to climate strategy, disclosure and engagement.

The National Investing Bodies stand full square behind our collective commitment to General Synod last July that we will engage urgently and robustly with companies rated poorly by TPI and, beginning in 2020, start to disinvest from the ones that are not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition to a low carbon economy; furthermore we will ensure that by 2023 we have disinvested from fossil fuel companies

that we have assessed, drawing on TPI data, as not prepared to align with the goal of the Paris Agreement to restrict the global average temperature rise to well below 2°C.

Ven. Malcolm Chamberlain: Congratulations on all the good work that is being done. Given that Legal & General Investment Management have since divested from ExxonMobil, would earlier disinvestment in this case add to momentum and send a very clear message not only to Exxon but to other fossil fuel companies that we are serious in our intent?

Loretta Minghella: Exxon, I think, has got a very loud and clear message from the Commissioners this year that they are not doing enough. We got together 9 trillion in our coalition for their AGM this year. Edward Mason has just recently won the International Corporate Governance Network Global Stewardship Champion Award, for his engagement with Exxon, which I think is fantastic. We are affecting their thought processes and they have agreed now to engage with us privately – there will not be a running commentary on that. We are hoping to make progress with them but they have got a long way to go, and I ask for your prayer and your continuing to hold us to account for our engagement with them.

57. *Revd Canon Catherine Grylls (Birmingham)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given that the carbon footprint of the Church Commissioners' investments listed equities portfolio rose by 77% over five years, as reported in the 2018 Annual Report, what action are the Church Commissioners taking to reduce it, and keep on reducing it year on year, and how much progress in quantitative terms has been made in moving from investments in fossil fuel companies to investments in renewables and other low carbon companies?

Loretta Minghella replied as the First Church Estates Commissioner: I am grateful for this opportunity to explain that the footprint we are able to measure and disclose is for our listed equities portfolio only – that represents 40% of the Commissioners' overall fund.

The end of year figures quoted are a snapshot at one point in time and we, too, were surprised at the footprint for 31 December 2018 so we re-ran the analysis for 31 January 2019. Our footprint had fallen by 23% in that month and was more aligned with the benchmark. Our portfolio generates significantly (67.5%) higher revenues from clean tech products and services than companies in the benchmark index.

Our policy on climate change will be to put companies that are not aligning themselves with the transition to a low carbon economy on our restricted list. We expect this to lead to the worst performing fossil fuel producers and utilities becoming restricted, and perhaps some industrial companies too. We have committed to starting to implement further climate change restrictions next year and expect this to lead to reductions in our carbon footprint for 2020 onwards.

Revd Will Gibbs (St Albans): Thank you very much for your answer to the first part of the question, but could Synod have an answer to the second part of the question? How much progress in quantitative terms has been made in moving from investments in fossil fuel companies to investments in renewables and other low carbon output companies?

Loretta Minghella: Thank you very much for pointing out we have not given you a full answer. We now give it to you for no extra charge. On our land that we own, we have wind and solar farms now with 43 megawatts of generating capacity. That is enough to power about 25,000 homes or thereabouts. In the private markets, we now have £309 million-worth of low-carbon investments. That comprises our sustainably certified forestry and our Waste Stream Opportunities Fund, and that represents 3.8% of the overall fund.

Finally, in the public markets, one of the benchmarks we use to see if we are doing well financially is looking at the MSCI All Country World Index. That is one of the ones we have tried to beat financially. If you look underneath the lid of that, you will see for every million dollars invested in that how much generates renewable energy, and, if you compare that with our portfolio, our low carbon revenues are 70% higher than that benchmark index. We are making some progress. We are not complacent; we have got to make a lot more progress than that.

58. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Church Commissioners: What are the Church Commissioners doing to engage with large tech companies on ethical issues?

Loretta Minghella replied as the First Church Estates Commissioner: All the large tech companies in which the Commissioners have significant holdings are included in the Commissioners' 2019 engagement programmes on either corporate governance or corporate tax, or both. The National Investing Bodies have asked the Ethical Investment Advisory Group to undertake a review of ethical issues associated with their investments in big tech companies. This is now getting underway and will inform future engagement with the sector.

Mr Gavin Oldham: Are the Church Commissioners aware of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 2013 article, "How Technology is Destroying Jobs", and is it including polarisation of wealth in its review?

Loretta Minghella: I was not particularly aware of that, so I will take a look at that. What we are doing in relation to our tech investments is looking to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group to help us develop a framework for engagement with technology companies which present huge benefits to society but also generate huge numbers of ethical considerations. That will be something that we can add into our thinking.

59. *Revd Dr Mark Bratton (Coventry)* asked the Church Commissioners: Given that BP's Board of Directors has been commended for its carbon emissions policy, how will the Church Commissioners respond to the facts that BP has excluded their Scope 3 emissions (from the burning of their products), which account for 85-90% of the company's overall emissions, and their Chief Economist declined to give any timetable for achieving net-zero carbon emissions when asked publicly on 11 June 2019?

Loretta Minghella replied as the First Church Estates Commissioner: BP made a major commitment in February to investors participating in the Climate Action 100+ engagement initiative, agreeing that it would back the initiative's shareholder resolution requiring the company to provide annual assurance of the consistency of its capital expenditure with the goals of the Paris Agreement. This is a significant discipline to impose on the businesses through the transition to a low carbon economy and will mean that BP is focused on investments that are advantaged in a well below 2° scenario and foregoes investments that are not.

Revd Dr Mark Bratton: The Church Commissioners are aware that BP is making conflicting statements and has no actual plans to achieve net zero Scope 3 carbon emissions. Is the First Church Estates Commissioner planning to arrange to meet BP board members and use her considerable eloquence to persuade them to include the carbon emissions from their products in aligning their investments to the Paris Agreement?

Loretta Minghella: BP have, of course, already taken a very, very significant step in agreeing to align their capital expenditure with the goals of the Paris Agreement, so there is a step that is already taken there. We have expert engagers who engage with their board already. Flattery will not get you anywhere on this occasion because I think they are better than I am. We will be holding them to account in the same way that we are holding all of our investee companies to account against the Synod-agreed resolution last year. You can rest assured I will have my beady eyes on that.

The Chair: Questions 60 to 72 are to the Archbishops' Council. Questions 60 to 67 are being answered by John Spence. I think we are probably only going to have time for one of them, John.

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

60. *Revd Stewart Fyfe (Carlisle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Following the recommendation in "Released for Mission" that multi-church groups should be encouraged to improve administration and such provision "should be a legitimate call on mission funding", how many strategic development grants to fund administrative support for multi-church groups or deaneries have been:

- (a) applied for;
- (b) approved.

Canon Dr John Spence replied as Chair of the Strategic Investment Board on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The need for Strategic Development Funding to make a significant difference to the mission strength of a diocese's funding for administrative support at parish or deanery level is a component of a number of Strategic Development Funding awards, but we are not able to give a definitive number for how many include multi-church groups.

61. *Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Of the strategic development funding so far distributed, what percentage has gone to parishes which are amongst the 20% most deprived nationally?

Canon Dr John Spence replied as Chair of the Strategic Investment Board on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Strategic Development Funding is awarded to dioceses rather than parishes, and whilst we do not use the 20% most deprived parishes as a specific threshold, we do track the proportion of funding which dioceses are planning to use in the most deprived communities. We estimate that 30% of Strategic Development Funding has been deployed this way. Note that not all the funding can be attributed to individual parishes where diocesan-wide schemes are funded, and so this figure can only be an estimate.

Some examples of how Strategic Development Funding is being used to support mission in deprived parishes can be found in the SIB annual report, and the *Resourcing the Future* projects booklet in Synod members' papers. We are also working with those dioceses that are recipients of Lowest Income Communities funding with the aim of focusing those grants intentionally on the poorest parishes/deaneries.

Revd Catherine Pickford: Thank you for your clear answer and the thought that has been given to the distribution of funds to benefit the poorest in our communities. I note that you do not use the 20% most deprived parishes as a specific threshold. What threshold do you use? How do you define a "deprived parish" in this context?

Canon Dr John Spence: We do not use that 20%. As our answer explains, sometimes it is quite hard for us to be parish specific in diocesan schemes that range across different communities. As I have said, we do base it around the Lowest Income Communities funding qualification which is based on a formula that we developed with Sir Andrew Dilnot, and then we are looking at it in more of a qualitative assessment, I would have to say, in terms of that space. I think it is a very good question and one which we will keep under review within the Lowest Income Communities approach.

The Chair: Thank you, Synod. That brings us to the end of this section of Questions. Remember that we are going to resume from Question 92 first thing on Sunday afternoon.

We now move to worship and I would encourage you to stay for worship, which is going to be led by Justin Brett.

Mr Justin Brett led the Synod in an act of worship.

Questions not reached during Synod.

62. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Noting that several dioceses have not yet applied for Strategic Development Funding, how much of the money released for the Fund by the Church Commissioners remains unspent?

Canon John Spence replied as Chair of the Strategic Investment Board on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Details of the amount proposed for Strategic Development Funding are included in the GS 2140 paper "Triennium Funding Working Group: National Church Spending Plans for 2020-22". As this explains: "SDF is a ten-year programme (2017-2026). Assuming that the current level of funding continues to increase in line with earnings up until 2026, it is estimated that the total amount of SDF available over the 10-year period will be £270m".

Following the awards made in June 2019, around £130m will be left to distribute to dioceses until 2026, although this will depend on the outcome of future spending reviews.

63. *Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What provisions are in place, or being put in place, for an independent, objective and continuing process of assessment of the effectiveness of Strategic Development Funding in turning around the decline of the Church of England so that the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the General Synod can tell whether we are deploying the funds in the right way to achieve this objective?

Canon John Spence replied as Chair of the Strategic Investment Board on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Every Strategic Development Funding project is subject to on-going monitoring and evaluation. This includes some element of independent evaluation. A progress update on every project is provided to the Strategic Investment Board at each meeting. More detailed assessment of projects takes place at their mid-point and end.

All of the above feeds into the evaluation of the overall programme. Clear criteria to assess the effectiveness and impact of the SDF were set out by the Church Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council when the programme was agreed in 2017.

Progress is reported to both bodies each year in the Annual Report of the Strategic Investment Board. The SIB includes a Church Commissioner and two others chosen for their expertise and independence. We are resolved to undertake a formal assessment and review, at a time when sufficient funds have been spent and progress made, to enable a sound assessment and will consider whether a further independent exercise is justified.

64. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In addition to the monitoring and evaluation that all projects supported by strategic development funding are subject to, please will the Archbishops' Council consider commissioning research across denominations to determine the full cost and impact, in both financial and human terms, of Resource Churches on local communities?

Canon John Spence replied as Chair of the Strategic Investment Board on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: The question appears to start from a position that resource churches are a cost rather than a benefit to the communities concerned. In its role, the Strategic Investment Board takes a completely objective look at the growth and other outcomes sought, and every application is thoroughly assessed on that basis. A proposal which sought growth solely at the expense of other churches (of whatever denomination) would not be supported.

Resource churches are intended to be proactive resources for dioceses as a whole – revitalising mission in cities and towns, producing ordinands, starting new congregations and supporting parishes in other ways – and are being assessed and evaluated on that basis.

Evidence to date suggests they are fulfilling those aims, producing and nurturing new disciples and making a significant social impact. We will continue to ensure that the net impact of resource churches is evaluated over time.

65. *Revd Charlie Skrine (London)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In view of the reduction in (i) total giving from regular planned givers after many years of increases (from £337.9 million in 2015 to £336.4 million in 2016) and (ii) the number of planned givers (from 633,000 in 2007 to 525,000 in 2016), as reported in the 2016 Parish Finance Statistics and to which you drew attention in your address to Synod in July 2018; and since the continuation or acceleration of those reductions in giving and givers would have a significant effect on parishes, given that the median parish receives over 25% of their income from planned givers; would you please publish (on the website and the noticeboard) a table of the number of planned givers by diocese for the years 2007-2016 showing any analysis that has been carried out of future trends?

Canon John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Total planned giving and numbers of planned givers are published annually in Parish Finance Statistics. The latest publication reports figures for the years 2008 to 2017 and includes trends in planned givers and weekly planned giving per giver over this period. The publication is supplemented by an annexe breaking down figures by diocese and is accessible online at <https://www.churchofengland.org/more/policy-and-thinking/research-and-statistics/key-areas-research#parish-finance-statistics>. For the number of planned givers by diocese for the years 2007 to 2016 see Table 2 of Diocesan Total Parish Finance Tables 2016.

While future trends may be extrapolated from historic numbers of planned givers, further work would be needed to review the assumptions on which these were based. Indicative annualised percentage change rates for each diocese are reported in Table 2 of Diocesan Total Parish Finance Tables 2017.

66. *Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Data released at the February sessions of Synod revealed vast disparities in the level of historic asset held by different dioceses, from 65p to £92 per head of population. In the light of this will the Archbishops' Council invite the 10 dioceses who hold the highest level of historic asset to a meeting to explore sustainable patterns of inter-diocesan generosity compliant with charitable law?

Canon John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: We recognise the huge disparity in historic assets held by dioceses. However, comparing historic assets only tells part of story. Some dioceses rely on these assets to achieve balanced budgets, and all dioceses are independent charities with their own constraints on how their assets can be used.

The National Church Spending Plans for 2020-22 (see GS 2140) include new funding streams for Strategic Ministry Funding (helping to support dioceses with the costs of additional curates) and Diocesan Sustainability Funding and we will take account of diocesan resources in determining the scale of support we provide.

We are one Church and the concept of inter-diocesan generosity is, like inter-parish generosity, a good one. We would encourage those dioceses with the greatest assets to consider together how they could create an initiative in this sphere.

67. *Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Following the assurances given by John Spence and the Bishop of Portsmouth at the February sessions of Synod, would the Archbishops' Council initiate some work to assess the theological and missional strategy underlying the continued charging of fees for funerals and weddings?

Canon John Spence replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: After discussing these issues and consulting the Life Events Team and the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum, RACSC and the Finance Committee remain unconvinced of the case for changing the policy Synod has adopted since 2011 that parochial fees should contribute towards the costs incurred by the Church and that clergy should have discretion to waive fees in cases of financial hardship. Any diocese, working through its DBF and parishes, could test the effect of fee waivers linked to a promotional campaign. We prefer a local evidence-based approach to an initiative from the centre.

Parochial fees are estimated to provide £73 million per annum in income for the Church. Fees form a small part of the overall expenditure on a wedding or a funeral. The work of the Life Events Team has found little evidence to suggest that the level of the fee has a significant effect on the number of Church of England weddings and funerals.

68. *Mrs Rhian Parsons (Leicester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What progress has been made in implementing the motion passed by this Synod in February 2019 commending the vision of the Estates Evangelism Task Group to see a serving, loving and worshipping Christian community on every significant social housing estate in the country and calling upon the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the NCIs, through their work under the Renewal and Reform programme, to enable the voices of people from estates and other marginalised communities to be heard and heeded in the life of the Church of England?

69. *Mr Richard Morgan (Ely)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: What progress has been made in implementing the motion passed by this Synod in February 2019 commending the vision of the Estates Evangelism Task Group to see a serving, loving and worshipping Christian community on every significant social housing estate in the country and calling upon the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the NCIs, through their work under the Renewal and Reform programme, to enable the voices of people from estates and other marginalised communities to be heard and heeded in the life of the Church of England?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: With your consent, Chair, I would like to answer Questions 68 and 69 together.

The work on Estates Evangelism is a key strand of Renewal and Reform. The Estates Evangelism Task Group, chaired by Bishop Philip North, also works closely with the National Estate Churches Network which is doing excellent work in this area. It has been hugely impressive to see how, simply by talking constantly about the importance of people and communities on estates – and showing that we are putting resources and energy into championing them – clergy, church workers and lay people from estates are rising up to

make their voices heard. About 200 attended the NECN's recent conferences in Bradford and Birmingham, and that is just some of the people who are feeling a new sense of empowerment. To appreciate the proactive work of the Task Group, you need to look at their impressive work programme which I will make available to Synod members in the usual way.

70. *Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Will the Parochial Church Council (Powers) Measure 1956 and, particularly Section 1, be included within the forthcoming scoping review by the Legislative Reform Task Group?

Revd Canon Simon Butler replied as Chair of the Legislative Reform Committee on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: Yes. If Mr Greenwood would like to write to me about his thoughts about the Measure, we would be happy to consider them.

71. *Mrs Christine Fry (Winchester)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the last 10 years, how many weddings have not proceeded as a result of objections being raised when banns were published?

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury & Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: There is no requirement on anyone to report an objection raised when banns are published. Therefore, there is no national record of this information, and I am not aware that this information is collected anywhere, either by the NCIs or dioceses.

72. *Mr Samuel Margrave (Coventry)* asked the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: In the light of the research: *Chaplains on Campus: Understanding Chaplaincy in UK Universities* by Dr Kristin Aune, Professor of Sociology of Religion at Coventry University, and its findings of the positive impact chaplains make to society, will the Archbishops' Council bring forward an opportunity for this Synod to debate the report and its findings?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied on behalf of the Presidents of the Archbishops' Council: We welcome this research which was made possible through funding from the Church of England's Church Universities Fund. It shows the positive impact chaplains make to the pastoral care of staff and students, including the exploration of faith, which is a vital part of our vision for higher education. Chaplains, including those in schools and colleges, are an integral part of our Christian mission and would be an extremely worthwhile focus for debate by Synod, especially in relation to *Growing Faith*.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

73. *Mr Andrew Presland (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What steps, if any, is the Council taking to promote the understanding of the "big story of

salvation” and the other main concepts of Christianity among people of all ages – e.g. by building on the *Understanding Christianity* resources recently produced for use with children in schools?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Understanding Christianity has been a huge success and is being used in over 5,000 schools. The way it presents and teaches the core concepts of Christianity through the biblical narrative and using the beautiful big story freeze (Check with Education – should this be “frieze” (this is as in the original submitted, but doesn’t make sense ...)?makes it extremely accessible and we are aware of dioceses and churches using it as a basis for work with all ages. The Education Office has received a generous donation to develop an App based on the “Big Story” which is likely to be focused for the 12-14 age group in a way which encourages *Growing Faith* so that connections are further developed between church, school and households. As part of this we intend to encourage the use of the big freeze(As before – “frieze”?) in every church and find other ways to ensure the big story of salvation is widely understood.

74. *Mr Jeremy Harris (Chester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How do the Bishops intend to respond to widespread concern about the teaching and promotion of transgenderism through “Mermaids” and other organisations to young children at Church of England schools?

The Bishop of Ely (Rt Revd Stephen Conway) replied as Chair of the National Society Council on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: School governing bodies (in consultation with their local parental community) will be developing policies for relationships and sex education as the new Regulations take effect from September 2020 and we are developing a framework to enable them to do so in the light of the Church of England vision for education. We are aware of some strong views that have been expressed within the Church, both in favour and against schools drawing on the services of “Mermaids” and other organisations. We will take these views into account as we develop our framework, informed also by the work of Living in Love and Faith.

75. *Revd Stephen Trott (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In the five years since the 2014 House of Bishops’ Declaration on the Ministry of Bishops and Priests was published, how many of the clergy for whom the Declaration was intended have been appointed to senior office as bishops, deans, archdeacons, or as residentiary canons?

76. *Revd Graham Hamilton (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since the enactment of the legislation on consecrating women to the episcopate and the adoption of the Five Guiding Principles for mutual flourishing, how many women have been made bishops, deans or archdeacons, and how many traditional catholic or conservative

evangelicals unable for theological reasons to recognise the priestly or episcopal ministry of women have been appointed to such senior positions?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development and Appointments Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission, I will answer questions 75 and 76 together.

Since the enactment of the legislation in 2014:

- 22 women have been ordained bishop;
- 4 women have been appointed deans;
- 23 women have been appointed archdeacons;
- 31 women have been appointed residentiary canons.

The diversity monitoring data for those appointed to senior roles since that time indicates that:

- 1 diocesan bishop;
- 2 suffragan bishops; and
- 1 archdeacon

identify themselves as either traditional catholic or conservative evangelical. However, the labels which people use to describe their church tradition do not necessarily correlate with whether they are unable for theological reasons to recognise the priestly or episcopal ministry of women.

77. *Revd Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many people with a visible physical disability are involved in the Senior Leadership and Development Programme?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development and Appointments Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Six participants (representing 3.7% of the total) stated on the diversity monitoring questionnaire that they have a disability as defined by the Equality Act 2010. We do not ask participants to differentiate between “visible” and “hidden” disabilities.

78. *Revd Mark Lucas (Peterborough)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the answer to my question (Q92) of last February regarding the ability to thrive of those holding a traditional, biblical, reformed, complementarian view of ministry across the genders, what steps have since been taken to address balance, and encourage mutual flourishing in each of the House of Bishops; the College of Bishops; the Archidiaconate; and among cathedral deans, and how will future balance be assured?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development & Appointments Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Development

& Appointments Group have referred this issue to the Implementation and Dialogue Group, and we await their report.

There have been conversations between the Archbishops' Secretary for Appointments and the Bishops of The Society about how clergy who may have potential for senior appointments and on theological grounds cannot receive the ordained ministry of women can best be encouraged and supported in the discernment of their future ministry. A further development programme for such clergy is being planned in partnership with Forward in Faith and the Bishop of Maidstone. A number of clergy who are participating in the Strategic Leadership Development Programme have also met with the Bishops of Ebbsfleet and Maidstone to discuss their ministry and development.

79. *Ms Josile Munro (London)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the *Turning Up the Volume Project* was first initiated in 2012 what progress has there been made, specifically in identifying and consecrating (with the guidance of the Holy Spirit) BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic) men and women as bishops as well as other senior clergy?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development & Appointments Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: When the *Turning Up the Volume* (TUTV) Task Group was established in 2012, 1.1% of clergy in senior appointments were of BAME heritage, compared to 2.8% of clergy overall.

Since then, four BAME clergy have been appointed as bishops, and four as archdeacons, some of whom have now retired. Currently 3.2% of the total number of senior appointments (5.2% of bishops, 1.5% of archdeacons and 2.3% of deans) are from BAME backgrounds. This compares to 3.7% of all clergy.

Other initiatives are also contributing to this agenda: 10% of the participants of the Strategic Leadership Development Programme are BAME, and the recent Wilfred Wood programme is helping to prepare BAME clergy for wider leadership responsibilities. CMEAC has led the roll-out of Unconscious Bias training, addressing the risk of bias in appointments processes. Clearly, there is still more work to do, but the increasing representation in senior appointments is encouraging.

80. *Revd Timothy Goode (Southwark)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In 2016, during the debate on the report GS 2026 "Nurturing and Discerning Senior Leaders", I expressed concern about the lack of representation of disabled people in senior leadership roles, and Synod was assured that this would be 'an additional focus for 2017-2019'. Can the House update Synod on progress made, including the steps that have been taken in that time and the challenges that still need to be faced?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied as Chair of the Development & Appointments Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Since the 2016 Synod debate, we have met with the Committee for Ministry of and Among Deaf and Disabled People (CMDDP) to better understand what the challenges may be and how these might be addressed, as well as to share learning from the work to increase BAME representation.

We are also working with specific individuals who are considered to have the potential for wider leadership roles, although it must be remembered that not all disabilities are visible and not all disabled people wish to be identified as such.

Making the whole church a place of welcome for disabled people has become incorporated into the Archbishops' Council's Objective 9, and we hope to see progress in due course.

81. *Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Who is currently responsible for drafting, and scrutinising, the new IME/CME training materials on “the sacramental ministry of reconciliation”, and the resources for the Church of England website, as proposed by the Report of the Seal of the Confessional Working Party?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I have been asked to lead a small ad hoc group following up the House's recent consideration of the Report on the Ministry of Confession. That group will include colleagues from the Ministry Division and the National Safeguarding Team.

As reported in GS Misc 1221, the House delegated detailed work on the training resources to the National Safeguarding Steering Group, but I shall be ensuring through the group to which I referred that all relevant considerations are taken into account. My group will also liaise with the Communications Unit as necessary in respect of on-line resources.

82. *Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In November 2014, the Bishop of Dover told Synod that letters had been sent to the Deaneries of Jersey and Guernsey to start the process of ensuring that the Bishops and Priests (Consecration and Ordination of Women) Measure would be included in the laws of Jersey and Guernsey. Could you tell us when it is expected that this process will be completed?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Tim Thornton) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As members may be aware, the Archbishop of Canterbury has set up a Commission to review the relationship between the Channel Islands and the wider

Church of England. That process may well lead to some legislative changes (as flagged up in the Business Committee's forecast of future business).

Any changes would need agreement of the relevant legislative bodies on the Islands as well as of this Synod. My understanding is that, although a start has been made on the necessary legislative drafting work, those bodies' preference is to extend the women bishops legislation at the same time. So we are probably looking at some time next year. It is not possible to be more precise at this stage, but this is a matter of practical process not – as far as I am aware – any theological reservations about women in the episcopate.

83. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Is it the explicit intention of the House of Bishops to ensure that the LLF process is a safe place for LGBTI+ people?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied as Chair of the Living in Love and Faith Coordinating Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The explicit intention of the House to ensure the LLF process is a safe place for all participants, including LGBTI+ people, is articulated in the Memorandum of Understanding to which all LLF members subscribe. The matters being discussed within the LLF process are often sensitive and relate to the very core of people's identity. The LLF groups are committed to conducting their work with utmost attention to the mutual respect and care required of them. Members of the groups are keenly aware of how these discussions affect some of their members with greater immediacy and depth than others and are conscious that, regretfully, good intentions are not always fulfilled. They are thankful for the diverse range of engagement with the project and are determined to continue to develop and learn from their relationships with one another, including through their partnership with the Pastoral Advisory Group.

84. *Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Please could the Bishop advise the Synod how the concern expressed by Revd Dr Christina Beardsley when she withdrew from the co-ordinating group for Living in Love and Faith, that "the principle of not talking about us without us has been diluted", is being addressed, other than by replacing her on the group?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied as Chair of the Living in Love and Faith Coordinating Group on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Living in Love and Faith Group has a number of ways of ensuring that the work is done with LGBTI+ people. First, through the membership of its groups which include LGBTI+ people. Second by organising meetings between LLF members and LGBTI+ individuals in order to enable LGBTI+ people to discuss and respond to the draft resources from the perspectives of their lived experiences and understanding. Third, by inviting individuals to read and respond to the draft resources. Fourth, by incorporating

the work of the Wider Participation process into the work of producing the draft resources. This will include giving unmediated voice to some of the lived experience stories of over 50 individuals.

85. *Revd Canon Wyn Beynon (Worcester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Has the House of Bishops considered undertaking a theological exploration of Male Headship Theology?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: It has not.

86. *Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that the Church of England's teaching about marriage is that it is a lifelong and exclusive union between one man and one woman, if one person in a couple undergoes gender transition, has consideration been given as to whether they are still married according to the teaching of the Church of England?

The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Pastoral Advisory Group considered this question in the context of one specific case and I cannot comment here on the personal circumstances involved or draw a general theological principle from a single instance. However, we noted two important points. When a couple marry in church they promise before God to be faithful to each other for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health – come what may, although we preach compassion if they find this too much to bear. Secondly, never in the history of the church has divorce been actively recommended as the way to resolve a problem. We have always prioritised fidelity, reconciliation and forgiveness, with divorce as a concession when staying together proves humanly unbearable. In the light of those two points, if a couple wish to remain married after one partner has transitioned, who are we to put them asunder?

87. *Mrs Rosemary Lyon (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What consideration has the House of Bishops given to the implications of the Government's proposals for "no fault divorce" for the Church's teaching that marriage is lifelong?

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The MPA Council made a very full submission to the Government's consultation on this subject last year. Following Synod's decision in 1994, the Council agreed that "irretrievable breakdown" should remain the sole ground for divorce. However, the response criticised the concept of "no fault" divorce as the Council believed that all marital breakdown involves some fault, although not necessarily on one side only. We argued that the Government's proposal to introduce a simple notification process fell down on a number of points, notably: it did nothing to encourage reflection and re-

examination of the marital situation, did nothing to support the resilience of marriages and removed the important element of consent. The consultation raised many other questions of detailed process. While the MPA Council shared the Government's objective of reducing family conflict, it was not persuaded that the proposals on divorce had been sufficiently thought through.

88. *Mrs Christine Fry (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many non-disclosure agreements have the Archbishops, bishops and their councils or boards issued in the last 10 years?

The Bishop of Portsmouth (Rt Revd Christopher Foster) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Figures are not available nationally for the number of clergy whose resignation has been the subject of a non-disclosure agreement over the 10 years. Figures for the staff of Archbishops employed at Lambeth Palace and Bishopthorpe, staff in Diocesan Bishops' Offices employed by bishops in their corporate capacity, and staff employed by the National Church Institutions would take a disproportionate amount of staff time to compile.

89. *Revd Canon Ruth Newton (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How is the Church of England responding to the Anglican Consultative Council's Environmental Resolution #ACC17 and in particular the call to promote a day during the Season of Creation as a day of public repentance?

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell) replied as Chair of the Liturgical Commission on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: As Synod will know from previous debates on environmental matters, a great deal of material has been made available to churches for use during Creationtide. This includes penitential material. As parishes have considerable freedom to use Creationtide material imaginatively, we have not felt it necessary, or indeed advisable, to be prescriptive about nominating a particular day as a day which focuses specifically on repentance.

90. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given reports of a church offering to cover up crosses and a picture of Jesus so that Islamic prayer could take place in the church, what is the Church's policy on multi-faith worship in the light of Canons F 15 and F 16 and the Church Report *Multi-Faith Worship*?

The Bishop of Birmingham (Rt Revd David Urquhart) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Presence and Engagement programme has produced guidelines for churches on hosting services and events where people of other faiths will be in attendance. These note that Church of England churches are set apart for worship according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England forever, and Canon Law

must be adhered to. Diocesan interfaith advisers have shared these guidelines in their dioceses and are available to support clergy with their implementation.

91. *Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given reports of clergy being told by the Bishop of Chelmsford that they are “free to leave” the Church of England if they disagree with the approach of the diocese on matters of human sexuality, what disciplinary remedy is available to these clergy?

The Bishop of Chelmsford (Rt Revd Stephen Cottrell) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: I have not said what is attributed to me in the question. Nor have I suggested that the teaching of the Diocese of Chelmsford on human sexuality is any different from the teaching on that subject in the rest of the Church of England. For the purposes of answering the specific question that has been asked, I am advised that in the event that a bishop were to say that a member of the clergy or anyone else was free to leave the Church of England, that would be a statement of fact and would not of itself be misconduct.

Full Synod: Second Day Saturday 6 July 2019

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 9.00 am.

WORSHIP

The Chair: Good morning, Synod.

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester) led the Synod in an act of worship.

ITEM 7 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Chair: We come now to Item 7 on the agenda, the Presidential Address from his Grace the Archbishop of York. At the end of his address the Archbishop would like to give Synod five minutes just in small groups with your neighbour, with one another, to reflect on what he has said to us, so please listen more keenly even than usual. Archbishop.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): In his address to this General Synod in November 2010, the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, asked this question: how can people who read the same Bible and share the same baptism come to strongly diverse conclusions about human sexuality?

Having discussed the issue of the ordination of women, he turns to the issue of same-sex unions and I quote: "The other issue, still bitterly divisive in the Communion, is that of our approach to same-sex unions. It is inevitable that, whether in open debate or in general discussion, this will be around during the lifetime of this Synod. I shall make only a brief comment here, having said a fair amount on the subject this time last year and in other settings. And it is that this has become a cardinal example of how we avoid theological debate. The need for some thoughtful engagement that will help us understand how people who read the same Bible and share the same baptism can come to strongly diverse conclusions is getting more urgent, because I sense that in the last few years the debate on sexuality has not really moved much. It is unthinkingly treated by some as almost the sole test of biblical fidelity or doctrinal orthodoxy; it is unthinkingly regarded by others as one of those matters on which the Church must be brought inexorably into line with what our culture can make sense of. Neither side always has the opportunity of clarifying how they see the focal theological issues – how one or the other position relates to our belief in a divine Saviour. And if we are not to be purely tribal about this, we need

the chance for some sort of discussion that is not dominated by the need to make an instant decision or to react to developments and pressures elsewhere". Ended Rowan Williams.

Nine years later there has been little, if any, progress in answering that particular question, so in this Presidential Address I will offer some pointers towards an answer to Dr Rowan Williams' question.

It has been said rightly that the Church often has to wrestle painfully with issues that public opinion is prepared not to wrestle with, because public opinion can jump from one conviction to the opposite, and back again, without caring very much about consistency or fairness. Our disagreements can be a positive test of our faith - an opportunity to model difficult discussions that ought to be going on everywhere, but are not. But we cannot do that, if we cannot draw on the resources of faith, God's word and God's work.

The kind of disagreement we have is exactly the kind of disagreement one would expect to find in a church where the old habits of reading the Bible consistently and thoroughly, as part of a liturgical pattern or a pattern of private devotion, has actually broken down. The expectations we have of biblical literacy - not only of laity but of clergy too - would strike most earlier generations of Christians as sadly low.

And if we do not read consistently, we shall not think consistently. This is the kind of disagreement one would expect to find in a church which has got used to jumping to conclusions quickly, driven by the need for a crisp soundbite, a church no longer capable of pursuing a question patiently and in hope. The Church has come to rely on others to do its serious thinking for it - whether they are theologians, philosophers, scientists, sociologists, statisticians, or simply those who have a story to tell. The Church acts as an echo chamber instead of an interpreter and guide to the problems others in our time are facing.

We cannot read well if we read only to solve a crisis, driven by anxiety. The anxiety is kept stoked up by the context of a world around us which simply does not believe in anything very much. In a disagreement such as this, each side suspects the other of colluding with this loss of faith - of substituting one or another kind of moralism for belief. To understand our opponents, then, we need to be able to understand how they believe the faith of Christ before we can question them on how they reach conclusions that strike us as false.

We need to understand our opponents, how they understand their faith in Jesus before we question them on the conclusions they have actually come to.

What is crucial is working out how we recognise in someone else the sincere will to love and serve Jesus Christ, for this is the deepest level of mutual recognition in the Body of Christ. For example, in Philippians 1:18, the Apostle Paul writes, "What does it matter? One way or other, whether sincere or not, Christ is proclaimed; and for that I rejoice" - which seems to me to be saying that even with doubtful motivation people can still be recognised as in some way proclaiming Christ; not to mention Romans 14 - which is not about a minor matter, given the context of the Apostle Paul's overall polemic about the law and his almost obsessive concern about table-fellowship and what it entails. Indeed, I suspect that the feeling around this matter in the Apostle Paul's context (love respecting the scruples of others), with its deep entanglement with ethnic and religious identities is more of a precedent or paradigm than we sometimes realise.

To put yourself in your opponent's shoes you need to believe that God is leading your opponent, too, on the pilgrimage of faith and seeking understanding, and that it lies within the mind and purpose of God to reveal the points of authentic convergence for those who start from different initial experiences.

The power of faith seeking understanding is more nourished by reading and engaging with the whole of Scripture and Scripture as a whole. In doing this, the Holy Spirit brings our minds and wills onto a convergent path. We need a faith working through love (which has the capacity to seek for the basic point of unity), a faith which will make the rules of engagement.

The kind of rules promulgated many years ago by social psychologist and game theorist Anatol Rapoport (creator of the winning Tit-for-Tat strategy in Robert Axelrod's legendary prisoner's dilemma tournament):

And these are rules:

1. You should attempt to re-express your target's position so clearly, vividly, and fairly, that your target says, "Thanks, I wish I'd thought of putting it that way".
2. You should list any points of agreement (especially if they are not matters of general or widespread agreement).
3. You should mention anything you have learned from your target.
4. Only then are you permitted to say so much as a word of rebuttal or criticism.

Holy Scripture is capable of shaping our minds constructively and convergently if we read it not merely as a book of solutions to problems we have just come up with, but as a consistent guide to living which helps us understand what the real problems are. Then

we should be able to reframe the questions that the world puts to us in Jesus Christ shaped ways; and even if we did not immediately agree on their solution, we shall agree on the kind of approach they demand of us. To disagree Christianly requires a common Scriptural perception of what is foundational.

As Cardinal John Newman helpfully insisted in his Grammar of Assent, the rationality of faith allows us to give weight to past experience and reasonable presuppositions. Since the mind is not a *tabula rasa*, and can never be, it is rational not irrational, to build on, and correct, the presuppositions formed by experience of God's word and God's work.

And as the Archbishop of York, Dr John Habgood, said to the General Synod on 6 July 1986, during the Debate on The Nature of Christian Belief: Report by the House of Bishops: "We read the Bible in order to meet the living God who encounters us now and leads us towards our future. We read the Bible, in other words, as testimony, testimony within which history and interpretation are intertwined, and intertwined in such a way that it is, in most circumstances, extremely difficult to say precisely where history ends and interpretation begins.'

And quoting Rabbi Magonet, he said, "The division of the Hebrew Scriptures into three sections, the Law, and the Prophets and the Writings is not a question of classification ... For the prophets - which include books from Joshua to 2 Kings - you do not read from Joshua to 2 Kings just to learn bits of history and pieces about ancient history, you read them in order to learn what God is saying now (if you do not call them historic books but call them prophetic books). Similarly, if you read the first books of the Old Testament (the Pentateuch) as the law, you are not reading this for ancient history, you are reading it in order to determine God's character, his purposes and his demands". If Christians had, in fact, read the Bible in this way, they would have saved themselves much agony over precisely how you interpret the early chapters of Genesis.

Now then, where do my pointers towards an answer to Dr Rowan Williams' question he posed for us as a Synod in November 2010 lead us?

I suggest that they are pointing us to living such a life vividly described for us by the Apostle Paul in his letter to the Philippians, Chapter Two, a Chapter in which he incorporates an ancient Christian hymn in verses 6 to 11. In these verses we hear a clarion call to unity and humility. For the Church of Jesus Christ is a palpable community of the Holy Spirit. And the Holy Spirit is the enemy of division and party spirit.

Speaking personally, I need to remind myself constantly that my Christian character is still in the making and not fully formed. I intend to do right but many a time it does not come off. I intend to live reconciliation, but in what I say, I sow seeds of discord. And I know that I must be reconciled to God before I can reconcile others. And I hear constantly

the Apostle Paul's plea to me: "We implore you in Christ's name, be reconciled to God! Sharing God's work, we make this appeal: you have received the grace of God; do not let it come to nothing" (2 Corinthians 5:20b and 6:1).

The Holy Spirit is in my heart, activating me to live Christ and to do Christ-like deeds; and re-activating me to work anew. I also know that the Holy Spirit is doing a Christ-like work in me. Books, study, retreats, worship and witness can stimulate my living a Jesus Christ shaped life, reinvigorating my relationship with the Holy Spirit and the Father and the Son as well as with my brothers and sisters in Christ. I now know, friends, that it is not how much I get through all this, but how well I get to know God: Father, Son and Spirit.

That is what it is all about. The clear sign of following Jesus Christ, discipleship, is our unity with the followers of Jesus Christ. Living a Jesus Christ shaped life. "By thinking and feeling alike, with the same love for one another and a common attitude of mind" (Philippians 2:2). "Leaving no room for selfish ambition and vanity, but humbly reckoning others better than yourselves" (Philippians 2:3).

Put it differently, "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory". This would be a good motto for all of us. Doing everything as unto the Lord, and as in his full gaze. This is living a Jesus Christ shaped life.

I want to plead that, beyond the criticism that we tend to make of each other, we listen to the words of Jesus Christ himself. In John Chapter 10 verses 11, 14 and 15 he says: "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep ... I am the good shepherd; I know my own and my own know me, as the Father knows me I know the Father; and I lay down my life for my sheep".

Jesus Christ "calls his own sheep by name and leads them out to find pasture and brings them back into the sheepfold for safety: They follow him 'because they know his voice'." A true minister, a true witness of the Gospel will be one who can say and dare to say this: "Follow me, as I am following Jesus". Now that to me is a bloodcurdling text for any witness, any minister of the Gospel. "Follow me, as I am following Jesus". A true disciple, witness, minister of the Gospel must have such a relationship with Jesus Christ and with members of the Body of Christ that they follow Jesus Christ and enable others to be followers of Jesus. So what matters is not just that programmes should succeed, but that people should grow in holiness, wisdom and love. For the life of Jesus Christ was not written; it was lived. And that is the secret of every witness, every disciple, every minister of Jesus Christ - that the life of the Good Shepherd is being lived in them. Living a Jesus Christ shaped life.

Yes! "Look to each other's interests and not merely to your own" (Philippians 2: 4). Our debates on human sexuality, gender and human identity, which began in 1987, have had

a chilling effect on all of us - as we have participated in patient empathy and patient listening - and by God's grace have digested the hurt. The urgent task before us is to find a trusting and tending way for the Church overall to support people on all sides who are experiencing the damage the debates have done. We need to discover a proper empathy which does not diminish any one of us as members of the Embassy of Heaven - the Body of Christ, the Church.

I experienced, for the first time, unbridled hatred some years ago, when I appeared on a Kilroy Silk programme, exploring the refusal of a vicar in Essex to baptize baby twins on the grounds that their parents were gay. I was invited to appear on the programme to outline the Church of England's policy on infant baptism. My response was that children living in a parish should be welcomed and baptized after careful preparation of the parents and godparents; the issue of the parents' sexuality cannot trump Jesus' command to welcome the little ones in his name (Matthew 19:14; Mark 10:40; Luke 18:16). Following the programme, I was astonished by the torrent of abuse and hate mail I received from members of the Body of Christ - it was not just from this country but from all over. What disappointed me most was the deafening silence of the many who uphold the policy of the Church of England. No one, and I mean no one, came to my aid. No one - not even my Bishop.

We should always consider how we can help others, and in what way we can help them to flourish, both in things of the earth and in matters of the Holy Spirit.

We are members of a body, so no member should think only about themselves. The unity of the whole body requires that every separate and distinct part of it should be in harmony with the whole. We are part of a symphony orchestra: none of us should play a discordant note; and none of us should ignore the conductor - the Holy Spirit. None of us is the centre of the universe. Jesus Christ is. And the Holy Spirit is the Director of Mission.

"Take to heart among yourselves what you find in Christ Jesus: he was in the form of God; yet he laid no claim to equality with God, but made himself nothing, assuming the form of a slave. Bearing the human likeness, sharing the human lot, he humbled himself, and was obedient, even to the point of death, death on a cross!" (Philippians 2:5-8).

This ancient Christian hymn exalts the work of Jesus Christ. But because it speaks of a Christ who "made himself nothing" (v.7) and humbled himself (v.8), the Apostle Paul quotes it to set forth Jesus Christ as the primary example of humility which he urges upon us and on his Philippian friends.

The first line presents a downward movement, from heavenly pre-existence to human life; the second line describes the exaltation of the obedient Jesus.

Jesus of Nazareth humbled himself - made himself of no reputation - so do not be unwilling to humble yourself. What a cruel and ignominious death for the Son of God to suffer. Did he lose anything by going lower and taking the place of a slave? Do you think that you will lose anything by going lower like your Lord? Are you willing to take the place of humility in the Body of Christ, and render the humblest service? Count it to be an honour to wash the feet of the saints. Be humble in mind; nothing is lost by nurturing this spirit. This is living a Jesus Christ shaped life. Living as Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit.

And see how Jesus of Nazareth was honoured in the end. "Therefore God raised him to the heights and bestowed on him the name above all names, 1that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow - in heaven, on earth, and in the depths – 1and every tongue acclaim, 'Jesus Christ is Lord', to the glory of God the Father" (Philippians 2: 9-11).

"Raised him to the heights" (v.9): A contrast to the "he humbled himself" of verse 8. "The name above all names" gives the title "Lord". And "heaven, earth and the depths" (v.10) is all of creation - join together in concert confessing Jesus' Lordship.

What we are taught here is the great truth that Jesus Christ, though once he stooped down to the level of the lowest slave, is now exalted to the very highest glory, and everything in the created order - and even the devils in hell - are compelled to bow down to the might of his power.

We also learn from these verses that the way to ascend is to descend. He who would be chief must be willing to be the servant of all.

The Father gives this gracious humbleness of mind, for Jesus Christ's sake. And will lead us to participate in the unity he has given us as pure gift. It is this gift of humbleness of mind and oneness in Jesus Christ that will enable us to live a Jesus Christ shaped life. This is discipleship.

May this General Synod, as a palpable community of the Holy Spirit, find a way of thinking, reflecting and acting by attending to the whole of Scripture and to Scripture as a whole, not bits of it. May our reflections and actions grow from the saving history of Israel and through Jesus Christ, the New Testament proclaiming the fulfilment of the gracious promises of the Old.

What Scripture has to teach about the human body in particular can certainly be overlooked, but neither can it be taken apart from "the whole counsel of God". And living in unity and humility, in a Jesus Christ shaped way so that people will ask, "what manner of people are these who love each other implicitly. Lives that are Jesus Christ shaped".

May this General Synod continue to think and act in catholic communion with the wider Church and in the pursuit of Christian unity, and especially in partnership with the Anglican Communion as it expresses its unity and humility through the Lambeth Conference. And when we disagree, to disagree Christianly in a Jesus Christ shaped way. May the Lord bless us all. Thank you for listening.

The Chair: Thank you, Archbishop. We invite members of Synod now just in twos and threes to spend the next five minutes reflecting on what you have just heard. The lights will operate in the usual fashion to assist us to keep to time.

Thank you, members of Synod, if we could draw those conversations to a close. Copies of the Presidential Address will be available from the information desk. That concludes this item, thank you.

THE CHAIR *Professor Joyce Hill* took the Chair at 9.47 am.

ITEM 8 RESPONDING TO SERIOUS YOUTH VIOLENCE: DEBATE ON A MOTION FROM THE MISSION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL (GS 2132)

The Chair: Good morning Synod, we come now to Item 8 on the agenda, Responding to Serious Youth Violence: a debate on the motion from the Mission and Public Affairs Council, and for this you will need GS 2132. I also draw your attention to the financial item reference in the Fifth Notice Paper, paragraphs 13 to 15 on page 5 of that Notice Paper, but we have had no notification of a particular intervention on that point.

This is a debate which has got a little bit of complexity in the middle of it. If you have read the amendments, you will see that two of them are actually not compatible, Items 42 and 43 are incompatible and so Synod, as it were, cannot have them both. I will explain in a little bit more detail how we are going to manage that when we get to the amendments but in brief, just simply to say at this stage, when we get to Items 42 and 43 I will initially ask each of the proposers of the amendment to speak to their amendment without moving first so that Synod has some sense of an overview of how the two amendments, individually, might work. And that will help you make your mind up as between them. I will deal with that in a little bit more detail, I will go over the procedure then. Once the overview has been given to Synod, I will then ask the proposers in turn to move them and we will in turn debate them in the usual way, or according to whatever happens in terms of the voting. We will confront that issue in more detail when we get there, but just to warn you that that is going to happen.

Item 44 will simply be dealt with in the usual way since that is a freestanding amendment and does not need to be dealt with alongside something else.

There are just one or two other things I want to say very briefly. We do need a robust and honest debate on this extremely serious issue, but I would ask those that are contributing to the debate to bear in mind the sensitivities of people in the chamber and in the public gallery who may have been affected by youth violence in some kind of way, so please bear that in mind.

I am now going to invite Dr Rosemarie Mallett to move Item 8 and she may speak for up to 10 minutes. We will then have a debate on the main motion as it currently stands for about 15 minutes or so and then we will move on to tackle the amendments, and then we will revert to the main motion as amended or not as the case may be. I hope that is reasonably clear. We will steer our way through it, it will be fine. I call upon Dr Rosemarie Mallett to move Item 8, then, she may speak for up to 10 minutes, thank you.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Good morning, Synod. As a member of the Mission and Public Affairs Council, I am really looking forward to the debate that follows on this very serious issue for our nation and for our parishes and for our young people. I am the incumbent of a parish in the Diocese of Southwark which is comprised of five inner city estates and with all the issues of social disadvantage that are often part and parcel of such areas and so this issue is close to my heart and to my parochial work.

When I moved to Angell Town in late 2007, I was also a relatively new mother and it has been mine and my daughter's home for the past 12 years. Our lives there have been bookended and punctuated by deaths of young people to serious youth violence. Their lives are often steeped in tragedy before ending tragically. I have conducted the funerals of too many young people and I prefer to be there supporting the living rather than presiding over the dead.

Soon after I arrived, I installed the first weapons bin in a Church of England parish right beside the church door. The knife bin was run by Word 4 Weapons, a charity which not only provides the bin but also offers a range of practical support and signposting resources for those who wish to access them, including a Bible. We knew that the bin would not solve the problem of knife crime in Angell Town but it was a practical and prophetic witness to the calling we have to be as peacemakers, and also a visible sign of hope.

Serious youth violence has risen over the last decade and 2018 saw nearly 40,000 offences in the United Kingdom, a two-thirds increase from 2014, and the highest number since comparable data has been collected. The current situation is at such a level in part because successive governments have failed to understand the causes of violent youth

crime. These include the pernicious nature of poverty and trauma, and risk factors like school exclusion and adverse childhood experiences, along with public sector disinvestment nationally and locally.

The government and many local authorities are attempting to rectify this by using a public health model, which includes working with community and faith groups. This model means that instead of simply using the criminal justice system as a punitive deterrent for what is a relatively small number of perpetrators, a broader raft of services to a much larger group is being provided to tackle risk factors and work to prevent youth violence in the first place.

It is widely recognised that many of those at risk of serious violence, both as perpetrators and victims, male and female, have grown up and have been shaped by trauma. According to research, more than 16% of young people do not feel safe at home and depression rates for gang-affiliated young people are twice as high as for others.

Adverse early-childhood experiences have a significant effect on children's lives, increasing the likelihood of violence by more than 10 per cent. Added to this, growing evidence also shows that those most vulnerable to serious youth violence, both as perpetrators and victims, are more likely to be either permanently excluded from school or off-rolled and sent to pupil referral units, which can be used as recruiting grounds by gangs.

We, of course, recognise the serious safeguarding concerns this raises, and the Children's Society has recently produced a report that states that victims of county lines child criminal exploitation are as young as aged seven.

We can sometimes see this as just an urban issue, but with middle-class drug-taking fuelling the rise in county lines drug trafficking, vulnerable young people are groomed and exploited to feed this lifestyle, and violent crime in our coastal, university and market towns has increased. One of the young men from my parish was moved, for safety, to Portsmouth and was shot dead there not long after.

So why do we think the Church should act? We must remember that the stories of violence among young people are not simply "their" stories, but that "they" are our stories, not only through our common creation in the image of God, but also because these young people are part of our communities, many either attending the Church school or living in the local area. One of our young men, killed at age 15, was confirmed the year earlier.

At present, churches are remarkably good at responding when a death occurs on our patch. Our contribution is mostly reactive, and this motion is calling upon the Church to be proactive and to really adhere to the fourth Mark of Mission which asks us to challenge

violence in all its forms and to see peace built up. There is already good news regarding some churches' response to this issue.

There are many churches throughout the country working with street pastors and some with school pastors. Churches in Kent have received funding for delivering a knife crime awareness programme across Medway schools. A number of churches in London Diocese and in Southwark have worked with Citizens UK on community safety issues. The call for safe havens, particularly after school, has been heard and a number of churches and organisations have already opened their doors in this way.

Despite these responses, we know the issue of serious youth violence can feel overwhelming for many priests and church leaders, already stretched by working to meet the wide range of social and spiritual needs of those in their care. But the Church is in a unique position and we should not let the potential for action go. We must be the Samaritan and not the Pharisee.

We have buildings in almost every community along with dedicated, passionate local people who want to see God's transforming love and reconciliation power at work in those places. In most places the Church has been there for generations, this is important. Being a place of stability and peace for families and individuals that lack both these in their lives is invaluable.

In some parishes, families of perpetrators and victims live side by side, and there the Church can be a place not only of pastoral care for individuals but also for repentance, forgiveness, healing and reconciliation with each other and with God. So, it seems manifestly obvious that the Church should care about the unnecessary and violent death of young people in our communities. What may seem less manifestly obvious is how.

This MPAC motion reflects diocesan motions from Southwark and London and more recently Birmingham and lays out how the Church can use its structures to play its part in tackling serious youth violence. We are calling upon National Church Institutions and dioceses and parishes to be a place of resource for those supporting individuals, families and whole communities impacted by serious youth violence. How this will look will depend on the context each church or diocese operates in, and it includes opportunities for dioceses, parishes and schools to take action.

In the motion we are calling for the Church of England schools to monitor, measure and report on exclusions and to encourage alternative strategies with the aim of keeping exclusions to an absolute minimum. As the second largest provider of state education in England, we believe the Church of England can make a significant contribution to wider work on exclusions.

We are asking that dioceses provide resources and training for their clergy and church leaders to support those affected by serious youth violence and to be aware of signs of vulnerability to county lines, sexual and gang exploitation and modern slavery.

Added to that, we have asked that dioceses work in partnership with civil society and para-church organisations to provide or signpost young people and their families to local pastoral support for violence prevention and mental health services. The paper that supports this motion recognises the key roles played by chaplains in all sectors, and asks dioceses to equip them with training in this area and also to support youth work both within and outwith the church.

And, finally, we know the amazing work already being undertaken by churches in partnership with a range of groups as they open their buildings to run night shelters and food banks. The accompanying paper highlights the need for local churches to open their buildings as places of sanctuary for young people and to work with others locally on violence prevention or intervention work.

In conclusion, when ---

The Chair: I am sorry, but the 10 minutes has expired. Thank you. The motion is now open for debate. There will be a speech limit initially of five minutes. I may need to cut that later on in the debate because quite a lot of people want to speak. But we'll start with five minutes for each speech. In the first place I would like to call Alistair McHaffie, please.

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

Revd Canon Alistair McHaffie (Blackburn): The introductory words of our motion acknowledge that serious youth violence affects the whole community. Let me just tell you how it has affected our community in recent weeks.

I am the vicar of an inner-city parish in Preston, and on Tuesday night a large part of our parish became subject to a 48-hour Section 54 Dispersal Order. This means that when the police are suspicious of any groups they are able to prevent groups of two or more gathering together and disperse them immediately.

This came about following a wave of antisocial behaviour by a group of some 30 young people, which culminated in them clashing with the police, throwing stones at the police and resulted in three arrests for public disorder offences. Last Friday, I heard from one of our street pastors, a 65-year-old lady, who told me they had been approached by three youngsters demanding chocolate. The youngsters know they carry chocolate, it is something that is meant for the sex workers on the streets. Within minutes they were surrounded by about 15 youngsters, some on bikes, mostly white males aged between

nine and 14, and despite attempts to engage with them, this group remained hostile to the street pastors, some frequently using the 'c' word, and two of the street pastors had their hats taken and spat in before being returned to them.

In the last few months, there have been two stabbings in our parish, the second of which resulted in a Section 50 Order, giving the police the powers to stop and search people that they may be suspicious of.

Gang culture has mushroomed in our area, and groups of young people are causing fear in many of our residents, especially the elderly and the vulnerable, and I am told by people who have lived in the parish for a long time that what is happening now is unprecedented. As already has been said, research tells us that this sort of violence ultimately stems from poverty and that is something that is very real where I am and has become increasingly real up and down our country.

I am told that 20 or 30 years ago our council employed over 90 youth workers of one sort or another, today they employ no youth workers. Young people without money and nowhere to go will seek to belong to some group or another and I think that is where we, the Church, can have a significant impact.

The last phrase of paragraph (a) in our motion appeals to National Church Institutions to make available resources for those affected, and at our last Synod, at the end of the debate on Estates Churches Evangelism, there was great enthusiasm that we support churches in our estates. Bishop Philip North warned us that it would cost us, but I want to suggest at the moment this is a crucial area in which we need to be investing.

As a Church we are in every community, we have buildings to offer, we have people who will volunteer to help, and we have a transformational Gospel that will change lives. But whilst we have volunteers, what we do not have is experts, and what we need is trained leaders for our volunteers to work with and to support: young men and women who have the training and skills to relate to those young people, to build bridges and build relationships between them and the local church. We need youth workers who can link these young people into the family of the church or into a family community where they can gain a sense of belonging.

Can we somehow find substantial funds to train up a significant number of people like that? You see, I think we have got far more to offer than any local council because we have the Gospel, and we need youth workers who can not only engage with disenfranchised young people, but who can share with them the good news of Jesus Christ, which can transform their lives.

Bishop Philip has told us that if there is going to be any spiritual revival in our nation, it will start with the marginalised. Well, it seems to me that young marginalised people are feeling more marginalised than ever, and I wonder if this might be an open door for the Gospel and for the transformation of our communities and nations if we can find the resources to help parishes in those situations. I encourage you to support this motion.

The Chair: I call upon one of our Ecumenical Representatives to address Synod, Bishop Joe Aldred and after him Kashmir Garton.

Bishop Dr Joe Aldred (Ecumenical Representatives): I bring you warm greetings from the community of Pentecostal and Charismatic Churches across the country on whose behalf I am here, and on whose behalf I welcome this debate on serious youth violence.

Eleven years ago, in 2008, Churches Together in England published “Who is My Neighbour?”, a Church response to social disorder, linked to gangs, drugs, guns and knives. It is available still on the CTE website. In his foreword to that report, the then Bishop of Liverpool, Dr James Jones, wrote of the “ruinous impact of racism, deprivation and low self-esteem on the lives of many inner-city youths, rendering them vulnerable to criminality as perpetrators and victims”.

The Report found that these challenges had already spread beyond so-called inner-city areas and that the knife had become a weapon of choice in youth violence. It called for society to step up efforts to tackle the underlying causes of the alarming trend of rising knife crime.

Pentecostals sometimes approach matters of life by recourse to the language of spiritual warfare, and Holy Scripture says, “We wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places”. This may assist in our approach to these issues.

The Report before you today reminds us, soberingly, that the challenges of serious youth violence are complex and deeply rooted in an unequal society. There are no quick fixes, no offer that we can make that can change anything in a snap. We might need to change our mindset and our approach: less reactive, more proactive, less energy spent on symptoms, more spent on addressing root causes.

This Report helpfully highlights some of the matters that stand in the way of youth flourishing: the well-established link between school exclusions and the likely descent into criminality and prison; the often-counterproductive use of pupil referral units; the alienation that Professor John writes of in the Report leading to a mindset of having nothing to lose and even less to gain; the lack of love and affirmation so many young people say they feel; the erosion of education and youth services necessary to support young people develop emotional and spiritual intelligence, values and morals.

Some parents tell me they feel that their role as primary educators and influencers of their children has been undermined. And there are the gang and drug overlords operating across county lines, mercilessly on hand to groom and exploit the most vulnerable, sometimes to their own deaths.

The challenges, friends, are many, and are not confined, as we have heard, to London, they are national and international. Our approach must match these challenges with innovation and determination and for the long haul. There are many people that I know, and many programmes, already involved in addressing youth empowerment. For many, this is their life's work of prayer and accompaniment. I am grateful to the Report for pointing to some immediate and practical things that we can do, such as installing knife bins and opening up our churches.

In closing, many live with the pain of losing young ones, or giving support to hurting, bereaved, bewildered parents and families, asking why, why did this happen to my son, my daughter, to my family? And I can assure Synod today that the Pentecostal and Charismatic Churches that sent me here wish to convey to you solidarity with you in this programme and hope that not only the Methodist Church, who passed a motion of accompaniment this week, but also all other denominations will join us in this life saving project.

The Chair: Kashmir Garton and then Jason Roach.

Ms Kashmir Garton (Worcester): I declare an interest in this motion, as I am a senior manager within the criminal justice system and the National Probation Service. In my work, I have seen the result of young people who have grown up experiencing broken relationships due to abuse or neglect, being moved between care homes, having poor educational experiences and poor health outcomes.

The loss of any child is tragic, and it is particularly tragic when that child's life is full of setbacks that adds to their isolation and vulnerability. It is such vulnerability that makes them susceptible to being drawn into gangs and county line groups that target such individuals.

The Church is in a unique position to be proactive in such situations as it exists in every parish community. It is present at key life events and is involved in the delivery of education in its Church schools, Sunday schools, toddler groups and youth groups.

I fully support this motion and, in particular, want to endorse the importance of working in partnership with statutory and voluntary organisations. In the Probation Service, we work with the highest-risk offenders from the age of 18. We recognise that we cannot address

all criminogenic needs by ourselves. We therefore work in partnership with drug agencies, police, health and education.

In the same way, the Church can take immediate steps to make communities safer, such as providing safe places for young people. However, the Church can be even more effective by working in partnership with voluntary and statutory agencies at diocesan, deanery and parish level. These agencies can provide specialist and expert input and advice so that safeguarding remains at the heart of the Church's mission. This work will require a culture change.

However, given the work that has already started to improve safeguarding within the Church, a significant next step should be the formalisation of partnership arrangements with key agencies. Such a step will provide a clear indication of the Church's holistic approach to safeguarding vulnerable people and its mission and outreach to create safer communities of which it is an essential part. Thank you.

The Chair: Jason Roach, and, after Jason has finished speaking, we will move on to deal with the amendments and then return to the debate after that. Thank you.

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): Another Synod and another week in which I have had to take my children to school a different route because the normal route was blocked by a police cordon; a police cordon that spoke of tragedy. As we have already heard, my story is not unique. This is a timely thing to be debating and I welcome GS 2132.

Rosemarie, you brought our attention to the fact that it is easy to be, on the one hand, either overwhelmed by the task or, on the other hand, to simply dismiss what we are trying to do as superficial. I just want to remind us that in this room we have one of the most powerful resources available in the whole of the universe, for we have in this room people crammed with compassion, packed with the power of the Holy Spirit, looking to the living Lord Jesus Christ. And when a young person encounters that, it can transform their life.

Let me tell you about one young man called Jeffrey. He struggled to control his anger, he was only 10 years old. One of the youth workers from my church spends an hour a week doing this guy's favourite thing, which is drawing pictures. All he needs is a pack of paper and some pens. As they draw, he reminds him that he is a young man made in the image of God, loved by God, like every young person on this planet. He tried to take this boy home. His mum was not in, still at work, and so agreed with another family that they would take him in for an hour or so. So, this boy went to this home of another family from the local church where their children played. Now, instead of hanging out on the street, he is now playing with other children.

And when the mum came back, it materialised that there was no food in the fridge, so this same family fed them a meal and in the midst of the chaos read from the Bible and heard from the lips of the Lord Jesus how when people hurled insults at him, he did not retaliate and yet bore our sins on the Cross. I have seen many children like Jeffrey over the years grow up on my estate. Life is not easy 10 years down the line, but this kind of low-key early intervention means that they have a network of support that is bigger and they look to a God who is larger.

The President of the Mothers' Union, Sheran Harper, said, as she shared her vision for their work, she hoped for one home at a time to be influenced; for one family at a time to be affected; for one life at a time to be changed. It may seem simplistic. It may seem like there is a lack of resources and speciality. We do need programmes, many of them, but, more than that, we have one of the most powerful resources right here: people crammed with compassion, packed with the Holy Spirit, looking to the living Lord who can transform lives. I commend us to get involved with the young people where we are. Thank you.

The Chair: We can move now on to dealing with the amendments which are on your Order Paper. As I said at the outset, we are going to start by hearing the speeches from the movers of Items 42 and 43 each in turn. They will put their case, but they will not move. This will allow Synod, in the first instance, to hear the overall arguments for both of these debates since Synod has to choose between them in the end; there is no possibility of them both being incorporated.

ITEM 42

The Chair: I will now call upon the Bishop of St Albans to speak but not to move Item 42.

The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): There is not any part of this country which is not affected by this dreadful problem and, indeed, we have seen exactly the same thing in Luton. Some of you may have seen the national stories on what the churches are doing there with the Phoenix created out of reclaimed knives, which has been a prophetic act in the middle of the town.

Why have I put an amendment in? I really wanted to support this motion, but my question was when I read it, and particularly clause (b), is, is it sufficient to ask Diocesan Boards of Education simply to "recognise" how the use of exclusion impacts on serious youth violence and encourage alternative provision? Now, of course, we all know there are many, many causes of serious violence - poverty, drugs and the country lines, lack of alternative activities for young people - but we also know there is a link, and it is not necessarily a causal link but there is certainly a correlation between exclusions and serious violence. My question is at which point and at how many points can we intervene where we might get a handle on this problem to nudge it in a better direction?

Church schools have a huge role to play and, of course, Church schools, above all, should be at the forefront of everything we are doing. I think most people involved with Church schools would say that every exclusion is a failure. How is it that some children are pushed out of schooling and, indeed, as Church schools, where we value each person uniquely, there is surely a call that we need to try to address this problem.

My amendment is simply suggesting that rather than “recognising” exclusions, we record and publish the number of exclusions annually. Not actually to shame people, but because we might be able to redirect resources. If we do not have data, it is very difficult to know how we can address problems. On the basis of those statistics, and, of course, we would have trends if we did it annually, we could devise strategies for minimising exclusions. That would be one way in which we can make a practical tangible difference.

I will not move my amendment, but that is the thinking behind it.

The Chair: Thank you. That is very helpful. I now invite the Revd Paul Hutchinson to speak but not to move Item 43, to complete this overview of the logic behind both of the amendments, and then we will proceed through the natural process.

ITEM 43

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): I wonder if I can offer a procedural way out, which is that I would consent to the division of my amendment by you, if you wished, so that the lapsing of paragraph (b) and my substantive proposal for an addition can be separated, so it could be possible that my addition could happen regardless of what happens with the Bishop of St Albans’ proposed amendments.

I am chair of a local governing body of a non-Church secondary school, and I have been involved in exclusion processes from various angles. It is right that we talk about exclusions as we talk about this serious issue in all its wider aspects. Exclusions have impacts on many different aspects of a child’s development, and our concern this morning, of course, is part of a bigger story. Exclusions need to be reduced for all kinds of reasons.

But if we have something to say about exclusions, it needs to be directed at the right people. Who has the power of exclusion? The headteacher. Who regulates the exercise of that power? School governors in three ways: by reviewing accumulated fixed terms; by involvement in appeals panels; and by setting the strategic direction, values and ethos of every school, Church or not. That setting of values might sometimes influence a headteacher’s approach to exclusions.

Those of us involved in exclusion processes know that hanging over it is the statutory guidance provided by the Department for Education - currently we are working on a September 2017 version. And now schools are adjusting to a new Ofsted inspection framework which comes into effect at the start of next term. We may not always love Ofsted, but they have clearly woken up to the damaging effects of exclusion, as well as the tendency of some schools, including some in large academy chains, to deploy exclusions quite extensively in pursuit of whatever statistics make for school improvement.

From September 2019, two paragraphs of the inspection handbook deal with how well the school recognises and deals with behaviour patterns, how much the school is doing to support pupils at risk of exclusion, whether the school is taking account of safeguarding risks to pupils who may be excluded. Ofsted will evaluate the prevalence of permanent exclusions in every school and the procedures and reasons that are around them, and Ofsted will visit offsite provision, as in fact they already do. I think we should all welcome that and the increased focus that Ofsted bring.

It seems to me that DBEs, though they are important contributors to the life of Church schools, are not the primary actors in the issues that we are discussing and, of course, their influence on schools depends upon schools being in the area. There are substantial parts of our country that either have no Church schools at all or perhaps have Church primary schools but no Church secondary schools anywhere close at hand.

It therefore seemed to me, when first proposing this amendment, that the DBEs were the wrong target, but I am prepared to live with them still being encouraged to recognise the prevalence. Recognising is a good thing; I learnt that one in a debate three years ago. The amendment I have put before Synod could certainly have been amplified and extended and qualified - I could have added cheesemakers and purveyors of other dairy products - but it is not legislation or statutory guidance, so I have tried to keep it simple.

I hope Synod will welcome it as a more direct statement to all those who have power and responsibility in the current system and not just as an in-house recommendation to Church schools, and so will accept it as a helpful enhancement of the wider themes and the outward looking nature of today's debate.

The Chair: I hope Synod now has the measure of what the two amendments are about and the logic that lies behind them. We now move on through the procedure. I now invite the Bishop of St Albans to move formally Item 42.

The Bishop of St Albans (Rt Revd Alan Smith): I do so move.

The Chair: Now I call upon Rosemarie Mallett to reply. She has five minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): I will not need it. This amendment tightens up what is in (b) of our motion and so we accept this amendment.

The Chair: I now throw the amendment open for debate. Is there anyone standing? Yes, Luke Miller.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): Before Rosemarie accepted this, I wanted to resist it rather because I want to talk about the complexity of the whole business of exclusion. Of course, we welcome this very serious debate in this extraordinarily complex and difficult area of how we respond to the needs of our young people and the violence that is found amongst so many of our communities. The National Society is, of course, working on the whole business of growing in faith and of that tripod of support for young people between home, church and family. I should declare an interest as the Chairman of the London Diocesan Board for Schools.

Exclusion is, and can be, a really important point at which home and school meet, because it is a point at which the parents must come in. My wife, who works as a primary school teacher, has been saying in texts to me that: “While knives are extreme, I teach 11-year-olds and every year I’ve taught I’ve faced makeshift weapons being held in anger in school, everything from scissors to chairs. Most parents won’t believe what’s going on. It’s an opportunity for me to meet them under the framework that is provided”. Schools, of course, already collect the data on exclusions, they report it to their governing bodies and they put it out publicly, and so what the Bishop of St Albans is calling for should not be too difficult for us to be able to do very straightforwardly.

We have other challenges in other ways to engage with this whole area. To work with young people across the whole range of their experience is important. In a world where so much youth work is being cut back, let us not forget the other piece of engagement with other bits of society and the uniformed youth groups where so many wonderful volunteers work to provide precisely that sense of belonging, of structure, of hierarchy that is what so many young people are seeking and finding in an evil and wicked place and which can be offered in a good and holy place; a place which so often is calling for engagement from the Church, from chaplaincy and from provision of space to meet and of volunteers to help to lead. Uniformed youth organisations cannot get the amount of leaders that they need to serve the number of children who want to be part of their groups. Let us recognise the complexity in school and in homes and in the wider parts of society and let us work for the good of our young people, and let us not take away some of the tools that are there to enable us to help those connections to be formed, and the structures around exclusion are actually one of them, much as we want to see all of our children in all our schools all the time.

The Chair: Thank you. Mr Freeman and then – I am sorry, I do not know your name, but you will be next.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I wonder why we need this particular amendment. I have been a school governor for 40-odd years, I am a member of the local schools forum and its finance group. We regulate all the funds that go to all the schools in the borough. Schools, Church schools, academies, all of their money passes through our fingers.

I am concerned about the people that we are most concerned about, the ones who drop out of everything. They will not go to Church things, they will not go to uniformed organisations, but they will turn up if you open the door for them to come in, chat, pour out their woes to somebody who can talk to them. Now, an old codger like me is no good at all, but in our local community centre, which I manage, we have a girl who is brilliant at it. The first speaker complained about lack of cash. The only people who do not have their hands tied as to how much money they can raise are parish councils. There is no capping on them. We jacked ours up quite a bit recently for all sorts of good reasons and we give 5% grant, no strings attached, to the community centre which does this work and keep some of them on the straight and narrow.

We have a scheme with the local secondary schools to work on reducing exclusions. Every year you can ring up your local authority and they are obliged to give you the data. It is all published and all readily available. The schools work together. We have been working on dropping exclusions. We entertain some of those who will not engage with school in the community centre during the day where they can be educated one-to-one and keep them on the straight and narrow. You need imaginative solutions and to nag your parish councils for some cash.

I would not support this amendment but the second one is okay.

Dr John Appleby (Newcastle): I was a governor of a Fresh Start Church of England secondary school in the west end of Newcastle for its full life of 12 years. I welcome the idea that we should make data clearly available, but we have to keep our eyes open as to the consequences of that. Just as doctors publishing data on the failure rates of operations can be exposed because sometimes the surgeons with the highest failure rates are the ones undertaking the most risky operations, and that should not then be taken as a negative about them, the same can be true with schools.

The school of which I was a governor started as a very poor secondary and huge efforts were made and it improved enormously while the government continued to move the goalposts so that we failed and failed despite increasing three/ five/six times the success rate of GCSE. That meant that a lot of particularly families with fewer problems avoided the school because it continued to look like a failing school despite its very good work.

In this context, my point is that some of the surrounding schools, and this was a point made by Paul Hutchinson a few moments ago, in trying to improve their own league table position I got the impression that they lent on people to leave rather than excluding them and thereby moved some of their most troublesome pupils to our school which then had an unusually high proportion of difficult pupils. We did our very best to minimise exclusions, but inevitably we had exclusions because we had a large number of difficult pupils and had to maintain the safety and wellbeing of all the others.

If you take the raw statistics, in some cases the schools that are doing the best will have what seem like the worst figures. Just as the Archbishop of York said, when he was open and honest and then got attacked with little support, if a school has poor statistics but for good reasons, it must have support.

The Chair: I call upon Elizabeth Paver.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): I would urge Synod to reject this amendment on the grounds that I think that the proposer, the Bishop, said it himself: this could be seen, as Mr Appleby has just said, as very punitive. We know what local press can do. We have experienced in the past, through Ofsted reports, through all sorts of information, that they will grasp the bare statistics and schools will be vilified. In the second amendment we are covering much of that and the main amendment.

This has been a wonderful opportunity to debate this serious, serious situation that is affecting all our schools. If I can just say, while I am here, this is not just in secondary schools, it is now in primary schools and it is the primary pupils who are being goaded into behaviours. I really believe that the Church has such an important voice in saying that we are going to work with all the churches and we are going to open our churches and make them places of sanctuary.

I felt that any school that I was involved in had to be an oasis; an oasis that provided something that the community could not provide. I urge you to resist this amendment and let us go with the main motion and the second amendment.

The Chair: I am very conscious of the time and very conscious of the fact that we have other amendments on the Order Paper. I would also like to be able to move back to the main motion, as amended or not as the case may be, for some discussion before we vote on it. I see one person standing. If there is only one other person standing we might hear that and then I will be asking if Synod is minded to vote on this amendment, conscious of the time as I am. Thank you very much. You will have just three minutes as we are squeezing you in, as it were.

Mrs Sarah Beach (Salisbury): I will be brief. I declare an interest as, being a teacher, I have taught children who are excluded from school. Could I just point out that we do not exclude children lightly? It is very much a feeling of failure as a teacher when children are excluded. They have exhausted all of a school's emotional, educational and pastoral resources. It gets to the point where we do not know what else to do.

I feel that I fully understand why the Bishop has brought this amendment. My only question would be: what are you going to do with the figures? Once you have got them, that is fine. If it is going to cause you to plough some money into resourcing these excluded children, marvellous. If it is just going to be a case of looking at those figures and saying, "Oh my goodness me, what a lot of children", so what?

The Chair: I see no one else standing so we will move to the vote on this particular amendment, Item 42. All those in favour, please show. All those against, please show.

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

The Chair: Then the amendment falls. We move on to Item 43, therefore, and I ask Revd Paul Hutchinson formally to move this amendment.

Revd Paul Hutchinson (York): I do move the item standing in my name.

The Chair: Now we move on to Rosemarie Mallett to respond to this. She has five minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): As I looked at this amendment and picked out what it called headteachers and school governors and those who formulate exclusion processes to do, it called upon them to recognise how the use of fixed term and permanent exclusion impacts upon serious youth violence, and that is all it does, to "recognise".

We want our schools to take action and we specifically want our Diocesan Boards of Education, our Church schools, to take action, not only in recognising them, not only in terms of gathering statistics, but research undertaken in Southwark last year looked at what was happening in our schools and then worked proactively to try to see how schools could minimise - minimise - the use of exclusions by other means. In a non-Church school not too far from me they are using some forms of internal areas in the school where children who previously would have been excluded are able to access alternative education strategies but also care from the school's support mentor so that some of the other issues that the young people are facing are dealt with in the schools.

As a governor of a primary school and a former governor of a secondary school, I absolutely know how challenging it is and how difficult it is when you have to finally speak with a student and her or his parents and the people they have brought with them to tell them that their child will be excluded from the school. It is heart-wrenching, and nobody wants to do it. If schools can find alternative provision within the school to avoid exclusions, where possible, this is partly what saying that we want to have a strategy to minimise exclusions or encourage alternative provision is about. This particular motion focuses specifically on recognising the use of those exclusions and how they impact on serious youth violence. We would like more than reactive, something proactive to be done in our schools, and, on that basis, I do not accept this amendment.

The Chair: The proposer of the main motion is indicating that she does not accept this amendment and it will lapse unless there are 25 people standing in their place or otherwise indicating if they are not able to stand. If there are 25 or more so indicating we will continue the debate, otherwise this amendment will lapse. Do I see 25 people standing? I do see 25 people standing so the amendment is open for debate. There will be a speech limit of three minutes from now on right through until the end of this session because we are getting tight for time.

The Chair: Penny Allen please and then – the Archbishop is standing. May I invite the Archbishop and then Penny Allen.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): This amendment actually picks up bits of the Bishop of St Albans' amendment and (b), so I think it is more comprehensive. It is not simply recognising but asks the people involved to find alternatives.

I am going to give you an example. The Sentamu Academy when it came into being was led by an amazing head teacher Andrew Chubb. He realised that in the school he had in east Hull exclusions not only in his school but the schools around were actually damaging the lives of young people. He found some funding and set up a place called Aspire which takes in nearly all excluded secondary school pupils in Hull, and, you know what, when it was inspected by Ofsted, they marked it as outstanding. The reason is because children who have been excluded are taught in much smaller groups and have a much higher pupil teacher ratio and a head teacher who is doing wonderful things. Aspire has become one of those wonderful things.

I want to suggest on the alternatives that need to be had, they should come to look at a place like Aspire that has taken on excluded pupils. When their behaviour and attitude begin to change they can be integrated back into the school where they were before, but

it is achieving an amazing change in east Hull. The motion for me has a bit of Aspire in it and I hope you will support it because it is not just about recognising but asking head teachers, parents, governors and local authorities to work out where would our excluded pupils go. If you simply create another class within the school which they have been disrupting, I am afraid it will not work. They need to be in a totally fresh new environment with very clear care and work. If that can be done in east Hull, I tell you friends, it can be done anywhere. I support the amendment.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I am a retired teacher in state schools all my life. I am a governor of a state school as well. Please support this amendment. Ofsted is making a very important change and acknowledgement of the way in which young people at the moment are seriously affected by mental health problems, deprivation and poverty. Unfortunately, for some of them, they are being excluded from school mainly for safeguarding reasons for other pupils which we have to take very seriously in schools now, and safeguarding reasons for staff also.

The Archbishop is quite right to say that there are particular difficulties in keeping some young people inside the school environment and this amendment asks to look for alternative strategies. That is very important for those young people who do not like to acknowledge authority, who do not like to be in the company of their peers because they feel, for various reasons, unsafe or insecure in that environment. There is a desperate need for some pastoral counselling for these young people. The school nurse used to be the person who in most secondary schools saw these young people and offered them some counselling and help, and could flag up the other services. Sadly, the school nurse service has collapsed.

I am a member of a district and parish council. We are acknowledging ourselves that there are serious problems for our young people and trying to step up counselling, because one in four of our young people now is self-harming. This is not a problem to be taken lightly. Ofsted is recognising it. The exclusions issue is of particular importance for staff as well. It hurts staff wellbeing to have to exclude young people from school. Thank you to my teaching colleague who also spoke about this.

We have an urgent need for chaplains in secondary schools and primary schools. We have an urgent need for Ofsted to look very seriously at pupil referral units and the way in which they operate. We have an urgent need to look for church funding to assist people and in my own community, just to add to John Freeman's point, I am a member of a youth club committee that has accessed funding through the Police and Crime Commissioners Fund because they are seriously worried about violent crime. There are other avenues of funding that can be explored. I would ask you to support this amendment wholeheartedly because it affects every school in the country.

Canon Elizabeth Paver (Sheffield): Point of order Madam Chair. Under Standing Order 24 there is provision for division of text. The proposer has already perhaps suggested to Madam Chair it might be an opportunity to do this for this amendment. Under Standing Order 24, "Before putting a question to the vote, the Chair may with the general consent of Synod, direct that separate votes are taken on the text divided into two parts". We could therefore retain (b) and have (c). Perhaps this is a way forward, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you for that. I am advised that we are where we are with the amendment on the paper and part way through the debate and we should proceed with the matter as it stands. We will hear the speech that I invited just now and then we will have to consider voting because we have another amendment to deal with before we get to the end of this debate.

Mr Jacob Vince (Chichester): The point that I want to make is this: in paragraph (a) it refers to the National Church Institutions recognising and in paragraph (b) the Diocesan Boards of Education recognising, these are the corporate structures. Then it calls upon the head teachers and school governors to recognise. To some extent it will fit better after (b) and before (c) but it does not matter where it goes. The point is we are bringing it down much closer, not just organisational but where the head teachers and school governors are involved in the aspect itself.

The other thing is that it works in line with the Ofsted inspection framework and indeed is more than just recognising there is a need to develop alternative strategies, so bringing that into the motion assists. I am in favour of the amendment as is. It would probably fit better before (c) as (c) and then making (c) (d) but I do not think we can change that at this point.

The Chair: Thank you. I see no one else standing – I *do* see someone else standing. You may have three minutes. I think we are going to have to say we really do move to the vote then because we will run out of time otherwise.

Revd Canon Jonathan Alderton-Ford (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I will not keep you long. I am concerned about the nature of this debate in that it seems to be saying that the principal problem here is both poverty and exclusion. I work in one of the nicest parishes in the whole of the Church of England according to our own scale. There are huge problems with violence. Not every child who is excluded commits violence. Violence does not always happen outside the school; it happens inside the school. Schools have a duty of care to protect all their pupils and their staff.

One of the reasons why there is a high turnover of staff across the nation is the horrible conditions in which they have to work because they struggle to cope with the violence and other matters they face. It would be sad if this Synod seemed to be saying, "If we

could only hide the problem by shifting all the children back into schools this problem will be solved". It is much more complex than that. I am reluctant to name and shame through exclusions and I am concerned that this motion does not really help the problem. Greater thinking is needed. That is why I think the proposer of the main motion was right to resist it and I think I would ask Synod to resist it too.

The Chair: I see no one standing so we will move to vote on Item 43. All those in favour, please show. All those against, please show. The motion is lost.

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

ITEM 44

The Chair: We are now back to dealing with Item 44, which is another amendment, and I invite Mr Gavin Oldham to speak to this amendment and to move it. You have three minutes. We are under serious pressure of time.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): I am founder and Chair of the Share Foundation which runs the junior ISA and child trust fund schemes throughout the United Kingdom on behalf of the Department for Education. We act as the registered contact for about 40,000 young people in care. There is a strong correlation between knife crime and looked-after young people and the gang formation which is so prevalent in serious youth violence. For looked-after children, and I would suggest for many others, it starts with a deep yearning for a sense of belonging as a result of being passed from carer to carer and from school to school, not to speak of the exclusions referred to in the Report.

I recall meeting with Kriss Akabusi, who was in care himself, and he told me that the yearning was so deep that it could easily have taken him into the underworld of gang culture, but he joined the army instead, had a great sergeant major who took him under his wing, and he never looked back. Again, I have heard a graphic first-hand account of the trauma of families wrenched apart, from a university academic care leaver who described a whole day in tears to put the stress of years of childhood insecurity and instability behind her.

If there is one yearning that the Church can answer it is that deep yearning for a sense of belonging. I think we heard some of that from Jason Roach when he spoke of being crammed with compassion. Of course, we are doing a lot of that now, and not just the Church but the Children's Society and others. We need to do so much more, particularly in areas of acute disadvantage such as urban estates where we have already accepted that our presence is not good. We need government to help make that happen. Some 40% of care leavers end up not in education, employment or training, and it would help

hugely if there could be a structured programme to help young people find that belonging, perhaps by joining in the Church's social action work.

Of course, we can go it alone and, if so, I am sure there will be some great local initiatives, but from my regular conversations with the Department for Education and my personal knowledge of the very good Children's Minister Nadhim Zahawi, I can assure you that there is a real will to make this happen across the country. Furthermore, the Share Foundation has connections with all 211 local authorities and we can help build bridges between those local authorities and local churches throughout England. The downstream problems resulting from youth insecurity and instability are shared problems. There is so much we can do to help but so much more if we work with government to help solve the root cause; that deep yearning for a sense of belonging. Please, I ask you, will you support my amendment.

The Chair: I call upon Rosemarie Mallett to respond. She has three minutes.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Thank you, Mr Oldham, for your amendment. Your amendment sharpens up our desire to work in partnership. We have spoken about the need for churches and dioceses to work collaboratively to build a nexus of support. This sharpens up our desire to work in partnership with the government, and particularly with the group you focus on, those in care and those leaving care, with their lack of belonging and sense of alienation, and if we can find ways to work collaboratively to build for them a better future. We accept this amendment and hope that if it is passed we look forward to working with you and the work that you do with Share.

The Chair: This amendment is now open for debate. If anyone wishes to contribute to the debate there will be a speech limit of two minutes.

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): Thank you for calling me. I am conflicted with this amendment. Of course it is a good thing to call upon government to address issues of belonging, but better that we take the action that is within our control within this place, as highlighted by Jason Roach. We are made in the image of God - Father, Son and Holy Spirit - called to be in community dependent upon each other, which means as we grow closer to God we grow closer to each other and to our communities. Better that we walk into our communities and we work with our partners, including local government, to help our young people belong.

This is not just for our cities. We have heard how our young children dying has its roots in the recreational drug-taking in our more affluent areas. There too is an issue of belonging to which our churches can contribute. There are good examples across London and our other cities where churches, working with police, local government, education and volunteers, have made a difference.

Rather than call upon government, I call upon each one of us to take and use our resources to make the difference to young people's lives, not to our communities but with our communities, and to help our young people to find a sense of belonging within the love of Christ. At a recent pan-London summit of churches response, in her presentation, a former XLP charity youth worker said, "It takes a village to raise a child, but the same village can also kill the child. A young person can burn the village down to feel its warmth". Let us be the change that we long to see.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Over Christmas 2018 "Knife Angel", a huge artwork with 100,000 knives collected as a result of police amnesties across the country stood outside Liverpool Cathedral. It has been created to draw society's attention to the impact of knife crime. It was at the instigation of Rob Jackson who was a chorister and lay clerk of Liverpool cathedral, who is a nurse clinician and who has met so many young people affected by knife crime. As the "Knife Angel" towered over our nativity scene outside the cathedral, it was a strong reminder that God wants to see justice in our world.

I support this amendment because it brings in the government. I hope that in those discussions that we will have with the government they will see it is not just about the yearning of young people to belong; it is also the rise of knife crime, a direct impact of their policies of austerity. When Sure Start schemes are cut so dramatically, when the toxic roll-out of universal credit, when the benefit cap takes effect, when there are food banks and young people are hungry, surely we should say austerity has been a factor in the rise of knife crime.

I support this amendment so that it can open a discussion with the government on how we can all work together to make a bigger difference in our world.

The Chair: After the next speaker we will be thinking about a motion for closure on this part of debate in order to vote upon it.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): I want to vote against this and I want to urge us to vote against it, not because of the focus on government, although I actually agree with the Bishop of London that it is us who should be taking this initiative, and therefore I would resist it on that basis, but my focus here is to say I do not want us to send a message that this is all about gangs. Gangs are involved but our background paper was very strong that this is not just about gangs. I think the message that we as Church are against gangs is not going to be a helpful one.

We have done a lot of work on this in Luton where I live and work. The Bishop of St Albans has already referred to our "Knife Phoenix", which can go easily against your "Knife Angel", Pete Spiers, it has got some real attitude. I carry in my heart the words of one of our parishes, one of our outer estates, St Hugh's Lewsey, which has seen

considerable numbers of people coming in over recent years from a background of violent crime, serious youth violence, survivors, victims and perpetrators. They are beginning a project called “Lives before knives”, launching in just a couple of weeks’ time. But their organisers said to me, “Please don’t let the emphasis be on what young people are doing wrong. Don’t let the emphasis be on gangs. Don’t let the emphasis be on the negative. Let’s draw people in, a place where people can come and find hope and life”, and that is the message I bring.

The Chair: Thank you. I now wish to test the mind of Synod on whether Item 44 has been sufficiently debated, bearing in mind our time constraints. I therefore put the motion for closure on Item 44. Those in favour for the motion of closure, please show. Those against, please show.

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

The Chair: The motion is carried and therefore we will have a vote on Item 44. Those in favour, please show. Those against, please show. The amendment is lost.

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

The Chair: We return for a few moments to further debate on the main motion as it stands, unamended after all that. Michael Stallybrass – you have two minutes and after Michael Stallybrass, Catherine Pickford please.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): We have heard a number of speakers talking about the need to open our churches as places of sanctuary. I just want to tell Synod about how struck I was a fortnight ago when I was in Oslo. The Norwegian Church (recently disestablished) has clearly been going through quite a heart-searching exercise as to what their place in society is. On the Friday night that we were in Oslo, we found the cathedral was open. Every Friday night, the cathedral is open as a place of sanctuary, as a place where people can get counselling from 6 pm until 10 am on the Saturday morning. And it was quite clear that it was providing a real need, it was satisfying a real need for people who were coming throughout the night seeking help from the pastoral team who were there. It is not easy to do, but I was so encouraged by the way that that church was responding to a need in their society. Thank you.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of Order. Due to the time schedule for this morning would you be willing to accept a motion for closure after the next speaker?

The Chair: I would indeed, thank you.

Revd Catherine Pickford (Newcastle): Thank you for this motion which I wholeheartedly support. I would also like to pick up Bishop Sarah and Jason Roach's point about the capacity within ourselves to make a difference. The Venerable Bede Church in Newcastle's West End was a small struggling congregation on the edge of the city. One of its main challenges was disruptive young people. They climbed on the roof and they left the needles from their drug use around the building and they damaged the church. The shrinking congregation felt threatened and they were frightened to go to church sometimes.

Then some bright spark suggested that they ask the young people what it was they needed and wanted and from that conversation came a youth project aimed at children aged eight to 25 with the express purpose of building relationships with young people before they dropped out of school so that they would have a safe place to go on the estate and an alternative to drug use and gangs.

It was a wonderful thing not only for the young people but also for the congregation. I came for interview to be vicar of that parish a few years after the youth project was set up and it was clear from the parish profile and the questions asked at interview how much the story the church told about itself had been transformed by those young people and that project. They no longer saw themselves as a small impoverished church clinging to survival in a difficult area. They saw themselves as a church engaged in the life of the community that needed them and they wanted a vicar to support and share that vision. It was irresistible and I stayed for 11 years.

Earlier this year, the Church Urban Fund and Theos and the Church of England launched the Grace Project which explores the link between social action, discipleship and church growth. It is a programme of research to help us understand how these fit together in our communities across the country. Social action is not an optional extra, an also-ran which happens after we have done our mission and evangelism.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of Order. Would you be willing to accept a motion for closure at this point in time?

The Chair: I would indeed. Does that proposal have the consent of Synod?

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

The Chair: In which case the debate will draw to a close. I will ask Rosemarie to reply to the debate. She has just two minutes in which to do that. Then we will put the motion to the vote.

Revd Canon Dr Rosemarie Mallett (Southwark): Thank you to everyone, Synod, for your valuable contributions and your responses to the debate on this issue. Within the two minutes I am not going to be able to mention many of the things that you have raised.

You will know that this debate has received much attention in the media in the lead up to the Synod meeting as, sadly, the number of incidences of serious youth violence on our streets is not abating. There was another death in London yesterday.

What you will not know is the huge numbers of responses I have received from individuals, groups and churches around the country either just in support or asking what they can do. The potential for Church to offer space has touched a vein in our common understanding of what the Church is for and the role it can play in the lives of vulnerable young people. Being able to use our own structures to not only respond to human need and to seek to work with others to challenge violence and bring peace and reconciliation is powerful, and that is why the motion calls upon the National Church Institutions, dioceses and parishes to act in a contextually appropriate way to the issue of youth violence. We all have a part to play, whether the issue is on our doorstep or not.

I am going to end where I was going to end before. When Bishop Paul Bayes talks of the Kingdom of God, he says: "What is the Church about? To see more people knowing Jesus and more justice in the world". At present in the Church we rightly have an emphasis on building up the Kingdom through the development of new worshipping communities. We are seeking for a concomitant approach to social action and social justice. This motion calls for us to work collaboratively to provide opportunities in schools and churches and in community halls and community groups to support young people who may fall prey to serious youth violence and to be part of a nexus of support that will give these what thankfully remain - and this is important - a relatively small number of young people the chance for a more hope-filled future, for, as Jesus said, the Kingdom of Heaven belongs to people such as these. I am very pleased to formally move the motion standing in my name.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): Point of Order. Given the wide interest in this, would you order a count of the whole Synod?

The Chair: I am minded to do that, yes.

The motion was put and carried, 315 voting in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions.

The Chair: That concludes this item of business on the agenda. We move now to Item 9: Clergy Wellbeing.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 11.20 am.

ITEM 9

CLERGY WELLBEING (GS 2133)

The Chair: We come now to Item 9: an update on progress from the Clergy Wellbeing Working Group. This is a presentation under Standing Order 107. I should draw members' attention to an error in the agenda - there will not be an opportunity for questions, but there will of course be an opportunity to contribute to the debate on the motion at Item 10. I now invite Canon Butler to introduce Item 9.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): It is actually Jacqueline Stamper, Vice Chair of the Working Group, if I may, Chair. Thank you to the Presidents and the Business Committee for this opportunity to make a presentation ahead of the debate on Clergy Care and Wellbeing.

Our Report reflects extensive consultation, but what remains unchanged is the centrality to the wellbeing and flourishing of the clergy, and all Christ's disciples, of healthy relationships and mutual trust. That is why we propose the Shared Commitments and the Big Conversation. Between us - bishops, lay people, clergy, the local and wider church - we commit to supporting and caring for one another. The way we do that best is by talking to one another about the things that matter and that make life and ministry more fulfilling and less stressful.

While there may well be questions that are better answered in the context of the formal debate, the Covenant, with its associated proposals and recommendations, is in essence about the quality of our relationships, so we want to use this presentation to model the Big Conversation underpinning the Shared Commitments.

Here in the Synod chamber we have a bishop, Tim Thornton, the Bishop at Lambeth, representing Bishop John Thompson of Selby from the Working Group, who has another commitment this morning and so apologises that he cannot be here; a lay person, Jan Korris, from St Luke's Healthcare for the clergy; and a priest, Simon Butler, a parish priest; each ready to demonstrate in the light of the contents of the Report something of what each would like to say to the others as part of a Big Conversation about clergy care and wellbeing that we hope to see taking place. We hope this will give you a glimpse of our approach to clergy care and wellbeing and demonstrate the relational heart of our work and this proposal. Jan, what would you like to say?

Ms Jan Korris (Trustee of St Luke's Healthcare): Jacqueline, I would like to say to Simon, the priest: "In ministry there will always be more to be done than is possible to achieve, and it is easy for you to feel overwhelmed by the demands. To thrive, you need to set

healthy boundaries that enhance the quality of your relationships and to ensure the longevity of your calling”.

In the challenges and complexity of ministry what has been noticeably absent, and something that the Covenant wishes to address, is a real focus on preventive measures, things that can underpin positive wellbeing and best practice. Developing a coherent strategy for this needs to be a shared task between you, the clergy, your lay colleagues and the wider Church.

Simon, I would say to you don't try and go it alone. Seek out those who can support and challenge both your spiritual and psychological growth. Honour your physical needs and prioritise your family and friends. And remember that the greatest gift you can offer us is the inspiration of a flourishing life marked by a capacity to choose, to change and to grow. The Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing is here to support this.

Bishop Tim, I would say to you that the flourishing of your diocese will be in direct relationship to your own state of wellbeing, both modelled and expressed. You need to talk openly about your own boundary setting and your own self-care. You need, too, to have preventative care at the forefront of your mind. As a bishop, I am particularly conscious of the strains upon you of dealing with safeguarding issues that come up, and I exhort you to be aware of your needs in advance of the inevitable demands of the experience. Everything I said to Simon as a priest will be also applying to you in the role of bishop, but, in addition, your ministry requires a quality of discernment of how, and to whom, you delegate some of your pastoral care commitment, so ensure that your diocese has a clearly set up, defined and implemented wellbeing policy, with a named person to hold the key role and with access to resources.

But, of course, no amount of strategy and process will be effective without a diocesan culture that reflects its intent, so make sure that the pastoral relationships flourish, where there is timely and meaningful communication in a diocese, where the bishop knows his or her clergy and is demonstratively mindful of them. The Working Group decided to add the word “Care” to its title because we know you, as a bishop, are unable to resolve all the wellbeing issues of your clergy but you can enable them to feel that you care.

To both Simon and to Tim, bishop and priest, celebrate your humanity, I would say, sustained as it is by transcending grace, and remember that self-care is not the same as self-interest; it is not just beneficial to you, it is beneficial to others and to God.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): How do you respond to that, Simon?

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Putting this together, I thought: “What do I want to say to you, Jan, and to you, Tim, as colleagues and representatives of partners in

ministry and, through you, to my own congregation and bishop to try to relate more closely?"

I would begin by saying to you, Jan, thank you. I am an activist in ministry, and it is very easy to rush on by without taking the time to acknowledge the work that others do. In the past few months, Jan, you and your other non-ordained colleagues in the Working Party have brought insight and wisdom from the world in which you work that has caused me to stop and think about what I am doing. In that, you have modelled care of me. That prompts me to thank those in my own ministry who have shown that care and support, who do not just treat me as a deliverer of ministry but as a human being, who have allowed me to be the minister that I am, warts and all, but who have helped me to become a better person, a better Christian and a better priest.

What I think the Covenant is asking of the non-ordained people in my network is to show your love and commitment to me by seeing the Simon in my priesthood and the priesthood in a Christ-like but still Simon-like way. That involves challenging me to be better but also helping me to do that. I think I want to say to lay people take time to find out who the people are behind the collar. Do not let us get away with hiding behind the role. Do ask us about where we are with God and our vocation from time to time too.

Tim, any relationship with a bishop for a priest is complicated. You carry all sorts of roles and projections that we place upon you: father figure, mother figure, teacher, counsellor, boss, career adviser, discipliner, pastor - I could go on. But I would say to you, Tim, and through you to my bishop, that I need to see you behind the role. I need to know your struggles. I need to know how you handle those projections. I need to know that in all the challenges you face in being a 21st century bishop that you consider it among your highest priorities to serve as pastor to your clergy, not as a strategy for mission and growth but as a Christ-like response to your fellow ordained ministers. That might mean doing the simple things - picking up the phone, dropping in when passing, building in time to waste with us. We have not spent our time in the Working Group slagging you off - God knows you get enough of that - but we do, above all, long for you to be seen to look after yourselves better than you appear to do at the moment.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): What do you make of that, Tim?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton): First, I want to say to John Thomson, the Bishop of Selby, a very big thank you for landing me in this! It is very caring of you!

But seriously, and channelling my inner John, throwing in a few of my own words, as a Bishop I want to say this to lay people. We are partners in the Gospel called to love one another. We flourish when we work together and care for each other. Most clergy I meet

love what they are doing and love the communities they serve. However, they have a tough calling today, with complex, multi-focal roles, often living in a goldfish bowl within a society which does not really get what they are about. I am disappointed by the clericalism and deference that still exists and the hard work we still have to do for which this Covenant, I think, is one step to help us all treat each other as human beings.

Caring for clergy wellbeing means cherishing them so that they can give of their best. Realistic expectations about their role, respect for personal and household privacy, affirming their need for recreation, helping them to take a weekly rest day, an annual retreat and regular holidays, praying for them, and listening to them, especially when things are difficult, make all the difference.

As a Bishop, I want to say this to the clergy. I reckon the Clergy Care Bible Verse is Acts Chapter 20, verse 28: "Watch over yourselves and over all the flock of God of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers..." It is not selfish to care for ourselves because in so doing we are able to care for others.

Ministry today can be tough, and often we feel pulled from pillar to post, so it is even more important to take regular rest, exercise often, eat good grub, take holidays, go on an annual retreat, have a weekly rest day and try to keep a hobby or interest going if we are going to give our best. Ministry can feel isolating, so having a spiritual director and a support group, reflecting on what is going on regularly with wise people, nourishing ourselves with Continuing Ministerial Development and setting realistic targets and boundaries really matters if we are to keep going for the long run.

For myself, Tim Thornton, I would add that I do think - and have thought for a long time - that we should all be in professional supervision and that we should think very hard about why we appear to be so keen to work in isolation and talk about working on our own when there are so many wonderful people in our lives called laity who are also fellow human beings.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): Thank you. We think that this sort of conversation and supportive challenge and dialogue is genuinely possible and potentially enriching for everyone involved. There is much more to say, of course, and we can only highlight a few things that need to be talked through together.

I would now like to invite Jan, Simon and Tim to offer just one thing to their fellow priests, bishops and lay people that they would like to share in the light of this document before Synod today. Jan, let us start with you. What would you want to say to your fellow lay people?

Ms Jan Korris (Trustee of St Luke's Healthcare): To my fellow lay members of the Church I would say that we can be key providers of care and support for the clergy. The price does not have to be high. Better care does not necessarily mean more care. It means a different approach, perhaps defined by quality rather than quantity.

As you will recall, *Setting God's People Free* speaks of seeking to affirm and enable the complementary roles and vocations of clergy and the lay people. Continuing this theme, the Covenant sets out its Big Conversation. It is an opportunity for us as lay people to engage at every level with the minister and the wider Church to enhance the wellbeing of clergy.

Surprisingly, some of the requests are really quite simple, such as asking the minister how best to offer support, not making assumptions; ensuring that we do not intrude upon their household, respecting their space; and offering encouragement for a role where the unending demands seem rarely matched by gratitude and affirmation.

The Covenant offers us a structure and a way forward to challenge unhelpful patterns and create new ways of being together. It is an opportunity to support our ministers to flourish and, in so doing, to energise the parishes and the work of the wider Church.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): Simon, to your clergy colleagues?

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): It has been ironic, Jacqueline, that as I have been preparing this presentation I have had one of the most demanding periods of pastoral ministry I have faced for a long time. I have conducted four funerals in the past two weeks, three of whom were people I helped prepare for their death. There are two others I am seeing who will die soon too. Every ordained minister will have times like that. The irony is, of course, I have not had a lot of time to look after myself, but I must ensure that very soon I take that time. So what I want to say to clergy colleagues is this: before it is anyone else's responsibility to care for you, it is your responsibility and it is mine. The Covenant will not make a blind bit of difference if you and I do not start with ourselves. Let others help you too. Of course, some of us are not great at that. But it does begin with you.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): Tim, to your brother and sister bishops?

The Bishop to the Forces (Rt Revd Timothy Thornton): As a Bishop I want to say to fellow Bishops "Hello"! What a shower, I tell you!

"In my brief time as a Bishop", says John, "I have found that most of our clergy colleagues are highly motivated, principled people, deeply committed to those they serve, yet struggling with unrealistic expectations from within themselves, from the parishes and

often from us. In this situation I have also learned that episcopate with a human face really matters, that trusting and listening to colleagues is life-giving and that providing good, reflective support keeps colleagues motivated, energised and healthy”.

I want to say that we all know we have much work to do - and we have already been doing much work. I think this Covenant is to be welcomed, but no words on a piece of paper will make the difference. The difference will be made by you and me, brothers and sisters, stepping up to the plate, being honest and open with each other, accepting mutual accountability and speaking with each other about our vulnerabilities.

Mrs Jacqueline Stamper (Blackburn): Thank you to all of you. Synod, we have tried to model for you the sort of conversation about clergy care and wellbeing between bishops, lay people and clergy in which we wish to see the wider church engaged and to model the sense of partnership that is the core ethos of the Group’s Report.

We spent a lot of time in the Working Group talking about trust. We want this to be a trust moment, in which we all commit to better understanding and improved communication to try to eliminate the misaligned expectations and the erroneous assumptions that can cause so much damage and put trust at risk.

Clergy Care and Wellbeing and *Setting God’s People Free* reinforce each other. If we commit to improving the quality of our relationships and to supporting one another, all should flourish in the mutuality of respect and care we aim to foster. Thank you for your attention and for your care.

ITEM 10

The Chair: Thank you. We move now to Item 10. For this item we shall need GS 2133. May I also draw members’ attention to the financial statement on page 6 of the Fifth Notice Paper? It is the green Notice Paper. Members will have seen that the Revd Peter Kay has indicated that he wishes to move an amendment. It is my intention to take that proposed amendment reasonably early in the debate so that we might then return to a debate on the main motion as amended or not. I now call Canon Simon Butler to move the motion at Item 10. Mr Prolocutor, you have up to 10 minutes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Thank you, Aiden. Brothers and sisters, I hope you found the presentation a useful introduction to the heart of our Report, which seeks to initiate an open, undefended conversation across the Church about clergy care and wellbeing. I do not propose in this opening speech to re-rehearse the bulk of our presentation, but I would like just to spend a few minutes on process, what we seek of you today, and I will be happy, in response, to pick up on the specifics arising from the presentation during the debate.

The motion before you asks for four things. First, it asks today for Synod to adopt the Covenant for Clergy Care and Wellbeing. We want the Synod to be the owner of this process because when we gather in Synod we are asked to express the mind of the Church. From the beginning we have sensed that we would give the best chance of our work making the strongest impact, and with the least chance of gathering dust, if it were seen not as a project of Church House or Archbishops' Council or the House of Bishops but as an expression of the whole Church in Synod. Gathered as Laity, Clergy and Bishops together, today you have a chance to express our shared commitment to the care and wellbeing of the clergy, not just for the clergy's sake but for the sake of the whole Church.

Secondly, as a mark of that commitment, Synod has at its disposal the mechanism of an Act of Synod which will require this Covenant to be proclaimed in every diocesan synod and, hopefully, debated and adopted. We further hope that many PCCs and deanery synods will also want to consider adopting the Covenant in paragraph 20.

For reasons I will explain in a moment, we wish to propose adoption as an Act of Synod in the next Group of Sessions and the Working Group are encouraged that the Presidents are willing to both support and move such an Act of Synod motion in February. The effect will be Synod expressing the mind of the Church, asking the dioceses to affirm the Covenant. Those in other non-diocesan posts may also find it useful to see how the Covenant might be adopted in their specific contexts too.

Synod, the paper we have before us this morning is necessarily Synod-facing. The third part of our motion seeks to turn what is before us into a form digestible and usable across the Church. In particular, the heart of our work, the Shared Commitments and the Big Conversation, will be produced in an online downloadable form for use by clergy, parishes and bishops and their office.

In our own diocese, the archdeacon responsible for clergy care and wellbeing is already preparing something along those lines and every PCC in the diocese will be asked to have a conversation about clergy wellbeing with their clergy present in the coming months. In respect of that material, we are grateful to Tashi Lassalle and her team for being willing to bring their communications expertise to that work.

Finally, the motion seeks to create a facilitation group to act as a conduit between this Synod and the wider Church. We are sure we do not have the monopoly on good ideas in the Working Group. We also believe that such a group could mitigate the ongoing risk of silo working which bedevils the Church. Monitoring and evaluation are essential in any project, as are receiving and disseminating examples of good practice. The purpose of this element of the motion is for the Synod to take responsibility on behalf of the Church for such work.

In concluding, I just want to make a passing reference to paragraphs 33 to 41 in the Report, the specific recommendations. We were slightly concerned that by putting specific recommendations in they would become the main subject. They are not the main subject. They are important matters, but the main subject is the Shared Commitments and the Big Conversation. Those recommendations are not made without awareness of the resource implications or without acknowledging that they require some things to be done in different ways.

As Bishop Tim hinted, we are unanimous in our view of a culture where pastoral supervision is the norm to be encouraged. We would caution against shortcuts here because it is important that such supervision is a regular and non-managerial process. I have friends who support clergy care and wellbeing in very different ministerial contexts: Baptist, Independent Evangelical, Roman Catholic as well as Anglican settings. Without exception, they urge us to take pastoral supervision seriously, not just as a preventative measure but as a positive step towards encouraging the best from our clergy as they reflect on their own reactions, experiences and feelings in ministry.

We realise this cannot be done overnight but we believe it needs to be done for the betterment of the ministry and mission of all the people of God. So, friends, over to you. We have discerned as a Working Group the way ahead for clergy care and wellbeing. Now we offer it in openness to you, seeking your discernment too. I move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Item 10 is now open for debate. Because of the limitations of time, the speech limit will be three minutes from the outset.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate because clergy wellbeing is something which is very close to my heart. I am glad this is being addressed because I have known a number of clergy who have had to cease ministry. Apart from being a personal tragedy, it is a tragic waste to the Church of such a valuable resource. I think we should be aware of that when we are thinking about the resources we are committing to that.

There are many reasons for this but, often, I think the reason is that people become isolated and there is no one to support them at a difficult time and help them to objectively look at a situation. One way of addressing this in some ways is for people to have mentors - something we are doing in our area for first incumbents. It makes a difference to be able to talk to someone outside one's own situation who can offer advice without being directive but who can be used in whatever way that person wants. I act as a mentor to several people. I believe they find it helpful.

Perhaps the most important thing is a change of culture so that clergy are willing to accept help and do not see it as a sign of weakness and that those in positions of authority do not see it as a sign of weakness if clergy need that support. One person, when I started seeing them, wanted to know why she needed to see me as well as a spiritual director but, once she started realising the difference in the roles, she found that really helpful. Also, one person I know saw herself getting depressed, admitted it and asked for medical and counselling help and has made a good recovery. On the other hand, those who do not admit there is a problem, a situation where things are really bad, it becomes much more difficult to deal with.

It seems to me that a wiser use of support and encouragement to support a culture where it is not a sign of weakness to ask for help could make a significant difference to the wellbeing of the whole Church and to the best use of the resources of the whole Church.

Mr Bill Seddon (St Albans): Last Saturday, I was sitting in a packed St Albans Abbey to witness the priesting of our curate, Joe. It was a joyous occasion and I am sure that all those present were totally committed to support the wellbeing of the candidates throughout their ministry. However, as I sat there, the proposed Covenant on Clergy Care and Wellbeing came to mind. What, I thought, does it mean for Church of England members to take note of, and I quote from GS 2133, “the needs of the clergy from ministerial discernment to retirement and beyond”?

At the top of the list must be the provision of adequate financial resources for a realistic stipend and pension. If we cannot commit ourselves to this, the Covenant will fall at the first hurdle. If I have a criticism of GS 2133, it is that it says very little about finances and, yet, finance is probably the greatest cause of stress for clergy, particularly in preparing for retirement.

Here, I must declare an interest as a General Synod elected member of the Pensions Board. In addition to pensions, the Board also helps clergy prepare for retirement and provides housing support. I have been impressed with the dedication of staff, Board and advisers in seeking to enable scheme members to plan for the future with confidence. Is there room for improvement? Certainly, and those involved with the Board will be the first to recognise this. However, honouring the Covenant through continued support of the Pensions Board should remain a high priority for the Church. Clergy are not immune from unexpected disaster but, sadly, many do not have the financial resilience to cope.

It is, therefore, encouraging to know that there are charities that can help. One such is the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund which is controlled by members of Synod. It provides annual grants to bishops to enable them to make discretionary grants to clergy in need. GS 2133 mentions much wider Church support but leaves out para-Church organisations which do not necessarily operate through the office of bishop. One of these, the Clergy

Support Trust, which I am connected with, is the oldest and largest, making over a thousand grants to Anglican clergy and valued at over £2.6 million last year.

It would be helpful if the contribution of such para-Church organisations could be recognised to enable the adoption of a more holistic approach to care and wellbeing. Finally, as churchwarden, I welcome the commitment to produce a user-friendly suite of documents to help me implement the Covenant as well as possible in the local context. Overall, this is an excellent paper and I encourage Synod to adopt the motion.

Ms Carol Wolstenholme (Newcastle): I think few of us need reminding that one of our Church of England goals is to reimagine ministry. The Renewal and Reform programme is facilitating action in many areas that do this and many of them are enabling the roles and responsibilities of lay people to change and develop. *Setting God's People Free, Serving Together* and other initiatives are changing the way we understand and do mission and ministry.

In Newcastle Diocese, like many others, we are trying to do this. We are trying to reimagine ministry and authorising and doing all sorts of development. I want to talk just a little about my own parish in Newcastle, a parish of 12,000 plus people who have, instead of a full-time parish priest, chosen a half-time stipendiary post and a full-time lay missionary. Their task is to work in partnership in the parish to grow the Church and bring hope to the people we serve. In a nearby deanery there is a Reader and a part-time clergyperson who are sharing a post in ministry, a totally new way of doing things.

Because of just two examples of changes in cultures in Newcastle and many that I know are echoed all over the country, I see the culture and the focus and the economic reality of the number of clergy we have changing. It does not feel comfortable for me to support a proposal that excludes that army of lay ministers, people who will be subjected to many of the same strains and stresses as the clergy that they are working alongside. They too will need pastoral care for their wellbeing. It is an important issue, I think, for the whole people of God, lay and clergy alike.

I do care about a Covenant for clergy, but I equally care for the employed and voluntary lay people in ministry roles who are excluded from this proposal. I hope we will think and include and be more inclusive to say this Covenant should be for all ministers in ministry not just clergy.

The Chair: The Bishop of Willesden and then I will invite the Revd Peter Kay to move his amendment.

The Bishop of Willesden (Rt Revd Peter Broadbent): Nobody could be against clergy wellbeing. I think I am against the Covenant though. Let me tell you why. I think we are

getting ourselves in a terrible muddle here because lots of well-meaning stuff has come together in this Working Party but they have not differentiated between the different aspects of what is being urged upon us. We had all the soft stuff, the touchy-feely stuff which was expressed in the presentation. I am not looking forward to all my clergy coming up and saying "How are you" all the time. But those new relationships are good.

Secondly, there is the good practice. Good practice is there, well spelt out in the document. I do not think it is adequate. I think there is more to be done. I would love us to see something which draws up some good practice about how we care for our clergy by diocese and commit ourselves to it. There is also stuff, thirdly, that impacts upon terms of service. If you are not careful you are starting to make promises which drive us in a particular direction.

Some of the proposals in here do suggest that you are going to have to amend the Terms of Service Measure and make different Regulations in order to enact it. Let me tell you what I worry about. It is drift. When MDR goes towards appraisal; when the ordinal, which is what we signed up to, is replaced by role descriptions - I thought being a parish priest was the role description but obviously I am old fashioned on that one - when capability becomes micromanagement, and when licensing services become places where we spell out all the things we are going to do for our clergy, then I worry.

Because our most litigious clergy - and they are a minority - will say to you, "Oh, Bishop, at my licensing service you promised to do this. I am taking you to an employment tribunal because you cannot uphold the things you promised you would do". That is what the muddle is in this stuff. I do not think the Covenant will help us. I think the Covenant is actually a bad mechanism in order to put good practice into place. If we must do it, we must do it, but I think there is a worry because I do think the drift here is moving away from common tenure and moving towards an employment and contract culture. That is something we need to think very seriously about. It may well be where clergy terms of service are going, but I am deeply concerned that in getting into all this stuff we have not thought about the consequences.

I have been asked by the Archbishops' Council, with others, to think about whether we might rethink radically the way in which clergy terms and conditions of service are looked at and to think again about what might take place. I think we need to do that in a considered way and not drift ourselves into a contract culture without really thinking about it. I would say go for the soft stuff and go for the good practice. You do not need the Covenant. Let us think about what it means to look after our clergy properly without the unintended consequences that will follow.

The Chair: Revd Peter Kay to speak to and move his amendment at Item 45.

ITEM 45

Revd Peter Kay (St Albans): Chair, I would like to thank Simon and the whole Working Group for their very hard work in this very vital area. I welcome the Covenant, not just in its recommendations but also more widely in its approach and theological grounding. The time is right for a fresh look at clergy wellbeing. As a vicar of a benefice of three churches, I know that clergy experience a huge array of different demands, roles and expectations that come from that.

The world though is changing. The Church is changing. The skills clergy need are changing. It is right that we look at wellbeing in new ways. My amendment is offered in a friendly spirit and seeks to strengthen the motion in a gentle but clear way in what I feel is a very important area, the role of our dioceses. We heard in our presentation the vital role of different levels in our Church. As someone who has had occasion to draw on wellbeing support myself, I know that the role of the diocese is central to this in the services that they provide. Not least, they provide the delivery and the human face to so much of our support in a less formal way, but also in a system of rural deans, archdeacons, bishops and more specialist areas.

I am enthusiastic about the Covenant. I see a new, realistic humanising approach. I see though a lot of input at the national level, but a question kept going through my mind: where do dioceses really fit into this plan to improve things? There is a sense that this is always going to be an open and ongoing question because every diocese is different and works differently. Yes, the Covenant does provide helpful questions for a diocese to explore but to me it seems a little too vague and thin. Yes, it is implicit but there is a chance it may all drift.

My concern is that this important national work will not really land in the lives of our parishes and the lives of our clergy and their households unless we are a little bit more explicit on the part that our dioceses have to play. I want to recognise that dioceses are stretched. Some may be wary of Synod putting impositions on them. This is a gently worded amendment. It is an encouragement not an order. It is not prescriptive. We are not telling them exactly what to do. It asks for appropriate resources, not necessarily extra resources.

What it does say to dioceses though is we, General Synod, see this as a priority. What about you? Again, I strongly welcome the Covenant. I would like to thank Simon and everyone who is involved. I hope Synod will strengthen the surrounding motion by accepting my amendment. I move my amendment.

The Chair: Canon Butler, as the mover of the main motion, to indicate whether or not he supports the amendment.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Thank you, Peter. I think it is just important from my perspective - if I can do this by way of through you speaking to Peter, Chair - to say that the bulk of our Report really is not concerned with the work that the National Church needs to do. In fact, there is very little in National Church responsibility. The bulk of what we hope that is going to happen will take place out in the dioceses, in the parishes and in the lives of individual ministers. I think it might be a slight misreading of what we have reported, or we have not put it as well as we could have done, to say that this is not really about the dioceses.

I am ambivalent about this amendment and so I will resist it so that you can have your opportunity to say. Let me just say a couple of reasons where that ambivalence lies. In and of itself it is not going to make a huge difference to the outcomes. The ambivalence arises around the concerns that Peter alluded to, that we have been engaged with the dioceses already, that they are concerned about resources and they are concerned about how they can roll this out with many other project demands going on at the same time. We had a very helpful meeting with the Diocesan Secretaries' Liaison Group about this.

In a sense, whilst the amendment is couched in terms of encouragement, I still think it is slightly going to be received, if it is landed with this amendment, as yet one more thing to do. The other part I have got slight concerns about - and that is because it is still work to be done - is the last bit where it says, "Encouraging dioceses to share best practice in related developments and learning". I am not sure that the dioceses are the best place for that work to start. If there is a mechanism of sharing good practice, it is probably not best that the dioceses actually take a lead on that but we find some more integrative way, maybe through a national website or some other thing.

I am not sure locating the responsibility for sharing best practice in dioceses is going to get much traction and so maybe to leave it out would give us a chance for us to work on that in a different way rather than the way that Peter has proposed. So gently resisting but no real hostility.

The Chair: Canon Butler does not support the amendment and so it lapses unless 25 members standing in their place, or otherwise indicating, indicate that they wish the debate on the amendment to continue. Are there 25 such members? There are not 25 such members and so the amendment at Item 45 lapses. We return to the debate on Item 10.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): As Bishop Pete has said, it is very difficult to vote against this and so I want to focus on what are the resources available to get the best out of it. I would suggest a couple of things. As Carol Wolstenholme has already indicated, a lot is being said, particularly through Ministry Council at the moment, about focusing all our efforts on the flourishing of the whole people of God.

I would want to place the conversations that are about to start of the care and wellbeing of our clergy, who have an absolutely and vital and essential role as part of the body of Christ, within the context of the flourishing of the whole people of God. That is the big prize. That relationship, that clergy/lay relationship, is the second culture shift in the *Setting God's People Free* Report, which I think is the one that we are sort of losing sight of. We are very good on the discipleship stuff and the whole life discipleship 24/7, but we need to do more on the mutuality of lay and clergy.

I think this conversation, Simon, offers that ability. When the conversation happens, let us put it in that context. I would also put in a plea for thinking about self-supporting clergy and lay ministers in parishes, how are they going to be supported. I had a particular plea from a friend who has just moved from parish ministry to work in a prison where he is employed by the Ministry of Justice on a stipend without any housing and he is wondering where he should live. There is a group of ordained people out there who are at risk of being excluded from this conversation if we do not deliberately bring them in.

Finally, I would just like to say that the diocesan clergy chairs and the diocesan lay chairs are having a day session in October to look at how we bring together the Covenant on Clergy Care and Wellbeing in the light of *Setting God's People Free*. I hope that will be a really useful and powerful occasion and we will obviously feed that in.

Revd Canon Rebecca Swyer (Chichester): When things go wrong in a ministry, one of the key factors is often a life that has become dis-integrated in some way. The public and private reveal a different person. Function continues but is no longer fed by a healthy spiritual life. Discernment of calling is consigned to the distant past and no longer part of an ongoing journey. I support the proposals but I wonder if the Working Group could give some further thought to the importance of the integration of the vocational, theological, spiritual and personal dimensions of life for clergy wellbeing and which, together, constitute a healthy and a sustainable pattern of ministry.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): I just want to make two points, one about one of the specific recommendations, which is number 40, and about ministerial development reviews. I am a lay person who does ministerial development reviews and they are, the Bishop of Willesden be pleased to know, based on the Ordinal. I am grateful to the Bishop of London who, when she was the Bishop of Crediton, initiated a relook at the MDRs, and I think they fulfil the bullet points that are in the document and that is one way that laity can really support clergy.

The second thing is Bishop Tim said he was disappointed by the clericalism that still exists, and I think one of the ways that can be looked at is when you are sharing examples of good practice to share examples of what it really means to work in a team, because I

think that one of the things that would assist the wellbeing of clergy is if there were a greater emphasis on what that actually means.

One of the other things I do is work with mission communities looking at their mission action plans. It is a very basic thing but one of the things we do is look at what the parishioners expect from their clergy and what the clergy expect to be doing, and they are amazingly far apart sometimes, and there needs to be a much greater understanding of what each of us is expected to do.

Underpinning the whole of GS 2133 is the quality of the relationships and I think that is where we really need to put all our efforts. Two people have mentioned *Setting God's People Free* and I would just like to remind Synod that that document suggests that our hard-working clergy really should have two days off a week and not one.

Miss Catherine Farnborough (Deaf Anglicans Together): My name is Catherine Farnborough and I live in Farnborough, and you may think that is amusing! My question today about clergy wellbeing is for deaf and disabled clergy. When are we going to take their needs seriously where there are genuine practices caring for them? It is important to remember that mental health affects everybody, but deaf people in particular feel isolated when they do not have proper access, such as interpreters for incidental meetings or video clips that are subtitled that everybody else cannot access. In the mental health topic, hearing people have one-quarter of the people who have mental health problems but in the deaf world it is one-third. Profoundly deaf people like me cannot just pick up the phone for help, so it requires conversations by email or by mobile phone texting.

That is important because most of the support that is available for people is online talking therapy. Minorities like deaf people, blind people, BAME, wheelchair users, LGBTI - there are so many of us who need to be intentionally included and when we are not we feel that we do not matter. After all, we are all God's children, he sees us all equally, and, therefore, the minorities should expect to be treated equally and to have the same access to other provisions that everybody else has. When that does not happen we do feel that we do not matter.

I would like to let you be aware that sometimes we do need to be looked after and to be intentionally considered so that we can avoid those additional stresses. That is why I am asking this question today and asking if there could be a specific piece of work on the wellbeing of deaf clergy and also those in the process trying or leading up to ordination.

Mr Geoffrey Shuttleworth (Birmingham): Chair, it is my first speech to the Synod, so you will forgive me if I cover things already said. I welcome and support the motion and see its aspirations as being very valuable. Speaking about the role of the laity in supporting

the care and welfare of parish clergy, I note that Bishop Tim says we are all partners in the Gospel. I recognise that the work of parish clergy has many aspects and difficulties that the calling brings, with potential for stress and the range of reactions and consequences of stress. Like many of you I have seen clergy who have had to leave.

Ministry, whether in town or country, brings a high risk of feeling isolated, as we have already heard. Clergy have support networks - family and friends, other clergy, church wardens and from the diocese - and all of these relationships have their own dynamic and, for a range of reasons, may be unable to give the support necessary to prevent stress, and, perhaps just as important, to deal with the negative aspects of stress-coping behaviours.

Clergy are called by God but the Church should not hide behind the calling. We should recognise that we all are human and we are all vulnerable to the pressures of life. The Covenant and its linked Guidelines for the Professional Conduct of the Clergy place a lot of responsibility, it seems to me, on the clergy for self-care. I welcome the expectation that there needs to be a change of culture so that clergy can engage with laity without feeling threatened or having their spiritual authority diminished. The laity should grasp the principles, yes, *Setting God's People Free* is most important, and on Tuesday we will hear more about that.

I call on the laity to accept not simply parish church duties but also to share part of the responsibility for clergy care; of course, ensuring enough free time and holiday but giving affirmation of a vocation well-performed, to thank and to recognise the difficulties. With clergy and laity working well together, with God's help, the Church will prosper and I support the motion.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Given the time I propose a motion for closure.

The Chair: You read my mind, Mr Freeman, thank you. Mr Freeman has proposed the closure on Item 10. That has my consent.

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

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. I invite Canon Butler to respond to the debate. He has up to four and a half minutes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Thank you everybody for what you are saying. Part of the work we are trying to do is not really up to the Working Group any more to take responsibility for this. It is up to you as a Synod to take responsibility. To all those

speeches about groups that perhaps could be given more focus than the others and all of that, we have heard that and those who take this forward will make that point.

I entirely endorse the points that Carol Wolstenholme makes and Adrian Greenwood and the last speaker about working with the laity. Please, we are not precious about this document. If it will help those who are in less frequent situations, like lay people in full-time parochial posts who are holding offices in some way or another, please use it and adapt it for their needs. We are not going to be upset about that.

Obviously, the main challenge for me is to respond to the Bishop of Willesden whose points were rather more forcefully made in the chamber than they were in the bar last night, and I think more helpfully in the bar last night. The reality is, if you look at the paper we have prepared, the language of covenant and the language of contract are addressed in the Report and we set our face firmly towards the language of covenant. Clergy are officeholders. There is, you may be surprised to know, no general duty of care for a bishop towards his or her clergy. That does not exist in law. There are specific pieces of legislation that pertain to that, but there is no general duty in care. There is no employment. There can be no employment tribunal. Litigious clergy will be litigious, to my mind, when we have failed to do what we should be doing as a normal part of our ministry.

One of my concerns about what Bishop Pete says, if I may address him through the Chair, is it is looking backwards. It is saying, "How can we defend this role of officeholding from all threats to it without being realistic about the levels of accountability that are now being asked of us?" This relates not just to the Covenant for Clergy Wellbeing. It relates to issues around IICSA and other things as well. The level of accountability that we are being asked to take on now, along with other officeholders, is all to do with compliance. It seems to me that that is something that is coming and we are going to have to face up to it more realistically. The opportunity that the Covenant speaks to is the one where the Covenant will shape what we understand by that accountability rather than being something that we use to defend what might not be as defensible as it once was.

This is not a speech against officeholding, but if we want to retain the office holding status of the clergy and resist the fears that Pete has, and I think they are fears rather than realities, then two things seem to be necessary: best practice - and this Covenant offers us the opportunity to embed best practice in a benchmarking way across the Church - and an open way of relating.

I genuinely think, with respect to the Bishop of Willesden (my mate) the more we do what he slightly disparagingly calls the touchy-feely stuff, the less chance there will be of having litigious stuff to face. What we want to do in this Covenant is to deal with benchmarking, get things in a preventative culture and if we can put that in a way that does not express

itself in ways that will threaten legal action, we think that will be better for the future of the Church and its ministry. There is nothing to be feared by accountability. As the Bishop of Lambeth (the former Bishop of Truro) said at the beginning, "What is it we are afraid of in being asked to be accountable?" On this occasion, I have to say I do not agree with Pete, otherwise please vote for it. You know what the work is going to do and let us give it a fair wind and come back to it in February for a final go.

The Chair: We move now to a vote on Item 10.

Loretta Minghella (ex officio): Point of order. Could we have a vote by Houses?

The Chair: If there are 25 members standing to require a vote by Houses we shall have one; if there are not, we shall not. There are not 25 members standing. I put Item 10 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is very clearly carried, members. Synod, I hope that wellbeing can be helped by small gestures. In that spirit, may I express sincere gratitude and heartfelt appreciation to all the clergy in the chamber today, not least those on either side of me, for your ministry and for your care for the people of God. Thank you.

That concludes this item of business but I have a note to guide you concerning this afternoon's seminars. Please bear with me for just a moment. The Living in Love and Faith and Pastoral Advisory Group seminars will be taking place this afternoon. There are five seminars lasting one hour and 15 minutes, which will be repeated three times starting at 2.30, 4 o'clock and 5.30. The seminars are: Where are we? in PXOO1. You could not make it up, could you? Who are we? in PLOO1. How do we hear God? in PT005. Bible Study "Encounters on the way" in PT005 and the Pastoral Advisory Group in James Hall.

As indicated on the sign-up sheet, the Pastoral Advisory Group Workshop will only run at 4 pm and 5.30 pm. If these are full and you wish to attend one of these workshops, please contact the information desk for more information. I am told there is currently availability in all the other seminars and members are asked to sign up on the sheets which are at the information desk.

Worship will be taking place in the seminar rooms at 7 o'clock and also Berrick Saul. In addition, the Women's World Cup will be shown in the Central Hall from 4 pm. For all our wellbeing I think it is time for lunch. Bon appetite!

Full Synod: Third Day Sunday 7 July 2019

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

The Chair: Synod, good afternoon. Before we begin our business this afternoon I have been asked to give some notices. First, I can inform you that a reference has not been claimed by the Convocations or the House of Laity in relation to the Article 7 business Amending Canon No. 40 the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure or Amending Canon No. 41. Therefore, there will be no meetings of the Convocations or the House of Laity this evening.

It would also appear, members of Synod, that some of you think that you if you fill in the request to speak form on the Synod app during a debate that the Chair will get to see it. That level of functionality is not yet available, so please submit your requests to speak in advance of the debate.

Finally, it is my happy job to announce that last night at the open Synod quiz night £340.22 was raised for refugees in Calais. Thank you very much.

This afternoon, Synod, we are having Questions in Item 11 and in Item 12 a Presentation on Safeguarding. In a few moments I will explain how I intend to run those two things together. Suffice to say, we have some very important questions that need to be asked and also need to be answered. I want you to be mindful that there will be survivors of abuse here today listening and present in the chamber. It is important that as a church we continue to listen to those who have the courage to come forward and disclose. If you are called to speak, please be mindful of that background and that situation and be as sensitive as possible. We are going to operate the normal synodical procedures.

A member of the Chaplaincy Team will be available in the Berrick Saul building all afternoon and if you feel that you would like to go and talk to someone at any point, then please do go and avail yourself of that offer. In a moment I am going to invite Bishop Peter to come and say a prayer but can I invite you just to keep a moment of silence before he does.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) led the Synod in an act of worship.

The Chair: Members of Synod, we have 20 Questions that have been put down on Safeguarding, starting at Question 92 and going through to Question 111. That is 20 Questions in half an hour and it would be good, if we could, to get through all of those Questions that people have submitted. I would ask those who are going to be answering the Questions to be ready to answer any supplementaries that may be asked. If you wish

to ask a supplementary would you please be ready, especially if it is your original Question, at one of the podiums to ask your supplementary.

You already have a copy of the Questions to be asked. They were sent round by email and were also on your seats on Friday afternoon. Can I remind you once again that this is questions, not speeches, and I will be looking early on in what you have to say in the question about to come and, if need be, I will ask you to come to the point.

ITEM 11

QUESTIONS

CHURCH COMMISSIONERS

92. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Church Commissioners: Bishops do not carry insurance, and claims against them are required to be directed to the Church Commissioners; lawyers acting for complainants state that they are encountering significant delays in the Church Commissioners providing instructions to their lawyers so that claims can be dealt with.

What factors have been identified by the Church Commissioners as requiring attention to avoid inefficiency, delay, and distress to complainants?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Requests made to the Church Commissioners for assistance are managed by the Legal Office. In ordinary circumstances claims are managed expeditiously. We understand that there have been delays in the management of claims this year, which both I and staff regret. These delays have been a consequence of exceptional factors in the first half of this year. Most significantly, the Legal Office has been heavily occupied with work to tight external deadlines in connection with the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse at a higher level than expected.

By way of reassurance as to the future conduct of claims, we are confident that the Legal Office's workload will reduce towards normal levels once the IICSA hearings come to an end on 12 July. I can also confirm that the Legal Office has sought and obtained instructions such that appropriate steps have been taken to progress outstanding claims.

93. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Church Commissioners: In answer to my supplementary question to the written answer to the question (Q.25) from the Revd Simon Talbott at the February 2019 group of sessions regarding the funding of the legal costs of the complainant known as "Alison", in particular, asking whether any offer was made to fund the representation of Bishop George Bell's surviving 84-year-old niece, when seeking to ensure that the process followed by the Briden investigation was fair to all parties, the First Church Estates Commissioner stated that the Commissioners

had “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”.

Would the Church Commissioners please state the basis on which it was determined that the legal costs of Alison’s representation were costs “incurred by the bishop in his office,” giving the statutory authority for such payment and identifying in the Commissioners’ Annual Report for 2018 where the payment is recorded?

Loretta Minghella (ex officio) replied as First Church Estates Commissioner: Safeguarding is an episcopal responsibility. House of Bishops’ guidance emphasises that a diocesan bishop must ensure that his or her diocese puts in place arrangements to support survivors of abuse. In the language of the NSSG’s response to the Carlile Review, once Alison had brought forward claims of abuse to him, the Bishop of Chichester was the “decision-making body”. The Bishop of Chichester chose to delegate the decision to a commissary, the Right Worshipful Timothy Briden, but he retained ultimate responsibility for ensuring meaningful support for Alison, whom the Church asked to participate in the process. Such support was a cost of Bishop Martin’s office, since it flowed from his obligations as bishop, which the Church Commissioners were entitled to meet under section 5 of the Episcopal Endowments and Stipends Measure 1943. In line with their established practice, the Commissioners’ accounts do not record costs in relation to individual cases.

Mr David Lamming: I note that in your answer you say that a diocesan bishop must ensure that his or her diocese puts in place arrangements to support survivors of abuse. Since Alison, whose allegations against the late Bishop Bell Timothy Briden concluded were unfounded, was only a complainant, not a survivor, how was it considered by the Church Commissioners appropriate to determine that funding the costs of one party to a dispute were properly the obligation of Bishop Martin and thus the cost of ...

The Chair: Mr Lamming, I am advised you are asking for an opinion and you are not allowed to do that.

Mr David Lamming: A judgment not an opinion. How was it is considered appropriate by the Church Commissioners to make that payment? That was my question.

Loretta Minghella: It is the responsibility of the bishop to ensure that allegations are properly considered, and Bishop Martin put in place what appeared to us to be a proper procedure to look into an allegation that had been made. It was to be Mr Briden’s process to have hearings in which we were advised that the family and friends of the late Bishop

were to be represented by Desmond Browne QC, former Chairman of the Bar, in circumstances where the person making the allegation was not represented. That was put to us as the situation that obtained and for that reason we thought it was appropriate to agree to fund representation for Alison if she would wish to be represented so that the Church's process conducted on behalf of the Bishop could be a fair one with a robust outcome.

The Chair: Question 94 to the House of Bishops to be answered by the Bishop of Coventry.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS

94. *The Revd Dr Judith Maltby (Universities & TElS)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The *Church Times* (10 May 2019) reported that the hearings of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse this July will “scrutinise, among other topics ... the House of Bishops’ forthcoming teaching document on gender and sexuality” and the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding, the Bishop of Bath & Wells, in his response to the May 2019 IICSA report on Chichester and Peter Ball, responded “It is absolutely right that the Church at all levels should learn lessons from the issues raised in this report”. Will the forthcoming *Living in Love and Faith* show evidence of learning lessons from the IICSA hearings of March, July 2018, and July 2019, as well as the report of May 2019, about attitudes in the culture and practice of the Church of England towards women and LGBT people?

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth) replied as Chair of the *Living in Love and Faith Coordinating Group* on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The purpose of the *Living in Love and Faith* resources is primarily educational: The plan is for the resources to be widely used by parishes, deaneries, dioceses, the House and College of Bishops and members of General Synod to enable teaching and learning. In this way LLF will demonstrate its learning from the IICSA process by promoting a culture of mutual respect, clarity, openness and transparency across the Church in relation to matters of human identity, sexuality, gender and marriage. It will also provide appropriate correctives to misinformation about human sexuality and identity. We hope that the Pastoral Principles will establish a helpful culture for using the LLF resources by enabling the Church to address the evils of prejudice, silence, fear, ignorance, hypocrisy and misuse of power, all of which have played their part in the tragic realities of sexual abuse that have been the subject of the IICSA hearings.

Revd Dr Judith Maltby: I should say I am also a member of LFF. Given that the IICSA hearings are the most important external examination of the Church of England in modern times and the current draft of LLF has only one reference to IICSA in it, how much time have LLF participants spent being briefed about IICSA from those who are directly involved, for example the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding?

The Bishop of Coventry: The LLF project is conceived as a significant church-wide exercise – these are the words of IICSA, but I think this is exactly what we are trying to do – to “focus on encouraging clear, open and transparent conversations regarding human sexuality”. Our work has involved work with the National Safeguarding team. We have not, as far as I am aware, had direct conversations with the Lead Bishop, though as we move into our next stage of drafting the main volume, but also producing a whole array of other resources, that will be a really important part of it, especially now we will soon be the other side of these present hearings.

The Chair: Questions 95 to 111 to be answered by the Bishop of Bath & Wells.

95. *Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In his written answer to my question (Q.93) in February 2019, asking whether the House of Bishops had considered encouraging the Archbishop of Canterbury to revisit the judgment he expressed on 15 December 2015 (on publication of the Carlile Review) that “a significant cloud is left over [Bishop Bell’s] name”, particularly in view of the Briden Report and statement by Lord Carlile that, “The Church should now accept 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 at Lambeth replied that “the legitimate quest for certainty in connection with the 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”. Given that Chancellor Timothy Briden was able to say, after a thorough and fair investigation, that similar allegations made by the complainant known as “Alison” were “unfounded”, what is the difference between the two cases?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied as Lead Bishop for Safeguarding on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: In any allegation of abuse, each case must be taken on its own merits and the evidence weighed in deciding whether on the balance of probabilities, such allegations are “made out”. In the case of Carol, applying this evidential threshold test in her civil claim led to a settlement being made. It did not lead to a finding of fact that George Bell was either innocent or guilty. In respect of the allegations made by Alison, after an independent investigation and consideration by the core group and subsequently Timothy Briden, her allegations were not considered to meet this same evidential threshold. The NSSG is and will be carefully considering evidence given to IICSA and the views already expressed by IICSA in the development of guidance for responding to posthumous allegations.

Mr David Lamming: There is a difference, I suggest, between an evidential threshold and finding that a claim has been established on a balance of probability. Lord Carlile in his report has found, effectively, that the corporate process that led to the settlement of

Carol's claim was fundamentally flawed whereas Mr Briden's investigation into Alison's allegations was fair and thorough. Accordingly, is it not the case that if the Church is unwilling to direct a fresh investigation of Carol's allegation, in effect a retrial, it should withdraw any comments suggesting that Bell might be guilty of abuse alleged against him by Carol?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: As I answer that can I first thank the Business Committee very importantly that you have allowed these Safeguarding questions to be taken out of the normal procedure. That is probably without precedent and I am very grateful that you have accommodated these questions in this way. With regard to your question, I think my answer answers that, that there is a very significant difference between an evidential threshold and that which is balance of probabilities. That I believe is established, and so, in answer to your question, I think what I would want to say is that reopening that is not going to take things further, but IICSA have taken a particular interest and have commented on what Lord Carlile has said to the Church in his review, and I think we need to listen to what IICSA wants to say about this matter as well.

96. *Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Some victims experience difficulty in being referred between dioceses when cross-boundary issues arise. What clear rules (if any) exist for determining who holds responsibility?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: House of Bishops' practice guidance "Responding to, assessing and managing safeguarding concerns or allegations against church officers" (2017) alongside "Responding well to those who have been sexually abused" (2011) is the basis for ensuring that victims and survivors are well supported regardless of where they live. Whilst the guidance provides a basis for ensuring good co-operation between dioceses, and between dioceses and relevant statutory agencies, it will be made more explicit in future revisions to minimise these situations from occurring. The "Responding Well" guidance will be reviewed with the direct engagement of victims and survivors. This work will be supported by an information-sharing protocol and the development of the national casework management system.

Mrs Carolyn Graham: Thank you for answers. I just want to clarify now that we have guidance and the Provincial Safeguarding Advisers, are you satisfied this has resolved the difficulties of earlier survivors, particularly of complex cases such as that of Bishop Peter Ball, being passed around from diocese to diocese? Has that been resolved?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: The practical steps we are working towards that is an information-sharing system which has not been in place before. There have been some really good steps and developments on that and there was a recent announcement about that. The other is the national case management system, which will have the effect of

enabling information to be logged centrally, to be accessed more widely. That will make two very positive ways in which we can ensure that people do not hide in the shadows and, if you like, pass between dioceses unnoticed. Those are the two things that I think will bring rigour to that process.

Ven. Gavin Kirk (Lincoln): I am a member of the National Safeguarding Steering Group. In the review of the “Responding Well” guidance would it be possible for consideration to be given to those survivors whose experience has led them to distrust the diocese where they live? To require them to be cared for by their home diocese runs the risk of re-traumatisation.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: That is a very good point. The simple answer is yes and certainly there is very much, not only the intention but an action, which means that the voices and presence of survivors and victims are involved in that process of redrafting the guidance. Your point has been noted. I will make an undertaking to you that that point will be made to that group.

97. *Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What steps are being taken by the National Safeguarding Team to protect LGBTI+ children against practices in churches that can harm their mental health?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Parish and diocesan Safeguarding practice and policies are central to ensuring this and the National Safeguarding Team offers advice and support as required. In addition, *Valuing All God’s Children* was produced in 2017 specifically with the prevention of bullying of LGBTI+ children in schools in mind, but it is available as a resource to churches and other settings too to ensure LGBT children are treated with dignity and respect. The *Living in Love and Faith* resources will help educate churches about matters relating to LGBTI+ people, including mental health issues. The Pastoral Advisory Group will continue to work on producing resources that help churches develop good practices of pastoral care of LGBTI+ people. These resources will be considered by the NST prior to their publication.

Ms Jayne Ozanne: Given the reality that we, the Church, seem very reluctant to admit that those who pay the highest price in our inability to resolve our differences over sexuality and gender are young LGBTI people who, through no fault of their own, find themselves growing up in conservative homes, what specific Safeguarding training can be given to churches that hold a conservative viewpoint and teach their young LGBTI people that they need to be transformed and celibate in a way that leads, sadly, many of them to attempt or consider suicide and have mental health issues? What specific Safeguarding training can we give?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: There has been a left hand and a right hand, and your question very helpfully encourages to join those together. *Valuing all God's Children* was very helpful in thinking about education. Education and Safeguarding have not communicated effectively in the cross and, therefore, in the middle of that, people have suffered. It is very clear to me that all children need to be treated with dignity, respect, care and compassion and that must be our starting point and that must be lived out in our policies and practices in Safeguarding. There is work to be done and we need to look at that.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams (Chichester): What evidence can the Bishop provide that sexual orientation and gender identity become so fixed in our children as described in *Valuing all God's Children*? Also what evidence is there with regard to the link with suicidality of people identifying as LGBTI ...

The Chair: Just one question, please, Mrs Williams.

Mrs Andrea Minichiello-Williams: ... and conservative churches and what safeguards is the Church putting in place to protect our children?

The Chair: Mrs Williams, could I ...

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: If you would like to put those three questions in writing to me I will endeavour to give you an answer, but I am afraid I cannot do it from here.

98. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many Dioceses have a staff member specifically designated to deal with the pastoral care of complainants?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Pastoral care is provided to "complainants" in a variety of different ways within dioceses and should always form part of the Church's response to those who describe themselves as victims or survivors of abuse, regardless of the nature of the abuse or the context in which it took place. The most recently completed diocesan Safeguarding annual return indicated that at the end of 2017, there were just over 100 Authorized Listeners across 24 dioceses appointed to provide direct pastoral care to those affected by allegations of abuse. Other dioceses have commissioned voluntary sector organisations to provide advocacy support including specialist survivor support workers such as Independent Sexual and Domestic Violence Advocates. The NST now has a part-time Safeguarding Advocate. The Safe Spaces project is also intended to strengthen independent trauma-informed advocacy support to survivors of church-related abuse.

99. *Mrs Jay Greene (Winchester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: What is being done to produce a “one stop” service for victims, with the burden of resolving jurisdictional disputes being undertaken by the Church, rather than by placing upon victims the burden of navigating cross-referral and delay?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The NST, via a specialist procurement organisation, will shortly be publishing an Invitation to Tender for providing an independent helpline in partnership with the Catholic Church in England and Wales. The service will also aim to strengthen advocacy support to victims and survivors of church-related abuse. The project will be supported by dedicated posts in each denomination who will liaise and co-ordinate with dioceses to seek to ensure the assessed needs of each individual are met. In response to the SCIE Report published on 4 April 2019, the NSSG has committed to the revision of ‘Responding well to those who have been sexually abused’ practice guidance and the development of a Survivors’ Charter, both aimed at bringing greater consistency in terms of response to disclosures and provision of services to victims and survivors across all dioceses in the future.

100. *Mrs Kat Alldread (Derby)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many survivors came forward and participated in the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) feedback survey that was reported to General Synod last July?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The findings of the SCIE feedback survey with survivors were published as part of the SCIE Report published by the Church of England on 4 April 2019 entitled “Final overview report of the independent diocesan Safeguarding audits and additional work on improving responses to survivors of abuse”. A total of 60 survey submissions were made to SCIE, of which 47 reported being victims or survivors of ecclesiastical abuse – abuse perpetrated by clergy and others with specific roles in the Church. The full report can be downloaded at <https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/SCIE%20Final%20overview%20report%20of%20the%20ependent%20diocesan%20Safeguarding%20audits%20%20additional%20work%20on%20improving%20response%20sto%20survivors%20of%20abuse.pdf>

The response of the National Safeguarding Steering Group can also be found on the Church of England website.

101. *The Revd Dr Patrick Richmond (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: The *Church Times* reported on 4th April 2019 that the Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE) concludes that lack of a “command and control structure” from the national Church means that inconsistencies in the way parishes and dioceses deal with child abuse are

inevitable. It recommends employing diocesan Safeguarding advisers nationally rather than having Safeguarding officers managed by diocesan bishops and their staff “without any requirement to have Safeguarding knowledge and expertise”. The National Safeguarding Steering Group (NSSG) has decided against this recommendation. A senior CofE official said that cultural change was the priority, and, therefore, each bishop had to maintain control over diocesan safeguarding and remain personally invested in the work.

Why does the NSSG think that Bishops have to be in control of diocesan safeguarding to be personally invested in safeguarding and cultural change?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: When the NSSG considered this it was felt that Safeguarding should be embedded locally. Improving Safeguarding practice and behaviour can best be achieved by strong diocesan leadership which needs to be integrated fully into the wide range of initiatives which Bishops lead including their expectations of clergy. Culture change in the context of Safeguarding requires developments in the way people think, feel and act and should not be separated from the spiritual, pastoral and secular functions for which Bishops are responsible. The NSSG is considering possible ways of further supporting diocesan Safeguarding teams.

Revd Dr Patrick Richmond: Can you explain what possible measures are being considered to deal with the alleged problems of diocesan governing of Safeguarding officers, specifically the inconsistency, specifically the problem of having to complain about your bishop as your boss and advice that you are making to your senior and (Need to check audio file here ...)also the problem of the lack of professional supervision and management that others in social services would expect to continue? What possible measures are you considering to alleviate those problems?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: There are three questions there and I think the answer is we are going to look very carefully at the structures of the Church in order that there is more auditing, more reviewing and, certainly from a national perspective, that the National Safeguarding Team, or an independent body or an equivalent body has more powers to intervene and to audit.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Will the Synod be given the opportunity to debate the SCIE Report on the Church?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: That is a matter for the Business Committee. I suggest you write to them. Unfortunately, that is not in my gift to answer directly but if you write to them, I will certainly support that suggestion.

102. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: In setting out the terms of reference of the July hearings of IICSA the counsel to the Inquiry Fiona Scolding QC posed the question: “How far does the structure of the Church and the way that it is governed affect or impact upon its ability to prevent or minimize sexual abuse or respond adequately to such allegations and complaints?”

Is it safe for us to assume that when the final report is delivered, the House of Bishops will be open to significant structural change, including mandatory reporting and the removal of all or part of Episcopal responsibility for Safeguarding and Victim support, if that is the plain recommendation?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church of England, under the auspices of the Archbishops’ Council, has sought to engage openly and effectively with the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) investigation into the “Anglican Church”. The NSSG will shortly publish its response on behalf of the Church to the Inquiry’s report of the Diocese of Chichester and Peter Ball case studies, which supports the five recommendations made by IICSA. The House of Bishops will consider carefully any recommendations the Inquiry makes as a result of evidence provided to the national and wider public hearings taking place during the first two weeks in July. In the interim, the NSSG will consider what actions can be taken to make improvements, building on the work previously outlined to General Synod in July 2018 (GS 2092) and subsequent reports. Where improvements can be made, the Church should not wait for the Inquiry’s report.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper: I think there is one area where it still remains a little vague. Could you kindly comment on the specific issues in mandatory reporting and the removal of all or part of episcopal responsibility for Safeguarding which the Church has previously dismissed? Would an IICSA recommendation cause you to reconsider?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: There are three questions there. Part of the last one was would an IICSA recommendation cause us to reconsider? So far, we have received five recommendations from IICSA. The Church has not only accepted and welcomed them but suggested we go further in two of those. We are suggesting the recommendations are taken further. Any recommendations that come from IICSA are going to be treated very, very seriously. Indeed, there is a meeting next Tuesday when we are going to start to think about what we have heard in IICSA for these next two weeks.

With regard to your specific question about mandatory reporting and episcopal oversight, you have heard me say on other occasions that where we have put down “should”, clearly we should change that to “must”. There must be reporting, and the Church must get as near as it can to mandatory reporting as possible. That is my conviction. I have said publicly to IICSA that I support mandatory, although I know that is not the result that came

out of the Department for Education's consultation on this, but the Church needs to think about how we can take what IICSA have called "due regard", they have called it "a work of art" and they are asking us to look at what we can do within our own structures, guidelines and policies to make things as clear as possible. We say that abuse must be reported, and it must be.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper: And episcopal oversight?

The Chair: Sorry.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper: But it was in the original question.

The Chair: I would like to get all the questions in.

103. *Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given the frequency of victim abuse having been perpetrated on individuals by multiple offenders within the Church, is there any known work being undertaken to map the links between known offenders both in their Church capacity and associated organisations?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Each diocese works closely with those responsible for offender management within the statutory agencies as part of multi-agency public protection arrangements. The NST has not formally undertaken any mapping of "multiple offenders" within the Church, although it is aware that some mapping of local intelligence has taken place between dioceses and local police forces in relation to specific police operations concerning non-recent abuse. The NST is now in dialogue with Operation Hydrant to explore ways of better working together with regards to allegations of non-recent sexual abuse against church officers. The national case management system will provide an important resource to enable a better understanding of individuals who may pose a risk who move between dioceses and other church bodies. Discussions are ongoing with ecumenical partners as to how such information is and can be shared to strengthen risk management processes.

The Chair: Questions 104 and 105 will be taken together.

104. *Mrs Carolyn Graham (Guildford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Given that there may be some difficulty with collating reliable statistics concerning multiple Safeguarding complaints across multiple Dioceses, has consideration been given to allocating unique Diocesan related numbers to each Safeguarding complaint, complainant and respondent to assist the NST to map the extent of our problems?

105. *Mrs Carolyn Johnson (Blackburn)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many Dioceses have a staff member specifically designated to deal with the pastoral care of Safeguarding complainants who require sensitive support?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission, I will answer questions 104 and 105 together.

The National Safeguarding Team (NST) is currently in the process of commissioning a provider to develop a national casework management system for all dioceses and other church bodies including the NST. As part of this system, those individuals who become known to the Church either as victims or survivors of church-related abuse or people who may pose a risk to others will have a unique identifier which will enable improved information-sharing between dioceses, other church bodies and the NST. A dedicated project manager has now been appointed to progress this extensive development over the next two years. An information-sharing protocol is currently being consulted on, which will assist in the sharing of information for Safeguarding purposes in compliance with data protection and GDPR requirements.

Mrs Carolyn Graham: Thank you for this information. I have just got one clarification about the new casework management system. Will this apply to existing known survivors and people of concern or will it only apply going forward to new people?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: No, because it has to be as comprehensive as it can be. The NST – I think this month – will have the first access to it, so nationally there will be access to it and I think the hope is it will be rolled out to all dioceses by 2020. There will be some teething problems in implementation, but the hope is to get this as quickly available as a tool to ensure that those concerns can be addressed.

106. *Mr Stephen Hogg (Leeds)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Where a Safeguarding concern has been reported to a cathedral or a diocese, but in the view of the reporter the matter has not been dealt with adequately, to whom can the matter be referred for review, and what power does that reviewer have?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: All church bodies, including dioceses and cathedrals, are expected to have clear and well-publicised complaints procedures in accordance with House of Bishops' guidance on Safeguarding. It is recommended that an element of complaints procedures will include independent investigation. In some dioceses, there is recourse to write to the Independent Chair of the Diocesan Safeguarding Advisory Panel if they are not already explicitly part of such complaints processes. In July 2018, General Synod supported the development of an independent Safeguarding ombudsperson service to be accessed when such complaints processes have been exhausted. A specification has

been developed by the Legal Office, in consultation with the NST, and further discussions are now taking place as a result of consideration by the National Safeguarding Panel and National Safeguarding Steering Group. It is envisaged that this will be reconsidered by the end of 2019 following further consultation with survivors and other interested parties.

107. *Mr Martin Sewell (Rochester)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: When can we expect an announcement of the timetable and scope of the joint inquiry into the activities of the late John Smyth QC by the various organisations with which he was associated including the Church of England?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Terms of Reference have now been drafted for an independent learning lessons review in respect of the handling of the allegations against the late John Smyth. They are in the process of being shared with all known survivors for comment. An independent reviewer has been identified to undertake this review. He will liaise directly with the other institutions with whom John Smyth was involved during the period of time when the abuse was alleged to have occurred to the extent to which they are prepared to co-operate. The known survivors of John Smyth will be encouraged to contribute directly to this independent review in order that every opportunity is maximised to understand their experiences and enable their views to shape the findings, recommendations and the subsequent improvements to current and future Safeguarding practices. It is expected that the review will be concluded by late 2019 or early in 2020.

Mr Martin Sewell: When trying to piece together the story of the Smyth cover-up our investigators will doubtless be asking, "What do you know, when did you know it and who did you tell?" Given that the same institutions and some individuals will be common to both, is it intended to save time and money by asking the same people the same question about the problems emerging from Emmanuel Wimbledon and Jonathan Fletcher?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: That is a question I cannot answer but I can make sure that question is passed on.

108. *Revd Simon Talbott (Ely)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: To the best of your knowledge how many outstanding cases of abuse are there, which have not yet achieved a resolution, broken down by Diocese?

109. *Very Revd David Ison (Deans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many cases of allegations of Safeguarding failures pertaining respectively to clergy, to lay officers, and to others (e.g. volunteers or members of congregations) are currently being handled in all Church of England dioceses and at national level?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: With permission, Chair, I would like to take questions 108 and 109 together.

In any report that relates to data, it is important to recognise that behind each statistic is a person and that “resolution” might mean different things to different people. The data available to the national Church was published by the National Safeguarding Team on 19 June 2019 and relates to Safeguarding data taken from annual Safeguarding returns, collected by dioceses from 2015-17. The Report contains information about Safeguarding concerns and allegations reported to dioceses each year along with data relating to risk assessments and Safeguarding agreements. Each diocese is responsible for recording this data. The report can be found at <https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2019-06/Safeguarding%20Data%20Report%202015-2017%20for%20publication%20%28003%29.pdf>

The annual return for 2018 data will be sent to dioceses shortly.

110. *Very Revd David Ison (Deans)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: How many cases of Safeguarding failures are the subject of proceedings under the Clergy Discipline Measure 2003?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: Complaints against priests and deacons are made at diocesan level to the relevant bishop. Complaints against bishops are made at provincial level to the relevant Archbishop. Information and papers in respect of individual complaints are therefore held by the relevant diocese or by Lambeth or Bishopthorpe, as the case may be. As indicated in the response to Questions 108 and 109, the NST has recently published data in respect of Safeguarding activity within dioceses between 2015-2017. The report indicates that disciplinary measures were taken out in 72 Safeguarding related cases in 2017, of which 39 were under the Clergy Discipline Measure.

111. *Revd Canon Rosie Harper (Oxford)* asked the Chair of the House of Bishops: Many victims will have achieved closure through legal settlement, external counselling, personal resilience or family support, but others may not. Given the inherent difficulty of predicting how abuse affects individuals, and our pastoral duty to support the broken, is the Church willing and able to subsequently commit resources to go above and beyond its minimal legal obligations, to support those who have ongoing unmet need, after formal settlement has been concluded between lawyers?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock) replied on behalf of the Chair of the House of Bishops: The Church provides a range of different forms of support to victims

and survivors, regardless of whether they are making a civil claim or not. The independent report commissioned by the NST from SCIE published on 4 April 2019 provides a richness of experience from survivors as to what a good response could and should look like. The NSSG has committed to undertaking 3 key pieces of work, one of which is to co-design a Survivors' Charter with survivors.

In respect of civil redress, General Synod agreed, as part of the debate in July 2018 in respect of GS 2092, for the NST and Legal Office to undertake some exploratory work into the Church's approach to redress whilst continuing to support more established civil settlement processes for claims made in respect of insured and uninsured cases. It is intended that this work will commence late 2019 or early in 2020.

Revd Canon Rosie Harper: Bishop, thank you very much for your reply. I wonder if you are able to describe what the difference is in Christian Gospel terms between what you are talking about, the bare minimum legal redress and the moral imperative we have to restore and indeed heal that moral imperative we have towards survivors.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: The way to address that would be in two ways. One would be having a standards-based approach to Safeguarding which will set that out, and as a Church that will start with Christian principles. That will then be worked out, I hope, in practicalities, but we have to start with our Christian understanding of the value of people and the nature of God and his love for us. Alongside that, a charter which will then provide survivors with a confidence there is going to be consistency across the dioceses. You asked what is the Church-wide view going to be and I think if we have a charter that will help to alleviate what has sometimes been called the postcode lottery, where responses have sometimes been adequate and sometimes they have been woefully inadequate. Those are the two things, but it would have to be framed around our understanding of the love of God and the value of each and every single human being.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): Last year I proposed an amendment which was accepted about working with those survivors who remain in dispute with the NST. Could you update us on that, given that it falls within the same area as the question does?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells: There certainly have been attempts and efforts to take that forward, Simon, in terms of mediation. Mediation is something which some people have already been involved in and it has been new for others. There is also work moving forward that has just begun in terms of looking at redemptive justice to see how we can gather parties where there has a complaint, or a failure or misunderstanding, and how that could be restorative. Again, only recently has some work been commissioned to think about restorative justice and how that might help us achieve the aims that you put in your amendment last year.

The Chair: Thank you very much. That concludes Item 11 and all the Questions.

ITEM 12

SAFEGUARDING (GS 2134)

The Chair: So now we move to Item 12 which is a presentation followed by an opportunity for members to ask questions. Can I just explain who is on the platform behind me and who might well be participating in this next session? We welcome Meg Munn, Chair of the National Safeguarding Panel, Sir Roger Singleton, who is the interim Director of Safeguarding for the Church of England, and Phil Johnson, a survivor representative on the National Safeguarding Panel, as well as Bishop Peter, the Lead Bishop for Safeguarding.

After we have had the presentation then, as I have said, there will be an opportunity for questions. I will be giving priority to those who have not so far asked a question under Item 11 and we will see how we go. I will explain more nearer the time. We have until 4 o'clock and it is my intention to ensure that we are finished by then. We do not have to go on until 4 pm but hopefully we will not go beyond that. This is a presentation. Can I invite the Bishop of Bath & Wells to come and introduce Item 12. He may speak for up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): Once again, I am grateful to the Business Committee for giving the time for this presentation and for the questions. I know there have been already calls this Synod for Bishops to speak from the heart. The need for compassion and pastoral care is clear. Whilst words are important, ultimately, actions speak louder. It takes actions to change policy. It takes actions to respond properly to disclosures and instigate independent reviews. It is action that will bring reform, support survivors and ensure that we keep prevention at the forefront of our work.

I am now going to respond by reporting on some of the actions that we have taken, but there is also much more still to do - Synod needs to be aware of that - and that will take people, money, time and resources. There are current questions about major policy shifts, the level of independence in our safeguarding teams, the concepts of a national or wholly independent safeguarding service. These are matters that require proper detailed consideration, exploration and discussion. It is important that Synod are aware of all these significant matters as I cannot address them fully here today.

I would though like to make two preliminary observations. First, as Synod we absolutely need to have these conversations. We need to discuss the management of safeguarding and how to ensure that best possible practice is achieved. As the letter originating from Blackburn Diocese powerfully expressed, there are very few areas of our common life that we will not need to look at very closely and honestly in the years to come. Vague

and evasive talk of culture change is not enough because culture change is driven and determined by structures, appointments and decisions.

Secondly, whatever happens we all have a role in safeguarding. It is not something that can be done to the Church. It is instead integral to the Church's very life and it remains at the heart of the Christian Gospel and message.

With that in mind, I would like today to take the opportunity to update you on the developments which are being made in building that safer Church we long to see and to draw your attention to the progress report by the National Safeguarding Steering Group, the NNSG, which you have received (GS 2134). That Report contains information and details of progress since the debate which was held here in July 2018 and the presentation focuses more briefly on four matters. There may well be four slides appearing.

First, we have made changes already to the leadership and the management of safeguarding which will help to cement the position of safeguarding in the Church as being of the utmost importance. The NNSG now meets more often and for longer, allowing us a greater ability to maintain a better strategic overview and to commission and scrutinise new developments. There have also been significant changes to the National Safeguarding Panel which I know that Meg Munn and Phil Johnson will update you on.

I am also pleased to confirm to Synod the appointment of Melissa Caslake as the first permanent Director of Safeguarding. Melissa is currently the Executive Director of Children's Services for the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea and the City of Westminster. She will be taking up her post later this month and her extensive experience of safeguarding combined with her strategic and leadership qualities will enable the church to become a safer place for everyone. Melissa has also overseen the provision of support for children affected by the Grenfell Tower tragedy and demonstrates a real understanding of the needs of victims and survivors. The change from an adviser to a Director of Safeguarding is a significant development and will help to ensure that safeguarding is fully integrated into the structures and priorities of the Church. I look forward to welcoming her and to working with her.

Secondly, as Synod will be aware, we are currently half way through the third IICSA hearing. This inquiry has not been an easy experience for the Church and some justifiably difficult questions are being asked of us. We know that we have a long way still to travel on our safeguarding journey, and IICSA has shone a helpful spotlight on the Church's safeguarding procedures and our failings.

Given the timing of this Synod, it is not appropriate for me to discuss the inquiry in detail, but I would draw Synod's attention to two very significant documents. The first is the IICSA interim report on the Chichester and Peter Ball case studies. The report addresses highly complex issues very clearly and the key themes which emerge from the report emphasise the need to continue to improve the safeguarding practices of the Church. The second report is the Truth Project's thematic report into child sexual abuse in the context of religious institutions. The key findings identified by the Truth Project mirror the themes from the interim report with issues of clericalism and deference causing significant harm. These reports are difficult to read and the accounts within them are harrowing.

At the May House of Bishops, the Archbishop of Canterbury instructed all Bishops to read these two reports. I am sure Synod will join with me in welcoming the letter from Blackburn Diocese and that Synod is encouraged that many dioceses have urged their clergy and parishes to read these reports. I cannot overstate how important it is that you read them.

The whole Church, every parish, diocese, cathedral, TEI, religious community, national institution and this very Synod, we all have a role to play in improving safeguarding practice. If we are to move forward and change how we will respond to victims and survivors and how we are seen by them, we must be willing to have these difficult discussions and to make proactive decisions.

Thirdly, I would like to briefly touch on some key national developments. The first is that a project manager is in place to lead on the development of the case management system already referred to in the Questions. This will provide a national recording system for our local and national safeguarding advisers and it is something that we have been sorely lacking. This will be available to the NST next month and rolled out across diocese in 2020.

I am pleased to confirm three national learning lessons reviews into the cases of John Smyth, Trevor Devamanikkam and Victor Whitsey. Whilst there have been delays in being able to announce these reviews, this is a highly significant development and for victims and survivors who have waited a long time for these reviews, I hope this announcement will be welcome.

A Working Group has also been formed to consider the Clergy Discipline Measure and will meet for the first time in October 2019. This will build on the consultations that have already been undertaken by the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln and the consultation by the National Safeguarding Team, and we know that the operation of the CDM is a matter of interest to the national inquiry.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, areas in which I wish to update Synod today are the Church's engagement with victims and survivors. There is no doubt that our response to survivors in the past has been inadequate. Both the NSSG and the NST have committed to addressing this and I would like to end this presentation by updating you on a few developments in this area.

Since last year's July Synod, a group of survivors have continued to meet, facilitated by SCIE and supported by MACSAS. This group, the Survivor Reference Group, are working together to develop a survivor-led framework for what future engagement with the Church of England might look like. There has also been significant progress with the Safe Spaces Project. It is an example of the positive outcomes that come from co-production and, whilst there have been delays and frustrations in developing and procuring this service, I look forward to seeing it beginning to deliver independent advice, support and advocacy to survivors of church-related abuse.

In September 2019, in a few months' time, the NST are hosting a National Safeguarding Summit here in York University. This will bring together for the first time the NSSG, the National Safeguarding Panel, survivors of church-related abuse, DSAs and the National Safeguarding Team, a significant step in working together.

The Church has also committed to co-producing a National Victim and Survivors Charter which will outline the key statements and principles that we will agree to working and adhere to when we are involved with victims and survivors. Work amongst restorative justice is going forward, as I have already said, and we remain committed to exploring what a redress scheme might look like for the Church. This is no small task and requires the input and engagement of all our stakeholders. I can confirm that work is now starting.

My challenge to Synod is that if you are concerned about safeguarding in the Church, now is the time to stand up, get involved and be counted. Please come and talk to members of the panel today, Roger Singleton or Emily Denne, the adviser for survivor engagement. I look forward to your questions in a moment, and I look forward to continuing to update Synod on safeguarding matters in the future.

The Chair: Now may I welcome Meg Munn, Chair of the National Safeguarding Panel, to update us on the work that she has been doing. Thank you. You have up to 10 minutes.

Ms Meg Munn: Thank you very much, Chair, and good afternoon Synod. I should be a little bit nervous being here as a Methodist among so many Anglicans, but actually I feel you are all on my turf, not just Yorkshire, God's own county, obviously, but I was at the University of York, so I have spent the last hour or so walking round bumping into these ghosts of my past. Given that later you are going to be talking about Anglicans and Methodists, perhaps it is a good time to mention that when I was at university, the

Anglicans and the Methodists already were worshipping together just down the road at Heslington, so there is a little bit of encouragement.

My real purpose today is to give you an overview of the National Safeguarding Panel and I hope that at the end of it you will be clear about what is our role, because I hear and read all sorts of things about who and what we are supposed to be, not all of which are correct. We are a group of people brought together to be critical friends. In essence, we do two things. We look at and provide advice to the Church on policy issues, but we also provide a level of challenge. I was appointed to the role of Chair, as independent Chair, the panel was previously chaired by Peter in his role as lead bishop, so I was the first, if you like, independent Chair brought in.

My background, after I left this wonderful university, was 20 years in social work. I was Head of Children's Services here at York before I followed another of my passions, politics, and spent 14 years in Parliament. I left Parliament in 2015 voluntarily! So many of my ex-colleagues - I do not know whether Caroline, who is sitting there, and we used to play tennis together, would think that, but people said, "How did you know?" So, I obviously knew it was a good time to get out. I really wanted, as part of range of things that I do, to do some further work in child protection, children's safeguarding generally, so I applied for this role, was interviewed a year ago and have been in place since September.

The first thing I did was to talk to people who have been on the panel for a period of time, which includes Phil, who you will be hearing from later, and he can give you more of the previous background, and to really look at what could the panel best do in order to provide that advice but also that challenge to bring some external view. And so, again, drawing perhaps on my political background, we have introduced a different way of working. A bit like the National Safeguarding Steering Group, we are meeting more often, so instead of meeting only four times a year, we are meeting six times a year. And for the majority of that meeting, so the first half of the meeting, a little bit longer than that, we adopt a Select Committee approach.

I also say when we do this, although she is a good friend of mine and we share a first name, I am not Margaret Hodge at the Public Accounts Committee, it is not scary, nobody has left the room very red or in tears so far, but in my experience in Parliament it was absolutely the best way to get an in-depth look at policy issues. So far, we have had three meetings where we have adopted that approach.

First, we looked at training and development, we thought that would be a little bit of a softer area to start off with for us all to try that out and get used to it, and then in the last two meetings we focused on the Clergy Discipline Measure. We have done that not just because I think it is fundamental to safeguarding but also because this is a good time to

do so. There is a working party setting up to look at the measure in relation to safeguarding and we need to input into that. So, we have come up with a number of areas that we think the Working Group should look at and we will come back to that Working Group, hopefully once they are getting towards having considered some issues to have some further input.

So, who are we? Well, we are a combination of people with particular expertise, current and former professionals working in adult safeguarding, children's safeguarding and with offenders. We also, really importantly, have three survivor representatives. For me, the fact that these people who have been so damaged by the Church are prepared to walk into a room regularly and take part in trying to make the Church a better place is something that I think has to be treasured and seen as a great contribution.

It is really important because unless you understand what abuse does to people, and I mean really understand how it completely devastates lives, then what you are talking about does not take on the import of what you are actually doing. You really need to have that voice, so I am very grateful to the three representatives we have on the panel.

So, as we go forward, we will continue to look at what are the issues we should be tackling. At our next session in September we are going to look at prevention, and I would really, again, stress that issue to everybody. Prevention is and has to be a real big priority. If we can prevent the devastation that comes with abuse then we will be doing a great service. But the Church is late to this work, it needs to catch up, it has got a lot to do. I see a lot of people working really hard, I see a lot of people with good intentions, but we all need, you all, need to do more, and you need to more, more quickly.

I am delighted now to hand over to Phil. Phil has been on the panel a lot longer than I have, and he can give you the previous history and also highlight what he thinks are the key issues. So, thank you. Phil.

Mr Phil Johnson: Thank you Chair. Thank you, Synod. I guess some of you know me already, but for those who do not, my name is Phil Johnson and I was one of the first survivors to come forward in the 1990s in the Diocese of Chichester, in what turned out to be a major scandal.

I have been a survivor representative on the National Safeguarding Panel since its inception in its current form in 2014, and it is important that you do not see me just as a lone survivor. I represent many other survivors who are unable to be there through the damage that has been done to them, through their physical and mental health, and I try and speak for them and to represent them in as best a way as I possibly can. Some of those people also have big issues around trust and cannot directly engage with the

Church, but they do engage with other organisations like MACSAS, which I also represent, and through that we can hopefully bring their voices to Church.

Now, I think it is important, as Meg mentioned, that survivors are represented and are valued because survivors have unique experience. They have not only the experience of the abuse that they have suffered but they have the experience of reporting that, going through the criminal justice system, the civil justice system and their almost invariably bad experiences of the response given to them by Church.

Now, hopefully this is changing, and it is something that I, with my colleagues here, have worked very hard to try and improve, but there is still an awful long way to go. Survivors also are passionate, they care about the prevention of abuse, they care about making Church and society a much safer place, and they care about the fact that survivors coming forward and when they report should be treated with compassion and be treated fairly.

I think those people who have worked with me on the National Safeguarding Panel, like Bishop Paul here and Bishop Peter, will attest to the fact that I am probably one of the most outspoken and vocal people on the National Safeguarding Panel, and I think that is important. You know, not being part of the Church establishment brings an outside voice and the National Safeguarding Panel is moving much more in the direction of having those independent voices that provide more scrutiny.

The panel in the past has been quite frustrating, and much of the time it has felt like just a rubber stamping or tick box exercise where we have just been asked to nod at decisions that have already been made elsewhere. A good example of this was the Parish Handbook and the development of that, where for many months we were told “We are developing a parish handbook”, and I, amongst others, said, “Well, when can we see a draft? Can we have input into this?”, and eventually we were presented with a draft, which was effectively the final proof of the handbook, to which we made substantial comments. And at the next meeting I said, “Where is the next draft of the Parish Handbook?”, and they said, “Oh, we have printed it”, and I said “Well, you know”. They said “Oh, don’t worry, some of your comments were taken into account”. But that is the kind of level of involvement we had.

Things are moving on, thankfully. I think in the past the National Safeguarding Panel has been very over complicated and has been far too involved in the policy and the work programme of the National Safeguarding Team. I think that that sometimes takes you away from the fact that safeguarding should really be a very simple thing. It is about vigilance, it is about protection and it is about compassion. It is not about endless bureaucracy and I think we should sometimes not lose sight of the fact that it is a simple thing.

There is a danger, I think, in the Church that the Church assesses the quality of its safeguarding by the amount of money that they are spending on it rather than the effectiveness of the safeguarding that is in place. Things are changing. I think with the introduction of Meg Munn and Melissa Caslake, things will change and it will bring more of that independent thinking.

Meg's involvement and her introduction of the Select Committee model for the meetings has definitely made a significant difference and it has certainly led to a lot more scrutiny of policy and of those people who are writing and developing the policy. Whether that leads to more power or more intervention or the ability for the National Safeguarding Panel to actually change things kind of remains to be tested, but I live in hope.

As they said, we have begun by looking at the Clergy Discipline Measure which I think we all agree is an imperfect vehicle for many, many things, but I think particularly for safeguarding. With the recent statistics that were published, I think it is shocking how few cases involving safeguarding actually lead to any sanction or even to a CDM being raised in the first place, particularly in cases where there is no prosecution. I think one of the serious flaws is it is designed to reach sanction by consent and there is a big danger in that in safeguarding terms that that leads to a minimisation of something that somebody is willing to admit in order to receive a sanction that is acceptable to them, and I think that is dangerous in safeguarding terms. There is a lot more work for us to do on this, along with the panel that has recently been set up, but I believe it needs a clear and fundamental change.

I will just follow on from some of the things that Bishop Peter mentioned when he was talking about survivors' engagement. We have started very difficult work of setting up a Survivors Reference Group. Now, this is largely formed of those people who came to Synod last year and some of them are sitting in the room here today. It is very difficult for many of these people. There is an immense lack of trust in the Church, there is a huge lack of trust in the National Safeguarding Team. The work that MACSAS has been doing with SCIE has been invaluable, because SCIE have been able to facilitate their involvement and their engagement in a safe way without direct Church involvement and I think that needs to continue. We will work towards a co-production model working with the National Safeguarding Team but that will take time, and it is very important that we have a neutral intermediary for the time being.

The Safe Spaces Project was mentioned. Now, this is a project which I and a colleague Alana Lawrence, the former chair of MACSAS, proposed to Bishop Paul nearly six years ago. We have been through countless rounds of consultation and the Church has spent tens, if not hundreds of thousands of pounds over a six-year period developing this model, which essentially is very simple. And in all of that time, despite having the funds allocated for the last four years, it has not spent a single penny of those funds on supporting

survivors. I think this typifies how church does things. This is something we all need to come together and cut through to make things simpler, more efficient, quicker and, by doing that, more cost-effective.

We are working towards a Safeguarding Summit in February, and that is a big opportunity for the key players to get together, hopefully with the Survivors Reference Group people, but there is much work to be done. There is still a huge level of trust that needs to be earned from the Church for these survivor representatives to engage properly.

Out of Synod last year, the Survivors Reference Group, in its embryonic form, put forward a list of the bars and problematic areas that Church had to develop before we could engage fully, and those, as yet, have not really been resolved. So, until they are, it is very hard to set up that Survivors Reference Group in its final form. It is hoped, though, that we will develop a charter and a constitution so that we can move forward and hopefully funding will be agreed to allow that to continue. I think it is important that we involve SCIE (the Social Care Institute for Excellence) for as long as possible, as long as is needed, to provide that independent buffer that has been so important.

A redress scheme was mentioned by Bishop Peter and this is hugely important for survivors, but I think it needs to be very well resourced and I think it needs to look at virtually all cases of abuse, including those that have been settled and have received settlements, because in many cases with those settlements, survivors have been forced into them, on legal advice, out of fear that they will be landed with the Church's legal costs, which are astronomical. Sometimes people really are cajoled into accepting settlements out of fear and not because they are content with the settlement or that it actually settles the case for them.

There has been much talk about culture change, and culture change is very hard. I think the lessons learned in Church and in the way cases have been handled can benefit the whole of society. It is my personal view that the best way to do this is by the introduction of mandatory reporting law nationally. There is a good model for this, which is the Mandate Now model, designed and developed over a long period of time by the Mandate Now pressure group.

I think it is noteworthy that in the recent safeguarding statistics that were published, two-thirds of safeguarding concerns were still not reported outside the institution and were handled in-house. I think there is still a danger there that cases will continue to be dealt with in-house unless there is significant culture change. But this has, in the past, come about when there is legislation, and when there are sanctions when people fail to report or to follow the law. The good examples of this are the wearing of motorcycle crash helmets, the wearing of seat belts in cars, drink driving and more recently simple things like the use of disposable carrier bags in supermarkets. It is my view that the Church

should actually take the moral high ground and, as Bishop Peter did in his maiden speech in the House of Lords, back mandatory reporting.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Thank you, members of Synod as well. We have now got about half an hour for questions on the presentation and, in a moment, I will invite you to stand in your place if you wish to ask a question. There is a reminder that this is questions and not speeches so if you can keep them short, so that the members of the panel can follow, we will do it in batches of two, and, unless you specifically ask which member of the platform party you want to answer the question, I will leave you to decide who will answer. So, if you would like to ask a question please stand.

Revd Anne Stevens (London): A question for Bishop Peter, I think. Reading the Report, I was very aware that a lot of the actions identified as priorities 12 months ago are still unfinished and quite often the reason for this is the “exceptional year” the NST have had, and I do understand that is because of the IICSA hearings. Will there be an opportunity with the new director coming in to review the levels of staffing of the NST and whether the right people are in the right posts?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): If I was the new director I would do absolutely that, and I am sure she will.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): This is also for you, Bishop. As a result of the survivors’ survey, SCIE now has nearly 60 accounts of safeguarding cases where the response to the victim was poor and where the situation was not properly resolved so that there is a risk of the perpetrator reoffending. What does the Church propose to do with this information so that vulnerable people are protected from known abusers, so future victims are protected from officers and senior clergy who have failed to do their job and so restitution is made to the survey respondents who were re-abused by the Church after reporting their experiences?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): The Church has to use all the tools we have, which is our policies, our guidelines, it is our training, and it is our disciplinary frameworks. You will notice that you have made significant advances on all of those, but it is also about having an atmosphere of openness and trust where people can genuinely feel able that when they want to report something, whether it is a disclosure of abuse or a complaint about the way they have been handled, that they will be listened to, that they will be believed and that somebody will act upon it. And that is why I started with actions in what I tried to say, that when people see actions, they will believe that there changes that are being made.

The Chair: Any more questions?

Revd Dr Jason Roach (London): I note that a CDM Working Group has been established and will meet for the first time in October. I have also heard very clearly that the CDM process is not fit for purpose. My question is what timescales are in place for that Working Group? What specific outcomes are in view?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): I wonder if it would be helpful if I asked the Chair of the Working Group to come and answer to that. You will get a crisper answer. Can I ask Tim to answer that as the Chair?

The Chair: Yes, that is fine.

The Bishop at Lambeth (Rt Revd Tim Thornton): Obviously, as quickly as we can, work is being done before the first meeting, so we are not doing nothing until the first meeting. Clearly, we also need to listen carefully to what many people are saying to us, so I cannot say it is going to be very quick. It is also the case that changes to the CDM will have to come through this place and those processes do not happen overnight. My own view is that we might be looking at different processes, in particular a completely different process for handling safeguarding cases. How that will be done and how it will need to be brought into being I cannot say at this stage. I think realistically it is going to be at least a year.

Revd Martyn Taylor (Lincoln): This is probably to Tim actually. Given the suspension of the present Bishop of Lincoln, who is on the review of the CDM, does that therefore hold up that review or has somebody taken his place?

The Bishop at Lambeth (Rt Revd Tim Thornton): The Bishop of Lincoln was not on the review of the CDM, he was working very well with the Bishop of Salisbury and consulting the Bishop, so he is not going to delay that in any way.

Ms Meg Munn: What the National Safeguarding Panel looked at was the work that had been done by the Bishop of Lincoln and the Bishop of Salisbury. We had the Bishop of Salisbury in front of us but we also had Emily Denne, who was talking to the survey work that had been done by the National Safeguarding Team, so we were interrogating that information, and we hope that the list of things that we have come out with that we think the Working Group need to look at will also be very helpful.

My own view is that they need to go back to first principles, what are they trying to achieve, and to look at what do other people do, so what happens in other professions, is it discipline, is it about professional competence, and, particularly also in relation to clergy, to look at the issue of them being officeholders. Things are very different when you are an officeholder compared to an employee. There are other examples. This is the time

for the Church to look out, look at how other people deal with this and to look at them, from first principles, what would work within the Church.

The Bishop of London (Rt Revd & Rt Hon Dame Sarah Mullally): This is a question for Phil, if you feel able to answer it, but you can pass it to somebody else if not. I continue personally to feel shame at the way in which individuals have abused the high trust that was put in them, with devastating consequences on individuals. I am also aware that clericalism continues to hinder the Church's response, for which I am sorry.

I wonder whether you could reflect on the fact that I believe that clericalism must be addressed, and it is all of our responsibilities here to do that. I wonder, Phil, if you could give us some reflections on how you think we could be addressing this?

Mr Phil Johnson: Now, that is a very difficult question, is it not? I can give a brief opinion. I think there has been a lot of deference. I think it is a problem not only in the Church, it is a problem in many institutions. Good examples recently have been seen within football clubs, for example, whereby coaches hold positions of great power and authority, power over people's careers and things like that, so there is a natural tendency for people to keep things within the institution and try to deal with things in-house as well as being fearful of the consequences of not doing that, whether that be for reputational damage or, in the case of public schools, for example, for fear to the funding stream and the image.

I think things are changing but watching IICSA this last week there is clearly evidence that this remains, and it is all of our responsibilities, whatever your role in the Church or in any other branch of society, to address these things, to be open. The best way of dealing with this is talking about it. It is about being open and honest, making these non-taboo subjects, not just the abuse but how things are handled. If somebody has a concern about somebody, we should treat it in a very similar way to how we do having an accident book under the Health and Safety at Work Act. Things should be recorded in a routine manner and dealt with very routinely rather than the way that they have been in the past.

Revd Julie Conalty (Rochester): I am Bishop's Lead for Safeguarding in Rochester. Phil, you spoke really well about how the Church is slow in effecting change and how frustrating it is when the need of victims is now. My question is very specific about a current need. This may not be a question you can answer, it may be the Bishop who needs to take this. Are you able to tell Synod what arrangements are in place right now for victims of Jonathan Fletcher to make disclosure or to seek support from an organisation that is independent? By "independent", I mean not accessed via Emmanuel Wimbledon and not with reference back to Emmanuel Wimbledon through the Core Group?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): I am not really in a position to comment on that. I can speak more generally about that. I will ask Sir Roger Singleton to answer it.

Sir Roger Singleton: Insofar as we are aware of the full circumstances of Jonathan Fletcher's activities, then in fact it is quite clear that they have fallen outside conventional Church rules and discipline and, seemingly, the Church has not been able to do anything about that. It seems to me that the review that has been referred to in relation to the CDM and safeguarding should certainly take into account the position of clergy operating in proprietary chapels.

Mr Phil Johnson: I think that issue was also raised by other prominent cases, such as the Peter Ball case, where you have religious communities which tended to fall between stools and nobody really wanted to take any responsibility for them. In those circumstances, what tends to happen is that victims and survivors come forward to organisations such as MACSAS and then we have tried to negotiate on their behalf and get somebody to take responsibility in their cases, which often is difficult, although there was a question earlier that addressed this with the new case management system and with the introduction of provincial safeguarding advisers. It should help for those cases which fall between responsibilities, such as this.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): May I also add my thanks to all of you. Chair, with your permission, since this is under Standing Order 107 I can put a question, through you, to the Synod. We have heard Mr Johnson talking about mandatory reporting and some of us think this needs to happen. I just want to know, Synod, should we change our guidance? Would you be in favour of mandatory reporting? How many would be? Raise your hands, please, sirs, madams.

Mr Phil Johnson: There is a very good model of what we mean by mandatory reporting developed by the campaign group Mandate Now. I suggest you look that up online. It is well worked through, it is well researched and that is what we are proposing.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Thanks again for all you are doing in the NSP. You are meeting more often, it is a lot of work. Are you getting enough resources in your work? Meg and Phil, are you getting enough support? If not, what do you need?

Ms Meg Munn: No. We cannot operate at the level that a Select Committee in the House of Commons or the House of Lords does because we do not meet as often and our meetings are not as long, but ideally what we need is some resource to do the background work so that when we come to sit down and question whether it is CDM or training, prevention or whatever, somebody has done some research, has written some draft questions. At the moment, we are reliant upon whoever we are questioning to provide

the background information and I then draft the questions for that. I have asked for this sort of support and it is under consideration. That would help us a great deal.

Also, making sure that we are providing the support to the people who are on the panel, so we are clear what it is they need to be there, and perhaps too that will enable us to increase our diversity. Obviously, the key reason people are there is because they bring particular experience, but we are not as diverse a group as I would like us to be. That often does cost more. I do not think these are huge demands and I do not think it is a huge amount, but, from my perspective, at the stage of the development of the panel now, when I am nearly a year in, that would be top of my list.

Mr Phil Johnson: The survivor representatives and other members of the National Safeguarding Panel do do other work and we take part in consultations, which we have done with the Faith and Order Commission on things such as the Seal of the Confessional and on Theology of Safeguarding, for example. However, this is over and above the work that we do for preparing and attending Safeguarding Panel meetings. This is all voluntary. We have been doing this for the last five years and we claim travel expenses but that is all. We have virtually no resources. For those of us who have to work other day jobs, which we do, it is quite challenging if it is not resourced. Yes, I think it needs to be better resourced.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): Thank you very much, Phil, for what you said, I really appreciate that. I want to ask you about the Parish Handbook. As a lay representative, the parish is my home and I believe that the things that come from the central Church to us, given as the Parish Handbook, is best practice. It is very disturbing to hear that the process had not gone as you had hoped, that you did not feel consulted as you should have been. I would love to hear that you are confident or, if you are not confident, can you say? Is what we have in the parishes best practice? Is that what you would recommend? Do you have confidence in that? Can you assure all of us from parishes that what we have is the right tool?

Mr Phil Johnson: I think it is the best tool that is available at the moment. It could have been simpler. It could have had reporting and recording much earlier on in it. I think that it would have benefited from having survivor involvement at a much, much earlier stage. I am not saying do not use it or throw it away, absolutely it is a valuable tool to have, it is the best tool that you do have so by all means use it. Yes, if I had designed the process it would have been different and a lot more simple, a lot more straightforward.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Bishop Peter spoke earlier regarding our case management system. Please correct me if I am wrong, but I think you said this would be spread throughout the Church eventually. Can you please tell us what impact that will

have upon those dioceses that already have a very, very good reporting system in place and case management system? Are they going to be made to replace those?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): There was considerable consultation with diocesan secretaries who were concerned particularly for that issue. The feeling was that we needed a national issue and there was a procurement process. A number of dioceses already do have their own systems and I think I am right in saying that each of those were reviewed and a couple of those were seriously considered. A decision has been made on a system which is designed to be the best system across the whole of the Church and that will mean there will need to be adjustments in some dioceses. I am always aware that the central Church is aware of that and I believe there are going to be efforts to try to ameliorate the impact of that, which I think means money.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): I was wondering that.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): I think this is a simple question, which I drafted before I heard Phil speak. It seems to me that we have been waiting for Safe Spaces, which is intended to offer a fast response, for an awfully long time, and no one is in any doubt of the need for it. At best, 2020 is five months away. Can you give us a better idea of when in 2020 we can expect Safe Spaces? It is a sort of how long, Oh Lord, how long?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): This is a policy matter, so Sir Roger is going to answer that for us.

Sir Roger Singleton: The invitations to tender are now out and they will involve consideration by members of the survivors' reference group. There will be pilot projects initiated which we hope will be in place by the end of this year. I think I would be a hostage to fortune, or at least my successor's fortune, if I were to give a particular date in 2020, but we are hopeful that the scheme across the country will be up and running next year.

Mr Phil Johnson: This has been a long and frustrating process, particularly for me. I am one of those survivors who is on the procurement panel for the Safe Spaces project. I think and hope that we can put something together and deliver it soon, but I do have some deep concerns in that I think it needs to have Church survivors at the heart of it so that this project understands not only the issues relating to sexual abuse but those that relate to spiritual abuse and the abuse of power.

My fear is that if the tender goes out to an organisation that is very secular, they might not understand those finer details. Somehow, whilst trying to avoid conflicts of interest with procurement and awarding contracts and things, we need to get the voice of Church survivors at the heart of this project, and that is challenging. That may delay delivery, I fear, slightly. Well, it has already been six years.

Revd Simon Talbott (Ely): A question to Bishop Peter. Last week, a victim's lawyer told IICSA: "We have seen through various investigations in Chichester and Peter Ball that the Church is a safe place where paedophiles have good reason also to feel safe". Given that in the Fletcher case he appears to have been welcomed as a guest in churches across the country for two years after his PTO had been withdrawn for safeguarding reasons, and that the websites which provided the evidence for this have been rapidly cleansed within the last week, can you offer us any assurance that our Church has been equally swift to capture evidence for future CDM processes where appropriate?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): You understand that I cannot comment on any particular case.

Revd Simon Talbott (Ely): Generally.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): You were using that as an example and saying, on the basis of those areas where we have failed, what assurances can I give you. I think that is where the lessons learned reviews come in and that helps to disseminate good practice. This Synod has had a role in having to make sure that, where possible, that has become a Regulation and therefore it is something which people have had to take due regard to. I appreciate the words "due regard" may need strengthening. So, there are processes that are open to Synod in order to ensure there is proper compliance with best practice, but best practice alone does not guarantee the safety you are looking for, there has to be that stick as well that enforces compliance.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): To go back to the question of deference, am I right in recalling that in the Manchester Report the issue was not simply deference; it was a question of oaths? Oaths had been made from the Bishop to the Archbishop and from clergy to the Bishop, and they were enormously important in both directions.

The Chair: Your question, please.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I did phrase it "am I right in recalling?" It was difficult, but I did do it. Thank you.

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): I am afraid I do not know enough, April, to answer your question, and I apologise that I do not. Someone will have noted your question and I will try to ensure you get a written reply to that.

The Bishop of Burnley (Rt Revd Philip North): Meg, you have already touched on this but given deep questions being asked by IICSA and others about accountability, do you believe that children and vulnerable adults would be safer in our churches if clergy, including bishops, were employees rather than officeholders?

Ms Meg Munn: No is the answer. I have spent 10 months trying to get my head round the Church of England and it is still a work in progress! I do not actually think that that probably is the difference. It is why I said in relation to the work on the Clergy Discipline Measure that I think it has to go back to first principles. If I can give you an analogy. I spend quite a bit of the rest of my time going to other parts of the world, working with members of parliaments in new and developing democracies, and people often say to me, "Oh, you can't import UK/Westminster style democracy into other countries", and that is absolutely right, you cannot. What you can do is you can work with people who are developing their own democracy about what the principles are. I can talk to them about the principles and then they work out for themselves how to best do that.

I cannot say to you that this is how you need to do it. What I can say is this is what you need to do. If you want to look at my views in a wider aspect, because we have limited time today, I did an interview for the *Church Times* after I had been in post for a relatively short period. You can read the interview or, if you really want to know what I said, listen to the podcast - because obviously you have got their spin on what I said - and I set it out there. I think you need a number of things in place.

If you have people in positions of high responsibility but also a high degree of autonomy added to the deference that they get from having the title Archbishop, bishop, whatever that is, then you have to have a decent amount of accountability to hold them to account for that great responsibility they have. Inevitably, I go back to my political experience. The Prime Minister of the UK, unlike a lot of prime ministers elsewhere, has to come to Parliament every week to answer questions. You might think it is a bit of theatre, you might think it does not matter, but I can tell you it does matter. Finding ways to hold your most powerful people to account - and that may not just be Archbishops, bishops, that can also be the local vicar - not just to make sure that they are not up to anything but to make sure they have got in place the systems and processes where they can be as confident as they possibly can. You cannot be 100% certain but having those processes in place. Somebody has to be asking them those questions and I do not know whether your systems are able to do that.

It is a huge job. You have hundreds of churches, thousands of volunteers. This is not easy. I am not convinced yet that you have all those things in place and that is what I would say. I do not think it is to do with whether you are an officeholder or an employee; it is to do with what are the mechanisms that hold you to account for the power, the influence that you have.

The Chair: Synod, we are moving rapidly to the finish. We have got about five minutes left. I am going to ask for two more questions and, depending on how long those questions and answers are, we will see whether we can get another two in.

Canon Peter Adams (St Albans): Thank you for your report, Bishop, and to you, Phil. The witness for Ecclesiastical Insurance speaking at IICSA this last week was very clear that an apology to a survivor, offers of compensation, counselling and so on would not void insurance cover, yet we are consistently hearing from survivors that they have not received an apology, counselling, et cetera. Could you clarify the guidance that dioceses are using in the acknowledgement of responsibility and apology to allegations? This is especially how the Church can sharpen up its core business as a place and instrument of God's grace and reconciliation?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): In terms of the EIG published advice, I think it is, if we can get a copy of that, that will be on the Notice Board, I would hope today, so that will give you the advice. The important thing is that dioceses, DSAs, bishops, all involved take account of the advice. Bear in mind that is only the guidance from EIG and in a sense the Church needs to go not just to that guidance but to go beyond it so that whatever we are doing in terms of pastoral care, listening, compassion, outreach or apology, that it is sincere, it is swift and it is delivered in a way that is appropriate for the situation and particularly for the survivor who is at the heart of that.

Mr Phil Johnson: If I could add to that point. The most striking thing that came out of the IICSA report to me which resonated and hit home was that it described the Church's apologies as "unconvincing". That was not something that came from us. This was something they deduced and concluded themselves. Whilst these apologies are negotiated and certainly in the past they were very legalistic, they do not always resonate with the survivors themselves. As I was saying to Bishop Peter earlier, it would be nice if the Church spent as much as it does on lawyers as it does on supporting survivors.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): This is a question for Bishop Peter. Bishop Peter, do you believe that diocesan bishops have the capability and capacity, both of those, to be effective in this area of their work? Personally, as the national lead and as a diocesan Bishop, how do you find the capacity to do honour to both of your roles with fullness and everything that is required of you in those two incredibly important roles?

The Bishop of Bath & Wells (Rt Revd Peter Hancock): I will leave my other colleagues in the House of Bishops to speak about their own capacity and capability. I do not have enough of either, I am very clear on that, and that is something which needs to be addressed. It is easy to say that as a flippant reply. I am also clear that bishops have a very significant role in terms of being champions for safeguarding, for being advocates (and that is a spiritual role) and the pastoral role with our clergy for the parishes and the people that we have. There is a strategic role that the bishops have but it is important that bishops do not get drawn into the operational managing of safeguarding which must and does sit with the DSA and with their team.

The Chair: Synod, I am afraid we have run out of time but thank you very much for your questions.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Point of order. I wonder if we might end this time with a few moments of prayer. I wonder if we might look to the Chair, rather than just go rushing into a very, very different subject, to have a moment of prayer and then 10 minutes for people to gather their breath and talk to each other rather than seeing this as just another bit of business.

The Chair: Archbishop, thank you very much. What I was proposing to do is to say thank you to people, have that moment and then suggest we should have that break. I will take advice as to how long that should be because we are under time pressure.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): My apologies, I should have waited for you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Archbishop. On your behalf, may I thank Bishop Peter, Sir Roger and Meg Munn for their contributions. I would like to especially thank Phil as well.

The Chair: Synod, let us be still for a few moments and remember what we have heard today and perhaps one thing that we will do as a result of what we have heard today. I am going to suggest we have a break for five minutes.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 4.09 pm.

ITEM 13

MISSION AND MINISTRY IN COVENANT (GS 2135 and GS 2086)

The Chair: Synod, we now move to Item 13, Mission and Ministry in Covenant. For this item you will need the paper GS 2135 and the paper GS 2086. I also draw your attention to the financial comments in the Fifth Notice Paper, paragraphs 21 and 22. You will have seen on the Order Paper that there are three amendments. The way I am planning to play this is to hear some speeches and then to get on to the amendments. One is a standalone amendment, which we will deal with first of all, and then there are two where you need to make the choice. Both of them you cannot pass. You need to have one or the other.

We will hear the movers of those amendments speak to them but not move them and then you will know what the difference between them is and then, hopefully, we will have time at the end, after we have dealt with the amendments, to get back to debating the main motion, amended or unamended.

I call upon the Bishop of Coventry to move this item. Bishop, you have up to 10 minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Members of Synod, oneness is a mark of the Church. That is because the Church is the Body of Christ. On the night the unity of the disciples broke apart, Jesus prayed that we, the successors of the first disciples, who found it so difficult to stay together with him, would be one that the world may believe. The great awakening of Christian faith during the 18th century caused many to believe in this land and in America, but it proved beyond the Church of England to hold all that new life within its own life, here and there.

John Wesley, having exhausted his pleas to bishops for help, made other non-episcopal arrangements for the succession of ministry. British Christianity and the World Church fractured further into denominationalism, its credibility weakened. The 1910 World Missionary Conference set in motion a movement “to heal the Church of the divisions that impeded its mission”. Almost 100 years ago, the 1920 Lambeth Conference made its own appeal to all Christian people to reunite, and for those who lived without the sign of the historic episcopate to receive it as a gift, to embrace us all in a common life.

The bonds of history connecting the Church of England and the Methodist Church gave a special urgency to the quest to heal our divisions. Twenty years of work were given to the scheme of unity rejected by General Synod in 1972. A major step to mend the damage done on that day was taken in 2003 with the signing of the Anglican-Methodist Covenant. Both Churches, having recognised each other as true churches, with authentic ministers of word and sacrament, committed themselves to work towards “a united interchangeable ministry”.

Proposals to achieve that intercommunion were brought by the Joint Implementation Committee of the Covenant to Synod and the Methodist Conference in 2014. The Faith and Order bodies of both Churches were mandated by Synod and Conference to develop these proposals according to the clear principles on which they were based. That work was done at Mission and Ministry in Covenant and was brought to Synod in 2018. Further reflection was asked for on some key matters and it is the result of that careful work, steered by the Bishop of Lichfield and former President of the Methodist Conference, the Revd Ruth Gee, that I bring it before you today on behalf of the Faith and Order Commission. It is a joy to have the former President in the gallery together with other colleagues, including Professor Peter Howdle, who has done so much work through the Joint Implementation Committee.

The Faith and Order Commission is confident - and we have had this twice confirmed by the Inter-Anglican Commission on Unity, Faith and Order - that these proposals are consistent with global Anglican principles of ecumenism, principles already put into

practice in Ireland and the US. Anglican principles of ecumenism recognise, under proper circumstances, both non-episcopal churches and their ministers as churches' administrators of Word and Sacrament, and also require a further stage of reconciliation, a prerequisite for being in communion as churches and for receiving their ministers into our life.

As we have already seen, that recognition of the ecclesial reality of the Methodist Church and its ministry was given in the Covenant. Reconciliation is provided for in the proposals before you. Reconciliation happens as the Methodist Church makes the bold and courageous step of receiving the sign and gift of the historic episcopate, thereby committing itself to a permanent pattern of episcopal ordination. In this way, two episcopally ordered churches will be reconciled into a relationship of communion, not formed into one church but reconciled in relationship.

Reconciliation happens in a national service according to these proposals, replicated regionally as the two Churches declare their new relationship of communion through solemn statement and joyful celebration of the Eucharist, sacrament of unity. Reconciliation happens through episcopal prayer within that service as Methodist bishop and Anglican bishop, with hands outstretched, pray for the ordained clergy of both Churches to receive the gifts of grace needed to serve in those Churches and commission them for the apostolic vision in which they will share together under the sign and gift of the historic episcopate.

Reconciliation happens as presbyters from either Church, whenever they were ordained, take up a ministry in their partner church in, as the Report puts it, "suitable services where appropriate forms of prayer and liturgical action that express participation in the one apostolic ministry of Word and Sacrament in the mission of the church in the local environment".

Most importantly, reconciliation happens in the new possibilities for strategic mission and ministry that the alignment of oversight and presbyterial ministry created by these proposals will allow in our estates, cities, towns and villages.

Members of Synod, I am conscious that the decision, though, of the Methodist Conference recently to consult the districts of the Church on whether it should develop its teaching and practice on marriage will have raised new questions for some about the proposals before you today.

Let me say three things in this connection. First, in the Anglican Communion, and as we were reminded on Friday by the Bishop of Ribe, in the Porvoo Communion, we are already in communion with a number of churches whose discipline differs from our own in these matters. We would not be facing a new situation.

Secondly, clergy serving in a church that is not their own will minister according to the teaching and discipline of that church. Methodist ministers serving in the Church of England will be subject to the discipline of the Church of England and we have good precedence in the Anglican and Porvoo Communion.

Thirdly, it is a longstanding convention, already well established in LEPs, that ministers invited to serve in another church do nothing that is not permitted in their own church. I have no doubt that a lively debate will follow and I look forward to it.

My responsibility as chair of FAOC is to present to you the work you asked for within the parameters you set. It is now for you to decide whether, and in what way, to take it forward. My prayer is that we make a clear and well-informed decision, with full awareness of its implications, not only for our relationship with the Methodist Church, our close historical cousin and Covenant partner, but also for the credibility of the commitments the Church of England and the Anglican Communion have made for 100 years to restore the unity of the Body of Christ. Let our debate be mindful of the word from the world spoken to the Archbishop which we heard about this morning. The Church does healing. Let that healing begin with a household of faith that we might better serve a country in need of healing and reconciliation.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. As you can imagine with such an important issue, there are lots of people who have put down to speak so we will try and cover as many people as possible. Could I call first of all Anderson Jeremiah for a maiden speech. You have five minutes.

Revd Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities and TEs): I stand before you as a living specimen of “anomaly”. That is what the Mission and Ministry in Covenant calls me. I was ordained as a presbyter in the Church of South India and now I am part of this Church. I know many present here are sceptical or anxious about this motion, but I think we need to take the risk in faith, trusting in God’s wisdom, directed by the Holy Spirit, so that we may bear witness to Christ in this land effectively together.

Let me offer two thoughts. First, on some of the points of sharp differences as outlined in the document pertaining to historic legacy, we should be careful not to see them simply as theological or doctrinal flashpoints. We need to remember that even within our Church we are still in the process of discovering the full meaning of episcopacy as a gift from God to God’s Church.

As an outsider, and speaking from my CSI experience, these theological incompatibilities often implicitly articulate the power and privilege of an established church. As I see it, the hesitancy is nothing but our unwillingness to share our special privileged place for the

sake of Christian unity. We are not to be bogged down by a top-down hierarchical model of church but nurture bottom-up grassroots flourishing of Christian unity.

Secondly, the founding mothers and fathers of the Church of South India knew very well that ecumenism and the desired organic unity almost 74 years ago can only be lived and experienced, and not achieved through theological cartwheeling or ecclesiological gymnastics. We need to begin the journey in all sincerity so that the perceived irreconcilable differences could be worked through along the way as barefoot pilgrims, hurt and wounded by that experience but with the commitment to trust and obey the call of our God. We need to act and speak as one member among many others in the Body of Christ, the universal Church. We cannot bear witness to the love and compassion of God in isolation.

In an increasingly fragmented, broken and polarised society we have a great opportunity for bringing together healing and reconciliation of the divided household of God. We should be very careful not to perpetuate and relive the bitter denominational divisions of the past. In his Presidential Address, the Archbishop of York invited us to bear witness to Christ through visible unity at all cost and we have an opportunity in this motion.

Finally, let me invoke the words of Bishop V S Azariah, an Anglican Bishop of Dornakal speaking to the bishops at the Lambeth Conference in 1930, quite frustrated in the process of the formation of the Church of South India. He said: "The cost of union is penitence in response to the high priestly prayer of our Lord himself. We need to dedicate all our knowledge, possessions and privileges to this great cost. Are we ready to pay the cost?"

This morning, very rightfully, we were challenged by Archbishop Justin to strip back all our privileges and be vulnerable so that we can follow Christ to its fullest. Are we listening? Are we ready to listen for the healing ministry that we are being invited to? I welcome the recommendations from the Faith and Order Commission, with the knowledge that further work needs to be done, and I warmly urge Synod to support this motion.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): When is an anomaly bearable? It is a question that underlies much of our ecumenical discussion and, indeed, much debate among ourselves in the Church of England. We all live with anomaly of one kind or another. In the Church of England we have even institutionalised anomaly within our Five Guiding Principles. What that makes that anomaly bearable for the majority of us most of the time is a vision of mutual flourishing, or at the very least an instinctive aversion to excluding faithful brothers and sisters from the fold.

I am privileged to speak after Anderson Jeremiah. Two years ago, I was privileged to

preach in Chennai Cathedral at the 70th anniversary of the Church of South India. Along with its sister church in North India, and some years later the Church of Pakistan, the CSI has wrestled with many of the same questions that we are tackling this afternoon, before concluding that the various anomalies accompanying the creation of this united Church were bearable given the sheer urgency is its missionary context, all of which makes me extremely reluctant to do anything other than welcome this motion with open arms.

And yet I am genuinely concerned this afternoon about two anomalies, each of which might entirely bearable for many of us but both of which, taken together, may very well bring this motion down and threaten to undo the years of patient discussion that lie behind it. One is well spelt out in the papers, the anomaly of non-episcopally ordained ministers presiding at the Eucharist during an interim period that will inevitably last for several decades. Personally speaking, I could quite live with that, but the same may not be true of my catholic brothers and sisters. Then there is the other one, of course, hot off the press, the Methodist Conference's apparent enthusiasm for conducting same-sex marriages at just the point when we are wrestling with this as a Church and Communion, and where many of us feel deeply uncomfortable at either the direction or speed or both of these current developments.

Is the bigger vision compelling enough to make the potentially unbearable bearable? In some parts of the country I am sure the answer is yes, as Anglicans and Methodists strive together side by side for the sake of *Missio Dei*. That may not be true of everywhere, I suspect, or strong enough motivation to convince many in the chamber to overcome their qualms and press button 1, all of which makes me fear the potential lose-lose scenario of the motion going down this afternoon.

What is the alternative? Paragraphs 25 to 29 helpfully articulate three areas in which further work is recommended. The recent Conference has added a fourth, all of which made me warm to Paul Benfield's amendment or, if not, to Jane Steen's amendment as a way to flag up that we are not yet ready to pass the motion as it stands. Yes, I can already hear those frustrated references to the infamous long grass and I entirely understand that frustration, and indeed share much of it, but I fear the alternative might be to lose the ball altogether, which would be a real tragedy.

The Chair: Nikki Groarke followed by Kevin Goss for a maiden speech.

Ven. Nikki Groarke (Worcester): As someone who tries to approach life with prayerful and principled pragmatism, I can cope with a good fudge from time-to-time. Where I live, local fudge has been given a boost with the introduction of Droitwich Spa salt, mined again after years in abeyance. Grains of salt make the fudge more healthy and palatable - try some later.

These proposals are not perfect but are a healthy and palatable enough fudge for me to support them. As a Church we are used to living with grace-enabled imperfections. As an evangelical woman in a diocesan role working across traditions, I navigate the consequences of other less-than-perfect pieces of legislation all the time. I live with the muddle, as it enables me to be a priest where some cannot accept that, and we work it out amicably. Some, understandably, struggle with the significant theological issues around priesthood and episcopal ordination, which communion with the Methodists would bring. But you only have to listen to any group of curates in the Church of England talking about their ordination as deacon or priest to realise that the spectrum of understanding and opinion on the significance of each is as wide, perhaps, within Anglicanism as it is between us and the Methodists.

As Churches Together, we are called to mediate healing, reconciliation and blessing to the world. In the Diocese of Worcester, like many places in the UK, 98% of people do not belong to any church, so let us keep our internal differences with the Methodists in proportion. These theological issues are important, of course, but surely of far more importance are those 98% who will only experience God's love for them through His Church if we focus together on serving them and sharing good news rather than being bogged down in internal wrangling about who can legitimately do what and why.

I asked some of the clergy in our diocese what they thought about these proposals, some were in LEPs, others in informal relationships with Methodist neighbours. Without exception they spoke of excellent collegial relationships and joined up working to reach their communities, and their hope that what happens on the ground naturally could be simplified and, in some cases, legalised.

A Methodist friend commented that though she in principle supported the proposals as necessary for mission, one of her main concerns was around issues of hierarchy that could be introduced into Methodist structures. Interesting in the current context of our rightful critique of deference. Perhaps some learning there for us. I am sad that my friend would have to be described as a bearable anomaly and wish a less pejorative phrase could be found, but I think there is enough here to work with.

In a spirit of prayerful and principled pragmatism, and hoping for the grace to enable living with fudgy imperfection, for the sake of unity and mission I will support these proposals and encourage Synod to do the same.

The Chair: Kevin Goss and then we are going to begin moving through the amendments.

Revd Kevin Goss (St Albans): Chair, I thank you for calling me to make my maiden speech. As a priest in the Church of England leading a church in the affirming catholic tradition and having very deep Methodist roots within my own family, for which I am

profoundly grateful, my heart yearns for visible unity between our two Churches and I welcome much in the report before us to establish this.

I have to say, however, that having read this Report I am torn for my heart and my head find themselves in two very different places. My difficulties with the Report and the motion before us lie with the move away from catholic order and Anglican ecclesiology specifically with regard to its understanding of the historical episcopate and the need for those who preside at the eucharist to receive ordination from a bishop in historic succession.

First to bishops. The Lambeth Quadrilateral recognises the historic episcopate as a gift of God for the unity of the whole Church. The significant move the Methodist Church has made in accepting the ordination of bishops is to be much appreciated and applauded. However, it is still unclear from the Report what the historic episcopacy with the Methodist Church will really look like. To use the language of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, episcopacy may be open to adaption but what, really, are the limits to this.

Secondly, priests. I welcome the Report's response to the Bishop of Portsmouth's amendment at Synod's 2018 debate regarding the ecclesiological necessity that the president at the Eucharist must have been ordained by a bishop in the historic episcopate both for the sake of unity and sacramental confidence. But I am not sure that we are that much further forward. The different understandings of ordination appear elided in the Report. Ordained ministry in one church is not necessarily the same as priesthood as the Church of England understands it.

That future Methodist ministers will be episcopally ordained is to be welcomed, however those already in ordained ministry will not be re-ordained. This anomaly, of course, is the sticking point for many in our Church. We are told that this is a bearable anomaly, but maybe for 70 years or more? Services are welcome in commissioning and acknowledging previous ministries, of course a step in the right direction. But, however well intentioned, they do not overcome this vital sticking point - commissioning is not the same as ordination.

Finally, I hope all our hearts can support the first clause of our motion, but I believe our heads should warn us of the real danger of papering over the cracks by adopting the remainder. In view of what I have said, the rush to legislation proposed in the final two clauses and supported in the Report to my mind seems premature. There is much more work to be done on these issues which, frankly, will not go away. The kindest and most gracious and most loving thing to do is to be honest with ourselves and with our Methodist brothers and sisters to pause now so that together we may find a better way forward for christian unity in the future. Thank you, Synod, for listening.

The Chair: I call upon Cameron Butland to speak to but not to move, at this point, the amendment 46 standing in his name. And you have up to five minutes.

ITEM 46

Revd Canon Cameron Butland (Carlisle): Paragraph 19 of Mission and Ministry in Covenant says that the purpose of mission and ministry in covenant is to transform the mission dynamic in our communities. I am proposing this amendment to make explicit what is in danger of being lost. This motion is about mission first and foremost, and we need to take that seriously and think about that.

Thirty-seven years ago, 100 theologians came together at Lima from the World Council of Churches and were asked, "What is apostolic succession?" Article 35 of that declaration says that we are inheritors of the apostolic commission. Our priority in ministry is to go and proclaim the good news and to baptize all nations.

My question for this motion is: it is first about mission, but who will it benefit? Does it really benefit the Methodists? The Methodists may not accept our offer in this respect. Does it really benefit us? We have already heard from Bishop Christopher that there is a wide diversity of episcopal authority within the Anglican Communion and a wide understanding. So why should we vote for this? Why should this Synod say yes to this amendment and to this motion? It is for all those people who do not know Jesus yet in their life. It is all those people who do not know the good news.

Last night, at a fringe event, CCU presented the research that has been done in 12 towns, 151 parishes of the experience of doing mission together. The bald headlines from that research are that if you do it together the impact is far greater and the effectiveness is much more significant. I know this from the ecumenical county of Cumbria, in the Diocese of Carlisle. We have been an ecumenical county for eight years. In that time, we have seen dramatic growth in Fresh Expressions, Messy Church and in Network Youth Church, as well as in a whole variety of ways.

I give you one statistic: one out of every four members of the churches in Cumbria has come since we made that declaration. That is what doing mission together looks like and means. In February we spent a long time in this Synod talking about mission. We heard a national report about motivating the million, and we said we need a complete culture change in the Church of England to sweep away restrictions. We heard about evangelism on housing estates and we were told we needed to be much more flexible in how we operated Church rules. We heard about youth evangelism and were told that we need to be very much more innovative and creative in evangelism.

Well, Synod, here is the rub, this is the test. Are you prepared to put your unease aside? Are you prepared to make mission the priority to work together with others in proclaiming the Gospel, to receiving the apostolic commission and show all those who we wish to work with and all those outside our churches that mission is our propriety and we want to show the love of Jesus to all who are drawn close and nearby to the Church.

The Chair: Cameron, I apologise, I should have asked you to move your motion. So, could you formally do that please?

Revd Canon Cameron Butland (Carlisle): I formally move my motion.

The Chair: That is brilliant, thank you. I therefore call on the Bishop of Coventry to respond. You have up to three minutes

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Dr Christopher Cocksworth): Thank you, Cameron Butland, for that really powerful speech. You are absolutely right, both reports before you - there are two reports, the original one and then the one that we were asked to provide some work for - is Mission and Ministry in Covenant.

As you say, this is first and foremost an exercise in mission. It is about making interchangeability of ministry possible for the purpose of mission. I hope that this will lead to a renewal of apostolicity in the churches, a renewal of the sentness of the Church. Sentness is one of the charisms of apostolicity that belongs to Methodism. And through the reception of the sign and gift of the historic episcopate into the Methodist Church - and there has been a renewal, I think, of the sending missionary character of the episcopate in our own Church through this development - it will allow an alignment of missional oversight, missional presbyterial ministry, an alignment of missional use of Church resources and missional diaconal service.

People up and down the country have been sending me stories of mission together and have said that with these proposals that mission together will be even more effective. So, I very much welcome and support this amendment. My one little alliteration on it is that the proposals allow us, as it were, to move from sharing to a much more streamlined alignment of missional activity and that, of course, Cameron is exactly what you are doing in the Diocese of Cumbria. It is about the 98%, as Nikki Groarke said. It is about all those who do not know Jesus.

I support this amendment and I think it helps to underline exactly what we are looking for in this new set of possibilities that these proposals will open up. Thank you Chair.

The Chair: This is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Canon Joyce Jones (Leeds): I wish very much to support this motion and this amendment, because I believe that our working together, our reconciliation, is central to our mission. That particularly applies in the sort of parishes in which I work, which are villages where there are Anglican and Methodist churches. I have always worked closely with Methodist colleagues. I trained, in fact, with Methodist colleagues including the Revd Ruth Gee, so it is good to continue that in ministry.

Our unity is vital for our mission. If people see our two Churches separately, they will not see Christ easily. If they see us loving one another and working together to serve the Christ we follow, they are more likely to be drawn to faith. In our village communities, there are both Anglican and Methodist churches and our most effective mission activities are when we do it together. We do Messy Church together, we share ecumenical services together and we take turns in ministering to one another in preaching, and the more we can have interchangeable ministries, the more that will be demonstrated as a reality. We do open the book together in schools, and we work on equal terms.

Our witness to the community is evidenced by our unity and without that, that damages our witness and damages our mission and that seems to me far more of an anomaly than the others we speak of.

The Chair: The Bishop of Carlisle, and then is anybody wanting to speak against this amendment, against mission? Anyone? Bishop, you have three minutes.

The Bishop of Carlisle (Rt Revd James Newcome): Thank you for calling me. Although it was a long time ago, I still have vivid memories of a training exercise I had to lead as a junior infantry officer in the TA. Part of it involved getting an injured soldier down to the ground from the top of a high tower. I was rather proud of our rather swift, and I thought rather effective, way in which we achieved it. So imagine my surprise and disappointment when I was informed by the person in charge that I and my team had been disqualified. When I asked why, I was informed that according to the book the method we had employed was not possible. "But it worked", I impertinently replied. "That's irrelevant" came the reply, "It was impossible and that's that".

I therefore felt a slight sense of déjà vu when reading through the papers for this debate and GS 2135. After each imaginary scenario there is a little section on what is currently possible and what might become possible if we are able to move forward with the Anglican Methodist Covenant. I have to tell you that most of what might become possible is already, as we have heard, happening in Cumbria and it works. -

Not wishing to be disqualified again, I will not go into detail, but in this brief contribution to the proceedings I would like to offer some reasons why today's motion is so

tremendously important, why the anomaly for us is entirely bearable and why it matters so much that we should support it as soon as we can so that this can become normal rather than exceptional. I was going to give you four reasons; I think I will stick to one or two because of the time.

First, and this is why I am supporting Canon Butland's amendment, because it is all about mission, visible unity that the world may believe is quite simply a Gospel imperative. The papers describe our common calling to serve the people of England and share the Gospel with them and suggest we should be willing to cross denominational boundaries for the sake of responding to God's call. I agree absolutely and feel strongly that this theological rationale far outweighs some of the ecclesiological hesitations that have been expressed about the Covenant both from an Anglican point of view and the Methodist point of view.

Of course, I understand all those hesitations, but from a theological perspective I am persuaded by the argument that we are looking for the transformation of episcopal ministry in both Churches through new ecclesial relations for the sake of unity in mission. Our disunity is currently a major obstacle to our mission.

I was going to talk, too, about the principle of covenant and reconciliation and generosity, but let me finish just by saying that a few days ago here in York I was privileged to attend a memorial service for John Habgood; outstanding scientist, powerful theologian, respected Archbishop and passionate ecumenist. During the service I was especially struck by one comment made by his former chaplain, who is now a Bishop. "The Archbishop", he said, "refused to be told what could not be done. He just got on and did it". Synod, I hope and pray we will follow his example and, with much gratitude for all the work that has been done by the faith and order bodies, support this motion, however amended, which has such enormous and serious implications for the mission of the church.

The Chair: There is no one standing. There is, but I am minded to draw this to a close. Would all those who are happy to close this particular debate on this amendment please show?

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

The Chair: Sorry, that is clearly carried. I now put Item 46 to the vote.

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

ITEM 47

The Chair: Thank you. I now call on Fr Benfield to speak to but not to move your

amendment, and you have five minutes, Paul.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): This amendment removes paragraph (c) dealing with the legislation from the motion, and makes consequential amendments to paragraph (d). We need to remove legislation from the main motion because we are not yet ready for legislation. First, there is no consensus in the House of Bishops as to whether to proceed. For such an important ecumenical step, it seems to me incredible that we should go forward without the wholehearted support of the House of Bishops. We are told that the majority of the House of Bishops agreed to test the mind of Synod. Well, I suggest that to successfully and properly test the mind of Synod, we need to remove legislation, for many of us can vote for other parts - we are happy with much of the work that has been done, we are happy to call for further - but we cannot support legislation at this time.

We are told in paragraph (a) of the motion that there remain concerns about this proposal, but we are not told how those concerns are to be dealt with. We are told in the original report, Mission and Ministry, in paragraph 80, and I quote: "It should be emphasised that the interchangeability of presbyters and priests would be at the invitation of the appropriate authority. In the case of Church of England parishes incumbents, patrons, bishops and parish representatives as applicable have sufficient existing powers to regulate such invitations". That is a breathtakingly broad statement and I would suggest it is wrong.

It suggests, however, that this is merely a permissive proposal that you can have Methodist ministers in your parish if you wish. Well, if that is the case, if it is to be permissive, do we not need an opt-in provision somewhere in the legislation? We do not know. Under existing law, an incumbent can invite someone to preside at the Eucharist without the permission of his PCC, without the permission of his or her churchwardens. Where is the provision for those who have great concerns about this in parishes? Do we need in the legislation an opt-out provision? We need to be told how we are to proceed.

I am told by some of my friends, "Oh well, it is alright for you catholics because you have passed already the motion under the House of Bishops' Declaration on Ministry of Bishops and Priests", but that does not apply or say anything about episcopal ordination, it talks only about theological views on the ordination of women. Further work needs to be done as to how we are to proceed if we are to proceed. All these questions need answering before we start the legislative process for the legislative process will not answer them.

May I remind you of the history of the first women bishops' legislation? The House of Bishops could not agree as to how to proceed, so it thought it would leave it to Synod. Thus, we had those awful Synods. I remember particularly the one, I think it was in July 2008 here in York, where we tore at each other and the hurt and injury from that took

many years to heal. The legislative process on the first women bishops' legislation trundled on and on without sufficient support and eventually crashed in November 2012, falling at the Final Approval stage.

We must not make the same mistake again with these proposals. We must have sufficient consensus before we start, otherwise we risk a repeat of that women bishops' fiasco. Such a disaster would not be helpful for us, as we tear each other apart during the legislative process, it would not be helpful for our Methodist friends, as we seem to ditch them at the altar at the last stage again, and it will not be helpful for Christian witness and mission as those outside the Church do not understand what is going on. And, as such, I believe it is not God's will to proceed to legislation at this time. I urge you to support this amendment and remove legislation from the motion.

The Chair: I now call Jane Steen to speak to but not to move amendment 48 standing in her name. This is so we can get an idea of what the difference between the two is.

ITEM 48

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): Thank you, Chair. I originally, though slightly hesitantly, put in to speak in favour of this motion, but the documents we have before us seem to me to be hesitant. Many of us in this chamber have concerns about episcopacy, about ecclesial cultures, to name but two. In putting this amendment before you I speak both from my own sense that we may not have this quite right yet, and in the hope that we will not lose the original motion and thus so delay as to destroy closer Anglican-Methodist relationship.

The imperative for Christian unity is great. Methodism comes from the Church of England. Its theology, especially around personal and social holiness, is a theology to deepen our personal and corporate Christian character. I hardly need remind Synod that we sing Methodism's hymns, we are sister Churches, and our estrangement hurts the whole Body of Christ.

My amendment is intended to buy us time. This does not mean kicking the matter into the long grass. This is not a wrecking amendment. The new clause before you asks someone - the House of Bishops - to do something, to report on progress made on the work in the motion and proposals for implementation, and to do so within a specified timeframe, the next quinquennial.

Progress with more time can be more considered, genuine and honest, not rushed and potentially confused. Shared mission on the ground can and will continue, nothing is lost, and it may be that Methodism too would be glad of a bit more time. The amendment also removes all mention of proposals for legislation. This is not to say that legislation will not

be necessary, but although in some ways working out law and principle together as currently envisaged is attractive, it is a tall order to do both by February and once we are into legislation it may be that the legislative timetable drives our work.

The papers before us suggest that more words will not contribute to our debates. Perhaps, but we must proceed with the right words in the right time, whether according to theological or ecclesiological need, or, dare I say it, by the rhythms of prayer, for these are all necessary if we are to have a good outcome. The Archbishop of York challenged us in his Presidential Address: are we really a church no longer capable of pursuing a question patiently and in hope? I trust not. Yes, we have been working a long time on closer communion with Methodism, so let us not throw it away now.

The Archbishop spoke of the need to believe that those to whom we are opposed - and if I may extend his idea, those with whom we are in dialogue - are also on the pilgrimage of faith seeking understanding. Pilgrimages, and we are all pilgrims on the Christian journey, are not for rushing. They are for praying and worshipping, friendship forming, telling and hearing each other's stories, for making the journey as significant as the arrival.

One last point. If the Methodist Church and we proceed in these conversations, the European churches, with whom the Methodists are in a form of Ecclesial Communion, will need to be involved. Just now, cross-European Christian dialogue is vital, but dialogue which is timely, courteous and informed, not hurried and time pressured. Synod, please let us not risk capitulating these conversations about Christian unity over the edge of a cliff from which it would be hard to draw them back. Let us rather proceed at a more measured pace, understanding more deeply what these proposals would mean for our very different ecclesial cultures and not rushing into legislation. Synod, I ask you to support the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair. The way we are now going to do this is, Paul, would you come and formally move your amendment.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I do so move.

The Chair. Lovely, thank you. I now ask the Bishop of Coventry to respond. You have up to three minutes.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth): The motion itself, yes, of course, it acknowledges that some remain unpersuaded that the proposals are sufficiently mature to begin the legislative process, but it makes the judgment, carefully negotiated with the Methodist Church, that the next phase of Faith and Order work, the drafting of texts described in clause (d), is best done in tandem with the drafting of legislation.

That is for three reasons. First, by starting the process of legislation we signal to the Methodist Church that we are serious about our intentions, that we will allow them to proceed. That will then allow them to proceed with their next critical step, which is to decide whether they are ready to receive the sign and gift of the historic episcopate. Secondly, it will signal our seriousness to the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church in Wales, our sister churches in the island, who have expressed real interest in joining this Covenant process so that the benefits of what happen in England can be extended across Britain. Third, bringing forward legislation keeps this movement towards reconciliation moving and with all the checks and balances that our processes involve.

My problem with this amendment, though I recognise the spirit in which it is given, is that it leaves the long road to reconciliation with the Methodist Church rambling into nowhere. Yes, it asks for more work, but it says nothing about when that work should be done. It gives no clear signal to the Methodist Church or our sister Anglican churches in Britain that we are really committed to completing the road. It leaves words without determined action, it loses momentum and so I oppose it.

However, I can see that a case can be made for beginning to draft liturgical and other texts and dealing with other matters before the legislative process commences, so long as there is clarity about the next steps and proper responsibility is taken by the Church to bring credible proposals to fulfilment. It does seem to me that these concerns are addressed in the amendment standing in the name of Dr Jane Steen.

If I may say at this point, I would be inclined to accept that later amendment so that Synod can make a judgment on whether to hold back from legislation but continue the process or, as the original motion proposes - and I am still confident this is a good proposal - to continue the process by beginning legislation.

The Chair: The Bishop has indicated that he does not support this amendment. Therefore, under the 25 member rule, if I see 25 members standing or more then we can have a debate. If not, then it lapses. I see 25 standing. Therefore, this is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Christopher Smith (London): The Bishop of Coventry in his opening speech at the very beginning of the debate made the point that the Faith and Order Commission has been doing what Synod asked it to do. Just to remind us, in the 2003 Covenant we did “look forward to the time when the fuller visible unity of our churches makes possible a united interchangeable ministry”. I think we should bear in mind the order of things in that statement. The second thing is made possible by the first.

Then, in 2014 Synod asked the Faith and Order Commission to bring forth proposals that would enable ordained ministers from one church also to serve in the other. The matter of interchangeability of ministries was the cart which the later Synod asked the Commission to put before the horse of the organic unity of the two Churches. Do it that way round and perhaps we can avoid the trauma of the failed attempts of the 60s and 70s.

Now it is hardly my original thought but I am convinced that, as a theological enquiry, ecclesiology is a branch of Christology and, if our ecclesiology flows from our Christology, our principal way of being one derives from more than promoting a common cause or enjoying a set of benefits from being a member of a club. We are not one in the sense of our common membership of an organisation to which we as individuals belong.

We are one because we are united in the unity which already exists between Father and Son. The Word is one with the Father and, then, by the incarnation, this unity in the person of the Son takes to itself human nature and then that very unity is communicated to all those who are adopted and incorporated into Christ. But there are genuine theological differences within that body, even within the Church of England herself. These differences are perhaps better faced at the beginning rather than brushed under the carpet. Hence, the Bishop of Guildford's point that an anomaly, bearable or otherwise, perhaps predicates further division albeit with the noble and perhaps greater aim of eventual organic unity.

That brings us back to his question to Synod: is that further anomaly bearable or are we in the same place as we are in the 60s, postponing again a discussion on the nature of the Church, postponing the question of the sort of unity we wish to achieve, reducing the idea of unity to the question of who can do what job, suggesting that priests and bishops have an existence independent of their ecclesial context which is their context within the Body of Christ? Episcopacy is not important because it is historic. It is important because it is apostolic.

The Bishop of Liverpool (Rt Revd Paul Bayes): I am speaking as Anglican Co-Chair of the Joint Advocacy and Monitoring Group for the Methodist Anglican Covenant. I welcome and honour the presence of my Methodist Co-Chair, David Walton, who is here today. As far as I know, ours is the only group that has been set up by this Synod in order to advocate for something that faces the Church.

The Synod, ever since 2003's Covenant, wanted a road to be travelled. What does it mean that a Synod wants to travel a road? It means that we consider what we must do to make a change; in other words, reconsider legislation. It has, as the Bishop of Coventry says, been a long road but it has clear milestones and this debate today is one.

I strongly advise that the Synod reject this amendment and approve the main motion and take a further careful step along the road, a step to interchangeable mission and ministry and theological ecclesial convergence. It is a step, indeed, that asks for more thought, and there clearly needs more thought, but that constitutes a step forward. Therefore, even though it involves the construction of legislation, I believe that it is a moment of grace.

I agree with Jane Steen that law and principle together need to be seen as an attractive proposition, especially for a Synod. Here is a Church, the Methodist Church, which has agreed to consider taking episcopal order into its life. It would do so in a way appropriate to its life but it would change its own life and that would be a moment of grace, not only for them but for us.

We on our part are also being asked to embrace a moment of grace. What we are actually talking about here as a Synod is whether, corporately, we can put into practice all the fine things we say in pulpits and in hymns about laying down our life for our friends, about emptying ourselves of all but love, about preferring others before ourselves and about sacrifice and vulnerability.

Are we prepared to take a bold step as a Synod, which means a legislative step, not to rush into things but to begin them? I hope so, and I hope today that we will not embrace our own security so tightly that we smother the moments of grace by smothering the moment of drafting legislation. Please vote for the motion and resist this amendment.

Mr Robin Lunn (Worcester): Speaking enthusiastically in favour of the original motion and against those amendments. When I was first elected onto Synod in a by-election 15 years ago, one of the main reasons for standing for election was to see intercommunion with the Methodist Church become a reality.

The previous year we had seen the publication of the Anglican Methodist Covenants and there was great optimism that the breach of 1739 and the failure to pass the legislation in 1972, to the everlasting regret of Archbishop Michael Ramsey, would be resolved. Heady days indeed. It is, therefore, to my everlasting regret that, 15 years on, so little progress has been made.

When I speak to deanery synods now and mention this issue, people yawn and say, "What is keeping you?" Years of grinding along in first gear have created both bewilderment and sadness. It will not surprise you to learn that I fully support the motion and am against the amendments. Legislation needs to come before us. All of the points that have been raised this afternoon and concerns about the direction of travel can be addressed by amendments in the legislation. All we are calling on today is that we move this process forward.

People will have different views but we need the debate and we need a clear distinction. Most importantly, we need to inspire and invigorate both Churches but also to compromise and look at how to overcome obstacles, not to create further ones. In the June 2019 Report, the Bishop of Coventry spoke about the importance of making process if all our ecumenical discussions were to mean anything. I totally agree.

We can always come up with reasons, 280 years of reasons, why as not to make the leap, but I say to you in all conscience, if we cannot make this comparatively straightforward step towards bringing forward legislation, why continue to discuss relations with other churches in similar ways? On a range of subjects, we discuss our innermost beliefs, people lobby, argue and cajole for things that matter to them.

Well, let me tell you that this is particularly the major issue that matters to me and to a lot of other people within this Synod. This is what we care about. Let us put an end to the tortured, creeping steps of the last 16 years and stride confidently to intercommunion. Let us go forward to legislation and move this process along.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): The House of Laity's voice seems to be missing in this debate and it is very important that we are heard. Many of us are involved in ecumenical ventures at home. My church belongs to a covenanting group of nine churches which includes a Roman Catholic church, a Methodist church and a URC church.

I stand before you having been baptized in a Methodist church. My mother was a Methodist. My father was an Anglican. They shaped my faith. I have joint membership in the URC and Anglican Churches. You have been very kind in accepting me. There seem to be some people here who think that legislation hurriedly happens in the Church of England. I have no idea, nine years later, why this opinion exists. I would like to have something on a piece of paper to discuss that is a positive move forward and I see this entire motion as a positive move forwards.

I do hope we will resist the amendments because I hope that in a spirit of grace - and that word has been used several times in this debate - and a spirit of reconciliation, just as we have acknowledged the United Reform Church we can also acknowledge our friends in the Methodist Church. People in the street do not ask me if I am an Anglican or a United Reform Church member or how I grew up or where I came from. They ask me what I am. When I reply to that, I say to them "I am a Christian" and I hope that stands for most of the people in this room.

So, please, please, in the spirit of trying to get this anywhere within this quinquennium, see this forwards. I say again to you, if you think this is going to happen in a hurry, I am afraid that does not happen in the Church of England and creeping along at a snail's pace sometimes is not the way forwards. Let us go forward in faith, my friends, and let us go

forward and embrace all Christians. That would be my wish and my hope for everyone's future here and particularly for the future of our young people.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Chairman, after the next speaker could I tempt you, as you hold the balance of power, to vote for a motion for closure on Item 46?

The Chair: You always tempt me.

Revd Dr Andrew Atherstone (Oxford): I confess an interest as a member of the Council for Christian Unity and also the Faith and Order Commission, which has written this Report jointly with the Methodists. I want to commend the Report to Synod, especially its doctrine of bishops. What is proposed here is a giant leap forward in our ecumenical thinking. Not only will the Methodists receive episcopacy under their system but we will receive, for a limited period, the eucharistic ministry of those who have not been ordained by bishops.

This is nothing less than a revolutionary step and I think a particularly exciting one. It requires a bold leap in our imagination for the sake of the visible unity of the Church. Not since 1662 have ministers presided at the Anglican Eucharist without episcopal ordination. We have been waiting three and a half centuries for this ecumenical breakthrough.

These proposals remind us that episcopacy is not a fundamental Anglican doctrine. Bishops are beneficial. They are valuable. They are a blessing to the Church usually, but bishops are not essential for the nature of a true Church. That is basic Anglican ecclesiology that we have agreed with our Methodist friends. For that reason, I welcome what the Report has to say about bishops and I hope it will establish a precedent for how we as Anglicans build unity with non-conformists.

As we have heard already, a second ecumenical dilemma has now opened up in front of us. That is, of course, the doctrine of marriage. It is not being considered yet by the Faith and Order bodies. It is nowhere in our Report because it has not been part of our brief. The decisions by the British Methodist Conference this week present a very severe challenge to our ecumenical hopes because on sex and marriage, fundamental points of historic Christian teaching, a deep rupture is now opening up in front of us like those earthquake faults we have just been seeing in California. It has been highly disruptive within British Methodism itself. It is also highly disruptive, sadly, ecumenically.

Our unity proposals are built upon the Anglican Methodist Covenant and our Covenant is built upon a presumption that we are agreed in all essential Christian doctrines and now we see that that may no longer be the case. Remember the prophet Amos, "How can two walk together unless they be agreed". For that reason, I suggest it is premature today

to start drafting legislation, but I do welcome both of these amendments, especially Jane Steen's amendment, because it keeps the conversation alive. It keeps the dialogue going. We need to see guidelines for the integration of ministers before we go any further.

How will we safeguard the integration of incompatible marriage doctrines within the lifeblood of the Church of England? Or will our ministers now be allowed to practise one doctrine in the Anglican parish church and a different doctrine in the Methodist chapel over the road? So urgent attention, please, to these new questions in the next phase of the conversation.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Chairman, a motion for closure on Item 46.

The Chair: That has my consent, does it have the consent of Synod, please.

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

Mr Andrew Gray (Norwich): Point of order. Can we have a vote across all Synod?

The Chair: You can if I see 25 people standing. I see 25 standing.

The motion was put and lost, 118 voting in favour 118, 224 against, with 13 recorded abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on Jane Steen to move the amendment standing in her name.

Ven. Dr Jane Steen (Southwark): I move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair: Thank you. Bishop, you have already indicated but you have got an opportunity for another three minutes if you would like to.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth): I will not need three minutes but I would like to thank Dr Steen again for the thought with which she has presented this proposal. As I said before, the original motion makes the judgment that drafting liturgical and other texts would be best done alongside the drafting of legislation. I still believe that to be the case, but I can see that there is a case for commencing work on those texts without the pressure of legislation.

The merit of this amendment is that it sets a timeframe, unlike the previous amendment, for that work and clear lines of responsibility for completing it. I think it is right to place that responsibility with the House of Bishops. Members of Synod, although I remain confident of the merits of the proposals set out in Ministry and Mission in Covenant, and I very much appreciate and entirely agree with those who have said we need to keep

moving and this is a historic opportunity before us, I do not want to stand in the way of the thought of process, or at least testing out whether this process offered in the amendment is the right one.

My hope would be that, if this is the Synod's view, the process that it puts in place will increase the confidence of others in the proposal and help to build a wider consensus in the Church while at the same time maintaining momentum. I am very content, Chair, for the mind of the Synod to be tested on this amendment and on that basis I support it.

The Chair. The Bishop has decided to take the Anglican position of neither supporting nor opposing it, which means I will have to see 25 members standing if we are going to debate this amendment. I see 25 standing. This item is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker): It was a great and fascinating experience for me as someone with a longstanding commitment to ecumenicism looking in a Catholic direction to the Anglican Co-Chair of the Committee that brought to you Mission and Ministry in Covenant.

I continue to believe that there are good catholic arguments for the main thrust of the proposals we brought to you. One, because they are all about healing a wound, a tear in the fabric of the Body of Christ, and Catholics must be interested in that, but also because I do slightly differ in my interpretation of the work we did from my good friend, Father Atherstone, who spoke a moment or two ago.

One of the reasons why I was able to sign off that work was because it planted so clearly a flag for episcopal ministry and, therefore, episcopal ordination as the basis on which the Church of England seeks to strengthen and deepen ecumenical partnerships. I think that was something in which Catholics can rejoice that that was the keystone of the proposals and something that the Methodist Church has graciously said it will look to embrace the reception of the historic episcopate.

Nor do I believe it is quite the revolution in Anglican ecclesiology that we have heard. Anglican practice would not change at all. We would continue to ordain all our priests episcopally. There would be what some have called a dispensation and accommodation for a body of ministers coming from a church we have recognised as authentic, but we do need to move forward together and to build that wider consensus of which Bishop Christopher has just spoken.

Particularly, I think we need to do some more thinking and learning together, particularly about what it means to address the reconciliation of churches and whether that leads us

to look at certain issues differently from when we are considering them in-house. I am very grateful to Jane Steen for her amendment, and very grateful to Bishop Christopher for accepting it. I would urge Synod to unite around this amendment so that, prayerfully, we can keep the ball in play and we can do the further work and thinking that is needed to build unity that does not leave disunity in its wake, which I fear is where we might be at the moment.

Revd Canon Lisa Battye (Manchester): I am speaking from the evangelical perspective and from the perspective of 50 years rather than 15 and speaking first to say I really like Methodists. If any Methodists are watching this, we like you - we really like you! They have great things that we could learn from a lot. I became interested in this subject 50 years ago because of something I read and I just want to read a bit from a book, written by someone who became a friend. I think it has a lot to say about why on earth we would want to postpone what we have been offered. I am against this motion. I feel there is no real need for us to postpone. We should be working with God's deadlines because I believe deadlines are God-given and they help us work.

I am going to read that quote and it goes like this: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me".

I encourage people to vote for this motion as it stands with no amendment.

Revd Canon Peter Leonard (Portsmouth): This is my fourth year on Synod and like my friend who spoke earlier I would find it hard to believe that anyone could ever accuse us of rushing anything. We could get wrapped up in lots of clever theology and clever ecclesiology this afternoon. We probably will get caught up in all sorts of political games, because that is what we do so well, but we have heard a lot about mission imperative. The word is "imperative", and we can talk about all we like, but if we do not do anything then we are demonstrating the mission of God or how imperative we actually think it is.

Some 15 years ago I was priest in charge of an Anglican Methodist LEP. I had the privilege and honour of being recognised and regarded as a Methodist minister and played a full part in their circuit, presiding in their churches. It was an immense privilege. That church was on a housing estate where largely every other professional had abandoned except the church. The two denominations had the good sense to come together and, as that church grew, the people who came to it did not come to an Anglican church or a Methodist church, they came to St Michael's and at St Michael's they were

loved whatever their past was. At St Michael's they were married despite what had happened to them. Their children and they were baptized into both denominations, not that they particularly cared about that; it was about being a Christian.

The Methodist Church has been extending that grace and hospitality to us as Anglicans for many years. A temporary anomaly, while a horrible expression, is probably a small price to pay for moving forward in the mission of the Church.

Let us also remember that when Jesus called his disciples together, he did not check their credentials. He did not ask them to jump through any hoops. He simply asked them to follow him, and they did. Those fishermen and tax collectors went out and asked others to follow them, and they did. These are the Saints on whom the church is built. The Church - not the Methodist Church or the Anglican Church but the Church.

Synod, I would encourage us to resist this amendment. Remember that we are about mission imperative and to follow Christ and move closer to the Christian unity for which Christ longs and which will demonstrate the love of God for all.

The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Christopher Chessun): I wish to speak in favour of the amendment as proposed by the Archdeacon of Southwark. The connection does not inform my judgment on this. I am very grateful to the Bishop of Fulham for his irenic contribution to this debate and also supporting this amendment.

I strongly believe, and throughout 36 years of ordained ministry I have committed my life to this, that Christian unity is an imperative and our best endeavours need to be given to finding a way forward that is acceptable to everyone. We are not at that point yet with these proposals.

Members of Synod will have discerned that when the Report GS 2086 first came to Synod, the House of Bishops was unable to make a collegial recommendation on how to proceed because a significant number of Bishops believed that further work was needed. I am very grateful for the further work that has been done by the Faith and Order bodies, and particularly for the contribution from the Bishop of Lichfield, but there is still no consensus in the House of Bishops for what has now emerged.

With the time that we would gain if we support this amendment, I would just like to make one observation. In my own diocese, the Porvoo Agreement is lived out fruitfully in two Nordic churches in Rotherhithe, Norwegian and Finnish, whose ministers I am at liberty to license, which I do with great joy so that their ministry may be exercised in every Anglican community of faith across the Diocese of Southwark. The painstaking work which issued in Porvoo and which was validated in General Synod more than 20 years ago has led to convergence in sacramental ministry as well as the historic episcopate and

borne fruit in shared mission and witness. Something of that rigour is now required with these proposals because legislation for proposals on recognition of orders would be likely to need either a two-thirds or three-quarters majority. If this is ever to be achieved, similar rigour and painstaking work will be required if rancour and division is to be avoided. I urge you to support this amendment.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): Is anything more important than unity? Who could be against mission? I have been on a number of Through Faith Missions. That is where I first met the Bishop of Carlisle a long time ago in Cumbria. He has very long legs. I could not keep up as I tried to follow him.

The Church of England was one of the organisations least willing to take part in these missions, but we are Christians first, as Penny Allen reminded us, but, brothers and sisters, the deliberations of yesterday afternoon make me realise we have got some work in-house to do on mission. What Gospel are we going out with? I want to quote GS Misc 1224: “ministry for a Christian presence in every community”.

At the heart of our mission is good news. It is costly. It involves the Cross. There is no mention of the Cross in this document, no mention of repentance, no mention of sin, no mention of saviour and salvation, no mention of judgment, so I would say we need to get our act together on that. We are a legislative body. We must make good law. We had great trouble when the women bishops’ legislation failed at first but when it came back, it was better. So please delay. Do not be in a rush. We have got work to do on the Gospel.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. After the next speaker would you be interested in a motion for closure?

The Chair: I would be really interested, thank you. Rachel first.

Revd Canon Dr Rachel Mann (Manchester): I am speaking in favour of an unamended original motion. “I am no longer my own, but thine. Put me to what thou wilt, rank me with whom thou wilt”. Many of you will recognise this as the opening line of the Methodist Covenant Prayer, the prayer which arguably represents the very texture of Methodist conceptions of holiness and service. It draws our attention to the deep common call to humility, relationship and trust at the heart of our faith.

Synod, in speaking today in support of the original motion I do so as a member of the Faith and Order Commission. I do so also as someone who trained for ordained ministry with Methodists, who spent a year on a USPG project worshipping with Methodists. Dare I say it, some my best friends are Methodists. I hear catholic questions about episcopate. I hear evangelical anxieties about Methodism’s direction of travel and yet the Methodist

Covenant Prayer says, "I am no longer my own, but thine. Put me to what thou wilt. Rank me with whom thou wilt".

We are already in covenant with our Methodist sisters and brothers. The original motion before us today invites us into a further stage in that tender patient negotiation of the implications of friendship, indwelling and the kingdom of love; in short, the implications of being ranked with whom God wilt. The motion invites us along the path of deeper mutual recognition and communion. Order is mediated through the Body of Christ and it is time for the next stage in healing. We take our readings of covenant from God. His very being is promissory. We find freedom because he will not let us go. Our pre-existing covenant with the Methodists requires that we walk forward. Let us dare say, like our Methodist friends in the gallery, "I am no longer my own, but thine. Put me to what thou wilt. Rank me with whom thou wilt".

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Can I tempt you to a motion for closure on this item?

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

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

The Chair: That is carried. Now Anne.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): Point of order. Could I ask that we have a vote by Houses?

The Chair: I need to see 25 people standing. This is for a vote by Houses. I do not see 25 people standing.

A Speaker: Point of order. Would you take a vote of the whole Synod?

The Chair: If I see 25 people standing I will take a vote of the whole Synod. That is obviously what you want to do. This will be a counted vote of the whole Synod on Item 48.

The motion was put and carried, 221 voting in favour, 127 against, with eight recorded abstentions.

The Chair: The amendment is therefore carried. We now move back to the debate on the motion, which has now been amended by Items 46 and 48. There is a speech limit of three minutes now. Those wishing to speak please stand. I am going to ask Susan Howdle, who is the Methodist Church representative, to speak. You are going to get five

minutes though because we all love Methodists. The rest of you can sit down and I will make a decision later.

Mrs Susan Howdle (Methodist Church): Chair, thank you for calling me. I did not think it appropriate to seek to speak during the earlier points of the amendments. Thank you for the welcome from the Synod to me as the new Methodist ecumenical representative. I could perhaps have wished for a slightly easier occasion to make my maiden speech, but not because I feel discomfort with the proposals in the body of the Report. My personal pilgrimage - we have heard of pilgrimages - 50 years on from 1969, I still recall the profound disappointment then, and in 1972, that I felt as a young adult when the necessary majorities were not achieved for that scheme for addressing the real anomaly of disunity.

I was the Vice-President of the Conference at the time when we decided to embark on the current journey back in 1995. I had the excitement of being present at the signing of the Covenant. Since then I have been proof reader in residence to the Methodist co-Chair of the JIC, Professor Howdle, and seen 700 pages of carefully worked through text, and latterly I have been leading on some preliminary legal drafting work if we were to move forward, because Methodist legislation takes a long time as well. I still retain a sense of excitement and hope at the possibilities which could, in God's good time, lie ahead.

We have heard of covenant. Could I just one or two words from Dr Margaret Whipp's theological exploration we had before us yesterday? "The Church is called afresh in each generation to witness to eternal covenant of grace and to a renewal of covenantal faithfulness one with another in the bonds of Christian service and mutual love".

We are at a time of renewal. Is God calling us within this Covenant to take the path offered to walk together or do we sadly agree to continue to walk along separate paths despite our common calling to share in God's mission?

Mr Chair, these have been difficult decisions. I thank those who have brought the latest Report for their care and integrity. The direction of travel was warmly endorsed by the Methodist Conference at earlier stages, but if, in due course, these proposals are brought to the Conference I cannot stress too strongly to the Synod how momentous and permanent a step this will be and not all members of the Conference will find it easy nor will they find the language of anomaly pastorally helpful.

I am hopeful that the same spirit will prevail as did in 2003 when we agreed in Methodism the Covenant unconditionally, even though there were then serious concerns about whether the Church of England would go forward with the ordination of women to the episcopate.

Perhaps I might address one or two points that have been raised. On marriage - because that is what everyone has been wanting to talk to me about - we have not rushed. Some 26 years ago, the Methodist Church embarked on what was called our “pilgrimage of faith”. We have been walking that journey alongside a covenant journey during that period. On the report that came to Conference this week - and its proposals were adopted provisionally for consultation throughout the Church and with ecumenical partners in the coming year - the debate was gracious, sensitive, paying deep attention to the Scriptures and in the context of a wide-ranging report about relationships. God’s love in Christ unites us. The decision expressed honestly and openly that it is an area where we need to live together and live well with contradictory convictions, as well as making clear and strong provision for conscience. Yes, we need to talk further about our doctrine. Bishop Christopher referred to the fact the Church of England already being in communion with other churches where that situation obtains and, if I may say so, as to contradictory convictions, you have perhaps over the years experienced something similar in your own Church in relation to those who do and those who do not feel able to accept the ministry of women.

The President Bishop, I believe, does reflect properly Methodism’s understanding of the balance of personal and corporate episcopate. No, the President Bishop does not look like a diocesan bishop but is not a cipher of the Conference. I have personal knowledge of the scope and nature of that episcopate.

In concluding, one sentence: at the Methodist Conference last week, we were reminded by a representative of the Church in Wales of what Archbishop G O Williams said of the 1975 Covenant of the Welsh Churches when asked why “covenant” had been chosen: “We called it a covenant because we meant it”.

Mr Chair, whatever the result of today’s decision I want to assure you of the Methodist Church that we remain committed in our worshipping, witnessing and working together because we meant and still mean it.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Not far short of three centuries ago we caused Wesley to have to make his own arrangements, as we heard earlier, in a really very powerful speech. We put them out. I think we have to be very, very hesitant about setting terms for us to get back together. History is not on our side in the way we have acted in the past.

The amended motion before us is not where many of us want it to be, but it is a carefully worded one, and I am deeply grateful to Dr Jane Steen for her work on this. I, for one,

am profoundly committed to moving forward in this matter for the sake of the Gospel, as she said, for the sake of the Church and for the sake the world we are sent to serve. The motion before us as it has been amended means that the process of getting from here to where Synod has consistently asked us to go and, more importantly, where Jesus prays that we will go, that is the good reconciliation of churches, the putting aside of what was so eloquently referred to as the “unbearable anomaly of division”, has slowed down that process, but I remain committed and I hope this Synod will remain committed to the process of living out our covenant commitments, again carefully put because we mean it, with the Methodist Church. I fully support the welcome and the recommendations set out in parts (a) and (b) of the motion.

The Methodist Church is looking on as we debate these proposals. I urge Synod to approve them overwhelmingly so that we can get on with the process of listening carefully to each other, to seeking to understand one another better, to recognising our own failures over time because we need to repent - that word has been used already - and we need to turn and seek to walk in obedience to Christ together in the right way, and there is much hesitancy here about exactly how that is done, but it will require our listening, our prayer, our repentance so that the text referred to in part (d) means that the unity that Christ wills for his Church might come a step closer, for Anglicans and for Methodists in England, with the necessary but minimum delay.

A Speaker: Point of order. I offer you a motion for closure after the next speaker.

The Chair: You would not need to do that but I will be interested to hear from you again.

Miss Annika Matthews (Church of England Youth Council): I declare an interest as an incoming lay rep to the Churches Together Enabling Group. First, I wanted to say I really welcome the debate and update on this motion. In my view, anything which seeks to work towards as full a form of unity as possible should surely be applauded. As brothers and sisters in Christ we are called and granted by God to create (Romans 15:5-6) a spirit of unity as we follow Christ, so with one heart and mind we may glorify God. And where can that be most powerfully achieved? Not only in the receiving the Eucharist together with our ecumenical friends, as I have had pleasure to do on numerous occasions, but also in sharing and interchangeability of those who preside at the Eucharist.

The sacraments of the Eucharist allow us to affirm our faith, reflect and refocus our commitment to God and one another. It is in Christ that we are all held together. Indeed, before I divined as an Anglican, I first, and still do, belong to Christ. The visibility of this unity in sharing of ministers across our churches will surely demonstrate this mutual belonging we share in Christ together.

I had the privilege of attending conversations with the Methodists, one of two days

focused on receptive ecumenism held a few weeks ago. It was not on the giving of gifts but more on the receiving of the gifts that we can gain from each other. There was time to listen, ask questions of one another, raise fears and examine the needs and challenges facing our own churches. The next step, which will be held in October hopefully, is to see what we can offer from our churches to help towards filling the gaps and finding solutions in the other Church.

It is imperative that as a Church, to quote Ephesians 4:2, that we try to be “completely humble and gentle, bearing of one another in love”. There are challenges ahead which are noted in the Report, but these are hopefully being carefully considered and prayed through to ensure the uniqueness present in both our Churches will be preserved. Unity does not equal uniformity. There indeed might be some theological differences between us, but who knows those differences better and can embrace that than Anglicans, within whom we already have so much diversity. It was diversity that actually attracted me into the Church of England. More excitingly, there are so many opportunities for mission of the Church in local communities. If the interchangeability of clergy is permitted, it may encourage a greater resourcing of shared lay ministers, such as children’s and youth workers.

It is true that there are wounds and brokenness, because we are human and we hurt one another, but we also have great capacity to love each other and who better a guide do we have to walk with us, what better healer and reconciler to bind our wounds and fix our misgivings than Jesus, our Lord and Saviour, who promises to be with us always, to the end of the age. I pray that Synod might be encouraged to support this motion to take further steps forwards to fuller unity with the Methodist Church.

A Speaker. Point of order: motion for closure on Item 13.

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. That is clearly carried. I now call on the Bishop of Coventry to respond to the debate. It being such an important debate you have up to 10 minutes, but you do not have to use it all.

The Bishop of Coventry (Rt Revd Christopher Cocksworth): Ten minutes is very tempting. This has been a really powerful debate, and an informed debate, and with passion and compassion.

We began with Anderson Jeremiah. I thought it was such an interesting speech, and a really important one, because it talked about the dynamic of gift - the dynamic of gift that we believe will be received by the Methodist Church if they are able to make this bold and

courageous move. Susan Howdle gave us a bit of a glimpse of the cost of that. Anderson also told us something about his experience in the Church of South India of the gift of relationship, and we have heard a lot about that.

The Bishop of Guildford put it in a very interesting way: "Can we make the unbearable bearable?" I love them both, but I preferred the Bishop of Carlisle's way of putting it, with angelic resonance: "Nothing - nothing - is impossible with God, even overcoming the unbearable anomaly of division".

Nikki Groarke, thank you very much. Yes, I liked that concept of grace embodied in perfection. That is a doctrine of the church, as it were, in the penultimate.

Kevin Goss, thank you for your contribution. I realise - and I found this moving - the tension you have found between head and heart, but I think Anderson gave you some sort of answer as to what episcopacy will in God's good time mean for the Methodist Church.

Thank you to Joyce Jones and others for emphasising and holding before us the vital connection between unity and mission.

Christopher Smith, you made some very interesting points about which way round do you do this? I think this is where we can do some further work together, because there is a very powerful doctrine of the Church here that is saying if we can get things right at Church level, that has consequences for our ministers. The Bishop of Fulham has done a lot of thinking and a lot of work on this and has hinted at that larger concept of communion and of the gift of episcopacy and what that allows one to do when it is in place.

Robin Lunn, I fear that you will feel we are still in first gear. I will return to that later because we must keep moving.

Penny Allen, thank you for making sure - and others for doing the same - that the voice of the laity is heard.

Thank you, Andrew Atherstone, for your recognition that there is here – and I think whether you are with the Bishop of Fulham or with Andrew Atherstone, there is nevertheless, I think for us, a bold leap in our imagination which is being asked for.

Lisa Battye, I agree that God's time deadline is the critical thing. There is a disappointment in me that we are not moving forward at this point, but nevertheless let us seek together God's deadline as we do it and not allow this to stall.

Peter Leonard, I agree entirely about the mission imperative.

Thank you, Mary Durlacher, for your contribution. I think sin and repentance is in the report, but our further work can make it clear that we unite around the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thank you, Rachel Mann, for taking us back to the Covenant Prayer: "Put me to what thou wilt... with whom thou wilt". I think that is what I mean of something of the sentness of the Church.

Susan Howdle, thank you for the graciousness of your speech. If I may say to your husband, Peter Howdle, whom I have worked with for 10 years on these things, Peter, we will keep moving together. We will heed the Archbishop of Canterbury, who reminds us that history is not on our side, there is some repair work we need to do to our own history. We must move forward together, and we must move forward with urgency and with determination.

The Bishop of Southwark, thank you. I have enjoyed our conversations through this process. There is still some convincing of each other that we need to do. Through this opportunity for further thought I think we can do that together and find ways. You said, "bring everyone together". I am absolutely with working for a greater level of consensus than we have at the moment. I think that is our opportunity. Our everyone, of course, includes the Methodist Church as well.

As Andrew Atherstone said, this will require of us at some point some boldness and some imagination. When Bonhoeffer in the 1930s was calling for the churches of Europe to seek peace, he said: "Peace is not the same as security. Safety does not come in the way of seeking peace. We cannot guarantee our own protection as we seek the way of peace". I think the same applies to ecumenism. I think the same will eventually apply to the decisions that we will need to make in relationship to the Methodist Church, but for the sake of Covenant - and Archbishop G O Williams put it well - "We said 'Covenant' because we mean 'Covenant'". Thank you, Susan Howdle, for reminding us that when the Methodist Church says "Covenant" it means "Covenant". There will be some costs to take. There will be the acceptance, I think, that we cannot guarantee everything that we seek to be, as it were, protected from, but we can find that as we make that step.

I return back to our first speaker, Anderson Jeremiah, who talked about the dynamic of gift, that which is received through relationship, and we find that rather than losing something, we gain something greater - and our calling is for Christ's sake to gain the world. Thank you.

A Speaker: Given the importance of Item 13, would you consider ordering a count of the whole Synod?

A Speaker: Point of order.

The Chair. I can only deal with one thing at a time. If I see 25 members standing, then we can. Do I see 25 members standing for a count of the whole Synod? I do see 25 members standing.

A Speaker. Point of order. Are we not going to achieve the same result? Can we go to a vote by Houses?

The Chair. If I see 25 members standing. I do see 25 members. I therefore order a vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 13 (as amended by amendments 46 and 48): In the House of Bishops, those in favour 35, against one, with one recorded abstention. In the House of Clergy, those in favour 130, against 20, with nine recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, those in favour 123, against 29, with 10 recorded abstentions. The motion was therefore carried in each of the Houses and therefore carried by the Synod as a whole.

The Chair. Thank you, Synod. That now concludes this item of business, and we move on to the next item.

ITEM 14

SPECIAL AGENDA IV

REFUGEE PROFESSIONALS (GS 2126a and GS 2126B)

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 6.20 pm.

The Chair. We are now at Item 14 on the agenda, a motion from the Southwark Diocese on Refugee Professionals. You will need papers GS 2126A and GS 2126B. The Fifth Order Paper gives the financial implications of the motion on page 7. And the Order Paper for this afternoon shows the text of the motion and of an amendment. I intend to, after calling Mr Lebey to speak, to set a time limit of three minutes on speeches and to hear three or four speeches, then to call on the Bishop of Durham to speak to and to move his amendment and for Mr Lebey to respond. After that, if necessary, we will hear a couple of speeches on the amendment and deal with that before moving back to the main debate. I now call on Mr Lebey to speak. He has up to 10 minutes.

Mr Nicholas Lebey (Southwark): Good evening, Synod. Brothers and sisters, it is a privilege to bring this motion, which came from the Deanery of Battersea in the Diocese of Southwark.

Working alongside secular people of good will, Christians in Battersea have become increasingly committed to working with refugees. Battersea Welcomes Refugees is a local response to needs by the Deanery of Battersea. So far, they have managed to

provide and fund three rental flats at below market rent for Syrian refugee families coming to the UK direct from refugee camps. Given the cost of the rental market in South West London, this is no mean feat. The Battersea Deanery is ambitious for more. Working alongside other local partners, such as the Katherine Low Settlement, in the parish which provides excellent ESOL provision, the Deanery wishes to offer, in the words of the Area Dean, “a counter-narrative of hope for refugees, especially in the much-criticised hostile environment”.

But refugees need jobs as well as homes and refugees are not just people with a particular set of needs. Many of them have much to offer. Some of us will have experienced meeting a refugee doing a low-skilled, low-paid job, only to discover that they have a significant professional background and qualifications from their country of origin. They could be a doctor, a radiographer or an accountant. In many cases such skills are needed by Britain, their host country.

In the current Brexit uncertainty, we are already seeing decreased numbers of EU professionals applying for work in the United Kingdom. One of the interesting pieces of information that has emerged from the NHS is that the level of staff retention where refugee professionals are recruited is higher than in the general population.

Members of Synod will have seen the paper produced by the Deanery of Battersea and the extremely helpful paper from the Council for Mission and Public Affairs. Both of these review the extent of work going on in the United Kingdom to assist refugees who are professionals, particularly the Refugee Council’s Building Bridges programme and the Reach North West programme, which have had particular success. It should also be noted that such assistance as is available from the government has reduced in recent years as the policies associated with austerity bite. The papers outline the challenges faced by refugee professionals.

This story as an example may help. Dariya arrived at St Mary’s in Battersea one January evening, having seen details of an Alpha course on the parish website, as a refugee from Iran, where her unwillingness to conform, in an extremely conservative regional city, was placing her at increasing risk of coming to the attention of the authorities. Eventually, after managing to leave Iran, she found her way into the United Kingdom, initially as a student. Eventually, following parental advice, she claimed asylum. Dariya is a lively young woman, and one of the ways in which she found a place amongst the Christian community was through the parish church choir because singing is something she loved to do and something the authorities in Iran sought to discourage. From that basis of a simple welcome and the low key in which Alpha is done at St Mary’s, Dariya was subsequently baptized and confirmed.

But Dariya was also a qualified midwife. As she was going through the immigration processes, which the parish aided her in, she also needed support with the complex process of gaining the necessary accreditation and training to put her professional skills to use in the NHS. The parish priest said and I quote, “When I spoke to Dariya the other day, she said what mattered more than any financial assistance she may have needed was the support we as a local church were able to give her as she attempted to negotiate the complexities of the process”. The sort of sub networking with other healthcare professionals that churches can provide through being the diverse communities they are all helped Dariya find her way through the processes. Examples of help were a letter of support and relevant advice where necessary. All this help contributed to her achieving accreditation as a midwife in the United Kingdom.

Dariya is an unusual case because she had the personal and material resources to assist her, including a good command of English, but many people probably do not. This is especially true when refugees emerge from conflict zones or who are in desperation turn to traffickers. In these circumstances material support may well be more necessary, and this is where our motion has a modest amount of commitment attached.

We are inviting the dioceses of the Church of England to each commit to providing the funding necessary to assist with accreditation of one refugee professional. The motion is specific in that it does not require dioceses to set up new provision but to use the existing provision in each region. It also asks for the sort of help the Council for Mission and Public Affairs has provided in terms of advice in its covering paper to be provided to dioceses who may need assistance on this matter.

It is quite a simple motion really. It is not about the politics of refugees or the merits of immigration policies of this government or the previous government. It is not about whether there is a national emergency in the English Channel at the moment. It is simply about a potential win-win for refugees and for England as a host country. It is about providing a little bit more social glue, enabling refugees to integrate more fully into British society and if it is saying anything to the national government, it is saying that the Church of England believes that, rather than creating a culture in which able, intelligent and qualified professionals are forced into office cleaning, Uber driving, fast food delivery and the negatives of the gig economy, we believe human dignity and human need are best met when people are enabled to use their gifts to the best of their ability. And all this can be done on a very modest price tag.

Let me conclude on a happy note. Last June, Dariya married Mike. Mike is a Filipino nurse, and a Christian, here on a work permit. They have settled into their new home in Sutton in happy possession of that most British of things - a mortgage - and are pursuing their respective nursing careers with all the energy you would expect of those who have travelled so far to thrive. Mike and Dariya had their reception just next to City Hall in

London, not far from Southwark Cathedral. The backdrop to their wedding photograph was the iconic Tower Bridge and as the parish priest said he observed such happiness portrayed in that scene. He went on to say and I quote “What a statement it is about their commitment to this country to see two people, one a refugee, finding a home, a spouse and a career. What a privilege to have been able to help that come about” enof quote. Indeed, this is something good for them, for Britain, for the Common Good and, importantly, for the Kingdom of God.

Synod, I urge you to vote for this motion. I move the motion standing in my name on behalf of the Diocese of Southwark. Thank you.

The Chair: Joanne Kelly-Moore for a maiden speech, followed by Heather Black.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven Joanne Kelly-Moore (Canterbury): On World Refugee Day this year, 20 June, members of the churches of Dover and the wider community, and the wider Diocese of Canterbury, and in the Pas-de-Calais, were gathered on the coasts of our nations to call in the campaign of People Not Walls for asylum seekers and refugees for compassion and care in how they are cared for. Kirrilee is in the midst of the horror as the Chaplain in the Pas-de-Calais in a partnership between the Diocese of Europe, the Diocese of Canterbury and USPG. As we gather around this motion, I invite our Synod to keep praying for those for whom Kirrilee supports.

In the Diocese of Canterbury, our Kent Refugee project officer, Domenica Precaro, is engaged daily with networking across local and central government, aid agencies, employers, schools and those who are refugees and asylum seekers, all the while seeking to put in place the best care of welcome and support as they come to live among us as members of our communities.

With all this in mind, I stand to support the offer of this motion to engage us in that ministry of welcome and want to note very briefly in our experience in the Diocese of Canterbury what possibilities they are. In doing so, I note the helpful detailing of some of that ministry that can be offered in the Bishop of Durham’s suggested amendment but want to suggest that in this context where our treasure is there our hearts will be also.

Domenica has been very proactive in working with our universities to seek joint partnerships and other training agencies to see where we can increase our funding by what we can offer with what they can offer in this care of welcome, as we see it enriching the flourishing of all our communities. She has also been proactive to ensure that our job centres and employers are using the national agency for understanding and recognition of international skills in supporting individuals and families.

We are keenly engaged in supporting lifting the ban also, that asylum seekers can have that ban lifted if their application takes more than six months to consider. In all of this, our local parish support is vital and that is alive and well. With all that in mind, I stand to support this motion.

Mrs Heather Black (York): Nicholas and Synod, I bring warm greetings from Middlesbrough and Teesside where REPOD, the Resettlement Programme for Overseas Doctors, is based. My own parish of North Ormesby has large numbers of asylum seekers and we currently have a GP, university lecturer and engineer, amongst others, worshipping in our congregation. We are blessed by them, their vibrant faith and their willingness to contribute to church and community life but quite rightly, they want to use their God-given skills and professional training to contribute to the community that has welcomed them.

The REPOD scheme is run by a charity that I work closely with, Investing in People and Cultures, working with North Tees Hospital. The programme provides a comprehensive package of support from language classes, pastoral support, personal development plans, through to support with exams, GMC registration and applying for jobs. A recent evaluation of the scheme by Newcastle University reveals that doctors are successfully progressing through the programme and we have some in full-time employment at North Tees Hospital and some doing locum work. Previously, they were cleaning windows and delivering pizzas, whatever work they could find.

Now, anyone who lives in the North knows how difficult it is to recruit to professional positions, doctors, teaching and the Church. We now have refugee doctors relocating to Middlesbrough and Stockton because of the REPOD scheme. This is something to celebrate and support. I wholeheartedly support this motion and my colleagues in REPOD in Teesside would be delighted to share their experience in learning in whatever way that we can assist. Thank you.

The Bishop of Southwark (Rt Revd Christopher Chessun): I am very pleased to speak to this motion which has been sent up from my diocesan synod. It has had my full support through its gestation in Southwark where we have close experience of the issues involved. I do not want to speak at length for it is a motion that speaks compellingly for itself. This is a time for people of goodwill to join in urging the government away from the hostile environment approach and the Church has a distinctly prophetic voice. We can and should insist on the treatment of each individual as a unique child of God, not a number in a bar chart.

And although a fair regulatory framework, still to be developed - it is far from fair at the moment - is inevitable, we profess the Christ who came to bring abundant life and who teaches us that giving is better than receiving. It is our part to speak for generosity. So,

this is only a first step. We need also to encourage generous recognition of the gifts and skills of many more refugees without professional qualifications. What this motion before us attempts to achieve in small measure is precisely that sort of human contact that makes a difference.

The proposal, if enacted, will bring to both parties the sort of sympathy and understanding that is mutually beneficial and, as I have said, should be seen by us as just a first step. We should not obscure the very good work done by many churches in related areas. In the Diocese of Southwark, there is a link to the London charity, Hestia, to combat modern slavery. It is one of those dioceses that is participating in the vulnerable persons resettlement scheme for those seeking refuge from Syria.

We receive a grant from the Mothers' Union to run a number of projects in promoting English as a second language, invariably women to women, in precisely a way that the MPA paper, GS 2126B, commends. A recent report from Refugee Action identifies a great and an only partially met need in this area. This motion is a modest, practical and logical response to these imperatives. There are in the United Kingdom today men and women who cannot live in the countries where they were born and where they learned useful skills.

My diocesan synod wants to achieve something very specific with a particular group of refugees whose skills were acquired at some cost and effort in their home country. Once more, those who are engineers, architects, chemists, physicians and teachers can be the people they hoped they would always be. I urge you to support this motion.

The Chair. Now the Bishop of Durham to speak to and move his motion. He has up to five minutes.

ITEM 49

The Bishop of Durham (Rt Revd Paul Butler): I thank Nicholas and Southwark Diocese for proposing this motion. There is huge amounts to be welcomed, as Nicholas outlined well, but I think it misses an opportunity to speak more broadly to the specific question of employment issues relating to refugees and asylum seekers. It is also, unintentionally, in danger of being perceived as elitist, hence my amendment.

The motion identifies the importance of refugees accessing employment and of the difficulties often faced. The problem lies in the narrowness of the proposed application. My amendment seeks to retain the broad encouragement to help refugees access the workforce but adds three things. First, a recognition of the importance of ESOL. English language is critical to help refugees into work and has, sadly, been seriously reduced in recent times.

Secondly, encouragement to dioceses to support the Lift the Ban campaign coalition, arguing for the right of asylum seekers to work. This renews the policy decision that Synod overwhelmingly backed in 2009. As such, we are already members of the Lift the Ban coalition. Sixth months is proposed as this is where the broadest based alliance sits.

Third, and most importantly, it adds a specific request that MPA would build on the current available resources and advise dioceses as to the best models for supporting refugees into all kinds of employment rather than mandating a specific way of acting for each diocese.

Now I turn to the concern about a perceived elitism. Last week, I was in the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Migration looking at future employment. What was clear there from the CBI, the NHS, the social care sector, tourism, hospitality, farming and education sectors was that the division of employment into skilled and unskilled or professional and others is now regarded as deeply unhelpful in determining what work provision is required.

So, the thrust in the wider debate is away from only highlighting the issues around those in professions towards exploring the needs required of the labour market and the varied experience and skills that those seeking employment offer. This breadth needs to be applied to refugees seeking work. My amendment includes all the desired regarding professionals in the main motion but broadens it to all areas of employment that refugees might seek regardless of what skills they are offering.

The Building Bridges scheme was only able to help a very small number of refugee doctors registered in 2018 as a result of the dispersal and move-on provisions and house prices in London. Even if the scheme and those like it are scalable, it is unlikely that it is able to be taken up successfully by every diocese. That is why I recommend that Synod ask MPA to provide a toolkit of different models that dioceses can apply in their local context and that apply to all kinds of employment.

I am delighted that Synod has the opportunity to discuss our commitment to the flourishing of asylum seekers and refugees. I welcome the emphasis that Southwark wish to offer on professionals, but I urge Synod to take the opportunity to speak more broadly to employment as a whole. I ask Synod to amend the motion so we are able to honour our commitment to refugees more broadly right across the Church. I move my amendment.

The Chair: Mr Lebey to respond, please. You have up to three minutes.

Mr Nicholas Lebey (Southwark): I want to thank the Bishop of Durham. I know that he has a heart to help the refugee people and I applaud him for that. The amendment before us is laudable but general. It is general because what it is offering us, sadly, is moving

us from actually doing something specific to potentially doing nothing because it is far too general. What we are offering is just a first step. We are not saying that that is all it is that we can do to help refugees.

And if you look at our motion, it asks for a specific commitment. Synod, as I was thinking about this, I was actually reminded of a saying that my grandmother used to tell me growing up. It says, "If you try to look into a bottle with both eyes, you end up with your nose in the bottle. Try and use one eye and you can see what is there". The moral of this is that sometimes we just have to focus on one thing and get it done rather than trying to focus on too many and getting stuck.

And I think that that is what the amendment, sadly, is giving us. It takes away the commitment from a diocese to help one particular and replaces it with something important but too general. I think it is generic and it does not commit any resources to helping our brothers and sisters from the refugee community. Synod, on Friday, when we were praying, we prayed Psalm 112. Verse 9 of that chapter says this, "The righteous offers freely and gives generously to the needy. Their goodness will be remembered forever. They will have influence and honour".

What we are asking is for dioceses to be generous in helping our brothers and sisters and making this commitment is something that will be remembered forever. Just imagine for a minute, there about 42 dioceses or so. If each and every one of us commit to helping one individual, let us assume in the medical profession like a nurse or a doctor, that is 42 people that we are lifting out of a life of dependency.

Some of these people have nothing and they are living on just minimum salary and we can help them. Think about the benefit that this will bring to us and to them and their families. It is something important that we can do. I think also that refugees are often in the shadows. They are not visible enough. They are seen as a parasite and they are dependent on us, but they have something to offer and our motion is saying, let us try and help them to offer their skills and talent which will benefit our society. All this is coming at a modest price tag, as I mentioned.

The last point I want to make is this. What we are offering is just a starting point. It is not the end. Therefore, it gives us somewhere to start. There are so many things that we are doing. By asking you to resist this motion, we are not saying that those things are not important or they should be ignored. We are saying, let us start from somewhere where we can do something specific, measurable, accountable and realistic and I think this is a good thing to do. That is why I would urge you. I know we have to listen to our bishops and be nice to them but, please, let us politely resist this amendment and stick to the singular focus of helping people.

The Chair: Do I see 25 members standing, please? We do. I will call for debate on this amendment.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Lisa Battye (Manchester): In a parish with a large group of people in the asylum seeking process, many now with leave to remain, of at the last count around about 50 members from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria and Pakistan, and I could not pick one of them that I would ask you to single out to fast track through to a special place which would look tokenistic to the others, as well as being the possibility that we were only interested in them if they could bring something obvious to us.

Please do resist the original motion, not the intention of it but the idea that you have a minimum of one and, instead, support this well-worded amendment because what we need in our parish to help us to help our asylum seekers is the Lift the Ban. We need them all to be able to work sooner than they are allowed and we need a sea change. We need to call on the government to do work for us, not to turn in on ourselves and do tokenistic things.

The Chair: Thank you, I call on Priscilla White and then I am minded to test the mind of Synod on a motion for closure given the time.

Revd Canon Priscilla White (Birmingham): thank you for calling me Chair, I echo the worry about tokenism around choosing just at least one refugee in a diocese with many refugees and asylum seekers. I think that, yes, refugee professionals are very important, but the refugee who has worked as a panel beater in the car trade for 25 years also needs accreditation in the UK before he can work here.

So, the issues are not just about professionals. Language is a huge barrier for many people, so is help with understanding the application process, application forms, CVs. Parishes, aided by dioceses, perhaps through diocesan officers, could link with people offering support and guidance, a job club for asylum seekers dealing with the very specific needs that they might have.

In Birmingham, in the recent past, the organisation Restore has run a course entitled Equipping Refugees for Work which looks at the process of finding work in the UK and introduces issues like CVs, job applications and the like and helps people to deal with that very different application culture. The course is not running at the moment due to funding issues. It could be much more cost-effective for the Diocese of Birmingham to put money into that than into funding one person into accreditation.

The amendment widens the imagination in the ways that refugees, both those who are professionals and those who are not, can be encouraged and equipped for work. The main motion, it is really hard to vote against helping people, is it not? It could simply go to a pending tray and go nowhere. The hope is that by widening the approach more dioceses will be able actively to engage with the issues and more difference will be made for more people. Thank you.

The Chair. Thank you, I would like to test the mind of the Synod on moving to close the debate on this amendment. So, would all those in favour for the closure of item 49 please show, all those against. That is clearly carried.

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

The Chair. We move to vote on Item 49. Would all those in favour please show, all against please show. That is clearly carried.

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

The Chair. We move back to the main debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Dr Nick Land (York): We cannot be sure how long Jesus spent as a refugee in Egypt but it is likely that Joseph had to use his carpentry skills to support the family. Now it is probable that the requirements of the Egyptian carpentry council were less demanding than those of the GMC, but it is direct evidence from Jesus' life as to how important the restoration of a refugee's ability to work and feed their family is. It restores their dignity. It builds their wellbeing and helps them to contribute to the community that has given them refuge.

This is, of course, true for any refugee not just the professionally qualified, but there are particular barriers for the professional refugee. One of the most difficult steps, certainly for refugee health professionals, is that first one, getting the initial clinical attachment that allows them to refresh their skills and learn about the culture of the NHS. The provision of such placements are entirely discretionary on the part of the UK professional involved. A member will come round, "Are you willing to provide an attachment for x in your speciality?" It is additional work. Many hard-pressed doctors feel too busy to take this on.

This is an area where we can make real difference as a Church through implementing the recommendations of *Setting God's People Free* because, if we help our professionals understand what it means to be sent to Church in their practices and hospitals, if each

day they are thinking about how can they be working alongside God to build the Kingdom and to meet human needs, when the memo comes around to provide an attachment they will recognise that by doing so they will be fulfilling the words of Isaiah, to loosen the chains of injustice and untie the cord of the yolk, to share the food of their knowledge with the hungry and to provide the poor wanderer with shelter. They will recognise that, when they provide a placement for the refugee, they are serving Christ.

This is an issue that needs a change in behaviour of individuals within our Church, individual lay people who have control of that access to the discretionary decision that says, "Yes, I will help this individual to work alongside me to give them that first step". Thank you

Revd Canon Kate Wharton (Liverpool): Thank you Chair My previous church was in a very deprived part of Liverpool. Very close by was a tower block which housed newly arrived asylum seekers, so many of them came to join us in our church. One family, two parents, four small children, became a much loved part of our family, seeking asylum from Egypt on the grounds of religious persecution.

Their application was turned down again and again, which meant constant worry and fear for their family. They kept appealing but they had to wait four years for their status. He was an accountant. She was a teacher. Four years where they could not work, could not earn, could not train, could not study, could not contribute and could not use their skills. They could volunteer, but even that was hard as they were not allowed to do anything requiring previous skills and experience.

I told them about this debate and asked them what they would like me to say. I told them of its content and they said simply, "Yes, that will be better". They spoke of how very hard those years were for their whole family. Now, even with their status, they have had to start over to study and train again because it has been so long since they worked in their chosen professions and because they do not have any UK training or experience in those jobs, even though they tried and failed to gain relevant voluntary experience.

I support this excellent and important motion and delighted it is now in the amended form because I think it helpfully widens its scope, but also sharpens its aims and means that even greater good could come from it. I agree with Nicholas on the need for action and commitment and resource. I agree with those who have reminded us that this is not just about professionals. Had the content of this motion been enacted and in place when my friends arrived and the many others like them that I know from Liverpool, their lives would have been much enhanced but so I believe would the greater good of many others. Thank you.

The Chair. Thank you and now I would like to test the mind of the Synod on closing this motion. Those in favour of the motion for closure of item 14 please show, those against the motion for closure please show.

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

The Chair. In which case, that is clearly carried and I call on Mr Lebey to speak. He has up to two minutes.

Mr Nicholas Lebey (Southwark): Obviously, I am disappointed. I feel like I asked for oranges and they have given me lemons. We are going to make lemonade out of this. Thank you so much for the debate. Thank you for the points that you have mentioned which are very, very important. I think the Refugee professionals need help and I think that they are being overlooked and this motion aimed to redress that imbalance. But obviously, what has just passed also offers us a wonderful opportunity to help them.

So I am glad that you have mentioned some of the things and I just want to touch on one or two of the themes that emerged. Thank you, Joanne Kelly, you mentioned about what is going on in your diocese in Canterbury and talking about especially where our treasure is that is where our heart will be and I think that we care about these people and we want to help them. Of course, there are many ways that we can help and so we have this opportunity to do that.

The Bishop of Southwark, my Bishop, thank you for reminding that this is about showing empathy and understanding and I think we have people living in our parishes and our dioceses who at the moment need help and reaching out to them is the right thing to do. I hope that we can offer help like the Mothers' Union funding is trying to do with people, enabling them to have ESOL to help them integrate more. So, I will say thank you for this and I think we have something great to look forward to in our parishes and may this inspire us and encourage us to go forward and do more and turn our words into action. Thank you.

The Chair. Thank you. I now put Item 14, as amended by Item 49, to the vote. All in favour please show all against please show. That is clearly carried.

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

The Chair. That ends this item of business and we move to evening worship.

Mr Mike Stallybrass led the Synod in an act of worship.

**Full Synod: Fourth Day
Monday 8 July 2019**

MORNING WORSHIP INCLUDING BIBLE STUDY

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

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 9.47 am.

**ITEM 508
SPECIAL AGENDA 1
LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS
DRAFT CATHEDRALS MEASURE (GS 2136)**

The Chair: Good morning, everyone. We now come to the first item of business today, Item 508, the draft Cathedrals Measure for First Consideration. For this item members will need a copy of the draft Measure, which is GS 2136, and the Explanatory Notes and Memorandum, which is GS 2136X. Please also refer to the financial comments on the Fifth Notice Paper, the green booklet. Members might also like to have to hand GS Misc 1223. Please take note that we have passed the time when requests to speak can be processed for this debate. Thus members will need to signal that they would like to be called to speak in the usual way when the motion is open for debate.

I call upon the Chair of the Steering Committee, Canon Robert Hammond, to move Item 508: "That the Measure entitled 'Cathedrals Measure' be considered for revision in committee". You have up to 10 minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): Members of Synod, cathedrals, or more precisely Chelmsford Cathedral is a part of my family DNA. My father was a choirboy there. My parents were married there, I was baptized there. I went to Sunday school there. I went to the youth group there. I was confirmed there. I ran the youth group there. I have been on Cathedral Council. I was on congregational council. Along with all the deanery lay chairs in Chelmsford Diocese, I was made a lay canon of the Cathedral four years ago. I am still a Eucharistic assistant and although we no longer live in Chelmsford, I still happily travel there when I am on duty. The Cathedral is my family church and it matters to me, so cathedrals matter to me, and perhaps that is part of why I am extremely happy to be standing here before you today introducing this draft Cathedrals Measure.

Before I set out some of the key points of the draft Measure, let me remind Synod of some of the background. The Cathedrals Measure 1999 sets out the current statutory

framework for cathedrals and provides for the regulation of a number of cathedral activities by the Church Commissioners. In response to a request from the Bishop of Peterborough, following his 2017 visitation to Peterborough Cathedral, the Archbishop set up the Cathedrals Working Group, which was asked to look at how the legislation governing cathedrals was operating and whether any improvements could be made. The Working Group considered the existing governance structures of cathedrals, with a particular focus on financial management, major building projects, safeguarding, accountability, oversight and scrutiny.

In its final Report in June 2018, the Working Group set out its recommendations for the future regulation of cathedrals. The most significant of these recommendations proposed the reform of the current governance structure of cathedrals, bringing them in line with the jurisdiction of the Charity Commission. This Synod endorsed the Report in July 2018 and requested that the Archbishops' Council bring forward a draft Measure for First Consideration at the General Synod in July 2019, this Synod, to give effect to those recommendations that involve legislative change.

This draft Measure reflects those of the Report's recommendations that require legislative change. While most of the legislative recommendations in the Report are understood to have the general support among the cathedral community, there may be specific recommendations which do not have such support.

Should Synod members wish to do so, they may submit proposals to the Revision Committee to amend any clause in the draft Measure in the usual way. May I encourage you to do that?

The Third Church Estates Commissioner has overseen engagement with the cathedral community and its representative bodies to discuss what support cathedrals will need to make the improvements and changes required by the draft Measure. As a result of this engagement, the Church Commissioners have approved significant additional funding for cathedrals in the next triennium to support cathedrals to make the necessary changes.

So what are the key governance changes? First, Chapters and Councils. At present, the body corporate of a cathedral is comprised of three bodies: the Chapter, the Council and the College of Canons. Cathedral Councils have a number of statutory functions under the 1999 Measure, including receiving and considering the cathedral's budget, annual report, accounts and revising the constitution and statutes. However, Cathedral Councils have no power to act they consider there are problems with the way in which the cathedral is being governed. Therefore, the Report recommended that cathedrals should no longer be required to have a council and that all trustee functions should sit with one body, an expanded Chapter.

The draft Measure provides for an expanded Chapter with a majority of non-executive members. The Chapter's executive members are the Dean and the Residentiary Canons as the praying heart of a cathedral. All members of the expanded Chapter are its charity trustees. The draft Measure still enables chapters to set up a Cathedral Council should they wish to do so. However, such a Council would not be part of the cathedral's body corporate and would only have those functions conferred on it by the Chapter.

Secondly, safeguarding. The draft Measure provides that members of Cathedral Chapters will be required to have due regard to the House of Bishops' Safeguarding Guidance. In addition, the disqualification provisions for PCC membership in the new Church Representation Rules are replicated in the draft Measure, so they will apply to Chapter members in a similar way as to PCC members.

Thirdly, and very close to my heart, parish church cathedrals. The draft Measure confers power on the Church Commissioners to make a scheme similar to a pastoral reorganisation scheme so that those cathedrals which have a parish but no longer wish to have one can cease to have a parish. The other significant recommendation that the draft Measure addresses is around the proposed co-regulation by the Charity Commission and the Church Commissioners.

A key recommendation of the Report was for cathedrals to be brought within the definition of "charity" in the 2017 Act so that they will come within the Charity Commissioners' jurisdiction in the same way as other bodies of the Church of England, such as Parochial Church Councils. Cathedrals are civic and public buildings as well as places of worship. Bringing cathedrals within the Charity Commission's jurisdiction recognises the wider benefit they provide to their local communities, making them more accountable to the general public. The cathedral deans met at Windsor earlier this year to consider the theology of cathedral governance. You have the notes of that consultation as GS Misc 1223.

They noted that co-regulation of cathedrals by the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commission reflected the affiliation of cathedrals to both the Church and the State. The College of Deans also voted unanimously to support bringing cathedrals within the jurisdiction of the Charity Commission. The Report recommends that there should be more rather than less oversight of cathedral finances and financial transactions. The Charity Commission does not regulate many activities which are currently regulated by the Church Commissioners. Therefore, if the draft Measure only provided for cathedrals to be brought within the jurisdiction of the Charity Commission, much of the regulation and scrutiny of cathedrals' significant financial transaction would be lost. Therefore, the draft Measure provides for the Church Commissioners to co-regulate various aspects of cathedral activity with the Charity Commission. This means that the Charity Commission

would be the registrar and regulator of the cathedrals so far as they are charities in accordance with the framework set out in the Charities Act 2011.

However, the Church Commissioners would regulate a number of cathedral activities that are not regulated by charity law or the Charity Commission. The regulatory powers conferred by the Church Commissioners in the draft Measure are summarised in the annex to the Explanatory Notes. The Church Commissioners have approved the proposals for cathedrals to be co-regulated by the Church Commissioners and the Charity Commission. In principle, the Charity Commissioners' Board accepts that it would be appropriate to remove what is in effect an anomaly that excludes cathedrals from the definition of "charity" in the Charities Act 2011. However, it has highlighted a number of areas where it has important concerns that it expects to be addressed to its satisfaction before the proposals can be implemented. The Third Church Estates Commissioner and members of staff are working closely with the Charity Commission in order to fully address those concerns.

To conclude, as you can see, a vast amount of work has already gone into this draft Measure and the supporting consultations and the background activity. I would like to pay tribute to the Third Church Estates Commissioner, the Legal Officers and other staff for their hard work.

There are no doubt improvements and refinements to the draft Measure which members of Synod can offer and, in the hope that Synod is content that the draft Measure proceeds to revision, I would encourage members to submit them to the Clerk so that they can be considered by the Revision Committee.

We are aware that the timescale is tight if we are to bring revised legislation to the February 2020 Synod, please feed in specific thoughts and those on direction of travel early that can be clarified as we progress. The Steering and Revision Committees need to have the widest view of any concerns so that we can address them. I very much look forward to hearing what members have to say in the debate.

Madam Chair, I move "That the Measure entitled 'Cathedrals Measure' be considered for revision in committee".

The Chair: As we come to debate Item 508, I would like to stress that the matter before us is for First Consideration so please remember, members, that under Standing Order 51 speeches must be directed to the general purport of the Measure rather than to points of detail. As Robert has already pointed out, there will be the opportunity for members' feedback in terms of dealing with the detail and amendments they would like to be considered during the next stage of the process which will be the Revision stage.

Also, I would like to remind members of the need for members to declare any relevant interests if called to speak. Thank you for that. It would be good to hear from as many people as possible, so please be aware that there will be a three-minute speech limit from the outset. The motion at Item 508 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Dr Eve Poole (ex officio): Since the debate last year I have had the great good fortune to lead the implementation of the Cathedrals Working Group Report, the first fruits of which is the draft Measure before you. You also have before you GS Misc 1223 which accompanies it. This provides additional theological backbone to the proposals now enshrined in the Measure.

As preparation for our theological consultation I was advised to read the Rule of St Benedict and *Barchester Towers*. I hope you feel that this Measure treads a delicate balance between these extremes. As you will see from the consultation report, it was a rich discussion at St George's House, and, as the planes flew over the Royal Standard at Windsor, several ducks came into land on the wall outside the Vicars' Hall where the consultation was taking place. As they balanced on the parapet, jockeying for position, inside we also sought alignment, getting our ducks in a row about cathedral governance. At one point we found ourselves reflecting on the role of a cathedral as the first church of the diocese, the original resource church embodying and role modelling all that is best in church life as a showcase for both church and society, and, while in many ways cathedrals already do this well, we concluded that not to role model excellence in governance as well as in liturgy, music, mission and architecture was to miss an opportunity. While there may be clauses within this draft Measure that are not quite there yet, we concluded that there can be no theological justification for cathedrals to be the only ecclesiastical bodies in this established Church that do not make themselves accountable to the State through the Charity Commission.

The Cathedral Support Group, which I chair, has been hard at work in the cathedral community since you asked us to bring this draft Measure back to you. We are confident now that we know where there is broad agreement and where there is clear disagreement over what it contains. I am grateful to Canon Robert Hammond for chairing the Steering Committee on this Measure and I hope you will join us both in voting to commit this Measure to Revision stage so we can start the detailed work of reviewing all the suggested changes to bring a Measure that enjoys wholehearted support back to you next year.

Dean of Southwark (Very Revd Andrew Nunn): Those of you with long memories may remember that last year when I stood here I was a little bit grumpy about this Report. I can report to you now that a year later I feel rather different. A lot of that is due to the fact

that we have had a very, very good process of consultation. I also want to thank Eve Poole and the team for what they have given into that process.

I am delighted that I have been appointed as the Chair of the Revision Committee if Synod passes this motion today, and in the short time that I have I just want to raise some of the areas where I think we need to be doing some work. If you do not feel that yet your voice has been heard, obviously, this is an opportunity now but we are desperate to hear every kind of opinion that there is, because cathedrals are a concern to all of us.

Synod, the Measure that is before us is by right based on the paper of the Cathedrals Working Group as passed by this Synod last year, and so it will be our task to look and listen to the areas that may need amending. There are 44 cathedrals and 44 ways of being a cathedral, so we will need to allow flexibility and that local expression of what it means to be a cathedral which has allowed us to flourish and change and grow over the centuries that we have been in existence.

At the same time, there are some serious areas of concern that we have so, and unsurprisingly, we will need to look at the role and the appointment of the vice chair, at the place of Cathedral Councils and the proposal that bishops attend Chapter whilst retaining visitation rights and how that will function. We will need to think carefully about the demands placed on non-executive members of Chapter and how this works in smaller and less well-resourced foundations. While supporting the future role of the Charity Commission, we need to look carefully at how that will work and how the trustee role will work as a whole. These are just some of the areas that I think we will be needing to address. I believe that none of this is insurmountable and overall the Measure will help us achieve the sound governance that we all want for our cathedrals.

I therefore encourage you, members of Synod, to vote for the motion and to remind you again that the closing date for amendments to the Revision Committee is 5.30 pm, not a minute later, on 9 August, so if you are on the beach please do send us your thoughts.

Mr Timothy Fleming (St Albans): Good accountability and good governance is one of the tests of how organisations tick. It is one of the ways by which organisations are seen and viewed by the outside world. Can they be trusted? Are they worth investing in? Are they responsible? Do I want to be part of them?

In my role as head of finance and development at St Alban's Cathedral - and I guess there is an interest to declare - good accountability and good governance across all cathedrals is part of who we are, not for the sake of it but because cathedrals and the Church want to thrive.

At Report stage I talked about being proud - being proud that when we hold the mirror up

to our cathedrals what we see in them is a reflection of inspiration, something of deep mission, something of grace.

This Measure does much to secure and sustain a reflection I hope we will all wish for: a single body of accountability and chapter, a clear purpose of what cathedrals are for, robust structures and accountable committees. But, as well as good structural governance, we need to keep relational governance at the heart of this Measure, ensuring we have the right skills at the right time in Chapters, and ensuring that we maintain an appropriate balance between bishop, dean, congregation and diocese.

I would like to offer up three potential principles for the Revision stage and those are clarity, context and culture. Clarity to avoid misunderstandings and to ensure people are secure in knowing what they are doing and why and how they relate to others. Bishops being entitled to attend Chapters as proposed but then not attending really is not good governance for both parties. Phrases such as “keeping under review the activities of the cathedral” in the finance section need a little bit of unpacking.

Context: we know all cathedrals are different and yet similar, and of course they change over time. I feel sections of the Measure perhaps remain overly prescriptive and in revision I really do encourage us to look at that. Areas around financial expertise perhaps being too narrowly defined and elections of only third of lay non-executive members need unpacking.

Culture: we really, I hope, must ensure this Measure is grounded in the daily life of cathedrals, the here and now, the sense of place, the worship in community, the buildings, real living stones.

Eve Poole has mentioned the theology of cathedral governance. I feel it is a must read for chapters and it is perhaps through this that the revision of this Measure should be located. I was struck within that excellent Report by the framing of governance as care, because care is perhaps at the heart of good governance. Care is at the heart of the Church and care often means recognising things are not binary. So let us give this Measure a fair wind but let us improve it at Revision and let us be proud when we hold up the mirror.

Revd Canon James Allison (Leeds): I am on the Chapter of Wakefield Cathedral, representing the College of Canons and, as such, I am on the edge of cathedral life. I do not worship there very often but I am at the heart of the governance of the cathedral and that puts me in a very interesting place. As the former Dean of Wakefield said to me, “You’re not like us which is why we need you to be on the Chapter”.

Last September, I was surprised to be invited as a member of Chapter to be at the first

national meeting of cathedrals, which apparently is the first time we have met for 500 years, which seemed a little extraordinary. We were in Manchester. It was pretty impressive, and what that translates to is I was pretty intimidated by the whole thing really. At the beginning, as often with these things, there was a lovely welcome and a video from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who told us what a great responsibility we had and, to be honest, said the usual things that they say at meetings. But, at the end there was this moment when wonderfully he visibly relaxed, smiled and said, "But it has to be fun, doesn't it? Cathedral life has to be fun and if you cannot have fun in a cathedral you are not doing it properly."

It is about that fun that I want to bring to attention as we revise these wonderful documents because I think the fun needs to be there and it needs to have good legislation which creates boundaries but does not destroy the entrepreneurial nature of the work that cathedrals do. It is really important that cathedrals can be beacons to people like me in parishes, that they can, quite frankly, try things that we would not dream of doing, that we can look at and say, "We'll never do it but at least someone has had a go". That needs good governance because experimentation can lead to growth but it can also lead to disaster.

I want to give you one sense of how unusual cathedrals can be. Over the last three years Wakefield Cathedral has had 300 adult baptisms because it found itself at the heart of a way station for refugees coming into this country and has worked with them in a most creative way, including doing nurture groups sat on the grass outside the Cathedral in the middle of the precinct. Their morning congregation is full of young men, which is surprising - in any cathedral really - but it is full of them and they hang around wanting to talk about God and life, and the cathedral staff are able to respond to that.

I sit in Chapter looking around, and I was there the other day looking around and thinking, "There is Dean Simon at the front, captain of our ship", but then I thought, "What kind of ship is it?" I want to suggest to you that we are pirates. Seriously, we are pirates, but not buccaneers. Those were the pirates that went off and got cash for themselves. We should be privateers. They were the likes of Drake who went off and discovered lots of places for Queen Elizabeth by being those kind of people who under orders were able to do extraordinary things. I commend this to you and suggest that we need a bit of safe piracy as part of the legislation.

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): Like many others, I am really grateful to the Legal Office for their hard work in turning the many recommendations of the Cathedrals Working Group into draft legislation. I welcome it and I am supporting it.

There are just two areas that I think probably need a bit further thought. As Bishop of one of the cathedrals that is regularly cited as giving rise to the project, I would like to focus

on the section of the Report which speaks about the bishop's engagement with Chapter. The draft Cathedrals Measure at paragraph 7.3 tells us: "The bishop is entitled to attend meetings of... Chapter and must attend at least one of its meetings each year; and at any meeting (that) the bishop attends, the bishop may speak but... not vote". It sounds attractive and collaborative, but I question the wisdom of the provision. The bishop shall not have the right to vote. The very presence of the bishop could influence the decisions of Chapter. You may think that is a really good thing, except if things go wrong then the bishop can be held at least partially responsible, and even if not present but has the right to be, the bishop can then be accused of partial responsibility by neglect.

I am concerned that the very presence of the bishop at meetings of Chapter could compromise the bishop's role as Visitor. If I think of the situation in Exeter three years ago, I am not convinced that my attendance at chapter meetings would have avoided the deterioration of relationships, but it would have impacted on my role as Visitor to resolve matters. It is the Chapter's responsibility to govern a cathedral, not the bishop's, and this distinction, I think, needs to remain.

As this Measure proceeds to revision, I really would hope that this particular provision would not muddy the waters. I suggest that the legislation requires the bishop to meet Chapter annually, at the Chapter's invitation but outside a formal Chapter meeting, and not give the right - and therefore the consequent duty - of regular attendance at Chapter.

Secondly, just a thought about the role of the bishop as Visitor, because you cannot legislate for good relationships. Regrettably, sometimes, one hopes rarely, Visitations are necessary. In my own case, the last Visitation at Exeter was in 1965 - over 50 years earlier - and it would greatly have helped me if there had been some sort of protocol for a Visitation rather than a blank sheet of paper. Some sort of good code of practice would have provided a framework for my Visitation team and also given reassurance to the Cathedral community. It would have helped manage people's expectations and reduce levels of anxiety. I would also ask the Legal Office to give consideration to what the bishop does in the event of a Visitation. I am content for the abolition of Cathedral Councils, but in their absence to whom does a Bishop make the Chapter accountable for monitoring and implementing the Bishop's charge?

I think there is still work to do, but I gladly support this Measure.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Rt Hon Mrs Caroline Spelman MP (ex officio): I am here to show my solidarity with the Third Commissioner, with whom I work closely.

Cathedrals and churches are some of the only buildings in our country where the public feel a great relationship with a building. You will often hear the local communities refer to these buildings as “our cathedral” and “our church”. They are convening spaces for the wider community so it can gather for celebration or mourning and are pillars of local identity and civic pride.

Cathedrals are where the drama of religious, public and civic life play out together. They remain our most visited buildings, with over 10 million visitors each year. The congregations at the cathedrals are increasing, for which the Deans and Chapters should be congratulated. These buildings are our showroom to the nation. They demonstrate what the Church does best, contributing vastly to the local economy and employing over 7,300 people directly and indirectly. As we set forth in these ships of faith - I am quite captured by the idea of piracy - to reach the shores of Heaven, it is essential that these assets are stewarded well.

I am sure you are aware that the Church of England is already accountable to Parliament, through my office, for all its activity, domestic and international. The Church Commissioners, the Pensions Board, Archbishops’ Council, PCCs and Diocesan Boards of Finance are all accountable to the Charity Commission, so it is surprising really that cathedrals remain one of the only groups of charitable organisations in this country which have no independent regulator.

As a Church, we are in receipt of substantial support from the Treasury through grants - the Heritage Lottery Fund, Gift Aid, VAT relief - and all of these are open to listed buildings, but the days of receiving money without questions and accountability are gone. We have to accept a greater level of transparency and accountability than we have previously been used to. If, as Second Church Estates Commissioner, I am to go to the Treasury on behalf of cathedrals and churches, or stand up in Parliament and defend the Government granting the Church money, such as the World War 1 Cathedral Repair Fund, then greater transparency is essential, and it is increasingly expected at every level.

These proposals, Synod, help set out this transparency, good governance, clear management structures and independent regulation. They will help support the mission and ministry of cathedrals. I am also pleased to say, Synod, that following my meeting with the College of Deans last month, they passed a motion which indicated unanimous support for this Measure in principle. Synod, I commend the Measure to you, and I thank the Third Commissioner and her team for their extensive work on our behalf.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): Three years ago, in July 2016, having completed a series of preliminary inquiries at Peterborough Cathedral on behalf of Bishop Donald, here at the front, it became apparent to me that the Cathedral was indeed in significant financial

difficulty, that governance had broken down and that key operational and financial controls were absent.

After the ensuing Visitation, which I led on behalf of the Bishop, Bishop Donald in his charge urged that the Cathedrals Measure 1999 be reviewed. The result of the ensuing work of the Cathedrals Working Group, on which I served, is before us today. At the outset, I would like to make it very clear to Synod that, in my opinion, had the draft Measure that we have before us today been in place in 2016, the situation at Peterborough would have been significantly less likely to have arisen. The Cathedrals Measure is a masterful translation of the CWG Report into legislation, and I really do congratulate the Legal Office for its skilful work over recent months.

Much of what we have in our report does not require legislation and is being addressed through guidance notes and the sharing of best practice. However, what the Cathedrals Measure does do is set out frameworks within which cathedral communities will operate, most importantly bringing cathedrals under a regulatory umbrella for the first time; secondly, clarifying the role of the bishop beyond being simply Visitor to engaging with Chapter; and also appointing a trustee independent of the cathedral, whether clerical or lay, to serve as vice chair or, as I personally would prefer, to actually be the senior independent trustee, whether vice chair or not; and, thirdly, clearly separating governance and management, with the Chapter being the trustee body, as well as the praying heart of the cathedral, and the senior executive team managing day-to-day operations. Overall, understanding this separation of governance and management roles for me is fundamental to the understanding of the Measure and, in my view, to the safe and effective running of our cathedrals in the future. The draft Measure also affords considerable flexibility in implementation to ensure that this is not a one-size-fits-all measure.

In closing, I would like to offer one word of caution. The Howe Commission published its well-researched and insightful report into the work of cathedrals in 1994, and its recommendations in many ways were not dissimilar to those of the CWG. However, in implementing those recommendations in the late 1990s Synod chose to cherry-pick and substantially revise the draft legislation which became the Cathedrals Measure 1999 - a Measure which has proved not to be fit for purpose. I thus urge members of Synod to avoid making the same mistake again during the Revision stage. Obviously, I urge Synod to support this motion that the draft Measure be passed on to the Revision stage. Thank you.

Revd Canon Pat Hawkins (Lichfield): I speak as a Residentiary Canon and therefore as a member of Lichfield Cathedral Chapter.

When I went back to my room after a fun evening at the quiz on Saturday night, I discovered that the battery in my keypad had ceased to work and I therefore could not get in. Last night I could not even get into the block and on enquiring was advised that I had checked out on Saturday morning! I look forward with some trepidation to getting in to my new room tonight. There is nothing like feeling that your presence is welcomed and appreciated.

I have found it a difficult year to be a Residentiary Canon in relation to this Measure. The details of that do not need rehearsing again, but I would make the general point that all significant changes involve people and, therefore, how those people are involved in the process of change should be among the key considerations. Having said that, I shall be voting for this Measure to continue to Revision Stage.

A debt of gratitude is owed to the Third Estates Commissioner and her team for all the work that has been done this year. It is still felt somewhat top down, but that is being addressed. I found the fringe meeting last night both informative and reassuring.

Last week, members of our chapter met at my request to discuss the draft Measure. A number of significant questions have been raised, amongst them the proposed vice chair and the rights and responsibilities of the bishop in relation to Chapter, conflicts of interest, issues of the proposed joint regulation and how this might work in practice. These will need to be addressed with other issues at the Revision Stage. However, no one is querying the principles of good governance and robust financial management, regulation and scrutiny. Indeed, Lichfield has already put into place a number of recommendations which do not require any legislative change. In the same way, as a residentiary, I not only do not resist the principle that I should be accountable for my ministry, with clearly-defined responsibilities; I welcome it. As we are all too well aware, there is no place for unaccountable ministry in the 21st century Church, but I do think that we need to explore and pay careful attention to when issues of accountability and responsibility slip over into issues of power and control. We are not good at dealing with power struggles in the Church because, on the whole, we do not name them.

In conclusion, there is much work to be done at the Revision Stage in order to make sure that a piece of work that was done under great time pressure, in response to a specific crisis, is fit for purpose in relation to the broader complex issues it seeks to address. However, as I began by saying, much work has been done over this past year, and I would urge Synod to vote for this Measure to pass to the Revision Stage.

Mrs Anne Foreman (Exeter): May I first of all express my appreciation to the Third Estates Commissioner? It was not just that we got good papers, but it was the positive and optimistic tone of them, so thank you very much. I am a member of Exeter Cathedral

Council. I am also on the council of the Friends of Exeter Cathedral. All cathedrals need to have friends because they matter, as Canon Hammond said.

I just want to make a couple of observations, please, about the Cathedral Councils, and it is not a bid for them to be reinstated. I quite accept that they are going to be abolished. It seems a bit of a shame though, I think, as a member of an active Cathedral Council, that because several or many Cathedral Councils did not make full use of the powers that they had, limited though they were, they should be abolished altogether. I appreciate that there will be the opportunity for new councils and committees to be made, but they will be outside the body corporate and will have no particular authority at all.

What I would like the Revision Committee to consider is how the function that the Cathedral Councils have at the moment to be a critical friend to the chapter can be included. I appreciate that there are going to be a good number of lay executive and non-executive members of the chapter, but how are they going to be that critical friend? Cathedral Councils at the moment are independent. They meet independently. Some of them are elected from the praying communities associated with the cathedral. My request is that the Revision Committee takes seriously how it can encourage non-executive members to be a true critical friend to the Chapter.

Dean of Manchester (Very Revd Rogers Govender): In broadly welcoming the Report, can I say that we in the cathedrals world - many of our cathedrals, if not all of our cathedrals - have already implemented a number of the recommendations in terms of management and the like. It is important that Synod is aware of that first.

The second thing I want to say is that there have been a few occasions when my Bishop has received one or two complaints about things that I have allowed in my cathedral, but with the Bishop not being a member of the chapter it enables the Bishop to give his response and also give to me and the Chapter an opportunity to respond independently on similar complaints. I have had a similar occasion when I agreed to give permission to fly the rainbow flag on the tower of the cathedral and somebody complained to the Archbishop of Canterbury's office about what was the Archbishop going to do about the flying of this flag in Manchester. I think the Archbishop gave a good response. It read something like this: "What the Dean of Manchester decides to fly on the tower of his cathedral is entirely his business". That enabled me to respond to the person who complained.

The third thing that I want to just bring to your attention is to really emphasise the importance of Cathedral Councils. I am personally in favour of retaining Cathedral Councils simply because most, if not all, of our cathedrals operate in a very secular environment and the Cathedral Council membership often enables us to attract people from the city, from business, from community groups and the life of the diocese, as well

as the cathedral community, to work together, to sit together and engage with us, and challenge us in our own understanding of our outreach to the city and to the county. The Cathedral Council membership enables that to happen. I really would plead for that to be retained when this Measure goes to the Revision Committee.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): There have been quite a few issues raised about the draft Cathedrals Measure. Some of those thoughts have been new to me, and others of them have been other things that have been interesting, but I was really taken by the idea that 10 million people are visiting our cathedrals. I wonder how many of them might be deaf, or deafened, blind or have other disabilities. I know we are always talking about access, but it is not just us, it is refugees, or it is anybody that is coming who speaks another language to English. Of course, they might want to speak to people in English, but what about how they might understand other things that are in the cathedral? There are lots of people that are coming from abroad - Poland, Latvia, whatever. Even yesterday, I was talking to a family from Hong Kong who were visiting, and we were just outside the York Minster, and I found myself gesturing and trying to communicate with them, and consequently we were able to have a conversation.

The point I want to raise, and, in particular, I would like to mention this to the Chair of the Revision Committee, Andrew Nunn, is I would just like to ask you to take note and be aware in your process of allowing all cathedrals to make it mandatory actually. That is my position. I wanted to say, "be considerate of it", but actually what I want to say really is make it mandatory that all cathedrals are accessible so that if there is any video footage put up in one of the cathedrals that it has to be subtitled. It may even want to have a BSL in-vision interpreter. But if we could have these details put into the Measure then perhaps that is something that will get things right from the beginning. Andrew, I hope you will remember that and you will have Sarah on your shoulder as you are writing these revisions!

The Bishop of Bristol (Rt Revd Viv Faulk): I am a member of the Steering Group for the legislation. I support what has been said in terms of thanks to Eve Poole and those working with her who have moved so swiftly and so ably to enable us to have the documents that we have today. There is much to be done at the Revision stage, and therefore I also support what has been said by many in terms of your preparedness to submit proposals and amendments.

I am particularly concerned about what has happened because we have removed the Councils from close governance of the cathedral, from the body corporate, but we have not found a solution to that. The problems are, as I see them, that we no longer have a proper place for the voice of the bishop, and I endorse all that the Bishop of Exeter has said, and I think we have in clause 7 (4) something that is frankly rather bizarre in terms of relationship and ecclesiology when a chapter is invited to vote by three quarters to

exclude the bishop from conversation. That indicates to me that we do not have the solution right. We need to find a better solution for the voice of the bishop. That voice was properly held in the Council.

The second loss that we have is the voice of senior lay people. I have benefited enormously over the years, in Leicester as well as York, from the wise counsel of the chairs of Cathedral Councils. I do not think it is equivalent to making that person a part of the cathedral Chapter, which I think is what we thought we were doing in the Cathedrals Working Group, so there is more work to be done there. Whilst you are lying on your beaches, I wonder if you can help us with this because there is a wisdom in crowds and you may be able to crack it in ways that the Cathedrals Working Group could not and which I think this Measure has not quite achieved.

Secondly, I am concerned about building good relationships with the Charity Commission. I have been involved in this work of negotiating with the Charity Commission for over 10 years. When we first met with staff from the Charity Commission, the first question to me, as then chair of the AEC, was: "Are your foundation documents" - in other words, your constitution and statutes - "in English?" It was a peculiar question, I thought, until I realised that the Charity Commission staff were then handling the oversight of Oxbridge Colleges, many of which it seemed were producing scrolls in Latin and Medieval French. It is evidence of change in cathedrals that we now have English foundation documents, but there is still work to be done in terms of creating good relationships and confidence in the Charity Commission, which is itself feeling under pressure, not least reputationally, after issues in Oxfam. So please, brothers and sisters, if you are involved in the governance of cathedrals, if you are part of a cathedral community, please - you do not need to wait for legislation for this - make sure that your safeguarding is properly ensured. Make sure that your financial provisions and accountability are properly in place. That will help those of us seeking to build confidence in the Charity Commission.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Members of Synod may recall that last year I had the satisfaction of standing here and proposing to you a one-word amendment - "July" for "February" - postponing First Consideration of this Measure until now, and you almost all liked it, so I begin with praise and thanks, as many others have, for Eve and her team and all those who have been involved in the consultations. We have resources of high value, a good draft Measure, an excellent paper on the theology of cathedral governance. These things are not, of course, perfect. I was somewhat disquieted at breakfast yesterday to hear, I am sorry to say, one of the Cathedral Support Team say that they did not have enough information to consult directly with all members of Chapters. That puzzled me.

No doubt there is going to be a hefty bundle of amendments landing in the inboxes of the Revision Committee, and probably some more that do not make it through there that will

come back to us in February and the 40-member rule will apply, and we will have great fun with that.

Because of that, I want to address us to that likelihood of many, many amendments. We do not have a one-page measure - it is quite a thick little bundle of paper - but it is comparatively simple given what complex beasts cathedrals are. It has been drafted in a way that is permissive, that is enabling for our varied cathedrals to draw up constitutions which reflect their varied natures and contexts. So my plea to Synod is this. There will, quite reasonably, be revisions to make, but let us try to resist the temptation to mangle this legislation, as perhaps we did in 1999, by riding our favourite hobbyhorses all over it. We all know the perils of micromanagement. It is a character in people that I look for in discernment work because it can in any sort of ministry cause all sorts of pain. We all know that potentially it can be somewhat purgatorial for a cathedral to be micromanaged by an interfering bishop or a domineering dean. There are very few of them around now! But if it were to be right, it would be hell to be micromanaged by Synod over-legislating.

I can see that the clock is ticking. What I say in summary is that we cannot legislate for good relationships. We cannot compel people to love one another and work together in Christian charity, but we do have the ability also to resource it in other ways. Alongside the legislation, there will be a raft of good practice guidance - and I now belatedly declare my interest - and there will be a process of peer review, a panel to which I, amongst others, have been appointed. Pass the legislation strongly into revision, do not make too much of a dog's dinner of it, and let all those carry on working to make our cathedrals the most shining flagships of the Spirit they can be in our land.

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): I would like to speak about my own cathedral - our own cathedral - Winchester Cathedral. I am not going to sing anymore because it is not getting me down; it is a source of amazing encouragement to me. But I do want to share with you some thoughts on this Measure which have been shaped by a very helpful conversation that we had with the Dean and Chapter, at their invitation to us as elected Synod reps. I happen to think that we have one of the finest cathedrals in the country, but I am sure all of you think that too.

I would like to make three points. I am learning from some of you here. The first has already been expressed by many people: that legislation does not make good relationships. In my experience, in the workplace and in life, organisations work well when relationships work well. What makes good relationships? Well, Paul writes in many of his letters to us about this. We need love, patience, kindness, goodness, self control. I am not a lawyer, but it would be wonderful to see some of these things in the legislation. Timothy Fleming talked about a framework for culture. If we could think a little bit about how cathedrals can work, as well as what they do, that would be very helpful.

Secondly - I am sitting very near my Bishop, I have just realised that - the relationship between the Dean and the Bishop obviously needs to be a good one and I am very glad that ours is, but there are other relationships too which I think need to be good. I would find it very helpful, as lay chair of diocesan synod, if there could be a little bit more mention of dioceses and diocesan synod in the legislation. For example, in the very first point it talks about the cathedral being a centre of worship and mission for the people of the diocese.

Thirdly, money. There is another song about money and you will be glad I am not going to sing that. One thing that has worked well in Winchester is that our Receiver General has been a full part as a lay member of Chapter. This will change under this legislation. I would just like to ask if a little bit more thought could be given to the governance model that we want to use. In business, we have executive and non-executive members. In charities, there are trustees who are independent. I think we might have some of Nikki's fudge here because we do have here ordained members of chapter, residentiary canons, but our own lay receiver general would be excluded.

I would just like if a little more thought could be given to the governance model to make sure we are not getting into clericalism, which we spoke about yesterday, where there is one rule for the laity and another for the clergy. Overall, at Winchester we are very positive about this Measure and thank very much Eve and her team for all their work.

Professor Muriel Robinson (Lincoln): I speak as a lay canon of Lincoln Cathedral but mainly as a member of the regular congregation. Greetings from Lincoln Cathedral. Thank you, Synod members, for all your concern. We are in good heart but we would appreciate your prayers continuing. I would like to congratulate the Third Estates Commissioner and the team on this draft Measure which offers a good degree of legislative control but, at the same time, a clear sense that cathedrals are different and scope within sensible regulation to adapt to local need.

I was particularly reassured as a member of the worshipping community by the ecclesiastical purpose in clause 1 and by references later which emphasised the duty of care to the congregation in all cathedrals, whether they are parish churches or not. I do have some suggestions as to how that could be strengthened which I will submit to the Revision Committee. I would also welcome a development of that duty of care within the non-statutory guidance which I believe is being developed.

Another remaining concern though, as a lay person, is about the way in which the lay vice chair is to be appointed. I can see the value of the bishop having the right to appoint a lay non-executive member, but I think maybe more consideration needs to be given as to whether that person should be vice chair and about how we can make the appointment of that person more transparent, perhaps by the involvement of diocesan trustees.

Overall, though, I would suggest that this is a really good draft, well-ready for progression to the Revision Committee. I shall be voting to support it and I hope that the rest of you will too.

His Honour Judge Peter Collier (ex officio): I declare an interest in that I am the Chair of the Cathedral Council at York Minster. Last July, I spoke in the debate on this matter and expressed my concern that the Working Group had proposed the abolition of Cathedral Councils, something echoed today. I am delighted that the draft legislation enables cathedrals to provide for themselves advisory councils if they so wish.

My concern this year is that the Measure as drafted provides that that body would be a committee or sub-committee of the Chapter and that the Chair must be a member of Chapter. This was not recommended by the Working Group and I do not understand any rationale being advanced for it. Apparently, Councils are part of the body corporate of the cathedral. The loss of that would not, in my judgment, at any rate, be any real loss to the Council because the Council, through their independent Chair, are seen as being separate from Chapter and so able to fulfil what has in a number of cathedrals been a significant role as both critical friend of Chapter and independent advocate for Chapter.

It is that independence, particularly the independence from Chapter of the Chair, which gives the Chair the ability to hear what members of Chapter, members of staff, members of the wider public and sometimes even a Dean have to say when they feel the need to speak confidentially to someone about the cathedral. The current proposal will remove that visible independence and so take away the potential effectiveness of the Council as that friend and advocate.

I hope the revision process will look closely at that with a view to ensuring the independence is maintained where the cathedral wishes to have such a body. Otherwise, I am supportive of the general direction of travel which the Measure provides.

In York, we have already amended the constitution and statutes to provide that the number of non-exec and lay members of Chapter will be more than the number comprising the dean residentiaries. There is nothing to fear in that direction. I would encourage Synod to vote for this Measure to move it forward to the revision process.

The Chair: Therefore, I now wish to test the mind of the Synod on whether Item 508 has been sufficiently debated. I, therefore, put the motion for closure on Item 508 to the vote.

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

The Chair: I ask, therefore, Robert Hammond to respond to the debate, please. You have up to three minutes.

Canon Robert Hammond (Chelmsford): There is nothing like a challenge, is there. Thank you, Synod, for that excellent debate and all those great contributions. I think everybody was broadly supportive, so thank you very much. Three minutes does not allow me to comment on every contribution but just to pick out a couple of comments and themes.

Andrew Nunn, I am glad you are no longer grumpy. No one likes grumpy deans. Everybody wants cathedrals to be fun, like James Allison. I think Archbishop Justin's quote was, "If you can't have fun in a cathedral, do you really know what fun is?" That is why we have gone for light touch legislation supported by guidance. We heard how cathedrals are doing extraordinary things, "showrooms to the State" as Caroline Spelman put it, 10 million people visiting our cathedrals each year.

The Bishop of Exeter, yes, clearly more work needs to be done on the relationship between bishops and chapter. Patricia Hawkins, yes, change management and impacts on people are vital, so implementation will have to be handled carefully. The Dean of Durham, I understand, is leading on some work there. We are trying to create a structure which facilitates the creation of good relationships and allows them to flourish through this legislation.

The Dean of Manchester, Anne Foreman, Bishop of Bristol, Peter Collier, Cathedral Councils, yes, we would love to receive your thoughts in revision on that. Again, thank you. No draft Measure is perfect, but I hope you feel that we are starting to get our ducks in a row on this and I hope Synod will vote in favour of this draft legislation.

Your opportunity to feed back and submit proposals for amendment in Revision Committee is now. If you did speak today, or if you wanted to but did not, then please write in by Friday 9 August with your comments or suggestions. If you have your best ideas while sunning yourself on exotic tropical holidays on beaches or even on pirate ships or exploring great cathedrals here or abroad, then please capture those thoughts and send them in, ideally via email and in English. Scrolls and in ancient French are not quite as useful to the Revision Committee.

The Chair: We move to voting on Item 508.

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

The Chair: Item 508 - everyone is obviously delighted with this - is carried. Let me reiterate the point then that the draft Cathedrals Measure is now automatically committed to a Revision Committee. As stated in the Agenda, any member who wishes to submit proposals for the amendment should send them in writing to the Clerk to the Synod. These would need to arrive by 5.30 pm on Friday 9 August 2019. That completes this

item of business. We will move to the next item on the agenda in a moment. Thank you, everyone.

THE CHAIR *Canon Professor Joyce Hill (Leeds)* took the Chair at 10.57 am.

ITEM 509

FACULTY JURISDICTION (AMENDMENT) RULES (GS 2137)

The Chair. We now come to Item 509 on the agenda, the Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules. For this you will need (Amendment) Rules GS 2137 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 2137X. I invite the Chair of the Rule Committee to move Item 509. He has up to 10 minutes.

Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): This is the third July in six years that as Chair of the Faculty Rule Committee I have had the questionable pleasure of seeking Synod's approval of new Faculty Rules. I am glad to report that the changes already made, including the online system and the new Lists A and B, have bedded down well and been welcomed by parishes and DACs.

So why the need for further amendments? Well, there are two main reasons. First, Lists A and B came into force on 1 January 2016 and, after three and a half years, stocktaking is required to review their individual content. Extensive consultation has been carried out by the Church Buildings Council to which a large number of responses were made, primarily from DACs but also from bodies such as Historic England and from individuals, including several chancellors and at least one member of General Synod.

The Rule Committee also had the opportunity to review the various additional matters orders made by individual chancellors with a view to including some of these matters into Lists A and B. Second, the procedures of the faculty system themselves warranted review in the light of practical experience of its operation. Some of the consultation responses included suggestions for changes to achieve a more efficient system. The task has not been an easy one, hence the need for no fewer than five sittings of the Rule Committee.

I am extremely grateful to the hardworking members of that Committee, two highly pragmatic lay members of General Synod with considerable experience at parish level, a diocesan bishop and an archdeacon, registrars and chancellors, a DAC Chairman and secretary, a diocesan secretary and a member of the CBC with particular experience of the statutory amenity societies. It was a huge sadness that, before our work had been completed, the death occurred of one of our members, Caroline Mockford, the Provincial Registrar of the Northern Province.

I also pay tribute to our Legal Secretary sitting behind me, whose assistance and drafting have been, as on previous occasions, exemplary. He has now deservedly moved to an even more prestigious and demanding position for which he is uniquely well-qualified. In the time available to me, I can only highlight the principal changes. In the case of Lists A and B, a version with track changes is provided in GS 2137X and a flowchart is available on the *ChurchCare* website.

In addition to various relatively small changes to the wording of the Rules and the prescribed forms, made in the interests of clarity and simplification, there are three significant procedural changes. First, a substantial revision of Part 4 of the Rules. We propose, in line with the recommendation of Historic England and Chancellor Petchey, to frontload the procedure so as best to assist parishes by ensuring that all relevant materials have been considered by the DAC before it issues its formal advice to the chancellor.

The DAC will have a new power to issue an initial advice to parishes, informing them of what additional materials the DAC requires to be able to formulate its final advice. We are leaving it to individual DACs to work up their own procedures to accommodate this overall change. The result should be to reduce the time between formal commencement of faculty proceedings - that is, after the DAC's final advice has been issued - and the chancellor's decision.

Second, when the petition for faculty is lodged, usually nowadays on the online system, the documents which currently have to be available for inspection at the church will be available for inspection online. This is a matter for which the CBC has been pressing in the interests of transparency and fairness for some while.

Third, at the present time, any objector who becomes a party opponent can require the holding of an oral hearing. In future, the decision whether the matter is dealt with by written representations or an oral hearing will be one for the chancellor. The same position will apply in the Appellate Court if permission to appeal is granted. It is not merely where objections are considered unmeritorious or vexatious that an oral hearing may be refused; there may be other cases where, in all the circumstances, the chancellor considers that there is no need to hear oral evidence to reach an informed determination. This change simply brings the faculty system into line with the way in which decisions between written representations and oral hearings are made in other jurisdictions.

Let me turn then to Lists A and B, the really exciting bit. The aim has been to add to the items in List A, where this can reasonably be done, including moving to List A some matters previously in List B, such as installation of roof alarms and of safes in vestries, replacement of boilers and replacement of gas and oil tanks. Sometimes, in Lists A and B we have distinguished between listed and non-listed buildings; for example, in relation

to like-for-like replacement of roofing materials, the treatment of timber against beetle or fungal activity and installation of defibrillators in churches and churchyards.

On the other hand, an early decision of the Rule Committee was not to transfer all or even the vast majority of changes to an unlisted building to List A. That was considered to risk irreversible damage to buildings which, although not listed, warranted some controls. Just to give you one example of many, it has long been a grievance to parishes that new and replacement external noticeboards did not fall within either List A or B. That is now changed and provision is made for different types of noticeboard in each of those Lists.

So far as List B, we have again sought to include additional matters, such as the introduction of candle stands, the refurbishment of facilities for serving refreshments, extensive additional work to clocks and the provision of bicycle stands in churchyards.

I need, finally, to make four points about Lists A and B. First, and not recognised by a number of respondents to the consultation, there are numerous matters by which statute simply cannot be included in Lists A and B; for example, works to monuments, whether in the church or the churchyard. Second, even if a matter is not in Lists A and B, it may still be so minor that it can be done without a faculty. Where there is doubt on such matters, reference should be made to the chancellor, as explained in the new introduction to Lists A and B. Third, some relatively minor matters are best dealt with otherwise than through inclusion in Lists A and B. An example would be preliminary works of excavation in a church or churchyard. Such matters are best dealt with by application to the chancellor for an interim faculty, a swift procedure which can be conducted by email and ensures an appropriate degree of oversight. Fourth, there is no absolutely right answer to what should be in Lists A or B.

As I have said, the Rule Committee had on it individuals with a very wide range of experience. We also had the invaluable help of our consultant, David Knight, from the CBC and the suggestions of consultees. Before these new Rules come into operation, if they are approved by you, there will be considerable further guidance given to DACs and to archdeacons and to registrars and to chancellors on their working. I ask you, please, to accept these amendments.

The Chair: Item 509 is now open for debate. There will be from the outset a speech limit of three minutes, in view of the number of people who have an interest in wishing to speak.

Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford): Have you ever played Cathedral Top Trumps? If so - and it is a genuine card game much beloved of cathedral choirs - you will note that the cathedral with the highest spire is Salisbury. Well done. The longest nave? St Albans.

Greatest external length and all-round hugeness? Liverpool, fantastic. The city of my birth and the city of the greatest football team in Europe, if not the world.

However, Oxford loses on almost every count in Cathedral Top Trumps except one. The diocese has more parish churches than any other with 819. Perhaps, as a result, our DAC handles more faculty and List B applications than any other diocese - over 100 in the last month alone. I would like to salute the work of DACs, their officers and volunteer professionals who work tirelessly to help parishes find good ways forward as they care for and adapt their historic buildings. They can be much maligned but they do an amazing job.

Having consulted with our DAC and my fellow archdeacons, I would like to commend the proposals put before us today and hope that you will vote in favour for their adoption. In Oxford, we already frontload the faculty process, as is suggested in Rule 4 here, so that amenity societies are consulted before a notice of advice is issued by the DAC, not afterwards. We have found this works very well, preventing lengthy and frustrating delays at later stages and helping those societies to play a more positive part in the process, should they so wish. We are also happy to approve the many changes to List A and List B that are proposed here.

We have a concern about A1(b), which allows “work of repair not materially affecting the fabric or any historic material”. We have some concern that parishes may be tempted, for example, to undertake unwise mortar repairs and repointing using materials that may not be the best and would prove costly to rectify in later years. The dressed stones, or lithos, that Isabel so ably told us about in 1 Peter 2, can soon be reduced to petros, or rough stones, by the wrong mortar. We would like to suggest putting a clear guideline or condition to prevent this in the adjoining column or, if it is too late to do that, at least in the guidelines to parishes.

The Chair. I am afraid I am conscious of time and you are out of time.

Ven. Martin Gorick (Oxford): Overall, I am very happy to support the proposal.

Revd Paul Ayers (Leeds): I share with Martin a broad welcome for the alterations here but I do have some concerns and I want to go through those briefly. I have listened to other archdeacons and also to DAC staff, although I cannot claim to represent their views.

Like Martin, I am concerned about pointing. He has expressed that very well. Also, in List A1(6) “adaptation” could mean total rewiring of a church. Do we really want that in List A? I am concerned about A1(7), boilers. Very often, boilers that are proposed that come to us under List B or under faculty, our heating adviser says, “this is the wrong piece of equipment; it is not adequate to the task; you have not done your heat loss calculations,

and the contractor that you have got to do it does not understand how to do heat loss calculations”.

I am a bit concerned in A1(20) about what is the difference between adaptation and alteration to a sound system. Could this mean new speakers stuck up all over the place? In A5(9), new chairs could be like these here that we are sitting on at the front. They could be any design at all. Just because a building is unlisted, it does not mean that any old thing will do. PCCs can still seek advice, but the problem is when you are under List A that those who most need the advice tend to be the ones that do not know that they need it and so they do not ask and it may be a long time before anyone finds out what they have done and then it is too late.

My second concern is about the extended period for amenity societies to respond from 28 days to 42 days. There are those who think that amenity societies already have too much influence without any responsibility. If they had been pushing at the 28 day deadline, does this risk that they will be pushing at the new 42 day deadline as well, resulting in further delays?

There is also a little concern about the need for DACs not to send notification of advice until all consultees' views are in. There is a slight concern that this may compromise the independence of DACs. Chancellors consult a number of bodies and DACs need to be free to express their own views. I could be completely wrong about all of these matters.

The problem is that we have had very little time to reflect and consult and respond because this is one-stage business. It is kind of take it or leave it. I am sorry that I missed the deadline for amendments, although even the Chair of the Business Committee has admitted to me that she also missed it. When the Dean of Southwark is lying on the beach it is already going to be too late as there is no Revision stage. What procedure will there be for looking at some of these matters and possibly revisiting them?

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): I should declare an interest from the outset that I am a member of the DAC of the Southwark Diocese. I have consulted with the Chair and Secretary of the Southwark DAC and we fully support the intentions of making the system more efficient and effective, and there is much here that is welcomed and commended. We are confident that any concerns we have will be addressed by the CBC when they provide appropriate written guidance.

One particular concern, and it has been mentioned in passing already, is that the consultation process for statutory heritage bodies is being frontloaded with the intention that all consultations end up carried out before the DAC formally recommends a proposal, or not as the case may be. This change to the consultation process potentially adds in more requirements at earlier stages of the faculty application process but does not

actually amend or reduce the rules, existing requirements for public notice, website notice and later consultations as directed by the chancellor.

In particular, do the changes actually address the commonly experienced issue of statutory heritage bodies simply not responding at all? For example, presently, if no reply is received when the statutory heritage body is consulted for a 42-day period, the said statutory heritage body must still be consulted again later on. The intention therefore that all consultations actually take place prior to the DAC stage of the application being completed may not be borne out by the draft legislation. It would be particularly helpful to get clarification on this particular point, but let me re-emphasise that the direction of travel for this legislation is truly welcomed and especially the commitment to appropriate simplification. We look forward to the written guidance that I am sure will accompany the amended Faculty Jurisdiction Rules.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): I declare an interest as a member of the Rules Committee. As a deanery treasurer, it is my lot to justify the Parish Share quite often and people often wish to challenge those nebulous central costs. I do not think there are any central costs that are unjustifiable in Oxford and one of the things that I often speak about is the faculty jurisdiction and the DAC. At this point in the discussion I am quite used to people laughing or getting a bit annoyed. They perceive the faculty system to be a right royal pain in the behind - they say so. So I explain that the faculty system exempts our buildings from a lot, although not all, planning permission requirements and, critically, all requirements for listed buildings consent. I have tales to tell about the horrors of listed buildings consent were anybody to dare to ask me about it.

The faculty system enables us to avoid these horrors and puts the development of our buildings in our control so we can use them for our mission, which, sadly, we cannot expect the secular authorities to understand. It is a huge privilege. We must be thankful for it and use it wisely.

Of course, we are treading a fine line in our use of this privilege. We cannot ignore secular views of buildings, many of which are of enormous historic interest. The privilege of the faculty system could be withdrawn. That is a continual possibility. Also, it would be counter-missional to ride roughshod over the concerns of a secular community whom we would so dearly love to engage with us and come to know the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is why consultation with various amenity societies, including Historic England, is included in our rules.

In this revision of the rules our overriding objective has been to simplify the procedures and move as many things to List A or List B so they do not require faculty at all as possible. It has not been easy, and views have differed and we have needed expert advice. I now know more about bells and glass and oil tanks than I ever thought I would need to know.

These rules contain a better process, one that frontloads consultations required so that when a faculty requests there is less to-ing and fro-ing and the grant of a faculty is simpler. The expansion of Lists A and B will mean fewer faculties need to be requested at all. Of course, the exemption from listed buildings consent is not hugely useful if your building is not listed. For the first time we have included items in List A and B that only apply if your building is not listed.

Overall, I think these revised rules make the faculty system a little bit less of a pain in the behind. We must support them wholeheartedly and I for one will continue to extol the virtues of the faculty jurisdiction and persuade others to thank God for it, as I do.

The Chair: After Anne Dawtry has spoken, I am minded to test the mind of Synod for a motion for closure on this item.

Ven. Dr Anne Dawtry (Leeds): I speak as an archdeacon and also as a member of the Rules Committee. I would like to commend these new rules to you as being very much in tune with the simplification agenda with which this Synod has been exercised during this quinquennium. The additional matters that can now be dealt with via List A or List B will, I believe, help to ease the administrative burdens on busy parish clergy and church wardens. There is also, in my view, a helpful distinction between permission needed for certain matters in an unlisted church as opposed to the permission needed for the same works in a listed church.

The rules on trees caused great confusion in 2016 and these have been simplified as to what permission is needed for work on trees. Another very helpful change is that temporary minor re-ordering via an archdeacon's licence now lasts for 24 months rather than 15 before a parish has to apply for a faculty or reinstate things as they are. This will allow parishes to have a meaningful period of experimentation with, say, a nave altar or a children's corner before having to apply for a faculty or to make the re-ordering permanently.

Finally, I welcome the new Part 4 to the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules. It lays out very clearly a process to be followed by the DAC to help parishes consult in a timely way. Although the response time for amenity societies has increased from 28 to 42 days, I do not believe that this will hold up the process of faculties for parishes in practice as they will now be encouraged to begin the consultation period earlier, and it will also be beneficial in helping parishes to avoid last-minute and expensive changes to plans as a result of the representations of consultees. I very much ask you to support these Faculty Jurisdiction Rules because I believe they will help release parishes into spending more time on mission and ministry.

The Chair: I now put a motion for closure on this item to Synod.

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

The Chair: I call upon the Chair of the Rules Committee to respond. He has up to five minutes, but in view of the tightness of time it is to be hoped that he might not quite need five.

Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): Thank you very much, General Synod, for a helpful debate. To the Archdeacon of Oxford, I too join in saluting the work of DACs. I believe that his concern about the working of A1(b) for re-pointing works is probably misconceived because such re-pointing would be works materially affecting the fabric and therefore excluded from List A in any event.

So far as Paul Ayers is concerned, thank you for your thoughtful contribution. You are troubled about a number of matters in which parishes are now going to have much greater independence. Overall, we believe one has simply got to trust to the good sense and responsibility of the parishes, and that has been our guiding principle wherever we thought that to be appropriate.

So far as the extended period of 42 days, two points. First of all, if you are consulting an amenities society it really is not reasonable to expect them to have visited the church and produced a considered report in 28 days. It is just not possible. They are voluntary bodies. The church may be at a considerable distance. The 42 days is needed. But if the parish gets its act together it will do it itself at an early stage and will have had in their response and therefore there will be no need for the DAC to consult them in any event.

I am afraid the guidance cannot change what is in the rules, but the rules will be amended in the light of further experience. Happily I will be retired by that stage, but I can assure you they will come back if anything in the rules is found not to be working satisfactorily.

Thank you to Tim Goode for his observations. I refer him though to Rule 4.7.4 that where a statutory body does not respond to consultation then the DAC can simply proceed in the absence of a response. I appreciate the comments of Julie Dziegiel and the Archdeacon of Halifax and they were both supportive, as one would expect, having been members of the Committee, but they both made a very useful contribution during that work. I commend these rules to you.

The Chair: I now put Item 509 to the vote.

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

The Chair: Item 509 is clearly carried. The Faculty Jurisdiction (Amendment) Rules 2019 will now be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Thank you very much. That concludes this item of business and we will now move on to Items 505 and 506.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 11.28 am.

ITEM 505

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 40 (GS 2103B)

The Chair: We come to Items 505 and 506, draft Amending Canon No. 40 GS 2103B. This is Article 7 business. The Synod has reached the Final Approval stage for draft Amending Canon No. 40 and members will need the draft Amending Canon GS 2103B and the Petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence GS 2103C.

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. 40. I now call upon the Bishop of Manchester to move Item 55 "That the Canon entitled 'Amending Canon No. 40' be finally approved".

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Thank you, your Grace and members of Synod, I am delighted to present draft Amending Canon No. 42 for its final stages. Archbishop Justin has set out very clearly that the revival of the religious life is a necessary condition for renewal of the Church. The good news is that we are seeing such a revival take place at this present time with new communities seeking acknowledgement or recognition by the Church of England springing up from diverse routes.

Some of these are very new groupings. Others represent existing organisations which are discovering the fullness of their journey with Christ impels them towards the accountability, the discipline and the belonging which religious communities embody. Alongside this, the Church continues to be blessed by those communities which came from the revivals of the 19th and 20th centuries.

This Canon began its journey, Synod, as a response to the question of how the Church of England could remove some of the barriers to the flourishing of our religious communities, barriers which come as a consequence of the lack of having any formal status within the Canons of the Church.

At present, it is hard to authorize ordained ministries in many communities, to ordain

clergy to a title post within them and to include them properly in the synodical and governance structures of the Church at local level. This Canon and the (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure also being considered today will together enable us to begin to reduce and remove some of those obstacles.

Along the way, though, we have become more aware of the need for a Canon in order to properly support and oversee the work of safeguarding in our religious communities. As Archbishop Justin has already said to Synod, the recently published IICSA Report relating to the abuse perpetrated by Peter Ball under the cover of setting up religious communities is truly shocking. Like many of us here today, I live with a sense of shame and disgust as a proper human and Christian response to reading that Report. It was published since our February group of sessions and it contains five recommendations which IICSA expects the Church of England to respond to with speedy action. I want to read the first recommendation to you in full.

“Recommendation 1: Introduction of safeguarding guidance for religious communities. The Church of England should introduce appropriate guidance which deals with safeguarding within the context of a religious community affiliated to the Church. It must ensure that these organisations meet adequate requirements for safeguarding and child protection. The needs of victims should be prioritised when designing safeguarding policies and practices.

“The regulation and management of religious communities should include a mandatory requirement both to have and to follow safeguarding guidance. The requirement to comply with this safeguarding guidance should be the same as would be expected in any other Church institution. There needs to be clarity in respect of how safeguarding should be managed in these communities, along with appropriate auditing of compliance”.

In an earlier debate this morning we reflected on how important it was that cathedrals are not left without accountability. That same logic applies to our religious communities. A mandatory requirement IICSA says, “the same as will be expected in any other Church institution”. Those will not be possible whilst the legal status of communities “affiliated”, in the words of IICSA, to the Church of England remains undefined in Canon.

What I am asking you to do today therefore is a necessary part of our being able to meet what IICSA asks of us. You have seen and voted in favour of this draft Canon before at both the Initial and Revision stages. They took place here last summer and in London in our February group of sessions. No changes have been proposed since then. I am glad to be able to present this item to you in a form that I hope you will recognise from last time round.

For that reason I do not propose to take you through the text of the draft Canon clause by clause. Instead I am confining myself to comments on its general thrust and on the processes before us. Should this Canon be approved and complete its remaining legal stages it will then need us, Synod, to turn our attention to the Regulations that the House of Bishops will be empowered to make under it. In our debate last February a number of points were made which Synod determined not to address by amending the text of the Canon itself but where we agreed it would be appropriate to deal with them via the Regulations and the Guidance that the House of Bishops will produce. If you look closely among all your papers, you may have found GS Misc 1234. This document is the current draft of what such Regulations might look like.

Straight after February, we worked on an earlier version. That was shared at a meeting to which the leaders of our religious communities were invited in May on what was a very well-attended day. That draft was considered by the House of Bishops' Committee on the Religious Life a couple of weeks ago. I hope it will assist members of Synod in voting for the Canon today to have the best indication we can give of what the Regulations we hope to bring to you next year will look like. You will see we have taken on board the substantive points that were made in our group of sessions in February.

Passing the Canon will allow the Regulations to be finalised. However, it is important to note that when such Regulations are laid by the House of Bishops before Synod we get a simple yes or no vote. There is no space for amendment on the floor of the Synod. Only the House of Bishops can propose amendments. Hence, I would be grateful if any of you who have comments on GS Misc 1234 - and I suspect someone in the Synod Office thought that was a proper number to be assigned to a document that was going to be introduced to you by a mathematician - would let me have them by the middle of October at the latest so the Committee of the House can consider them in due course.

With that in mind, I invite Synod to support the approval of Amending Canon No. 40 through the motion that stands in my name.

The Chair: Thank you, Bishop. Item 505 is open for debate. May I remind members that under Standing Order 64, motions for closure, speech limits or next business are not in order in this debate. The item is open for debate.

Revd Fr Thomas Seville (Religious Communities): I want to record my deep appreciation for the attention, work and courtesy of both the Legal Office and of the Bishop of Manchester in the progress of this Canon. Religious, certainly of the traditional kind, are quite weird in some ways, we use words in strange ways, and that has been treated with great understanding by the Legal Office and we are very pleased at the progress that has been made.

If I may be allowed to refer back to a comment made by a member of the Synod in February group of sessions, which met with some puzzlement, I think, namely a reference to Article 14 of our 39 Articles on works of supererogation. I had a conversation with the speaker, the Archdeacon of Leeds, and it was clear to me that I really ought to have welcomed his comments. It was about the nature of particular callings. The article condemns the idea that those who think they do more for Christ's sake than bound by duty is required it makes you a better Christian. I am not quite sure that as a religious I do more than I am required to do. I do not think I think in those terms, but it is inimical to the religious vocation to think of it as a way of being a better Christian. There is a danger in any particular vocation, whether it is religious or not, of thinking that your particularity, your strangeness, is a mark of being something special. It is a human security in that respect and not one which rests on the assurance of divine grace. There is the danger that you end up condescending, looking down, on those who are not so particular. That is abiding temptation, I think, for many people and I would include myself in that, and I repent of it.

The grace of our calling is something which is common. We had that wonderful Bible study from Isabelle Hamley earlier this morning. A royal priesthood. All our callings are part of that one royal and priestly calling from our Lord Jesus Christ. All our calling is of grace, royal and priestly. That means that all our particularities are likewise but because they are part of that one calling. There is no advance, there is no lessening of that calling because one is particular; no grace which is greater afore or after.

We sang on Sunday that great hymn of Wesley "Can it be?" and that has that marvellous repeated line, "Tis mercy all, immense and free". That is true of any calling - religious, lay, red, yellow, blue, whatever. All is the grace of one calling. I thank the Archdeacon of Leeds for prompting me to make those comments.

Sr Catherine Harvey (Religious Communities): My appearance and constituency are a declaration of my interest in this item. I am also a member of the Steering Committee. I am a not very robust specimen of an endangered species. When I became a novice in the Sisters of the Love of God 45 years ago I was given a little book bound and inscribed by my fellow novices listing the whole community. Then I had 70 sisters; now I have 20. There were others of roughly my age; now there is no one under 50, and the majority are, like me, over 70. This decline in numbers is in some measure common to all the recognised communities. I do not have the latest figures, but between 2017 and 2018, the numbers in Europe, and almost all of them are in England, declined from 409 to 381. There have been some life professions but these by no means balance the deaths we have noted in the last year. It seems ironic that after more than 150 years of religious life in the Church of England, the Church has chosen a time when we appear to be in terminal decline to recognise and regulate us by a Canon.

When I asked the reason for the timing of this Canon, the answer most often given was “safeguarding”. It is of course right that the shame of the Church and her penitence and purpose of amendment should have concrete expression in this form. The need has been highlighted by the death of our brother Peter Ball, on whose soul may God have mercy.

Many of the religious I have spoken to find it hard to rejoice in the recognition we and the acknowledged communities are being given by the proposed Canon. Some of us have focused more on our misgivings, not so much about the Canon itself as the Regulations depending on it, which we have seen in draft form. I must emphasise that what the Regulations require is, for the most part, what communities are already doing under the guidance of what we know as the Handbook. However, my community is probably not alone in having work to do in making explicit our responsibilities in relation to safeguarding.

Perhaps it is too much to ask of a Canon that it be a channel of hope and of grace. However, the other response to my question, “Why now?” was a reference to Archbishop Justin’s priority of the renewal of prayer and religious life. We need the help of each one of you to make real and life-giving this connection. When you press button 1, I ask you to undertake to start a conversation with us, or about us, that will rekindle our hope. Will you please pray that we may live to the glory of God for the sake of the world.

The Chair: I see no one standing so I call the Bishop of Manchester to reply to the debate.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Thank you very much. I feel very underdressed for participating in this debate today!

Thank you, Brother Thomas, and thank you for your kind remarks regarding the Legal Office. I would want to pay particular tribute to Alex McGregor for working with us on the detail of this, but also - as he has now come back into the room - the Bishop of Winchester, who particularly in the early stages gave us some of the vision for the work that underlies all of this. Article 14 on works of supererogation: yes, the religious life is not about creating a better class of Christian; it is a particular way of living out our baptism. Having said that, if you think I am bad now, imagine what I might look like if I did not have the discipline of being a Franciscan Tertiary to help keep me somewhere a little closer to the straight and narrow.

Sister Catherine, an endangered species. When we look back at the reduction in numbers, it is not just the Church of England or the Anglian Communion. If we look across the Roman Catholic Church, there are very similar factors there. But, again, there are new things coming into being, in line with the Archbishops’ priorities, which are to be

blessed and to be encouraged at the same time as we continue to pray for the revival and renewal of existing communities.

You are right to say that much of what the Regulations are likely to require - they are only in indicative form at the moment - are what communities are already doing, but that will need to be made explicit in the way communities are doing this work. I think much of what we are doing in the whole field of safeguarding at the moment is becoming more explicit because sometimes it is only when you become explicit you discover that there actually was a gap - you thought you had some particular thing covered, but it was all implicit, it was all understood, and when you try to write it down you realise it is not quite as there as you had thought it was. Thank you for reminding us that we are doing this not just for reasons of damage limitation but to generally promote the work of the Holy Spirit through the religious communities in our generation. Thank you, Archbishop, for this Report.

The Chair. Thank you very much. The question is: "That drafting Amending Canon No 40 be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37 I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 505: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 23, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, in favour 100, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 111 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions.

The Chair. The ayes have it. I call upon the Bishop of Manchester to move Item 506: "That the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2103C) be adopted".

ITEM 506

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Thank you, your Grace. Given the enthusiasm with which we have just voted for the Canon, I therefore propose that the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence be adopted.

The Chair. Is there any debate? Thank you very much. I put it to the vote. This requires a simple majority.

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

The Chair. Thank you very much. The petition has passed. Therefore, the petition will accordingly be presented to Her Majesty the Queen. That concludes this particular item. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR *Miss Debbie Buggs (London)* took the Chair at 11.55 am.

ITEM 15

PRESENTATION ON THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT (GS 2138)

The Chair. We are now at Item 15 on the agenda: the presentation on the Archbishops' Council's Annual report. You will find the paper GS 2138 useful for this item. There will be an opportunity for questions on this presentation, and I will take these in groups of two. The next item is timed business and is due to start not later than 12.20 pm, so please do formulate your questions as succinctly as possible. Mary and Ian, over to you.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): We are very grateful for the opportunity to present to Synod about the work carried out in 2018 as the Archbishops' Council seeks to support the whole of the Church in its mission and ministry. Of course, this is referring to the calendar year 2018. We have seen all through this session of Synod how this work has continued to develop, and debates continue on each of the issues. The Council has continued to bring to life policies and approaches agreed and endorsed by General Synod to help bring more people to come to faith in Jesus Christ and to grow in their discipleship, as expressed in our nine objectives on the screen.

Number 7 is safeguarding. Obviously, we could treat that simply as one of the objectives, but the issues around safeguarding are clearly much more important than simply one item amongst many. I just want to say that within the Council we are extremely aware all the time of the importance of this issue. We discuss it on every agenda. We are paying acute attention to the results of IICSA. We have been reminded of all of that in the discussions that we have had so far in this Synod. I think on the Council it is true to say we are particularly mindful of the questions raised about resources. We continue to discuss that and want to ensure that we allocate the appropriate resources so that we are doing everything we can to ensure that the Church is a safe place for all people. Also, in the Report there are particular details of publications during the last year which support that programme.

The Council continues to be active in supporting churches to focus on mission and evangelism as a first priority. I do not think it is accidental that we have put this as number 1 amongst our nine objectives. A total of £64 million of Strategic Development Funding grants was allocated to 23 dioceses last year. Again, it is worth consulting the Strategic Investment Board Report - it is a separate document which you have in your pack - to look at the details of those and seeing how the work is continuing to spread and develop and is being taken up by dioceses right across the country. It is aiming to create new worshipping communities in a wide range of social contexts, often in communities where not only the Church has been historically weak in its presence but often, increasingly now,

where local services and charities are failing to invest. There is an ambitious programme of work in city centres, in coastal areas, in market towns, in housing estates and in rural areas as well. That allocation also includes £12 million which was given to dioceses to support them in strategic capacity to improve missional and financial strengths. Alongside this, the Council oversaw distribution of grants for dioceses who minister in lower income communities under the established formula.

Related to the strategic investment, of course, is the national initiative in digital development, which included launching an Alexa skill, which means people can ask for daily prayer, for Grace to be said or to find a church. As you will be aware, the launch garnered much coverage in the media, including interviews on BBC national television.

(Video played)

I should comment that Alexa normally works with the sound on the whole time!

There is a natural link between evangelism, seeing people come to faith, and discipleship, seeing people grow in faith, and that link is evident when we look at the other range of issues in digital development. I hope some people were able to go to the fringe meeting last night.

Last year saw the biggest Easter campaign to date. An estimated 7.4 million were reached by the Follow the Star campaign and its excellent supporting literature. We also saw our first Christmas advertisement film encouraging people to attend a Christmas service. For the first time there was a new app offering reflections through Christmas right up to Epiphany, and more than 120,000 booklets on this were sold, which is a 50% rise on the previous year. Live Lent, a six-week discipleship journey, had a reach of 3.54 million across the Church of England social media channels. I should follow on the Bishop of Manchester's comment that those who love the statistics will really love the digital stuff because we can measure things extremely accurately.

A significant emphasis has been on discipleship under the *Setting God's People Free* programme, with new learning communities set up in 24 different dioceses.

Talking Jesus was also launched in 2018, providing both inspiration and practical suggestions to help people talk about God with those whom they meet.

Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio): Efforts to foster vocations continued with the launch of the Great Vocations Conversation, supported by prayer, study and reflection materials, and the Ministry Experience Scheme has been taken up now by 20 dioceses, with 95 young people participating in a year-long placement - a growth of 17%.

(Video played)

It was really heartening to see another rise in the number of vocations. 587 people started ordination training, an increase of 8%, and a welcome step towards the aim of recruiting 50% more candidates by 2020. It is positive news too that the cohort is both younger and more diverse than previously.

Looking to the future, the Council initiated a programme of work to develop a shared vision for ministerial education. Regional conferences brought together principals of theological colleges, DDOs, directors of ministry and bishops to consider how best to equip the Church of England to fulfil its mission in the future.

Part of that mission is, of course, to transform our society and communities so that they more closely reflect the Kingdom of God. The Council's role in that is to co-ordinate major initiatives agreed by this Synod, to provide support to bishops as they engage in policy debates and to celebrate and promote learning from the wealth of activity undertaken locally. Last year, bishops spoke publicly about a wide range of issues, including child poverty, modern slavery and gambling, the latter having a direct impact on the reduction of the maximum stake on fixed odds betting terminals, and bishops also encouraged the government to commit to a target of net zero emissions by 2050.

The Council pressed forward with its environmental programme as a whole, and that, of course, has the potential to influence all our 16,000 churches, 10,000 churchyards and 4,700 schools. The potential is enormous. More than 2,000 churches are now running on green energy tariffs. More than 700 were registered last year as EcoChurches. The Plastic-Less Lent campaign - that is slightly difficult to say - received widespread parish support and global media coverage. A joint Accord was signed with two government departments to set out plans for how our churches could host new digital infrastructure to boost connectivity in hard-to-reach issues.

More wonderful, but perhaps less widely known and shared across the whole country, is the enormous range of activities being carried out by people in churches up and down England to support their communities. Last year, we counted more than 33,000 projects, and 16,700 were either led or held in churches, of which this is just one.

(Video played)

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Church of England schools are the largest single provider of education in England. Our role as the established Church ensures that a million pupils from all backgrounds attend them. These are not faith schools but Church schools for the community, with our vision being to equip a new generation of young people to shape society and contribute meaningfully to the world. Towards the end of

last year, we were involved in discussion with the House of Bishops about the Growing Faith Report, which I think will significantly strengthen this provision and connect it with the making of disciples. 2018 also saw the development of a diocesan education leaders programme and established a leading leadership network for our multi-academy trust leaders.

The Council provided specialist services and support to churches and dioceses over a range of areas and this continued to develop during the year. Around 650 churches have taken up the opportunity to offer cashless payments. I noticed a little cashless booth at York Minster yesterday. A further 20 churches have taken up contactless collection plates through the provisions of the Parish Buying scheme.

The Church Finder website - A Church Near You - was also enhanced to allow parishes to create their own mini websites. During 2018, people from 1,000 churches were trained in how to better use social media and their websites to share their life of the faith and their faith communities with those around them.

The way that clergy apply for new roles is changing. The Pathways service, set up with funding from the Archbishops' Council in 2017, grew again in 2018. We now have 33 subscribers, of which 30 are dioceses, and more than 983 ministry posts were advertised. The Clergy Transitions Service, a new feature of Pathways, has helped more than 60 clergy with free confidential support when looking for opportunities or direction.

Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio): Questions of governance, though not necessarily the most exciting part on the surface of our work, can make an enormous difference, both to good stewardship of our resources and to the delivery of ministry. Council has worked in taking forward decisions by this Synod to simplify governance and to take away potential barriers to ministry and mission. We have also worked during the year to take forward plans to make it easier to minister with colleagues in churches that do not share the same national structure as the Church of England.

We have talked a lot about cathedrals this morning. Last year, the Council worked in support of the Cathedrals Working Group, bringing forward the proposals for consultation to Synod during the year.

We are committed in the Council to playing our part in ensuring that the Church of England is a welcoming community for everyone. The Council's Minority Ethnic Vocations Conference, which ran for its fifth year in 2018, continued to encourage young BAME Anglicans to consider ordained vocations. We rejoice that the proportion of ordinands who entered training increased 7.7% and that the proportion of stipendiary clergy who describe themselves as being from that background also increased to 3.8%.

The Council picked up the challenge to increase the welcome and participation for people with disabilities. Archbishop Justin hosted a major conference at Lambeth Palace to listen to those with lived experience of disability. The more than welcome support resource that followed it is designed to help churches move through a process of welcome, inclusion and involvement to full participation.

A major focus for strategic development funding has been in areas of social deprivation. By the end of 2018, £36 million, or around 30% of the overall funding, had been awarded to support mission in areas whose experience of the Church was of neglect and withdrawal. These projects bring new resources, fresh energy and vision for a hopeful future, and that is the thread that runs through all the work of the Archbishops' Council: the bringing together of ideas, policies and resources, in service of all who work in Christ's name to bring the good news to the people of England and to reinvigorate Christian communities for a new generation.

Before I end, I just want to say that many of you, I know, understand what we owe to the commitment, skill and sheer hard work of the staff team led by William Nye. On behalf of my fellow Council members, and I hope you will want to join me too, I would like to thank them for all the work they did for us in 2018 but in every year. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. Are there any questions?

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): Thank you very much for that presentation. I am very encouraged by what I am seeing happening on the digital scene, but the number of people who are being trained to be able to help in the digital work I think needs to be greatly expanded. Has the Archbishops' Council considered training where in my profession we often train the trainers as opposed to just training the end user?

The Chair: I will now call Revd Charles Read to put his question, and then I will invite Mary and Ian to respond.

Revd Charles Read (Norwich): Whilst it is very encouraging to hear about increased numbers of ordinands, can you explain why you use the word "vocation" when you really mean "vocation to ordained ministry"? Whatever happened to the ministry of the whole people of God?

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Thank you, Mike, for your question about digital training. Yes, I totally agree with you there. I was not able to go to the presentation last night. Were you able to go?

Mr Michael Stallybrass (York): No.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Certainly, we recognise the importance of digital and of unfolding it right through the Church. I think also many people's experience is that there is a generation who are digital natives and so on one level do not need that training; they are already living in that world. It is really a question for many of the rest of us of playing catch-up. We certainly have looked at the digital team and its resources and during this year - obviously this does not apply for last year's Report - have agreed to increase funding there. But, certainly, there is a huge amount of potential.

On the use of "vocation", I think that is just, Charles, shorthand for us giving a summary of our Report in a brief time. I think there is absolutely no doubt that every member of the Council recognises that vocation is for everybody. The Council has published resources on that. Some of them are downstairs by the information desk if you want to pick one up. We are absolutely behind the report on *Setting All God's People Free*, and it is something we revisit at every point, but we also recognise that vocations to ordained ministry are also important.

Revd Dr Anderson Jeremiah (Universities & TEs): Thank you for the wonderful report. What I am interested to know is how can we instil that the Church of England and all the wonderful things you are doing are part of the global Church; that it is not just the Church of England, but we are connected, a network with a global universal Church?

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): A year ago, we heard the awful statistics about the resources in estates evangelism in urban estates compared with rural parishes, for example. I am hugely encouraged that £36 million has gone into socially deprived areas, but I wonder: would it be possible for both the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops to look into a new approach to mutual support which would run on a voluntary basis by twinning, so that we do not rely on this just top-down but we actually shared our resources within the Church as a whole?

The Chair: These will be the last two questions, I am afraid. If you could reply fairly briefly, that would be appreciated.

Mrs Mary Chapman (ex officio): On the matter of working globally, or more widely, I do not think we should underestimate the power and network of the Anglican Communion. There are already many, many projects with different parts of the Anglican Communion working with other churches. A very practical example outside of the discussions that we had yesterday about the Covenant is we are working practically together with the Methodists on the environment and on housing issues. There is already an outreach and it can only be limited by the amount of resource that we can put against it.

Revd Dr Ian Paul (Southwell & Nottingham): Gavin, thank you very much for your comment on estates evangelism. That is obviously very sensible. The first place, of

course, where that needs to happen is within a diocese but then there are big regional differences as well. You will have seen the news that today it has been announced that Stephen Hance has been appointed to join the team in Church House, and I think that is part of the continuing strengthening of the evangelism team. Those looking at all areas of strategy would do well to pick up your comment.

I would also like to say thanks to those several people who said that they enjoyed the report and they were encouraged by it. I am glad to see that. I think, actually, I was very encouraged by it as well. It has been really interesting to see during the last three or four years in my membership of the Archbishops' Council how many things are beginning to come together in some sort of strategic coherence. That is not to say that we are solving all the problems and there is not more work to be done, but we really should take some encouragement in the way that particularly things like the SDF, which in its early days was a bit rough and ready in terms of issues around governance and mechanisms and so on, are really working well together. I just hope that that over the next five years that development will continue.

The Chair: Thank you to our speakers. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool)* took the Chair at 12.19 pm.

ITEM 16

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL

The Chair: Synod, we now come to Item 16, the appointment of a member of the Archbishops' Council. There are two documents to refer to: GS 2139 and the Fifteenth Notice Paper, the yellow one, that gives us more information about Maureen.

The proposal is that this will fill a vacancy created by Mary Chapman's term of office coming to an end at the end of this year. I would like to call upon the Archbishop of Canterbury to move the motion and he has up to 10 minutes.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Thank you to the Chair and to members of Synod. As members will be deeply aware, the Archbishops' Council was established by the National Institutions Measure of 1998. When the Synod was debating that legislation, as many of you will remember, it agreed that 10 of the 19 places on the Council should be filled through various synodical elections: three being the Archbishops and one of the Estates Commissioners are ex officio and six should be for the Archbishops to appoint with the approval of the Synod.

We are now asking you for your approval on this appointment. The current vacancy will arise from the retirement of Mary Chapman on 31 December 2019 at the end of her term

of office. Since I have so long to speak, Chair, I want to just add a few words of thanks to Mary Chapman.

Mary has borne heavy burdens on the Archbishops' Council over the years that I have been on it in terms, particularly, of her extraordinarily assiduous and burdensome work on the Audit Committee. Burdensome not because the people are particularly difficult, quite the reverse - she was served by excellent, really outstanding staff and the other members of the Committee - but it is a work of detail and a work that is well hidden but is essential to the success of the Archbishops' Council and is one that is often demanding when there are requirements for events to be reported to the Charity Commission.

In addition, she has been someone who has always raised points that needed raising, has been assiduous in raising issues that we needed to face and not letting us just dodge by difficult questions. She has been an essential and remarkable member of the Council and on all our behalves I would like to thank her very much indeed.

GS 2139 sets out the recruitment process that we have followed for her successor. The Archbishop of York and I, and those who advised us on the appointments, believe that Maureen will be able to make an equal and equally considerable consideration to the work of the Council. She is a member of St Luke's Gamston and Bridgford Church in Nottingham. She was a senior manager in Marks & Spencer and Boots before working as a Church Growth Officer and then Diocesan Secretary in Derby Diocese. There, she was involved in securing a Strategic Development Funding bid for St Werburgh's Church in Derby.

Maureen is now trustee for the Potting Shed Church, which is a rural resource church, which was initiated as part of the first SDF bid for Southwell & Nottingham. She is also involved in diocesan life mentoring clergy and lay leaders, and is on the Finance Committee, diocesan and deanery Synods. In addition, she is actively involved with two charities in Africa, one being Five Talents, which works in partnership with local Anglican dioceses and therefore brings and on-the-ground familiarity with the issues of the Anglican Communion.

As you can see from her background, Maureen is passionate about seeing churches grow in numbers and in spiritual depth and flourish through local mission and individuals sharing their faith and sees the importance of the national Church serving local parishes and chaplaincies and all other expressions of local church as they seek to deliver their mission and ministry.

We believe that her presence on the Archbishops' Council will strengthen it very remarkably. I therefore beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Synod, we have about five minutes before we need to finish for lunch so if anyone wishes to make a point, ask a question, I am willing to take that. Paul Benfield and then I will move a motion to close the debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of two minutes.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I have nothing against Maureen Cole, in fact, I have met her and worked with her in the past on something, but I do have a problem with the way this is being done. We only had notice that Maureen was to be proposed this morning. I wonder if it could be explained, since the interviews took place at the end of June, why we could not have had a Notice Paper earlier telling us the name of this person, so we might have wanted to make further inquiries? I think there is a danger that we are just being used as a rubberstamp, which is unfortunate.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Absolutely. Father Benfield, and members of Synod, I am very sorry. This was an oversight that we realised at our Business Committee meeting at 8.15 this morning and, thanks to the amazingly fast reaction of the staff, it was put right almost immediately. You do have my sincere apologies, that paper should have reached you sooner.

The Chair: I would like to close debate on Item 16. Are you in agreement to that?

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

The Chair: Thank you. Archbishop would you like to respond to the debate?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): No, thank you.

The Chair: I would like to put Item 16 to the vote that Maureen Cole is appointed as a member of the Archbishops' Council until December 2024.

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

The Chair: I have been informed that Maureen is actually with us this morning. Maureen, would you like to stand? Welcome to the Archbishops' Council. That concludes Item 16. It also brings us to lunch and we will see you again at 2.30. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker)* took the Chair at 2.30 pm.

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. Before we go into our next item of business just the very gentlest of reminders that the taking of photographs while we are in session is not permitted. There have been some mobile phones and other devices seen flashing away,

or whatever they do these days. Please, we do not do that. I would like now to call Canon Sue Booy, the Chair of the Business Committee, to address Synod.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Friends, this is a request to you. You will see that there is some important business towards the end of the afternoon in our Standing Orders relevant to the Crown Nominations Commission, several of which are forthcoming, so I am going to ask you if the Chair could move that Items 37 to 41, which are all CNC related Standing Orders, could be taken before any of the other Standing Orders business just to ensure that these important items of business are definitely taken this afternoon. It is a bit of a safety net issue, but I felt it was easier to ask you now than to be changing things around in the middle of the afternoon if we needed to.

The Chair: Synod, the Chair of the Business Committee has proposed that variation in business which seems to me to be a modest and a sensible proposal. Under Standing Order 9(i)(a) it requires your consent.

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

The Chair: Thank you very much. That order of business is carried.

ITEM 17

TRIENNIAL FUNDING WORKING GROUP (GS 2140)

The Chair: We move now to Item 17 on the agenda. This is a presentation under Standing Order 107 and is the Report of the Triennial Funding Working Group. I need to draw members' attention to the financial implications of this business and Notice Paper Five outlines the potential financial impact. The presentation is going to be led for us by the Chair of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee, John Spence, by the First Church Estates Commissioner, Loretta Minghella, and by the Bishop of Manchester. After our three speakers there will be an opportunity for questions.

I am going to invite the Bishop of Manchester to address us first. Bishop, it might help you if there was a light to let you know when about five minutes has elapsed.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Thank you, Synod. Before lunch I was promoting holy poverty for our religious communities. After lunch I am now promoting the value of wealth for supporting us in our work in the Church.

Members of Synod, for us to flourish in the vision of becoming a growing Church for all people in all places, we need a partnership between all parts of our Church. Today's presentation will give a flavour of the national Church's spending plans for the next three

years which will support the work of our parishes, dioceses and cathedrals, and, potentially, other contexts within which our Church is engaged.

For the first time in our history, our two Archbishops called together representatives of the Commissioners, the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops to consider together how the Church's national resources could be aligned most effectively with our Church's priorities. We were a group of 11. We contained five members from each of these three bodies. Before you think I am giving you yet another mathematical conundrum let me explain that several of us, including Loretta Minghella and myself, are members of more than one of those bodies. I am a member of the House of Bishops but also was representing the Commissioners.

This group was a genuine partnership and that is being expressed in the way that this presentation is being given first by me with an introduction, then the First Church Estates Commissioner Loretta, who will talk about the Commissioners' actuarial review and their overall distribution plans and then, thirdly, John Spence, from the Archbishops' Council, who will talk about plans for distributing the funds that will be granted to the Council by the Commissioners.

My task before either of them speak is simply to give the House of Bishops' perspective that we provided to the other bodies at the start of this work. We now know, and I think we are all hugely grateful, that the Commissioners are going to be able to distribute significantly more in the next three years than has been distributed in the current triennium. Last autumn when we began our work, we were hopeful of such an outcome, but we had to recognise the possibility of there being no increase, or even a reduction in discretionary spending. Our priorities had to stand up in all scenarios.

The House discerned three priorities to which we gave equal weight. The first was about recruiting and training more ordained ministers. Rejoice in the fact that there are greater numbers now responding to God's call to ordained ministry, and we are grateful for the work of the Bishop of Guildford and others in helping us along that way. We recognise though that dioceses will need financial help to encourage them in the aspiration of further increases in the number of ordinands and curates who will help replenish and refresh the pool of our clergy.

Secondly, supporting mission and ministry in our poorest communities. There are areas of our country that are unlikely to ever be able to fund the full cost of sustaining the Church's presence and engagement in their midst themselves. Queen Anne recognised that 300 years ago and we should continue to support them.

Thirdly, growth programmes in our dioceses. We have begun to see the fruits of Strategic Development Funding. We are only a quarter of the way through what is a 10-year

programme of investment. Your Bishops agreed that we should continue to support new growth projects across all parts of the Church in terms of geography, churchmanship and wealth.

Three years ago, we made major changes in national funding for dioceses, with half the ongoing funding going specifically to the poorest communities and half to growth. But the only additional money that was available then was time-limited transitional help. I am now going to hand over to Loretta who will now tell us what is different this time.

Loretta Minghella (ex officio): Good afternoon, everyone. I begin by thanking Bishop David for his introduction and also for his expert chairing of the Triennium Funding Working Group. He ensured the Group's work was rooted in a desire to invest together in the Church's future to share accountability for impact and to support visionary risk-taking all with a focus on helping us become a growing church across the nation.

Starting on the journey to decide on distributions for the coming triennium, the big question was from the £8 billion fund how much overall can we sensibly afford to distribute in 2020-2022? Last autumn, the Commissioners began engaging with the actuaries to work it out. Who knew how much fun this was going to be! With their help, we have taken a new and radically different approach.

It is worth reminding ourselves where we are starting from by looking at the current triennium. What we see here is pension obligations costing about £125 million a year, and a further £105 million being spent on what we are calling core distributions, the core provision that we have been making to support bishops, cathedrals and dioceses, including through SDF and Lowest Income Communities Funding. We are on track to distribute about £800m in this triennium, about 15% of the Church's running costs.

Our new approach is underpinned by the four principles on this slide.

We are confident the Church will have a continuing mission to the nation over the coming years, decades and centuries. So, we need to be even-handed in how we support the Church of today and the Church of tomorrow. We call this intergenerational equity. We aim to be dependable, but sufficiently flexible, to be responsive to God's call to the Church in the current season.

The task involves - clicking to the next slide - juggling some fast-moving parts (or not so fast-moving parts) but the key questions are here: how much money have we got to invest and how much is it likely to increase? If we want to be even-handed between generations, how do we keep up with inflation? How will we help the Church grow and how much do we set aside for that? There are hard facts here like pensions in payment, current asset values and assumptions about the future, clergy longevity and future investment returns.

We had the drains up and we reviewed all the assumptions thoroughly. Most significantly at this review we looked hard at the inflation base for future increases in expenditure. We decided, and this is the key decision of the whole piece, that unless we are required to increase expenditure in line with RPI, such as for clergy pensions in payment, we will switch to CPIH - the Consumer Prices Index with an allowance for housing costs because this is now regarded as a more reliable general measure of inflation.

This one change has enabled us to increase distributions by £155 million over the next three years. This is exciting. But it is not new money. Yes, we are able to make this money available in the short term, but the change means that we expect that in about 40 years' time distributions will be less than they would have been under the previous approach. The Assets Committee is really great, but they are not miracle workers.

We describe our distributions under three headings - and this is where it gets a bit fruity - pensions, core and additional. Here I use a lemon to represent the pensions: it's sharp, it's good for you, and we just have to suck it up! The apple is used to signify our core provision, what we hope to provide, markets permitting, in any season. I should say that one very senior member of the clergy was a bit nervous of the scriptural ramifications of using an apple here, but I think it works because none of us should be encouraged to bite into this particular apple.

Then there is the tape measure to signify the additional distributions. I use it to remind us that this will extend and retract, and the size of the pot for time-limited projects will increase and decrease according to market performance of the fund and other financial factors at each triennial review.

For the coming triennium our actuaries estimate that about a fifth of the fund will be needed for the pension.

It is estimated that 56% of the fund will be needed for our core distributions, for mission and ministry in dioceses and through our bishops. Whilst this core support is, and will remain, fundamental to how the Commissioners support the Church, I am most excited about the additional distributions in the tape measure. 23% of our fund is currently available for these.

What does this mean in real money? Our annual spending on clergy pensions earned from service up to the end of 1997 is around £125 million. We plan to spend around £115 million a year on our core distributions during the next triennium. This includes our core support for bishops, cathedrals and dioceses and including LInC and SDF funding. This includes our own administration costs, funds to support senior leadership development and under the new power given to us by Synod last year, we are giving a grant to the Archbishops' Council to support its award winning Digital Team.

Our capacity for new additional distributions in the next three years is around £50 million a year. Much thought has gone into how this additional money - the tape measure money - can best be used to support what God is doing through the Church in this season. Most of the new money will be granted to the Archbishops' Council for distribution on priorities agreed by the House of Bishops, Commissioners and Council. John will tell you more about this.

An area where the Commissioners will make new distributions direct is the Cathedral Sustainability Fund that you heard mentioned this morning. The element I am personally most excited about is a grant to the Council of £20 million for the seed funding of a social impact investment fund. The Church Commissioners' fiduciary duty means we cannot ourselves operate such a fund to secure both social and financial returns, unless the financial returns are at market rate, and this has often been misunderstood as a lack of interest on our part in this kind of fund, but we are very interested. When we evaluated our work last year against the Five Marks of Mission, it was Mark No. 3, responding to need by loving service, where we felt our contribution was less direct. Supporting the Council in this way helps us round out our contribution so that we can see a direct line between our funding and all five Marks of Mission and we look forward to seeing the great contribution to the Common Good that such a fund can make.

How repeatable is this level of distribution? We have sought to devise a smoothing mechanism to give near certainty to our plans for the current triennium and a high degree of confidence in plans for the next. The price of this is that the level of additional distributions over time will be volatile because, as you all know, Synod, the value of investments can go down as well as up.

This new approach at least enables the current generation to participate more significantly in the last decade of enormous growth in the Commissioners' fund.

My fellow Commissioners and I are delighted that we have been able to make additional funds available to encourage and enable the Church to become more effective in service and in its plans for growth and sustainability. John will now talk more about that.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to start by also praising the work of the Triennium Funding Working Group. I think we owe a debt of thanks to William Nye who conceived of this new piece of synergy, the reverse of the $2+2 = 5$ and $5+5+5 = 11$, and I am looking forward to him employing it in future expenditure budgets.

I would also like to say that it has been a joy for the fifth time this year to listen to Loretta's presentation of the lemon, the apple and tape measure and I would like to say the

attractiveness never wanes! I have got eyes in the back of my head, Loretta, which are rather more effective than the ones at the front!

The responsibility of the Archbishops' Council in terms of those funds allocated to us is to ensure that the funds are spent in accordance with those priorities set out by the House of Bishops; to ensure that the funds are spent effectively and sustainably for the growth of the Church in every place; and to ensure that nobody leaves this hall believing that parishes and dioceses are somehow excused of the need to achieve greater levels of income generation which is the ultimate constraint. We are not constrained by the generosity of the Church Commissioners. We are constrained primarily by the inability we have faced in growing our own income on a year-by-year basis and in a greater way.

Those priorities are set out in the attachment which shows that core element again of Strategic Development Funding, Lower Income Funding and Digital and then on the other pie chart by the funds which you will see, overwhelmingly, in different streams are about diocesan sustainability allied, of course, to that social impact piece.

When I come on to talk about allocations of those in the additional category, that second pie chart, I would point out that the allocations are provisional and they are based on the best financial assumptions and demand assumptions we can make, but these will be reviewed annually and adjusted accordingly to ensure that we continue to meet demand effectively.

So let us look at each stream. On Lowest Income Community Funding £82 million is being allocated over the triennium. Those dioceses who receive the funds under this formula know what their grants are going to be. We will continue to work with dioceses to encourage greater intentionality and focus on those communities, and during 2020 and 2021, in the light of the experience of the first triennium of operation, we will undertake a review to ensure that this is working effectively before making recommendations for the 2023-2025 triennium.

Strategic Development Funding is important, as the Bishop has said, not just because of the projects but because they are enabling dioceses to build strategies and then take their flagship projects there. This is as much about imbuing a greater sense of confidence and overall strategic direction than just about the schemes themselves. We need to reach every part of the Church with these funds. We need to ensure that we are addressing all parts, but we will continue to focus on areas of poverty and need, on younger people and on some of those more heavily urbanised areas where we have been particularly weak. We will continue to see how we can develop the application of the funding and so we are creating a new fund for smaller applications which still have strategic impact.

On the illustration you will see just three examples. They happen to be from Coventry

looking at their 20-30 Project, Ely and their market towns work and London around their youth project, but I could have shown you pictures of every part of this country. Carlisle's superb work with youth, the Transforming Wigan piece where we have taken a deanery from which the Church of England had largely disappeared, and the diocese is rejuvenating our presence by creating a series of churches which meet the needs of that community. I could have talked about the estates work in Preston, the small plants in Manchester, the Ignite cafe churches in Canterbury. Examples show every form of new worshipping community, every way of enhancing the evangelism and discipleship of this Church in every part of the country, and that £82 million will, I know, be fully committed.

Then we come on to digital. We have heard a lot about the achievements of digital. I will not run through those that were reported this morning. You have seen them all here and I would just mention that while you were told this morning 1,000 churches had been trained up to 2018, that number will rise to 2,000 in 2019 because we have enhanced the amount of resource attached to this. I will take on Mike's point about training the trainers.

Our Digital Team has won 15 national awards. I had the privilege of attending one awards evening where we had entered four classes. When we won the second, a famous comedian, who was the MC for the night, noted that this was all very surprising. When we won the fourth he was heard to say that the Church of England had never been so dominant since they cleared out the Roman Catholics. We went on to win a fifth award, for which we had not entered, as the industry determined that the Church of England had the best in-house digital team of any in the entire industry.

On that basis, we feel fully justified in extending the budget available to the Digital Team from £2 million over this current triennium to £5 million in the next triennium. That will enable them to continue their work embedding and growing the pieces that they have done. We want to ensure that we move from reach to engagement. It is great to get to people in campaigns. We want to see more of them in our worshipping communities on an ongoing basis. We want to achieve effective digital resource for schools. I continue to have the personal ambition that every child leaving a Church school at the age of 11 if they are not going to a Church secondary can stay in touch with God through the apps they all have on their phone. We will continue to enable parishes to refresh and update the various schemes around the various websites. They will be engaging with every form of voice to enable people to continue to access God in all the different ways that they want so that those who are not yet ready to come living into our churches and our worshipping communities can access the Christ that they all need in their lives.

We move on to the additional funding pieces starting with the funding of ordinands. The central funding now available is going to enable us to promise that over the next triennium Vote 1 funding will not increase by more than inflation. We will provide the full cost, including maintenance, for all the additional ordinands coming through the system up to

2025 and it will taper thereafter. We do not ignore the importance of making sure that those ordinands are ready to do the job you want of curates and priests going forward and the Ministry Council under Bishop Martin Seeley are already engaged in reviewing the effectiveness of ordinand education.

Then on to curates. Where there have been ordinands before curates will follow and we are expecting a real surge in the number of curates coming through the system as we go through that ambition. If we are aspiring to 50% more ordinands so the curate numbers will grow in proportion.

We want to ensure that we provide the funding for those dioceses who are taking on more curates than they have done historically and that that funding is proportionately greatest for those where the finances are weakest. I can tell you that we are creating an interim process with decisions on placement which need to be made this autumn for curates coming into the system next summer and we expect those guidelines to be published to dioceses by the end of July.

What is really terrific, ladies and gentlemen, is that the way in which we are ordering our finances will ensure that even if the volatility of that tape measure comes into the play in the next triennium, if investment performance does not enable us to do all the things we want to do later in this coming decade, we can commit now that the funding for those additional curates will hold for the next four triennia so that every diocese can now plan on the ability for the funding of additional curates certain in the knowledge that, once we know what their plans are and we understand the deployment and development they are going to have, those funds will be available.

Another new element in the 2022 triennium will be the Diocesan Sustainability Fund. A sum of no less than £45 million has been allocated for this. We are engaged now in objectively and very thoroughly assessing which dioceses are those which are most in need of this funding and we will then work with them where they wish to undertake the restructuring that they need, the reimagination that they need of Church to ensure sustainability going forward so that we truly can stay and grow in all places. We expect to be able to assist up to 10 dioceses with this major tranche of funding.

As Loretta says, a particularly exciting element is the £20 million allocated to the Social Impact Fund. Let us not forget as a Church we are massive in the field of social impact. A recent estimate put at around 33,000 the number of projects under the sponsorship of worshipping communities across the Church of England. Never before have we had a fund which is dedicated to social impact building on the Marks of Mission.

That fund, where we are working very closely - and I am indebted to Edward and to Arun and the Church Commissioners - we have created a working party which will work out

exactly how this fund is able to place our resources in ways which keep the fund alive, so we seek a return simply enough to make the fund a revolving sum available not just in this triennium but in other triennia to come.

Then there is a modest sum required in order to ensure the funding of the Renewal and Reform teams that are working at Church House on all the items to do with *Setting God's People Free* and the work around Evangelism and Discipleship.

In terms of governance, ultimately it is the responsibility of the Archbishops' Council as trustees to ensure that these funds are spent, as I have said, in accordance with the priorities effectively and for sustainable impact. There will be annual reporting to this General Synod, to the House of Bishops and the Church Commissioners. It is my personal hope that the Triennium Funding Working Group will continue to operate at all times.

We are very clear of the depth of responsibility. Indeed, I am imbued with the responsibility that this involves. It is easy to downplay the importance of these developments. Through the reimagination of the way they do the work, the Church Commissioners have freed up a very large sum of money, enabling the Church to build on our wonderful ambition to bring Christ to the centre of more people's lives. I am very happy to conclude this presentation and to invite questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much to all three of our speakers. There is now an opportunity for questions and we will take those in groups of three. Just a reminder that the clue, as always, is in the name, these are questions, and the more succinct your question can be, the more people we might be able to hear from. I will leave it to the panel to decide who answers and in which order unless the question clearly indicates it is for one particular speaker. So those wishing to ask a question, if you would please stand or otherwise indicate.

Ven. Dr Peter Rouch (Winchester): It is going to be a Winchester double act. I would like to ask a question about section 29 of the paper before us which deals with the pipeline approach to the deployment and training and formation of curates and those for ministry. We have been very blessed in Winchester Diocese to have a significant increase in the numbers offering for ministry and the pipeline approach has proved really very valuable and quite a powerful tool in that, so I am very, very glad to see that.

I am also conscious that the growth of vocations varies from diocese to diocese and I am wondering if thought has gone in to how we enable a consistent pipeline between dioceses as well as within a diocese. Simply training people to the point of curacy and then going wherever it is the job happens to be is not a pipeline, and the transfer of

resource, I suggest, needs to happen earlier in line with the strategic priorities and partnerships between dioceses. Has thought gone into that?

The Bishop of Winchester (Rt Revd Tim Dakin): Thank you very much to the Working Group for your imaginative way of looking ahead and the positive and generous approach to funding. May I also say thank you for freezing the diocesan apportionment, at least for one year. I wonder, however, about the long-term realities of the funding and the amount that the Archbishops' Council is going to require over the next few years, and what thought has been given to that in terms of sustainability across the whole piece. May I focus that in particular around what the Finance Committee is doing in terms of monitoring the financial sustainability of the dioceses. It is invidious and a little bit sensitive to raise an example, but unless I do, probably the question will not land. For example, Lincoln has assets of about £100 million and yet receives LInC support of about £1 million. Winchester has few assets but we use those for curate housing, receives no LInC grant, and yet is asked to provide £1 million in apportionment.

The Chair: Could we come to the question?

The Bishop of Winchester (Rt Revd Tim Dakin): So, the question is could, particularly perhaps John, comment on the need for some global modelling of total financial capacity so that we can be clear about the whole church's long-term sustainability for mission?

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): A very encouraging presentation overall. My question is on the Strategic Development Funding and for John Spence. He is aware that I am calling for an independent and an objective assessment of this programme, and I see that that is kind of hinted towards in this paper, although it does say when there is sufficient evidence to do so. He has indicated to me that will not be until 2021, by which time the bulk of the quarter-of-a-billion pounds will have been committed to already. I am just wondering whether he could actually tell us if this could be brought forward so we can actually get this into operation earlier; independent, objective assessment.

The Chair: Thank you. Our panel to respond to those first three questions and then we will look for three more.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): David White is clearly tiring of being the sheepdog here, so he is going to give me a chair so that he does not need to keep walking to and fro. I do not blame him at all really! Thank you to Peter, the question of dioceses having a consistent flow across dioceses is one where I would always encourage dioceses to talk to each other and to think it through, but I know Ministry Council with Martin are also really thinking about this piece.

It actually ties in with the question Gavin Oldham asked this morning about could we create a scheme of voluntary, mutual aid between dioceses, to which I would say why do you need us to do it? Actually, how much stronger it will be if those dioceses who have, they believe, the greatest wealth, are in a position that they can get together with some others and create such a mutual aid scheme yourselves. It feels far better to me if it comes out of that place than if we try to impose it.

Which brings me to the Bishop's question, of course, about the question of relative levels of diocesan wealth. I can assure you that when I visited Lincoln last year, they were able to point out quite clearly to me why they are not really wealthy at all and they need every penny they have, but yes it has been a repeated theme of General Synod questions that we need to get stronger in this. We are more and more taking into account the resources of a diocese in terms of the assessment we have of strategic development projects and it will be on what we are calling the Strategic Ministry Fund projects in terms of curates. We are going to be ever more conscious of that. What we have to recognise always is that each diocese is independent and we could get involved in a very introverted, complex piece if we were to try to manipulate those resources, so I will always encourage mutual aid driven by yourselves at diocesan level, and we will do what we can to take that into account while getting a better objective view. It is actually essential that we take that into account in thinking through which dioceses we can support with the Diocesan Sustainability Fund.

Gavin, your question around Strategic Development Funding and why do I believe 2021 is the earliest? Because we have learnt a lot about the gap that exists between allocating funds and them being spent. We have begun to understand how long it takes to recruit the necessary people, to get planning permissions where they are relevant, and so in that case we see that while we allocated over £130 million since this scheme started, at the end of the first quarter of this year only £35 million had been spent. Now, that number is going to grow rapidly across the rest of this year and 2020, and at that point we will have enough evidence to undertake that objective, thorough and independent review, and I do believe, Gavin, as you do, that there needs to be independence in this.

But let me assure Synod that in the meantime every project is very closely monitored, that we do have a RAG system in operation for every single project, we have strict change control mechanisms in place so when a diocese is going down the route of one level and then it does not quite work out and we have to change tack, they have to come back to us and get agreement to that. I am very satisfied that the Strategic Investment Board, which comprises members of Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners and two completely independent people, is keeping a very close eye on everyone.

Let me just say one more. Loretta mentioned earlier that you need to take risks if you are going to grow. Remember the story of Jesus and the servant with the talents. If none of

the Strategic Development Fund projects fail, I have to conclude that we maybe did not take enough risks in the first place. We will minimise that, and if they fail we will learn from them, but this is about taking risks to generate the work of Christ.

Mrs Julie Dziegiel (Oxford): I praise the Lord for the decision of the Church Commissioners to move its inflation rate to CPI. I wonder if that decision and the thinking behind it could be communicated to the dioceses, so particularly those dioceses that have gone to a total return basis might also be able to release funds in the way that the Commissioners are.

Revd Canon Giles Goddard (Southwark): Many, many thanks for a very encouraging presentation and some really good news. I am particularly excited about the £50 million which is going to be distributed, especially about the Social Impact Fund, but, picking up about John's point about risk, can you indicate whether there is any risk likely to accrue to the Church, either ethically or financially over the longer term as a result of this larger distribution?

Revd Tiffer Robinson (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): Given the welcome joined-up thinking that has led to both increased numbers of ordinands and funding for their curacies, has there been any consideration about how to ensure we still have enough stipendiary posts for them at the end of their curacies, with some diocese planning to cut a drastic number of posts in the same period?

The Chair: The panel to respond.

Loretta Minghella (ex officio): I will take the first two questions, if I may, and then John will kindly take the third. In terms of communicating this approach to dioceses so that they might actually consider using something similar themselves, there is a very close ongoing dialogue between the Church Commissioners and diocesan secretaries and Diocesan Boards of Finance, so I hope that to the extent that it might prove useful to others, they are aware of it, and we remain, obviously, open all the time to any kind of conversations that might be useful to them.

Thank you, Giles, for your very good question. The markets are indeed at the moment very volatile and actually we have recently lowered our financial return target from RPI plus five to CPIH plus four, precisely to ensure that whilst the target is stretching it is also realistic, so that we do not take too much financial and ethical risk in generating returns for the church. But our actuaries are not taking our target, they are taking their independent view of what they reasonably think we can achieve, knowing our portfolio as they do, over a very, very long period of time. We are quite satisfied that what they have plugged in to the actuarial review is a number that we can properly aspire to and is not

higher than our targets. So, great question, but I think we can give you the assurance that you are looking for.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): If I could just add as a footnote on the first question, if it were the desire of Synod that we created a truncated version of the slides you have seen this afternoon, which could be used as a standard presentation for diocesan synods, I am sure the miraculous finance team would be able to put that together for you, so please indicate if you want that at some point.

On the point about will we ensure that there are jobs for the individuals to go to, let me make two points. First, it would be irresponsible of us to fund additional curacies into diocese A or B without having a clear understanding of their long-term plans for the deployment of ordained ministers. We will have an interim process this year to enable the decisions to be made, but when we come to the next round for curacies coming through in 2021 we will be expecting diocese to be able to explain all of that, both in terms of deployment on the short and longer term, and how they will be developed, how they are putting in place the arrangements needed for the development of those curates into wonderful priests.

Secondly, I am very conscious that several dioceses have indicated to me the extent to which they are having to take economies now. We have to focus on those cases which are most urgent, hence the point of the Diocesan Sustainability Fund. We will work with all that we can do to support dioceses have a balanced approach to the way forward, that they have a long-term vision for where they want to be and that we can enable them to achieve that without going through some trough in the middle from which they cannot recover.

Mrs Mary Durlacher (Chelmsford): Can I ask with the extra that you might have whether you would consider the need, the urgent need for primary schools, the Church of England primary schools? As a foundation governor, we find our finances severely tested by the rise in pensions and the rise in national minimum living wage, and we find that what has always been a carefully budgeted finance situation we are now in the red in conjunction with a lot of other primary schools in the consortium. We have done all we can, we have pared it down to a minimum, and this is the base of community. I plead with those who hold the purse strings to help the primary schools who do such wonderful work with our children.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): I wonder if I may push you just a tiny bit further on inter-diocesan equity? Whilst encouraging to hear that it should be generously given, arguably, in a biblical spirit, rather than taken from dioceses, I still hear often, particularly from wealthier dioceses, a sense that they are unable to do it for legal reasons. I think there are a number of us that would struggle with that interpretation. I wonder if the

Commissioners have given any thought to working maybe with the legal office to provide a brief paper with two or three easy options by which dioceses, should they wish to give to other dioceses, could find a mechanism.

Miss Debbie Buggs (London): Did the Triennium Funding Working Group consider allocating two or three million pounds to safeguarding, so that we could speed up our reaction and our assistance to survivors and also improve our safeguarding procedures a lot more quickly than we could otherwise have done?

The Chair: The Bishop of Manchester.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): I will take the first two and then Canon Spence will take the third one. On Mary Durlacher's point about primary schools, in my diocese in Manchester we have recently received an SDF bid particularly to do work in our Church schools. We are focusing over £1 million over the next five or six years in the Bolton area, just one metropolitan area of the diocese, working with our 22 or so primary schools and our three secondary schools there, putting resource in to ensure that they are giving right from even before primary school, from toddler group upwards, their intentional toddler group, developing young Christians, working with their families, seeing them through primary school, making that crucial transition to secondary school and maintaining their Christian engagement and involvement and faith through that transitional period. We are very excited about that and so far it is beating all of its targets, but it is early days yet.

It has to be said, of course, we cannot, and we should not replace the funding that the State is required to give to schools with our own funding, that sort of defraying of the Exchequer is not the purpose of any charity. Of course, our schools, many of my schools are voluntary aided schools and there are already contributions that come in for capital works in those schools.

On Barry Hill's point about could we look at perhaps, with the help of the lawyers, how it might be legal for dioceses to support other dioceses, yes, we will have a look and let us see where we get.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): The wonderful thing about always answering the third question is I can add a footnote on to a previous answer so, you know, there is nothing like having the last word particularly where a bishop is concerned. It happens so rarely!

On the question of education and schools, Mary, I have said before my personal wish that we would see more Strategic Development Fund projects featuring Church schools, and featuring schools in general, actually, and it has been just a slight mystery to me that we do not see more of those.

On the question of safeguarding, please be assured - I am actually taking this because it is really a question for the Archbishops' Council budget - we will spend what we need to spend on safeguarding. Full stop. We will do what we need to do. We heard yesterday from the National Safeguarding Panel that they felt they needed more resource. I have already had conversations and we are finding out exactly what they need. Those funds will be allocated. Whatever we have to do, we will do.

Revd Charlie Skrine (London): Thank you for the encouraging presentation, particularly for the money to turn ordinands into curates. You mentioned, however, that the primary constraint was the ability of parishes to grow their own income. I wonder if I could ask you for your view on how likely this is and any advice that you might have. The largest single source of income for parishes is planned givers, and there were over 600,000 of those in the Church of England nine years ago and maybe only 400,000 in nine years' time.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): Can I begin by thanking you for the hard work of the Commissioners and all Church staff, and also the money that was awarded to Coventry Diocese for work with 20s and 30s. In relation to following on from the point just made, while this package will benefit many, what about those parishes where growth will not be possible, or, indeed, where it is possible it will not result in significant income revenue? What support for alternative income generation either at parish or deanery level through ecclesiastical entrepreneurship has been given?

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): Thank you for the continuing support for low income dioceses. My question is about paragraph 31, which is about the funding for curates. It says here that dioceses will only be able to apply for one funding route for each curate. Does that mean that each diocese will have an allocation which they have to pay for and the extra will have to be paid for by SDF? Will that money be safe within the system so that the Strategic Development Fund can actually supply that funding?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I think I will be dealing with all those three. If I can deal with the last first. Penny, all we are saying is we cannot have the situation where one curate has funding applications which come forward from two dioceses. Dioceses will be able to apply for up to five cohorts of curates, depending on the additional numbers that they have, and the schedule under which they wish to deploy it, and the intention is that all the curates above the baseline that had been seen coming through the system will be fully funded throughout the next four triennia. This will be the single major funding flow coming through from the funds released by the Church Commissioners.

Charlie and Sam's questions about income generation at parish level are covered, actually, in my next presentation on the Archbishops' Council budget, and I would really cover them both there. Sam, the primary responsibility around parishes and growth and

how we support those parishes which are struggling with income generation has to vest with the dioceses. It is the diocese that needs to work out the strategy that it is to have. We are only here to serve dioceses, not to direct.

We are only here to do that piece that needs to be done at national level, but where there can be schemes, and I will talk about it later, around income generation that will support the Church in every parish and diocese, we will aim to come forward on those. I would be the first to acknowledge that that thinking has not been developed as much as some others and that is work in progress.

The Chair: Synod, time for one more round of questions.

Revd Canon Dr Simon Taylor (Derby): Loretta Minghella's image of the apple has rather inspired this question. How do the Commissioners, the Archbishops' Council and dioceses avoid the temptations and dangers associated with the bidding culture with a three or a five-year timescale for funding window? And what has been put in place and what might be put in place to mitigate those temptations and dangers?

The Bishop of Leeds (Rt Revd Nicholas Baines): While welcoming everything I have heard and with gratitude to the Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council for the approach they are taking, it does seem to me that what is proposed assumes a sort of stasis in relation to diocesan organisation. I wonder if any consideration has been given to the need for more radical diocesan reorganisation in the years to come.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): I am asking the question that Sue Rose wanted to ask, but I will charitably say she has got a cough. For those of us working with ordinands and curates, could the panel clarify the baseline above which the increase in numbers is being calculated, given the recent increases and the question of what might or might not be an increase?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I am such a generous guy, I will do the last question first this time and then David gets the last word, so that is Christian generosity! In terms of the ordinands, I believe the baseline goes from a number in 2017 when we started seeing the increases. To remind you, we moved up to overall increases of 22% across two years, we are expecting a slight slip back this year, but we will still be significantly ahead of where we were in 2016, but that is of new ordinands. The growth in the ordinands continues. We would always expect there to be variations in that space. On curacies, we are going to look at this on a diocese by diocese level, so we are looking back at what was the historic pattern of curacies in that diocese because we know that several dioceses have anticipated and have believed me when I said, "Don't worry the funds will be forthcoming" - there was a statement of faith - and they have gone on with

that. We are looking back and for each diocese we will work that piece back so that we are operating fairly to all.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Simon Taylor asked about what can we do to mitigate a bidding culture. I am glad he used the word “mitigate” as you can never entirely drive out the sort of incentives that bidding can create, but we do need to do what we can to mitigate. That is largely through the work of the strategic team in the Church Commissioners, Philip James and his colleagues, and then through very rigorous work at the Strategic Investment Board, making sure that the bids that do come in to us are realistic, they are proper, they are not largely competitive one with another. We are looking at those bids that meet a threshold for support and then supporting those dioceses to do that work. We are constantly monitoring the work that is being done.

Clearly, when we create incentives around Church growth, folks, we expect the bids to come in and be around Church growth, and if by that we are creating a culture or helping create a culture in the Church of England in which there is more energy and effort put into Church growth, I am not going to stand here and apologise for that today. These are the practices, the policies, set by the House of Bishops, by the General Synod and we will use the financial levers that we have got to encourage them. We do not want to create a system that is run by a bidding culture and people gaming their particular bids in order to meet specific targets that are not realistic or not appropriate for their particular location, so each bid that comes in for SDF goes through two distinct phases, an initial bid and then a more detailed proposal before there is Final Approval for it before we get into the business of the consistent monitoring of what is going on when the project actually lands on the ground.

Nick, around diocesan reorganisation, I wonder why that is coming from the Diocese of Leeds. As has been said, we have set aside a significant amount of money over this next period for dioceses that are doing potentially very major strategic reorganisation of the way the ministry of the Church of England is delivered in that diocese. Clearly, if there were a proposal within that time that involves some very major restructures between more than one diocese then that, obviously, would be something that potentially could be part of that fund. It could be if such changes are further down the line, that might come in a future triennium.

Obviously, as I think the example in Leeds has shown, when you start work at changing diocesan boundaries and diocesan structures in a very major way, we can very easily underestimate the sheer costs that are involved in that, and I would pay tribute to you for the personal cost that you have borne in leading your diocese through the changes over these last few years, and I think that is well known, understood and appreciated. We are aware that if similar proposals come forward, I think we will be a bit more canny in future

in understanding what the costs, human and financial, are to that sort of major reorganisation.

The Chair: Synod, I am sure you would want me, on your behalf, to thank our panel for their presentations, for their answers and for all the work that lies behind both. That concludes this item.

THE CHAIR *Very Revd Andrew Nunn (Dean of Southwark)* took the Chair at 3.31 pm.

ITEM 18

FINANCIAL BUSINESS

ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL'S BUDGET AND PROPOSALS FOR APPORTIONMENT FOR 2020 (GS 2141)

The Chair: Good afternoon, Synod. We now move on to Item 18, which is a debate on the Archbishops' Council's Budget and Proposals for Apportionment for 2020. You need GS 2141 for this debate. Canon John Spence, the Chair of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee is going to move the motion that is on the Order Paper. In order to enable John to do the task this afternoon, I am going to give him an initial speech limit of 15 minutes because he is not planning to speak to each of the individual items that come up later from Item 19 onwards. That is why he will be speaking for longer than the customary 10 minutes now. John, we look forward to hearing you. You have 15 minutes.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I cannot help but thinking if I was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I would have a gin and tonic up here rather than a glass of water, but there we go.

In considering the budget for 2020, the Archbishops' Council had to take account of its acknowledgement of the severe financial pressures that our dioceses are facing, and our parishes are facing. We recognise the context that traditional funding streams are proving very difficult to increase and we will keep coming back to that. But it is a budget of opportunity, and this slide, rather in our Church of England understated way, says that the Archbishops' Council are excited. Frankly, ladies and gentlemen, I am over the moon. This is wonderful.

Let us just understand the scale of this. For those of you who have been with me on this journey since 2014, in each of the last five years I have talked about sticking plaster budgets pending a strategic solution. The strategic solution is here. Let us equally understand that all that we have achieved - all you have achieved - since 2014 has been achieved without significant additional funding. The funding released through Lowest Income Communities and Strategic Development Funding only ever replaced that

previously distributed by way of Darlow. We recognise the challenge that dioceses that used to be major recipients of Darlow have faced and we have given them transitional funding. But even if I take that into account, and given the time it is taking for the SDF money to get spent, the total funds from these sources into the Church of England economy has declined. From 2020 that is massively reversed, and not before time.

If we look at the context in terms of attendance in church, we see that we have this continued decline from 1979 onwards as measured by average weekly attendance. The age profile, as measured by average weekly attendance, which in 1979 matched the population as a whole, is now on average 12 years older.

But that is not the whole story, because worshipping communities, as measured, have been stable since 2014 and in 2017 no fewer than 15 dioceses saw growth as measured by that number. And while we have to continue with AWA, because it is a number that is understood and has historic trends, I believe we should increasingly focus on the growth in our worshipping communities, particularly because so many of the projects we are doing under strategic development are actually not going to bring lots of people into pews and formal services as much as they are going to bring people into worshipping communities in more informal forms of church.

Yes, as was pointed out in the last debate, our pattern of planned giving is under severe stress. Since 2010, the number of planned givers has fallen by 16%. Income has actually risen by 13% because individual givers have increased their giving by an average of 34%. But, again, the age profile of planned givers is against us; it is getting older and older. What we have got to do is find ways to penetrate the new and more informal forms of churchgoers who are members of our communities now.

We have been underdeveloped in creating business cases for major investment and income generation. I take my responsibility for that alongside anyone else, but we are now strengthening our governance in the fields of stewardship. We are looking at different forms of enterprise. We are very keen to come forward with major business cases in the coming months using funds available to us to start the work of a much more concerted drive helping you to generate the income and to penetrate the wallets of those generous Christians of younger age groups joining our communities.

If I may just digress. We have available equipment enough for every church to have a digital application. Now, I appreciate it will not apply in every parish church, but the take-up has been particularly constrained. Yesterday in York Minster you saw the Good plate was there. As I left the Minster, the gentleman who was holding it told me he was on track for 150 donations, many coming from the younger people who simply do not carry cash. We need to forget the way we manage our finances and giving and get into the minds of those younger generations for whom this Church will stand in the future.

Nevertheless, across the period parish income grew by about 20%, but looking at Parish Share we see a more volatile story. We know that many parishes tell us they are only able to pay their Parish Share because they are drawing on church reserves but, equally, we know that the totality of parish reserves has continued to grow. It is a particular concern that if one looks across the total ask in 2019 for growth in Parish Share it is under 2%, well below the rate of inflation, 1.68%, and if I actually look at one province, it is in negative numbers.

In thinking about the context for the budget, the Archbishops' Council had to consider the pressures on dioceses. We know the strain dioceses are under through factors beyond our control: safeguarding with the past business reviews and extra resourcing, extra national income contributions and the impact of the living wage causing a general wage inflation at that level. Apprenticeship levies: we know that reserves have not been yielding as big returns as they did in the past and, again, we come back to the constraint in growing levels of income.

And so, when we considered the budget principles for 2020, we were complete in the view that we had to imbue confidence, that we had to continue to give church dioceses and parishes the capacity so that they can continue to build and grow their plans for the growth of Church in all places, and, yes, we had to have a focus on income generation. As referred to already by the Bishop, it is on that basis of imbuing confidence that we have decided for this year, and for this year only, to freeze apportionment - something we have never done before - in order to give a bit more breathing space to dioceses for this year.

If you look at where we have come from since 2014, the percentage of the total expenditure covered by Votes 1 to 5 will have fallen by 2020 from 89% to 70%. That has enabled us to invest and we have grown central budgets in investment areas by 6.4% per annum while only asking an increase of apportionment of 2.3% per annum. We have been able to do that by attracting funds from different sources: from the Corporation of Church House, initially through rent reliefs and now through grants, they are going to be paying this year and next year a significant part of our central safeguarding budgets; from the All Churches Trust, with whom we have had a particularly close alliance, and I do thank that board, some of whom may be here, for all the work that they have done with us. And, as you have heard from the Church Commissioners, who before today and these major announcements, have also been releasing funds as we have needed them for areas around leadership development and digital.

We class our investment and our budget these days in three key areas, one of which is investment in Church growth, again Digital, the Renewal and Reform programme, Evangelism and Discipleship. One around those areas that are mandated: safeguarding

of course, Living in Love and Faith, modern slavery, environment, to name just a few. And in business, as usual, where our focus always is on effective and efficient spend.

I should have mentioned in my previous slide that the other source of funding has been the use of our reserves. Over the last two years, in anticipation of today's announcements, we drew on the Archbishops' Council's reserves to fund the increasing number of ordinands that we were already seeing. This year, in 2020, we will draw £2.6 million from the central funding so that Vote 1 can be contained. We will also be undertaking a comprehensive budget review to identify those activities which must be done at the centre but also those which do not need to be, whether they can be organised better and done in different ways.

If we come to look at the budget vote by vote, on Vote 1, as you have already heard, we see the number of ordinands growing from 1,344 to 1,367 to 1,384. That increase is being paid for outside of Votes 1 to 5. Vote 1 will increase, as we have said, only in line with inflation.

On Vote 2, which is the operations budget of the Archbishops' Council and Church House, you see the list of items that we have been talking about already with one or two added as well. Those items, again, are around safeguarding, digital and all that space. What I would draw your attention to is the table at the foot of the slide. Taking those three categories of spend, in 2020 we are proposing an increase in business as usual spend by just 1.7%, mandated will grow by 7.5%, largely driven by the safeguarding element with our central support for past case reviews, and investment spend by 7.4%, largely driven by the increased budget for digital, which will actually mean that we grow the budgets of the Church at the centre under Vote 2 by 16.6%, a staggering sum, but I hope you will understand the rationale for its deployment.

On Vote 3, we are increasing a couple of the grants across the Anglican Communion and to the European Conference in line with inflation. Our support for Fresh Expressions is now taken out of the Strategic Development Funding pot but all other grants are frozen.

Vote 4, which is for mission agency clergy pensions, actually goes down a bit because the number eligible has declined.

Under Vote 5, we are in the final year of the current agreement with the Pension Board to increase support for retired clergy housing by 5% each year, so that number climbs from 5 million to 5.3 million.

Let me remind you, again, of all the support that will be coming to dioceses through grants which sit outside Votes 1 to 5: the Lowest Income Communities Funding, the Strategic Development Funding, the transitional funding for those who were previously in receipt of

Darlow as it tapers down, the Sustainability Fund and what we are calling the Strategic Ministry Fund, which is that element for the funding of curates which will be under the governance of the Strategic Ministry Board.

What are the messages I invite you to take away? A recognition that there are major new funding streams now available to us at parish, diocesan and central levels to invest in the growth of the Church in all places; a recognition that those major funds, however, still only account for a 3% addition to the Church economy; a recognition, therefore, that we must continue to think about how we grow our income for years to come; a recognition that we at Archbishops' Council take with utmost seriousness our responsibility for ensuring the quality of spend for sustainable benefit.

But above all, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to go forward with a message of confidence. This is about unlocking the Holy Spirit. I remember the Archbishop of York, as I have mentioned already in this Synod, saying to me, "John, do we really need a strategy when we have the Holy Spirit?", to which my reply was, "Even the Holy Spirit can do with a little bit of help along the way". This budget, ladies and gentlemen, provides that help in rather large measure.

At the end of this debate I will formally move the various recommendations: that you take note of paper GS 2141; that you agree Vote 1 in the sum of £17.6 million; Vote 2 in the sum of £22.1 million; Vote 3 in the sum of £1.2 million; Vote 4 in the sum of £0.7 million, Vote 5 in the sum of £5.3 million; and that you approve both the apportionment table and the pooling adjustments as set out on page 14 of your Order Paper. I present the budget for the Archbishops' Council for 2020 to General Synod and invite your approval.

The Chair: If only I had a memory like that! We are going to move into a debate. We are going to handle it slightly differently from how we usually handle a debate and I need your co-operation with that, Synod, if you do not mind. We are going to group your comments so that John has a chance to be able to respond to them rather than trying to do that all at the end.

Under Standing Order 21(3) I need your permission, please, to allow John to speak on more than one occasion, otherwise he can only do it once.

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

The Chair: We are going to now move into the debate itself and there is a speech limit from the beginning of three minutes.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Carl Hughes (Southwark): When I first spoke in a debate on the Council's budget after becoming a member of the Archbishops' Council's Finance Committee, I explained why I supported the motion, to which Canon Spence responded that it was actually inconceivable that a member of his Committee would not actually support his motion. However, for the avoidance of doubt, I am speaking in favour, John.

We are in a period where there are unprecedented funding needs and constraints across the Church at all levels, as we have heard earlier this afternoon. There is a continuing need to balance meeting our commitments to matters such as safeguarding with investment in the future and also taking into account affordability. The advent of the additional triennium funding from the Church Commissioners is thus most welcome. However, we should not see this as an opportunity to step back from seeking to be effective stewards of God's resources.

Indeed, whilst it is self-evident, we should be reminding ourselves continually that the vast majority of our financial resources come from the members of our Church families across the country. Preaching the Gospel, people coming to faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and discipling people in our churches are fundamental, both to the growth in the Kingdom of God and to our financial stability. We are well aware of the financial pressures on many dioceses and we hope that by being able to offset any increase in diocesan apportionment next year, with the additional £1 million of triennium funding, that this will indeed be very much welcomed.

We need to ensure that the additional triennium funding is applied appropriately in due course across dioceses on the basis of need. As I have mentioned previously to Synod, and building upon earlier comments from the Bishop of Winchester, I do believe that that basis of need increasingly needs to take into account the relative endowed and glebe wealth of dioceses that was so clearly set out in answer to a Synod Question in February. I would again urge diocesan bishops to give careful and prayerful consideration to whether those who have may be able to do more to support those who have not or who have little. This may require greater clarity from dioceses in setting out and distinguishing more clearly between funds which represent working assets, i.e. parsonages, curates' houses and diocesan offices, and pure investment assets.

The 2020 budget for the Council has been thoroughly reviewed and challenged by the Finance Committee. However, this process is made all the easier by the quality of what is provided to us by our finance officers at Church House. I would particularly like to commend Gareth Mostyn, David White and their teams for the diligence and also their ability to provide clear and detailed responses to every conceivable question. With this, I encourage Synod to support Canon Spence's motion.

Mr Keith Cawdron (Liverpool): Could I encourage Synod to look at pages 4 and 5 of the Report. If you look at paragraph 10 on page 5, you will see that we will very shortly be voting on £46.9 million of budgeted expenditure. If you look back to the table in paragraph 7, you will see that the Council will be spending a further £300 million over the next three years and we are not voting on that. What we are voting on today is only one-third of the Archbishops' Council's expenditure and I put it to the Synod that this is really not a very satisfactory way of undertaking financial governance.

The extra money, of course, is from the Commissioners. I would like to tell a story, so we remember how this comes to be available. In the 1990s the Church faced a major financial crisis. It became clear that if nothing was done, all the Commissioners' money would be needed for pensions. The lemon would have been 100%; there would have been no other fruit available. The decision was taken that we capped off the Commissioners' pension obligations and placed most of them on dioceses and placing them on dioceses, of course, means placing them on parishes through Parish Share, above all, to pay into the new clergy pension scheme.

The result of this, 20-odd years later, is we now find there is only 20% of the Church Commissioners' money that is needed for pensions, so extra money is available for a raft of good things, as we have heard, and they are listed in paragraph 7. I am a bit concerned that we have discovered the magic money tree: a bit for this, a bit for that, £20 million for Social Impact Investment, £5 million for Digital Evangelism, £2.4 million for Renewal and Reform.

This has been made possible by the increased burdens over that long period that have been taken on by dioceses and by parishes. Every penny that the Archbishops' Council spends, whether it is through the apportionment or from the Commissioners, could have been spent in other ways. It could, for example, have been used to mitigate pressure on Parish Share. We are taking decisions on priorities across two arenas: the arena of the Archbishops' Council and Commissioners and the arena of dioceses and parishes.

We need to ask where are the pressures? So how are your parish finances in your dioceses? How is Parish Share collection going? We need to give attention to both. It is no good having three new youth workers funded by Strategic Development Funding in a diocese if three of their parishes have had to cut down and make redundant their own youth workers. That is not progress. We need to be looking and taking an honest and fuller picture of what is happening in our dioceses and parishes, and we need that as we look at the spending of this money.

Finally, I suggest we should not claim undue credit for returning in to parish mission and ministry resources that are available above all because, as I have explained, of the

generous response of parishes and dioceses to those major financial pressures that have occurred over the last 25 years.

The Chair: Thank you. John, do you want to respond?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Carl, thank you for all the challenges the Finance Committee give me. You make sure I keep on the straight and narrow. You have left a question with the Bishops about how they themselves can think about greater equity between dioceses. It is not something for which we could easily legislate, and it could be entirely disruptive.

Keith, your history lesson is entirely accurate. I think you missed out one element, which is while those changes were made in response to the difficulties of the Church Commissioners at that time, what has happened over the last 20 years has been outstanding financial performance beyond the levels anyone could have envisaged because we ensured about 10 to 12 years ago that we took on board really high-quality investment personnel to enable us to do it.

I understand the frustration you must feel, ladies and gentlemen, about what you are asked to approve. You are asked to approve those budget streams which are funded by apportionment. I am afraid reform to that is beyond my pay grade. Not that there is any pay, but it is beyond my pay grade anyway.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I declare a couple of interests. I am a member of the Archbishops' Council and also senior treasurer of the Clergy Support Trust, formerly known as the Sons & Friends of the Clergy who have, I now know, the same amount of assets as the Diocese of Lincoln, so we are able to be very generous to clergy who face financial hardship.

It is that question about financial hardship and the value of clergy remuneration that I wanted to raise in this debate and to do a little bit of prolocuting, as it were, on behalf of the clergy, particularly hard-pressed clergy, and also on behalf of the House of Clergy Standing Committee that met this afternoon. The Chair of the House is away this afternoon, so I am speaking on her behalf.

I wonder if, John, in response, you could possibly articulate an answer to a sharp question that many clergy will feel needs answering. You could put it like this: as we see ourselves giving huge amounts of new and welcome money to this fascinating and wonderful work that we are seeking to do, as dioceses set their priorities for this work and make bids for funding from the Council, why is it that we find our stipends and pensions constantly reduced in value over the years? If the work is both/and, how can we sustain the work that we seek to do in what we might call the inherited model of Church and the value of

the stipend that sustains that work at the same time as doing all this wonderful new work that I shall be enthusiastically voting to support this afternoon? That is the first question.

The second question comes from our meeting of the House this afternoon. Last July, we passed a motion at the meeting of the House of Clergy noting the reduction in value of the pension and noting the reduction in the value of the national minimum stipend, which is set, of course, by the Council, and we requested the Council to review the adequacy of both stipends and pensions for the Clergy. We, as the House Standing Committee, would be grateful to hear both informally in response in this debate and formally from the Council what is the response and progress that has been made in that work so that we can update the House ourselves in the coming months.

Revd Bill Braviner (Durham): As a diocesan disability adviser as well as being a parish priest and a few other things, and as a co-founder of a disability organisation, Disability in Jesus, I declare a profound interest in what the Church is doing to increase accessibility and inclusivity and welcome for all people. I work with and alongside many other people and organisations who share that passion: other diocesan advisers, my own organisation DinJ, Churches for All, and many others.

It is greatly welcome to me that we have the Council's Objective 9, to be a Church that can provide a home for all people in England, that we have the Statement of Priority in paragraph 58 on page 22 of the paper that Mission and Public Affairs want to expand our support and advocacy for disabled people in the Church and in society, and make all our work on inclusivity more joined up.

I note that the overall budget for this and the other priorities listed for Mission and Public Affairs totals just over £1.6 million and the Council will have considered how much of that budget will be focused on this particular priority to do with disability and what is planned to be achieved. Perhaps that could be shared in some detail. As part of that work, I was heartened to hear yesterday that the post of National Disability Adviser for the whole Church of England is being increased from a one day a week role to a three day a week role to serve the entire country.

That is very welcome, though in the view of many people maybe we ought to be investing even more time in that important work, maybe even a whole person or more. I understand that part of the reason for this increased role is that the National Disability Adviser is to produce a strategic plan for work in this area. In order for that plan to be as useful and effective as possible, I wonder could we have a commitment that at all stages in the development and drafting of that strategic plan there will be wide consultation with diocesan disability advisers and other organisations working in the field of disability and church and other interested parties.

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Steven Croft): Thank you, John, for the careful work in this budget and its imaginative proposals. I support it. I want to comment on paragraph 32 and to welcome the increased provision for the new environment officer in response to Synod's call and also note from the answers to Questions on Friday evening that that was not achieved without considerable hard work.

I would like to ask through you, John, if I may, that the Archbishops' Council review that provision and ask whether it really is sufficient for the strategic need. The climate emergency we face is the greatest existential threat to our planet. I am continually told by the Environmental Change Institute in Oxford and other bodies with whom I work that the role of the faith communities will be absolutely key in the next decade in combatting the climate change emergency worldwide. Recent developments mean that the Church of England in particular has a particular opportunity over the next two years to influence the faith communities globally and the national debate through the Lambeth Conference next year and through the probable hosting of the COP talks in Britain in 2020. I would therefore respectfully ask that the Archbishops' Council review in the light of these developments and the rising awareness of this emergency in the Church and elsewhere, whether the provision really is enough and whether we do not need to increase our strategic resource. I am very happy, John, if it would be help to submit a paper to the Council arguing that case.

The Chair: John, if you would like to respond.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Simon, how could I ever be content with a scenario where we are not achieving a fair deal, if that is the view, for our clergy? The funds we have announced today are all about ensuring that the Church continues to exist in places where it may be under threat so that there are roles for our ordained ministers, enabling the Church to flourish and grow. On the back of that, I will keep saying we then need to ensure generosity and discipleship as one of the Marks of Mission, to enable us to grow the parish income in order that we can afford the salaries and pensions we all know that you deserve. I am absolutely clear on that.

However, one could not deal with that issue out of the sums that are available here. It is too big. We are talking about Parish Share income totalling £800 million. While I celebrate all we are doing today, we are talking about an annual additional £50-odd million into the Church economy. That will not address such a strategic issue. It has to be addressed by the growth and flourishing of the Church, the generosity and discipleship which then fosters the funds that are needed.

In terms of your review, I think it is fair to say this work is being led by RACSC around this piece. It is in their orbit. We have seen the figures for the tracking of those stipends over

the last decade. We understand the patterns that are there and we will all continue to seek to find ways. It is contingent on this growth of income over and above the sums we have announced today.

To Bill, you have asked for some detail and I am sure the Secretary General is listening and will be able to send you that information, and of course we will keep it under review. I would point out that the Archbishops' Council added a ninth set of objectives into its business plan for 2015-20 particularly to cover the extension of outreach into areas and minorities and disabilities is one of those. It is a real increase in resource. We will continue work on it, but your request for a commitment for continued engagement, as I say, will have been heard by the Secretary General and I am sure he will be asking that that happens.

Bishop Steven, yes we have increased the resource for environment. I would never want to turn away the joy of receiving one of your papers, so please do send it in. We have a budget for 2020 but we will always seek to see what we can do. The one thing I would say is do not always confuse the dedicated resource that is identified here with the totality of effort that exists. I do not know where the Social Impact Fund will take us. It may take us into areas of environment. The wonderful efforts of our Archbishops and Bishops in engaging with national dialogue on issues such as this can sometimes have far more impact than employing somebody for a few more hours a week. Of course, Stephen, do provide us with your thinking because we will always benefit from it.

Revd Dr Philip Plyming (Universities and TEIs): I want to thank Canon Spence for his presentation and I want to thank the Archbishops' Council, and indeed this Synod, for its ongoing commitment to training for ministry as evidenced in Vote 1 on which we will be voting shortly. £17.6 million represents a significant investment in the future mission and ministry of this Church. It is also important that we thank the Training Working Group in supporting the additional funding which will pay for the increasing number of ordinands. While we note that has not been the case this year, we in the TEI sector are still enthusiastic about the vision for a 50% increase in ordinand training.

I want to make three points to Synod, particularly in relation to Vote 1. First, Synod can be encouraged by where this money is going and how it is being invested. I say that not because there are two ordinands from Cranmer Hall in the public gallery, who I am trying to butter up, but I can say that we in the TEI sector are hugely encouraged by the vision of seeing an increasing number of ordinands. I can testify to an increasing number of ordinands under the age of 30, including an equal balance between male and female, which is hugely encouraging. As a TEI principal, I am hugely encouraged by the quality of women and men who are coming forward to offer themselves for ministry. It is exciting that we are investing this money in their future.

Secondly, Synod can be reassured of the impact that this investment will have not only on those being trained but on those who they will serve and the wider mission of the Church. Across the TEI sector we are clearer than ever that we are training ministers who will themselves release and train others in their ministry in the Church and in the world. We are therefore investing in people who will invest in others. Therefore, Vote 1 can justifiably be seen as part of the *Setting God's People Free* agenda because we are investing in people who will themselves invest in others.

Thirdly, Synod should be reminded that Vote 1 does not represent the full cost of training ministers for the future of mission. I know I speak on behalf of many colleagues within the TEI sector when I say that TEIs are required to find additional sources of funding simply to fund the core business of training ordinands. Therefore, I welcome the RME review including a real assessment of the actual costs of investing in the people who we are praying will serve God's mission in this next generation.

Therefore, Synod can be encouraged and reassured but Synod needs to be reminded about some of the realities that Vote 1 does not pay the full costs of training. Nevertheless, I thank Canon Spence for his presentation and encourage you, when we come to Vote 1, to enthusiastically support it and be encouraged by the investment in our future mission.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): John spoke of the pressure on dioceses at the moment - and he is absolutely right about that - and, as a result, the apportionment freeze. It is now two and a half years since my Private Member's Motion on mission and administration was passed by this Synod. Just to remind you what it said: first, it confirmed that the principle of subsidiarity should not be applied to purely administrative functions; and, secondly, it requested the Archbishops' Council to consult with the Church Commissioners and dioceses with the objective of establishing centralised administrative facilities so that other functions which can be handled more efficiently thereby are transferred accordingly.

I have to say that in all the discussion that we have had before about triennium funding and the budget here, I have heard no mention of these instructions from this Synod actually being carried out in any way over the next two and a half years. We also heard the Bishop of Manchester during the period before saying that the way forward for diocesan reorganisation was not by altering borders. The body that I joined at the beginning of the year, the Dioceses Commission, whose legislation is almost entirely about reorganising borders, finds itself very thwarted when it comes to doing anything as far as administration is concerned.

We have an extraordinary situation where the Dioceses Commission is not able to help with this, but the people who can help are the Archbishops' Council because my Private Member's Motion, which was passed, has given them that instruction. I would like to

know whether we can take some pressure off the dioceses by centralising administration. I know we are very dispersed and we have 43 fiefdoms all over the country, but the fact is there is no organisation that would run duplication of administration in the way we do in this Church. It would be unheard of in terms of sheer inefficiency. We are spending time and we are spending money. That time and money is putting pressure on resources, which is exactly the thing that John is talking about here. Could we please hear what action is going to be taken to follow up my Private Member's Motion?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Philip, thank you for the work that all the TEs do in bringing forward ordinands as great priests for the future. Gavin, you are quite right to remind us of your motion from two and a half years ago. I cannot say that we have taken a fundamental review of that but, clearly, if I am doing a comprehensive budget review of all activities in Church House, there will be questions about what we can do about rationalisation across the whole Church economy. It would be fair to say that one does not pick up masses of enthusiasm for this at diocesan level - you may not be surprised - but one does have to work sometimes in the power of consensus.

I would however point to some things that we are doing. We have a new process now in terms of recruitment of people to posts across the Church which is far more efficient. There is a national portal that people can apply to and I think we have over 30 dioceses now engaged with that. I am shortly, alongside the Church Commissioners and Pensions Board, looking to approve a new - the first ever - comprehensive people system around the Church. It is an absolute essential in the area of safeguarding, but it will bring huge administrative economies at diocesan level as we have one system rather than the multiple systems that operate now. That is a piece of work, Gavin, that we are taking on, but I recognise there is always more to do, and I shall do so accordingly.

The Chair: Synod, I am minded now to bring this debate to a close.

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

The Chair: I put Item 18 to the vote: "that the Synod do take note of this Report".

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

ITEM 19

The Chair: We move on now to Items 19 through to 25 and I ask John to formally move Item 19.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I formally move the item on Vote 1 in my name.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing therefore I put Item 19 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

ITEM 20

The Chair: John, would you move Item 20, please?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I so formally move.

The Chair: This is now open for debate. I see no one standing. I therefore put Item 20 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried. John, would you kindly move Item 21?

ITEM 21

Dr Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I formally so move.

The Chair: The item is now open for debate. Sam Margrave, you have up to three minutes.

Mr Sam Margrave (Coventry): As I alluded to earlier on, ecclesiastical entrepreneurship, I believe, is a central part of funding the future of our Church. In local government, councillors are developing new income streams to fund public services and I believe that parishes and deaneries need to do the same to fund new roofs, youth workers and to pay for the Parish Share. Excellent examples of ecclesiastical entrepreneurship could be pointed to as stclaresatthecathedral.org, in Coventry, my own diocese, an online book store, or the Additional Curates Society, where church goods are sold and profit is used for mission and ministry.

I wondered what consideration of grants had been given to support a new glebe for the next generation that could support mission and ministry. I also wondered, while I am not a bishop, whether I could develop a paper to submit on the idea of ecclesiastical entrepreneurship in supporting parishes, deaneries and dioceses to generate income where they cannot pay for mission and ministry.

The Chair: I see no one else standing. John, would you like to respond to that?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I would be delighted to. I am not quite sure why you brought that particular point up under Vote 3 but let me say this to you: you can do more than submit a paper. I will get you to get involved if you would like to be. I have already said we have a need to reform the governance of stewardship. We need to look beyond traditional forms of income generation into new forms. We talk about the Cathedrals Measure and enterprise. I continuously yearn for the day that we have, as Blackburn has already, a cathedral gin in every cathedral being sold and watch thousands people travelling around the country so that they get the complete set. Mrs Spence, in the gallery, please note that will be our holiday plan for the next few years. Sam, submit a paper on it by all means, but if you wish to get involved, we are going to be thinking very hard and I need to get some business cases put together and I know where I can get the funds for that, in order that we can do some real, imaginative and entrepreneurial work around income generation. I formally move Vote 3.

The Chair: Thank you. I therefore put Item 21 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

ITEM 22

The Chair: John, would you kindly move Item 22?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I formally move.

The Chair: This is now open for debate.

Revd John Dunnnett (Chelmsford): Simply to say, Synod, that a figure of £697,000 in comparison with some of the numbers we have been hearing this afternoon may seem small feed, but I want to underline for Synod the significance of Vote 4 and this particular budget, in that for individual mission agencies, and obviously I speak for a moment with my day job CPAS hat on, and we have heard from the Mothers' Union in this particular group of sessions and we have referred to others, this particular figure is a substantial figure in that it makes a real contribution to our budgets, all of which again seem miniscule compared with the numbers we have been thinking about, but it is substantial.

More than that, I want to suggest it is symbolic as well and the support that is given through this particular provision is one of the ways in which the mission agencies express

and engage with the life of the Church as a whole. I would want to encourage Synod to support this and on behalf of the mission agencies I want to say, hopefully in anticipation of that support, a big thank you to Synod.

The Chair: John, you have the right to reply.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Thank you very much for that acknowledgement which will be passed on. I formally move.

The Chair: I therefore put Item 22 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

ITEM 23

The Chair: John, would you formally move Item 23?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I so formally move.

The Chair: This item is open for debate. I see no one standing, therefore, I put Item 23 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

ITEM 24

The Chair: John, would you move Item 24 standing in your name?

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I so formally move.

The Chair: This item is now open for debate. I see no one standing therefore I put Item 24 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

ITEM 25

The Chair: John, the final one, Item 25.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): I so formally move.

The Chair: This item is open for debate. I see no one standing.

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

The Chair: That is clearly carried.

Canon Dr John Spence (ex officio): Mr Chairman, if I may beg your indulgence just for one minute. While Carl has already done so, I could not leave this stage without expressing my thanks to William Nye, to Gareth Mostyn and David White for the work they have done. I am going to have to particularly embarrass David White, who is not just the guy who guides me across stages and up and down the stairs but who has been a driving force in the delivery of the budget for 2018-19 and the development of the budget for 2020.

David was also the powerhouse of analysis that served the Triennium Funding Working Group and this, a year after, I noted that David had been the driving force in enabling us to get a multimillion pound housing bond away to support retired clergy housing. They are all outstanding but sometimes, David, I just have to embarrass you because you are a superstar.

The Chair: You are a bit of a star yourself, John, thank you very much. Synod, this brings to a conclusion that Item of business and we now move on to the next item.

THE CHAIR *The Archbishop of York (The Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu)* took the Chair at 4.24 pm.

ITEM 502

SPECIAL AGENDA 1

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

DRAFT CHURCH OF ENGLAND (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) MEASURE (GS 2104B)

DRAFT AMENDING CANON NO. 41 (GS 2015B)

The Chair: Members of Synod, we come to Item 502, the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure, GS 2104B. This is Article 7 business: that the

Synod has reached the Final Approval stage of the Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. Members will need the draft Measure GS 2104B.

As required by Standing Order 102, I declare on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice Chair in the House of Laity that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect of the draft Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. Therefore, I call on the Archdeacon of Knowsley & Sefton to move Item 502: "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved". Archdeacon, you can speak for up to 10 minutes.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Here we are at the end, hopefully, of this particular item of business. I would like to speak briefly about each clause to remind you what is contained in the (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure. Clause 1 compliments the provision for religious communities made by Amending Canon No. 40. It enables members of religious communities to be ordained and to be licensed to serve in their communities as a deacon or priest.

Clause 2 implements a recommendation from Dame Moira Gibb's Report following her review of the Church of England's response to the abuse committed by Peter Ball. One of the Report's recommendations was for the introduction of a national register of clergy with permission to officiate. This clause makes that possible and develops it further. Every clerk in Holy Orders who has authority to exercise ministry in the Church of England will have to be included in the register. Regulations will also be able to stipulate that lay people who have specified forms of authority to exercise ministry must also be included in the National Ministry Register. Bishops will be required to provide details to the Archbishops' Council on a regular basis, who will be required to compile and maintain a register containing prescribed information. A form of that register that omits personal contact information will be published by the Council and will be accessible free of charge. It is left to regulation to specify the details and it is expected that those Regulations will be brought to the Synod for approval in February.

Clause 3 builds on provision that was made in the last (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure which enabled any member of the clergy with authority to officiate in the Church of England to officiate at a funeral at the request of the persons concerned. This clause enables deaconesses, Readers and lay workers to provide funeral ministry on a similar basis, that is at the request of the persons concerned, usually the family or friends of the deceased. After having informed and sought the goodwill of the deceased incumbent, the deaconess, Reader or lay worker must also be authorized by the bishop to conduct funerals and have the consent of the incumbent of the parish to which they are licensed. Clause 4 makes provision for cases in ecclesiastical courts where a party is unable to pay the court fees

Clauses 5, 6 and 10 are concerned with cathedrals. Clause 5 makes it possible for the Cathedrals Fabric Commission or a Fabric Advisory Committee to vary any approval for works that it has granted. That should avoid the need for a cathedral to restart the application process where proposals need to be a revised. It also allows for approvals to be revoked and provides a right of appeal.

Clause 6 makes it easier to build on disused burial grounds belonging to cathedrals, providing there is no objection from a relative of anyone buried on the land in question during the last 50 years. And it provides a definition of relative for this purpose and for the purpose of equivalent legislation relating to churchyards.

Clause 6 also introduces the schedule to the Measure which updates cross-references in the Care of Cathedrals Rules.

Clause 10 allows the Cathedrals Fabric Commission to delegate functions to its officers.

Clause 7 amends the legislation relating to the inspection of churches to make it clear that the inspector appointed under the legislation is appointed by the PCC and is responsible to that body. Before appointing an inspector, a PCC will have to obtain and have regard to advice from the Diocesan Advisory Committee, but there will no longer be DAC-approved lists of inspecting architects. Instead, the DAC will advise whether a particular professional has the necessary qualifications and experience to inspect the church in question. There will be statutory guidance from the Church Buildings Council on the appointment and work of inspectors.

Clause 11 appoints a limit of two six-year terms on members of DACs to ensure that their membership is regularly refreshed.

Clauses 8 and 9 deal with parochial registers and records. Clause 8 brings the Parochial Registers and Records Measure 1978 up to date to take account of service registers that are kept in electronic form under provisions contained in Amending Canon No. 41. Clause 9 clarifies the meaning of records so that things that are fixed to the fabric of a church, such as benefactors, boards or photographs, are not treated as records and do not need to be deposited in record offices.

Clause 12 removes a technical legal issue, which currently causes problems where a diocesan Board of Finance grants a lease of property to a PCC.

Clause 13 replaces various outdated terms in the Constitution of the General Synod. Chairman formally becomes Chair and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity cease to be referred to formally as Prolocutor and Pro-Prolocutor.

Clause 14 corrects some straight cross-references in the Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011, and Clause 15 provides for the short title of the Measure, its commencement and extent. Indeed, a (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure.

But I hope, Synod, having done the necessary work that you will give it Final Approval. I beg to move that the Measure entitled Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure be finally approved.

The Chair: Archdeacon, thank you very much, Item 502 is open for debate. May I remind members that under Standing Order 64, motions for the closure, the speech limits or next business are not in order in this debate. Before anybody stands up wanting to speak, also I will give this notice: in Notice Paper V there are some financial implications in paragraphs 6 to 9 that you need to bear in mind, but that should not be a spoiler where this should go.

There is a financial implication if you put this into being. If you want to know what it is, it is that the estimated system development costs to facilitate the maintenance of parochial registers in electronic form will be up to £50,000, and the estimated costs for any of the 10 dioceses currently not using the CMS deciding to use it, the initial cost will be £9,000, and an initial annual cost of £4,000. Is there any debate?

Ven. Douglas Dettmer (Exeter): It is good to see this (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure coming in to land and I hope it will be passed enthusiastically, insofar as (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measures are ever passed enthusiastically. I want to address section 1 of the Measure and the new provision for licensing members of designated religious communities, which of course I support. However, I suggest further action needs to be taken in order to avoid an unintended consequence.

The combined effect of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure and the Regulations made under it is to make any officeholder who exercises his or her ministry under a licence from the Bishop subject to common tenure, with all the rights and obligations that involves, including the duty to participate in diocesan schemes of ministerial development review and continuing ministerial development, the right to a statement of particulars, rights to rest days and annual leave, and the right to hold office until the minister's 70th birthday in the absence of a disciplinary or capability procedure or apart from a limited range of specified conditions. That is as much the case for ministers holding a general licence under seal as for ministers licensed to a particular office.

At present, the only exception is a minister who holds a licence in connection with a contract of employment, for example a school or a hospital chaplain, or an employee of a Diocesan Board of Finance. In those cases, the Common Tenure Regulations do not apply.

Clearly, it would be inappropriate for members of designated religious communities to be subject to the whole package of Common Tenure requirements for a number of reasons, but, above all, because that would override the role of the superior as the ordinary of the community responsible for its ongoing formation and its common discipline. And because it would compromise the relative freedom of religious houses from the tentacles of diocesan structures, which historically are central to their identity, and a significant factor in enabling the gift they offer the Church at large.

Members of a religious community place themselves under a community's rule, and it is the rule by which their common life and personal development are ordered, not the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Measure as interpreted by some archdeacon or other, perish the thought. Neither would it be appropriate for a minister, once licensed as a member of a religious community to have the right to continue to hold the licence until aged 70, even if she or he had subsequently left the community.

The obvious analogy is with licensed ministers who are contracted employees, subject to appraisal, ongoing training and specified terms of service within their own places of work and exempt from Common Tenure. It would not be difficult for the Archbishops' Council to add an equivalent provision to the Terms of Service Regulations, disapplying the Regulations for ministers licensed as members of designated religious communities, either generally or under specified conditions. However, any amendment of the Regulations would need the consent of this Synod, and could I encourage the Archbishops' Council to consider making such provision before section 1 of the (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure is brought into effect.

It is important to add that all ordained ministers remain subject to the Clergy Discipline Measure and, therefore, in respect of serious disciplinary matters they are subject to the jurisdiction of their diocesan bishop, whether or not Common Tenure Regulations apply to them or not.

All that said, if individual members of designated religious ought to be accountable primarily to their superior rather than to the bishop of the diocese in which they happen to live, it is all the more important that the designated religious community as a whole should be accountable to the House of Bishops as a whole, and that the mechanisms for enabling that accountability should be effective, and that is why the Regulations to be made by the House of Bishops under the new Canon D A1, which we approved this morning, will be so important, not least for ensuring robust safeguarding standards in each religious community.

With those provisos, once again I warmly commend the draft Measure to Synod and particularly this first section.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): I warmly commend the motion, the legislation, to the House and I want to address briefly an issue to do with the safeguarding with the proposed ministers list. First, is it the intention that the list will be kept sufficiently up to date that consultation of said list by an incumbent inviting people into their parish will have been a discharge of their duties of safeguarding when people come to preach or assist at services?

Secondly, although I can imagine this would only be in an extreme case, will it be possible for photographic evidence of who the person is who is coming to preach to be alongside that register in order that we can check that there are not issues of impersonation?

The Chair: Dear Chair of the House of Laity, please?

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): It has been many years since I first started to ask for something like the National Ministry Register so I am absolutely delighted that we have reached the point of approving it, and not just for clergy but also in the future for those authorized laity. The reason I brought this up many years ago was because it would mirror what we have within the medical and other health professional lists, the national performers lists, which clarify the status of practitioners: that they are up to date, that in the case of many folk in the health system they are insured and their training and updates, particularly in areas of safeguarding and other areas, is kept going.

This gives us confidence in the parishes and in the wider world. It is essential for safeguarding and essential for good governance. In the past I was told it was too difficult, that dioceses did not know who they had on their PTO lists, that it was too complicated and the evidence just was not available, so I am very pleased to know that we are going ahead.

I note the comments from Simon Cawdell. I have a number of other points which sort of overlap, I think. I want this in electronic form to be in real time, if possible, so that I can easily access that information on the day I need it, that is updated on a rapid and regular basis. These are challenges, and I have already been able to talk to some folk at Church House about this and I know they are aware. It will take time to get it absolutely right, but I am so delighted that we have got to this point and I thoroughly commend this work.

The Bishop of Winchester (Rt Revd Tim Dakin): Following on from our colleague Douglas' comments about section 1 of the religious communities, as one of the people involved in helping to develop the Canon and then this Measure, I wanted to emphasise, bearing in mind the challenges that we have heard, the positive perspective that this now sets for those in religious communities. We have two kinds of religious communities, those which are of the traditional kind, taking vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, and the

acknowledged communities, which tend to be more widespread and engaged in other ways.

What this particular measure allows for them to now do as two sets of religious communities is to be engaged in all sorts of new ways. To be ordained, licensed and deployed as a member of a religious community I think is a very exciting step and something that we should welcome, something that will enrich the ecology of our ministry and mission across the diocese and something that I am very much looking forward to.

As one of those who has been leader of the first new acknowledged communities, CMS, which started in 1799 but actually not acknowledged until 2008, I think this is a fantastic step forward, and I really look forward to seeing what it brings to the life of the Church more widely.

The Bishop of Fulham (Rt Revd Jonathan Baker): I wholeheartedly support this receiving Final Approval. It is another question about the register of ministers and whether any comment can be made now or perhaps later in writing about any consequences or what the consequences are for clergy from other Provinces and particularly near neighbours, such as the Church in Wales, and for casual ministry in our parishes or at other events involving a minister/priest from the Church in Wales or wherever it may be assisting or taking part in some way in our liturgical life. Any guidance on that I think would be very welcome.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): My contribution too focuses on clause 2 of the Measure, and I too, like Jamie Harrison, welcome the provision for a National Register of Ministers. My comment relates to the timescale for this, because under clause 2 it is provided that the Archbishops' Council may make various Regulations and those Regulations would have to be made before the register can come into being and then it is provided in clause 2 (viii) that Regulations under this section may not be made unless a draft of the Regulations has been laid before General Synod and approved with or without amendment and then they do not come into force until they have been sealed by the Council. I wonder if Pete Spiers is able to give Synod any indication of the likely timescale for the implementation of section 2, the making of the necessary Regulations and when it is likely we shall be able to have the register up and running.

The Chair: For those who are able to stand, I see no one standing, and for those who are not able, I see no one waving their hand that they would like to speak. I invite the Archdeacon to respond, please.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much everybody for the points that you have made. Thank you, first of all, to Douglas Dettmer for his point. He is absolutely right, there do need to be some Regulations that need to be amended by the Archbishops'

Council. That was on our list of things to do and it will be done in due course, and that is something that can be brought to Synod eventually.

If I can go to David Lamming's point, it all depends, first of all, in terms of timescale, when we get Royal Assent to the Measure, and it might also be affected as to whether we have a General Election, so we cannot be precise. Ideally, we would be able to do all this in February of next year but there are some uncertainties ahead.

To Simon Cawdell, yes, it is the intention that clergy will be able to consult the register and, as for photographic evidence, then, yes, that could be part of the Regulations that will be coming to Synod in February.

Thank you, Jamie Harrison and the Bishop of Winchester, for your welcoming of this Measure. To the Bishop of Fulham, clergy from other Provinces have to have the permission of the Archbishop of the Province and the bishop in their diocese in order to officiate and, once they have that, they would be added to the clergy register. I hope that answers your questions.

The Chair: Thank you Archdeacon. The question is: "That the Measure entitled 'Church of England (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure' be finally approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 502: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 20, against none, with no recorded abstentions, none. In the House of Clergy, 91 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 110 in favour, none against, with one recorded abstention. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

ITEM 503

The Chair: We now come to Items 503 and 504, draft Amending Canon No. 41, GS 2105B, again this is Article 7 business, that the Synod has reached the Final Approval stage for the draft Amending Canon No. 41. Members will need the draft Amending Canon GS 2105B and the petition for the Royal Assent and Licence, GS 2105C. As required by Standing Order 102, I declare that on behalf of the Presidents, the Prolocutors of the Convocations and the Chair and Vice Chair of the House of Laity, that the requirements of Article 7 of the Constitution have been complied with in respect to draft Amending Canon No. 41. I call on the Archdeacon of Knowsley & Sefton to move Item 503: "That the Canon entitled 'Amending Canon No. 41' be finally approved". The Archdeacon may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Thank you very much. Just to go through the clauses very briefly. Paragraph 1 updates Canon F 12 so that registered books of services can be

kept in electronic form. The electronic form will need to have been approved by the Synod to ensure consistency and the secure storage of information. Paragraph 2 allows the House of Bishops to delegate the approval of services in languages other than English to any of its committees rather than only to the Standing Committee.

Paragraphs 4 to 6 update statutory references and outdated terms and make minor corrections, and paragraph 7 makes additional amendments to the Canons which are amended by this Amending Canon so that they employ gender neutral terms. So, I beg to move that the Canon entitled Amending Canon No. 41 be finally approved.

The Chair: Item 503 is open to debate. May I remind members that under Standing Order 64, motion for the closure, the speech limit or next business are not in order in this debate. Is there any debate? I see no one who is able standing, and those who are not able to stand, no one is waving a hand they want to speak. So, we proceed to the question: "That the Canon entitled 'Amending Canon No. 41' be finally approved" in accordance with Standing Order 37. I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 503: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 22, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 94 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Laity, 114 in favour, 2 against, with no recorded abstentions.

ITEM 504

The Chair: I now call upon the Archdeacon of Knowsley & Sefton to move Item 504: "That the petition for Her Majesty's Royal Assent and Licence (GS 2105C) be adopted".

Ven. Pete Spiers (Liverpool): Just before I do, when I first got asked to be on the (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure, my first thought was what have I done to deserve this but, actually, I have really enjoyed it and I have learnt so much. I want to thank Priscilla White and Mike Todd and Bob White, up there on the back benches, and Carl Fender for being on the Committee and working it through and the advice we have had from Alexander McGregor and Conor Gannon. I am very proud to be able to ask you that the Petition for Royal Assent be adopted.

The Chair: Thank you, Archdeacon. Is there any debate? I see no one standing or those who are not able waving their hand. Therefore, I now put Item 504 to the vote.

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

The Chair: The Petition will now, accordingly, be presented to Her Majesty. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Newcastle (Rt Revd Christine Hardman)* took the Chair at 5.04 pm.

ITEM 26

MISSION-SHAPED CHURCH 15 YEARS ON (GS 2142)

The Chair. Brothers and sisters, we now come to Item 26 on our Agenda and I am going to invite the Bishop of Oxford and Heather Cracknell to speak to a presentation. Heather is going to begin and it is going to be a bit of a double act so Heather and Bishop Steven, you have up to 20 minutes between you.

Revd Heather Cracknell (Head of Development for Fresh Expressions): Thank you. Members of Synod, it is a great privilege to present this update on the ecumenical missionary movement that is Fresh Expressions of Church and give you the opportunity to join in with what God is doing.

Bishop Steven is going to begin in a moment by reminding us of the history of the Church of England's involvement in this movement and also put some theological flesh on the bones, as it were, of the statistics that you have read in our briefing paper and after that, I will tell you about the exciting initiative, *Greenhouse*, that I believe will create opportunities to further embed pioneering and Fresh Expressions in the life of the Church across every parish, deanery and diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford (Rt Revd Steven Croft): Thank you, Heather. Good afternoon, Synod. It is a delight to give an ancient historical perspective on this piece of work. There is an important moment in the Book of Acts, in Acts 11, when we read that large numbers of Hellenists come to faith in the Lord Jesus in Antioch. That does not happen because of a plan or a strategy; it happens because of suffering, because the church was scattered through the martyrdom of Stephen. The good news of Jesus cannot be contained within the structures of the church and news of this comes to the church in Jerusalem.

The apostles look around the room, as I imagine the scene, and they try and discern whom to send to Antioch. They decide to send, thank God, Barnabas. Barnabas comes to Antioch. He sees what God is doing and rejoices and then joins in as best he can. Barnabas goes to Tarsus and finds Saul. For an entire year, Luke tells us, they associated with "the Church" and the word *ecclesia* is used very deliberately. A new church has been birthed in a different culture by the Holy Spirit.

The apostles discern God's grace in what is happening and their calling, they believe, is to nurture this new venture and to connect the Body of Christ together. I want to encourage you this afternoon, as we look back and forwards, to see *Mission-Shaped*

Church and the Fresh Expressions movement through the lens of this Antioch moment and through the lens of Barnabas.

This is something God is doing. Our job is to join in and connect it well. In the late 90s and early 2000s, the Church Army Research Unit began to notice and tell the stories of evangelists forming new ecclesial communities through going to part of our culture which was not able to connect with traditional church. Those evangelists were inspired and shaped by Vincent Donovan, Roland Allen, John V Taylor, Leslie Newbiggin and others who had spent time in God's mission in different cultures and reflected on lessons for the Church in the West.

A group was formed to reflect on this experience. *Mission-Shaped Church* did not set out to be a ground-breaking Report. It set out simply to collect and reflect on those stories and draw some lesson from them and the more Graham Cray and George Lings and their team listened, the more significant this fragile movement of the spirit seemed. Nobody anticipated the response to it from across the Church of England and other churches and worldwide.

The most significant sentence in the entire *Mission-Shaped Church* Report is, I think, from the preface written by the then very new Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams. I am sorry in a way it is such a long sentence and I am going to read it to you, but I am not sorry in other ways because there is absolutely no doubt who wrote it. This is what it says: "If 'church' is what happens when people encounter the Risen Jesus and commit themselves to sustaining and deepening that encounter in their encounter with each other, there is plenty of theological room for diversity of rhythm and style, so long as we have ways of identifying the same living Christ at the heart of every expression of Christian life in common".

Like Barnabas, we learned and we are learning a Christ-centred generous ecclesiology because of what God is doing in God's mission. In February 2004, I was unexpectedly invited to meet Archbishop Rowan and I was asked to set up and lead the new Archbishop's initiative to encourage this new movement. I wanted a sense of where this would sit in his priorities, so I asked very simply how important all this was to him and Rowan replied, very movingly, "This is one of my two key priorities for the Church of England in my time as Archbishop of Canterbury". You might like to know that my inner Sergeant Wilson rose up and I wanted to say, but I dare not, "Do you really think that is wise?" Four years later, I plucked up the courage to tell him this and he replied very quickly that if I had said that he would have said, "Stupid boy".

I came to realise, only as I got into the role and to share the view and to rejoice, that the Church is renewed from the edge, from the margins. But it is absolutely vital to connect the centre to the edge and to learn the lessons, to offer support so that all of that renewal

flows through the whole Body of Christ. My main job, together with Paul Bayes, then in MPA, and all the rest of the team was to do the listening and the connection. New ecclesial movements do not always stay connected.

From the beginning, Fresh Expressions was a joint Methodist-Anglican venture. At my licensing service, very memorably, Ken Howcroft, Assistant General Secretary of the Methodist Church then, began his remarks by saying, "I stand here as a representative of a Fresh Expression of Church which was not contained within the structures of the Church of England". We are still living with some of the consequences of that.

GS 2412 details some of the fruits of the Fresh Expressions movement over the last 15 years in our Church. The movement has been immensely fruitful also ecumenically and across the world. In the Church of England, we have benefited hugely from the investment and wisdom of other churches and streams. There has been a vigorous theological debate since 2004. *Mission-Shaped Church* was criticised very early by John Hull and others, I think rightly, for its somewhat narrow view of mission and the Kingdom of God. Others have championed the cause of the parish church as a vital and necessary component of the new mixed economy which, of course, it is.

Those debates were answered, in part, in the excellent 2012 Report, *Fresh Expressions and the Mission of the Church*, an Anglican-Methodist joint collaboration, a Working Party co-chaired by Bishop Alan Smith and which is a vital part of the story. I particularly commend in that book Professor Loveday Alexander's superb exposition of Acts 10-15 and the centre and edge dynamic in the development of mission and the Church. No doubt we will revisit some of those theological points again in the debate today.

There are three lessons which stay with me as we as a Church and as a Diocese of Oxford continue to try and put out into deep water and discern what God is doing. The first is to try to continue to centre all that we do on Christ and to let Christ be the pattern for the Church. Simon Peter, in the story in Luke 5, puts out into deep water against his better judgment, not because he received the memo from head office but because of Jesus and because Jesus says so.

The second is to remember that, like Barnabas, we are nurturing a movement here, not cascading a programme. I learned in the early days of Fresh Expressions that the same principles which are vital to planting a Fresh Expression of the Church are vital in encouraging Fresh Expressions also: love and hope and listening and an openness to the spirit.

The third is how much more is done when the Church as a whole is able to bless this movement and encourage those involved. The good news of Jesus Christ still cannot be contained in the structures of the Church. Like Simon, we continue to put out into deep

water. Like Barnabas, we do our best to discover what God is doing and to join in. Thank you.

Revd Heather Cracknell (Head of Development for Fresh Expressions): Thank you and of course, we are building on the work of thousands of people - the first pioneers of new forms of church that were coined as Fresh Expressions, the Archbishop's missionaries, Bishop Steven, Bishop Graham Cray and Canon Phil Potter, and the thousands of people in six denominations in the UK and around the world involved in leading these new worshipping communities across 20 years and more.

The impact, as you have read in our briefing paper, has been huge. But where are we heading and how can you as members of General Synod join this missionary movement? We have great confidence in the methods and approaches that people have developed and refined over the course of those 20 years and as Bishop Steven has remarked, the theology is now well-articulated. The pioneers of the early stages of the movement have tested these in lots of different contexts, so there are now resources for people with years of experience or with none at all.

What is more, it is free and available to anyone with a smartphone, tablet or computer. The *Godsend* App is free on Android and Apple, so anyone can have access to this training and resourcing in the time it takes to open the App Store and download an app. Downstairs, you will see some details of a new course, "How to Pioneer," which is another easily accessible resource for people who have never started a Fresh Expression, but they can get the confidence to have a go.

Synod members, I invite you to share about the app and the other resources in your reports and updates, encouraging people in your dioceses to use them to feed back to the developers and get the learning out there. We might not know who God is calling to start new worshipping communities yet, and so if they would feel more confident to step forward on that journey knowing that they have the resources from that wisdom from Fresh Expressions, then let us get the word out.

How else can people get involved in this movement? I want to tell you about the national team's now offer to dioceses, the *Greenhouse* initiative. This involves us supporting those on the ground in 10 dioceses across five years to set up and run learning communities for their Fresh Expressions teams and pioneers and others who want to just start out. It creates a supportive environment for those plants to grow. In each diocese, the senior staff member responsible for mission will be empowered to create a structure for the teams of people leading Fresh Expressions so that they can be well-supported.

By creating these learning communities, they will be able to encourage new teams to come forward and learn from those who are a bit more established. They can train Fresh

Expressions leaders to become enablers and coaches and facilitators so to facilitate more learning communities and thereby create more opportunities. I hope also that it will facilitate strategic conversations with the bishops' senior staff teams about what kinds of Fresh Expressions are needed and where, so that mission can flourish in all the parts of the diocese, benefiting all types of church plants from big Resource Churches to Messy Churches, so all Fresh Expressions can thrive.

But why is this project needed? Well, we want to show that Fresh Expressions can be part of every parish's mission. I think there is a lingering perception that "Fresh Expressions are not for us", despite the findings of the *Day of Small Things* research by the Church Army which identified that three-quarters of all Fresh Expressions are based in parishes, meaning that they are a great means of strengthening parish mission. There are many parishes who would like to start an outreach initiative but do not really know where to begin. They could be helped to do so by following the developmental cycle and methodologies of Fresh Expressions.

There is a great lack of knowledge about Fresh Expressions methodology and so, without realising it, many parishes have travelled through part of the Fresh Expressions journey. They have activities, like a parent and toddler group, that serve people outside of the Church and by listening to them, loving and serving them and building relationships they could make these more intentionally missional and thereby grow new disciples by moving these groups through to the next phase of the Fresh Expressions journey.

There are a large number of parish churches which could grow a Fresh Expression alongside their existing congregation in order to make new disciples who are not currently doing so and so *Greenhouse* can address this opportunity by enabling dioceses to bring novice teams into the learning communities and release more teams to grow Fresh Expressions.

The second reason we think this project is needed is we want to ensure that Fresh Expressions are as effective as they can be in making disciples. The recently released Messy Church research, *Playfully Serious*, confirmed that 40% of attenders had never been to church anywhere else before and almost all of the children said they had begun to follow Jesus. That is an incredibly exciting example of how Fresh Expressions of all shapes and sizes are creating opportunities for evangelism and discipleship.

The Report did also highlight that some Messy Church leaders are overstretched and, as a result, feel that their churches would thrive better with more support. We want to ensure that Fresh Expressions that we are developing are strong and sustainable. Things we know anecdotally are that, in order to be effective in making new disciples, Fresh Expressions need to be resilient. Following the developmental cycle all the way through takes a while and perseverance and steadfastness is needed.

If Fresh Expressions lack resilience, it can be due to a number of factors. These teams tend to spring up wherever they are, and it is sometimes hard to ensure that everyone gets the support they need and so some practitioners feel isolated or unsupported. It is especially important to ensure that there is good support for leaders who are lay people who are leading Fresh Expressions alongside all their other commitments just so that they are not reinventing the wheel.

Pioneering something from scratch is hard work and ensuring leaders are well-supported would prevent burnout and feeling overwhelmed. Wonderfully, when the leaders' pioneer vocations are discerned, and they are often called to train for ordination, that means that funding members of the team are uprooted and redeployed. We want to support the teams to be better planning for that and the dioceses too to plan better for succession.

Our third reason that the project is needed is we want dioceses to shift from what can sometimes be an ad hoc to a more strategic and joined-up form of support for planting and growing Fresh Expressions. I hope you can tell that I am really excited about the potential of this *Greenhouse* project. It will allow teams running on the ground to be well-supported to follow the spirit's leading in their place and in their way, but with access to the wisdom of the movement both locally and wider. It will enable them to be strategic in their planning, so they can become more resilient and sustainable and, ultimately, it will empower them to make new disciples and grow even more new worshipping communities.

The initiative will also support mission enablers, however they are known in the different dioceses, to encourage more leaders and vocations and identify new pioneers and, finally, also support the senior staff team to plan for growth knowing that tried and tested Fresh Expressions models and methods can be adopted and sustained in their dioceses. This initiative was released by the SDU at the beginning of the year and, even though we have not formally launched until this weekend - in fact, have not really got the word out at all before now – yet we already have 16 dioceses interested in setting up a *Greenhouse* project in their patch without any publicity at all.

There is so much energy around this already and we are delighted that we are going to be able to support the local Fresh Expressions teams and mission enablers. But it is not too late. We are now working out, beyond the first couple of dioceses that are acting as our pilots, how we can prioritise which dioceses we can work with and potentially widen the project in the latter stages of the initiative.

Synod members, you can influence the diocese you represent to register their interest in establishing a *Greenhouse* community, so we know how far and how wide the reach can be. But it is not the only way to engage. As Synod members, I urge you to start a conversation, wherever you are in the life of your church or your deanery or your diocese,

how are we looking to establish new forms of church that will effectively connect with the 92% of our country that do not go to church anywhere? How are we supporting those who are already running Fresh Expressions, both practically and financially but also encourage them in their ministry? Where are we investing our resources and where do we need to prioritise?

We are here today because we believe in our Church as a force for good in our communities and committed to seeing it thrive. God is inspiring and using this movement of people, starting and growing Fresh Expressions of Church, to reach out to those currently beyond the reach of our parish churches, strengthening our parish mission and making new disciples. I would argue that Fresh Expressions is the most influential missionary movement of the last 50 years and a significant means of allowing our Church to thrive now and in the future. Thank you.

The Chair. Thank you, Heather. We do catch that excitement. Thank you very much and thank you, Bishop Steven.

ITEM 27

The Chair. We now move to Item 27 and I invite Mark Sheard to speak to and move Item 27. Mark, you have up to 10 minutes.

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio): Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon, Synod. It has been a long afternoon, but I hope that some of Heather's excitement and Bishop Steven's excitement there has caught your imagination and inspired you. I am not going to repeat much of what they have said, but I hope they have set a tone here that prompts you to get something of the quite extraordinary nature of Fresh Expressions. The story is remarkable. It has got a remarkable history. What we are seeing in the present is remarkable. What lies before us in the future, I believe, is even more remarkable. I would like to highlight four brief aspects.

The first thing I want to say is that Fresh Expressions are growing rapidly and developing. Heather has already referred to the *Day of Small Things* research. Fresh Expressions on average now are making up 15% of a diocese's church communities. In 2016 over 50,000 people were attending Fresh Expressions. That is equivalent to two average sized dioceses. The average size of a Fresh Expressions congregation is about 50, which is more than many parish churches. Given that the research was undertaken in 2016, as I say, I think we can be confident that a lot more has happened since then.

Indeed, Church Army's follow-up research *Playfully Serious* undertaken last year estimates that the attendance at Anglican Messy Churches alone is 50,000. Secondly, Fresh Expressions are not just evangelical or middle class. The same *Playfully Serious*

research said, “We find messy churches balanced across all contexts from the most to the least deprived and in both urban and rural areas”.

Thirdly, Fresh Expressions is growing disciples. The *Day of Small Things* reports that 53% - that is more than half - of all Fresh Expression Churches meeting weekly are baptizing people and 70% of them have small groups. That is probably more than many of our parish churches. Fresh Expressions is definitely not church-lite.

Finally, Fresh Expressions unites the people of God. As we have heard, the ecumenical dimension of Fresh Expressions is extraordinary. Even at this Synod, I have heard wonderful stories of inter-denominational collaboration to bring the good news of Jesus into different parts of our land.

In short, Fresh Expressions is growing the Kingdom. Listen to these words from an SDU produced Report just last year: “Although it is still early days, projects which involve establishing new worshipping communities - be they Fresh Expressions of Church, Resource Churches or new congregations - are delivering numerical growth more quickly than other approaches”. Many of us here will be able to validate that statement by our own personal experience.

My friends, in the face of all this evidence, I am firmly of the belief that Fresh Expressions is one of the most significant ways in which we are seeing the Kingdom come. That, after all, is what we pray for daily, and it seems clear that God is answering that prayer through Fresh Expressions. We are witnesses to a real and exceptional move of the spirit of God.

So what of the motion before us? It is not deep. It is not profound. It simply calls on us to respond faithfully, wholeheartedly and joyfully to what God is doing. Firstly, it calls us to celebrate what he is doing and, as we have seen, there is much to celebrate, so thanks be to God. Secondly, in asking you to celebrate this moment, I want us all to recognise the faithfulness of the SDU and Church Commissioners who have, I believe, been visionary and courageous in keeping in step with the spirit and ensuring that the vision has adequate provision.

Time does not allow for a comprehensive description of all the provisions made for Fresh Expressions through SDF Funding, but it is worth noting that in terms of projects as at the beginning of this year, 22 SDF projects included elements funding either Pioneers or Fresh Expressions in 18 dioceses. You have just heard from Heather about the *Greenhouse* project. Our response to what God is doing must in the first case be celebratory, but it must also be to recognise our accountability to him and to each other in seeking to follow him and investing the provision that he has made available to us wisely for the growth of His Kingdom.

That is why we have brought the third component of our motion this afternoon, asking you to call on the Archbishops' Council to bring an update on this project to Synod in two years' time. We will be pleased to do that. In the meantime, we ask for your support and your prayers for those who work nationally, for Heather and Ed behind me, for Stephen Hance, Dean of Derby, who has just been announced as being appointed to the post of National Lead for Evangelism and Discipleship and for David Male and all the rest of the team in the rapidly influential and growing E&D department.

Our response to God's initiative in Fresh Expressions must include celebration and accountability, but what of that second element that I have not referred to yet, that second element of the motion you can see on the Fifth Order Paper which calls on us, or calls on you as Synod, to "encourage every parish and diocese to be part of this movement forming new disciples and new congregations through a contextual approach to mission with the unreached in their community"?

This is perhaps the most important part of the motion for us as a Synod and for us as the Church of England. If we are truly focused on bringing the good news of Jesus to every single community in England, and if we take seriously that injunction to be doers of the word and not just hearers, surely we should respond to God's Fresh Expressions initiative by more than just celebration or bringing another report to Synod. Let us consider the context of Colossians 4 2-5: "Devote yourselves to prayer, be watchful and thankful. And pray for us, too, that God may open a door for our message, that I may proclaim it clearly as I should. Be wise in the way you act towards outsiders, make the most of every opportunity".

I would like just to reflect for a moment on those words. How are we seeing God opening a door for the message through Fresh Expressions? What does that verse about being wise in the way you act towards outsiders and making the most of every opportunity mean? I apologise to you, Synod. The second component of this motion is far, far too timid. We are not asking enough of ourselves. My friends, if this movement is of God we should not simply be encouraging every parish, we should be exhorting every parish to join in with God and doing all we can together to make that happen. I do not believe that any of us can say with sincerity that our parish or our diocese reaches every part of our community and that our mission would not be more wide-reaching with a locally formed Fresh Expression.

However, while many of us are well on the way, some of us are not there yet. Some of us are still struggling to join in with God. I believe that God has opened a door through the Fresh Expressions movement, so I urge us to make the most of every opportunity, and, since it is God's initiative, why not challenge your PCC on how you might plan and implement an initiative to create a worshipping community in part of your local parish that you do not currently reach? Why not use your deanery and diocesan synod to share that

information? Why not ask your diocese to share all your aspirations with the national Fresh Expressions team, to explore how they might help facilitate your efforts?

We passionately want to see every parish and diocese forming new disciples and new congregations with the unreached in their communities, Fresh Expressions, but I hope it is clear that we are not advocating top-down instructions here. We are offering help. That is the whole rationale for *Greenhouse*. We are advocating a collaborative approach where working together and under God we can be so much better at joining in with him than we can be separately. It is what you might call partnership in the Gospel, just what Paul is demonstrating to the Colossians. Synod, let us open our eyes to see how God has opened a door for his message through Fresh Expressions. Let us be wise and seek to make the most of this extraordinary God-given opportunity and let us all in every parish in this land, a whole church together in partnership, devoting ourselves to prayer, being watchful and thankful, join in with God faithfully, wholeheartedly and joyfully.

I move this motion that stands before us.

The Chair: Thank you, Mark. Item 27 is now open to debate. Encouragingly and wonderfully, there are many requests to speak in this debate, so for the first few speeches I am going to have a time limit of five minutes but quite shortly I will be moving that speech limit to three minutes.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Mrs Lucy Moore (Winchester): I wonder if I could ask you, a moment - could you wave your hand if there is a branch Tesco in your parish? Fabulous, thank you. And now could you wave a hand if there is a Messy Church in your parish? It is rather a fun stat that there are actually more Messy Churches than there are branches of Tesco in the UK. That is a worldwide stat rather than just the UK one, but it is still rather fun.

Messy Church is a story of God smiling, working through extraordinary ordinary people to bring new life to local churches, but mostly helping people of all ages find the joy of belonging to their local church and to set out on an adventure with Jesus.

Fifteen years ago my husband peered at the brand new Fresh Expressions website and said, "I think our new Messy Church might be a fresh expression of church. Tell you what, I will sign us up on the directory". The next thing is we were being filmed by the organisation Fresh Expressions and our work in progress, very amateur complete fail of a pioneering thing, which was so amateur that everybody looked at it and said, "If it's that bad we can do that too", was being shared around the world, supported and resourced by the Bible Reading Fellowship. Fifteen years on and families in 20 to 30 countries all around the world are setting off on that adventure with their local church.

61% of people coming to Messy Churches are either unchurched or de-churched - 61%. Research this year through the Church Army has found it is growing disciples and modelling new patterns of leadership and maturing as a church and to this point it has cost the CofE centrally precisely nothing. Does it get any better than that?

This year we are working with the E&D department to discover even more about messy discipleship in three dioceses, in Bristol, Durham and Hereford. Do encourage churches, if you are in these dioceses, to join in with this unmissable opportunity to work with the Church Army and with BRF to develop and grow and research and deepen discipleship. It is going to be really exciting.

What could you do if you were so inclined to encourage this work of God? Could you check that Messy Churches and their leaders in your deaneries and in your dioceses are being treasured and valued, please? Recently, the Bishop of Hereford held a Messy commissioning tea in his house for Messy leaders who went away refreshed and re-inspired. My own Bishop, Bishop Tim, opened up his marquee the other year to Messy Church leaders and you have no idea what a difference it makes to be valued in that way. If you do not have a marquee, it might just mean thanking and encouraging the Messy team in your church.

Express, if you would, abject horror if anybody says, "It's lovely what you are doing in your Messy Church but when are they going to start coming to church?" We have all heard it and you can feel the pain in Messy Church leaders when we say, "They are coming to church. It might look very different. It might look very messy but, actually, Jesus' ministry was often very messy, too".

One of my favourite photos is of an eight year-old on the theme of finding the buried treasure in the field. He has had his hand in some goo and found the gold coin and as he holds it up to the camera his face is lit up with the joy of finding this wonderful treasure. I have often thought that Messy Churches have a lot in common with cathedral ministry in the way that we welcome people to come and just be and to observe and join in at the rate that is right for them. It is lovely to think that we are also in the business of hunting buried treasure like pirates with the cathedrals this morning, so thank you, James, for that. Thank you, God, for the joy of discovering the buried treasure of the Kingdom in the local church through Messy Church.

Revd Wyn Beynon (Worcester): Archbishops, Synod, please do not think that what follows is a criticism of what we have been doing and celebrating quite rightly. I have a tiny village where the whole village comes to coffee and cake on a Saturday morning but not on a Sunday and I think that is a Fresh Expression. I have a gazebo on a housing estate that does something that looks very like Messy Church. This is not a criticism.

It is taking you back to *Mission-Shaped Church* and its theological start, which you really need to hear. Page 13 said this, "Although western culture will continue to evolve, particularly through technological change, it has taken a shape that is likely to hold for the foreseeable future. The shape of the mission field has become clear". But society has changed in ways we could not have imagined 15 years ago. The forces of the New Right are increasingly powerful and dark, dark days are already on us. Distrust of difference, fear of the stranger, hate of those who do not agree or look like us. We marginalise those least able to stand up for themselves. I do not think we were expecting that in 2004. I was not.

But is it in here too? Instead of debating the sickness of our society which causes knife crime, we ended up just blaming schools for exclusions. Instead of opening our arms to our Methodist sisters and brothers and showing reconciliation to the world, we have put any chance of reunion back by who knows how long by reverting to the neo-Puritan and neo-Laudian tribalism that has dogged the Pax Anglicana from day one. We have been patronised by the LLF process by a level of theology that is, I am sorry to say, at best second rate. We were told not to make demands on government over knife crime. How ironic to hear that in York where Constantine, that disaster for the Church, was proclaimed Emperor.

Where is the prophetic voice which must always, the prophetic voice that must always precede the preaching of the Gospel? The public prophetic voice. I do not want to be told that we witter on to people in their ears. Nathan did not have a private conference with David when he called him out.

Thank God for all *Mission-Shaped Church* expressions, yes, but the world has changed. Now is the time to commit ourselves to reassessing the mission field. Do we really know what the mission field is now? Because it does not sound like it from listening to this Synod this weekend. I do not think we do understand the mission field. I think we have got to move from being a *Mission-Shaped Church*, which was a great strapline, which went on to become an ecclesiology. The Church is the Body of Christ. If you do not believe that I am not quite sure why you are here. If it is the Body of Christ, it is the most important thing ever, so the Church should be Christ shaped and our mission should be Christ shaped. Not the Church being defined by the things that we do but what we are, which is the continuing incarnation of God in Christ.

Mission-Shaped Church and all that stuff is fun but, look around, the party is over. Are we ready for what is to come or are we sleepwalking into not some distant future but the public order stuff, violence, hate and a whole set of New Right political stuff, which actually is in the Church as well, as I know from conversations with parishioners? Are we ready for that? Do we know it is coming? Are we going to wake up? Now is the time for a Christ-Shaped Church, for the storm to come.

The Chair: The speech limit will still be five minutes.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): I am delighted to say that the Mothers' Union welcomes the success of a *Mission-Shaped Church* and Fresh Expressions as a way of helping the Church in its mission to bring more people to Jesus. As a movement, the great majority of Mothers' Union members are highly committed lay volunteers in the church and many have been involved in Fresh Expressions. An example is the famous Messy Church. I cannot emphasise enough the vital role of lay ministers in the continued growth of Fresh Expressions, and I mean lay leaders, their impact on the culture of the Church, and the important need for continued support and empowerment of lay volunteers to maintain motivation and momentum in order to sustain Fresh Expressions in the long term.

I had been leading a Mothers' Union initiative successfully and for the first three years I had trained over 100 church volunteers. They worked incredibly well, but then I started losing them, losing valuable resources that we had spent a lot of money on. So training was ongoing and frequent. I attended a VSO workshop on keeping faith volunteers motivated, and, with the knowledge and skills gained, I was able to virtually stop the turnover of the church volunteers with just simple but very effective methods of helping people feel valued, encouraged, respected, updated and confident in their area of volunteering.

Having had that experience, I am very interested in the approaches that will be used for continuing support and empowerment of lay leaders to maintain motivation and momentum for sustaining Fresh Expressions in the long term.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): I am delighted to speak in support of Fresh Expressions. As Bishop Steven said, it sprang from many years ago, but was encouraged and blessed by my wonderful predecessor Rowan Williams and financed in its early years by the Lambeth Partners and one of the great things that they did under Rowan's leadership. It is one of the new things God is doing which is incorporated into the life of the whole Church. It links outward and provides a basis and an essential component to so much else that we are doing.

For Resource Churches that wish to reach out and resource something, well, a Fresh Expression is a wonderful way of doing it. For church plants it enables them to be more imaginative in their planting. For cathedrals it has been mentioned that it enables them to reach out in their local communities. It is an essential part of any church that is looking outwards.

As Bishop Stephen said at the end of his speech, the good news of Jesus Christ cannot be contained in the structures of the Church, and yet almost everything we do - think of the debates today - is about the structures of the Church, and this is the point where if we

bless Fresh Expressions we say, “Be free, go outwards, do something different and we are not going to try and make you look like us”. “Don’t tame, liberate”. And, therefore, it is to be welcomed. Moreover, it is ecumenical which means it will be untidy, messy, if I may say so, and praise God for everything messy in the Church. We need more mess.

It does with the spirit what the spirit is doing. It reaches to those who are looking for Christ, not conventionally, sometimes even not consciously. It reaches locally. Wyn’s powerful speech was not easy to listen to - thank goodness - but is important. He has reminded us of the reality of the dark clouds in the world around and in our country around. We have looked at those at some point each day in this Synod. I attempted to do so yesterday, and we will continue to do so. There is no magic answer. There is no single sentence, no single response that will enable the light to shine more brightly and force back those dark clouds. There has to be a portfolio of responses. There has to be the prophetic but there also has to be the local, the messy, the untidy, the small, the acceptance of the *Day of Small Things* and its welcome; the welcoming of those who are natural pioneers, entrepreneurs and inventors, and their blessing.

Messy Church offers opportunities for everyone to be involved in ministry. We know that one of the major opportunities Fresh Expressions gives is for lay people to exercise the ministry God has given them. This is not just for the few or the committed but for the many; for those on the edge, because what must concern us is not primarily those who are part of our worshipping congregations but those who are not. This is moving the heart of our mission to where it should be, recognising Jesus beyond the borders of the institutional church. If we simply keep doing what we have always been doing who are we not going to reach? *Greenhouse* gives a way forward to look at new ways. In order to reach those who we will not reach if we keep doing this, Fresh Expressions need to continue to become more established, more on the edge and more radical. If we do not do this we will miss out what God is doing.

Primate of Iglesia Anglicana de la Region Central de America (Archbishop Julio Thompson): I take the opportunity to say thank you to the Chair for calling me to speak. I come from a context where the words Messy Church and new plants are not the words that are used, but what is certainly used is disciples making disciples. Ten years ago, we had an opportunity to sit in Synod and talk about who has the mission and whose mission it is. Is it the Church’s mission or God’s mission? God is the one who has the mission and the Church participates in God’s mission.

For such a long time, church has been telling church that it is about making members and we have been reminded that it is not about being members only, that is where you start, but you need to die a disciple of Jesus Christ. What I am hearing here is an opportunity for the Church to move from that understanding of how members are being made to how disciples make disciples.

This morning, we spoke about 1 Peter 2 and at the end of that conversation there was a piece that was missing and maybe it was the most uncomfortable piece. It said that as the disciples gathered that they should honour the government and they should have a relationship with government. I stand before you today to tell you that members and people who live in Latin America are taking a different stance because they know what a disciple looks like and they know what Jesus wants. Panama, being one of the countries that are on the receiving end of migrants, is standing up because migrants is not a bad word. The Panama Canal and many industries in Panama were built by migrants and we are looking at shaping ways in which we can change the situation with migrants and refugees.

We are taking a stand in front of governments and we are asking governments why is it that people are leaving the countries? Why is it that there is such inequality? And all of this is done because we know what Jesus taught and Jesus said, "I came so that you would have life and life abundantly". It is speaking about Jesus, but it is also bringing Jesus into the context where we are. Disciples making disciples.

I stand to commend the work that you have been doing and, not only that, I want to encourage you to support that second encouragement that every parish and every diocese be part of this movement. For such a long time we been talking about the Church institution and we are getting back into what we really should be about, talking about the movement. I hope that this is an opportunity for us to embrace what the movement looks like, so I can go back to Panama and tell them, "Hey, it looks messy, it looks different, but, you know, the common thread in it is we are talking about Jesus and Jesus' teaching and what we are doing is making the rubber hit the road. We are putting Jesus' teaching to the test and it is working". I hope that you vote in favour of this.

Revd Andrew Lightbown (Oxford): Everything I say I want to predicate on the fact that I desire wholly to see a bigger church doing more good in the world and introducing more people to the good news and liberating news of Jesus Christ, so I welcome the success of the Fresh Expressions movement and hope in many ways it continues to be perpetuated. But I have concerns, and I fear I am about to commit a modern heresy and put myself ever so slightly on the wrong side of my diocesan bishop, Bishop Steven. I hope not, but maybe.

I am worried about some of the language in this Report and some of the context. Every parish? Really? Micro communities with 46 people in them? Do we really mean every parish? Are we getting a little bit carried away? The invitation is to play silly numbers games in October, when we send our mission statistics in. We run a Messy Church. We run a dementia service. We run a service in our church for people with mental health problems to help them live with, through and beyond. I have no desire to call any of them a "Fresh Expression". I want to label them as the ordinary activities of an ordinary parish

church doing what it should do, so we have put nothing in for Fresh Expressions, although we could easily have done so.

As a moderately Catholic Anglican, I also believe that communities that are truly missional must also be sacramental communities. Every time we drink this cup and eat this bread we proclaim the Lord's death until He comes in glory. How are these sacramental communities? In the Church of England, we cannot separate sacramentality from mission. We also need to celebrate traditional communities. We were blessed two weeks ago to take our parish choir, with, I think it was, 15 under-16s, to the Cathedral to sing at the ordination of deacons. Why would I want to divert some of them elsewhere?

I baptized an adult who came to church because they had seen a midnight mass on television. They live in social housing. They are the sort of people that, if we believe the cultural stories, should be going to a Fresh Expression and not a traditional church, with robed choirs and processions of the cross, bells and occasional smells. I do not want to diminish traditional church and for Fresh Expressions to become the sole missional orthodoxy. I want to work in partnership, I really do, and I will support this motion.

Revd Barry Hill (Leicester): We have seen many charts today. They have been, I think, generally very encouraging Kingdom charts, but let me suggest one which I think is possibly the most encouraging chart we might have had in the Church of England probably in living memory. It is a very simple chart, which some of you may have seen, of the number of Fresh Expressions of church we have in the Church of England and when they started. It is predictably upward, as we have heard, on the curve, but the most encouraging thing is if you then plot on that chart when it was that *Mission-Shaped Church* was published, we find that the chart was already going some before the Report was published. *Mission-Shaped Church* was not a strategy to start new forms of church; it was a response to what God was already doing by His spirit in transforming lives and serving communities.

For eight years I led day to day the work within a diocese and during that time supported, supervised and learned from a range of pioneers. There were many encouragements, but the great sadness was often they would say, "We open our New Testaments and we see that predominantly the opposition - not exclusively but predominantly - in biblical times came from outside the Church, yet what we experience is generally a welcomeness beyond the Church's borders but a scepticism, a hesitance, even at times a mild sneering patronism, from within the Church". Things have improved no doubt over the last 20 years, and we give thanks to God for that, but I was struck, as Bishop Steven reminded us earlier, who was it that the established church sent to Antioch to explore this new-fangled thing, the first place where people were called Christians, because it was so different? They sent, as we heard, Barnabas. What do we know of Barnabas? He was from the same island as the Antioch planters and he was an encourager.

The challenge, I think, for us as the established church, and in deanery chapters and deanery synods, and in conversations over coffee with a friend from the neighbouring parish, is how do we embody that spirit that first says, “Wonderful. Let us see”, rather than the first step being one of scepticism or hesitancy? Members may know the influential work of the psychotherapist Viktor Frankl, who said, “We have a choice when we experience something new. Do we react often out of our fallenness, our insecurity, our brokenness, or do we pause and respond?”

I commend and welcome this motion wholeheartedly but wonder, as Mark said, if we may go further in not just encouraging but in encouraging the specific people in the churches, the Fresh Expressions of Church that we come across day by day, to say, “Well done. We know it’s hard, but keep going for God is at work, Heaven is fuller, and communities are served more through the work that you’re doing”.

Revd Canon John Sinclair (Newcastle): That move of the spirit that Barry has been talking about was even happening in Newcastle. We had come together as a deanery and we knew that something needed to be done to help us with evangelism, but we did not quite know what it was. Then Paul Bayes turned up. In those days, his beard was very trendy. It was nice and short! It was while he still had a proper job as the national missionary. He came and produced his presentation on *Mission-Shaped Church*. We gathered in a very poor part of Newcastle, in a tiny little church, and we listened to his passion. We listened to him say, “You know, the Archbishop of Canterbury is wanting us to think of new ways of engaging people with the message of Jesus Christ”. There was not many of us there, and we were not very confident, and in Newcastle even saying the word “evangelism” was frowned upon. That is the truth. I am not making that up.

Then we just began. We knew that here was permission, permission had been given, so we went to every deanery - 12 deaneries in Newcastle - and we said, “Look, let’s start and do some new things for God. Let’s catch this wave and see what’s happening”. The following year, after Paul had been and had enthused us, and Steven had come also, so now we were very enthused - doubly. At diocesan synod we presented a strategy for putting evangelism into our bloodstream. That was a dangerous thing to do. I remember the diocesan Bishop at the time was very jittery, and he said to me, “Well, you’re not really going to get anyone there if you put the word ‘evangelism’ in”. But we did, and people did come. We decided from that moment on that we would have someone who would help us with evangelism.

We heard story after story after story. They were not great stories. In fact, some theologically we would probably call rubbish stories! But it was nearly every parish in the diocese that gathered in Alnwick when we presented our first Mission Action Plan to the Bishop. I do not know that he knew what to do with them, but we had them!

Thank you for this Report, and thank you for this opportunity, because it is giving - it has certainly given me - a chance to look back and just say: "Oh, there were lights on. Bishop, you're joking!" Look at all these bits of paper I have here! I warmly commend it.

Miss Emma Forward (Exeter): How on Earth do I follow that speech? I do not know. Those of you who know me might expect a catholic viewpoint on this, and I will not be disappointing you.

My home church does Fresh Expressions well. We have a really successful Messy Church. But the way that we like to look at it is that it is a way in to the heart of our worship. I just want to affirm now that Christ at the altar is the best possible expression of our faith and the Eucharist is the place that is closest to God. Messy Church, or any other Fresh Expression, is a particular lasting success when it brings people into the sacraments of the Church, it brings people to be ultimately baptized, confirmed, maybe even ordained, who knows. So that is what we should be seeking: for people to be brought to the Eucharist, to Mass, which can then form part of the pattern of their life and of their week.

I would just like to say let us not forget that what is fresh should lead us to value what is ancient. I have read in various places that evensong at cathedrals is an area where there is particular growth amongst young people and university students. That is evensong. Abstract, inaccessible, traditional evensong is seeing growth, not necessarily by doing anything differently but by doing the same and doing it well.

Just to finish, new people do not always ultimately, necessarily, need something new but perhaps just a different way in.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd Andrew Watson): It was unquestionably the high point of my first term on General Synod when *Mission-Shaped Church* came along, bringing into our vocabulary phrases like "mixed economy" and "Fresh Expressions" and setting out the stall for the Church of England's mission at the beginning of the third Christian millennium.

Since then, as our Report today helpfully reminds us, the impact of *Mission-Shaped Church* has been phenomenal, not just in this country but around the world. As 100 worthy General Synod reports gather dust in the bowels of Church House, Westminster, this one remains fresh and genuinely inspiring. Even in recent times it has been exciting watching parishes, even whole dioceses, catch the Fresh Expressions bug, a little later perhaps than many. In Guildford, for example, we set ourselves the challenge of developing 100 new worshipping communities by 2026 before repenting of our lack of ambition as nearly 60 sprang up in the first year. The large majority of them are low tech,

low key and low cost, but there is no question of the Heineken effect here - that they are refreshing the parts that inherited church cannot reach.

The Report before us, though, raises one quibble and one uncomfortable question for me. The quibble is the way that it compares Fresh Expressions with parish churches, often to the detriment of the latter - for example, point (e) on page 2 that, "Fresh Expressions do twice as well as parish churches in attracting those under 16"; or point (f), that the missional reach of Fresh Expressions is "far greater than any other form of church".

If most Fresh Expressions were stand-alone, these comparisons would be remarkable, but in my experience the very large majority of the best Fresh Expressions, as we heard from Heather earlier on today, form part of the mission strategy of the local church. To say that they are far better in reaching unbelievers than mother church, in other words, is not much different than saying that the sales team in a company achieve far more sales than those who work on the production line. That is not to question the vital role of Fresh Expressions and the mission strategy of any church worth its salt - any church worth its salt - but it is to recognise a false juxtaposition here. Indeed, I am increasingly wary of freestanding Fresh Expressions when they are not locally rooted, prayed for and owned.

Here is my uncomfortable question. When are we going to talk about money? It pops up a few times in the Report, mostly in relation to the welcome but temporary funding of the Strategic Investment Board, but more is needed - a Big Conversation, to coin a phrase - about how we determine which roles, pioneer and inherited, are paid for and which are not, because our inherited model to church ministry is very expensive. Until our basic operating system becomes that of the Body of Christ and of pioneers and vicars, and bishops indeed, only receiving stipends because we are prayerfully training up and releasing the whole people of God, the fields will retain their whiteness but the labourers will be few.

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

The Chair: I would like to hear one more speaker after Tim Goode, but then I would be very grateful for a motion for closure. Thank you.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): Synod, I would like to share with you examples of what I believe are fresh expressions experienced through my work as disability adviser for the Southwark Diocese. Part of the real privilege of this role is receiving invitations to attend a variety of services catering for the needs of specific groups: Dementia-Friendly Church, Makaton services, silent Eucharists, to name but three of many.

My experience of these services has proved transformational, for what was initially seen as “services for” have become “services by”, where all present are ministered by the very people the service was created for, whether these be physically disabled, hidden disabled, people with dementia - the list goes on. I am sure anyone present at the Disability Conference the Archbishop of Canterbury generously hosted at Lambeth Palace last year will remember the extraordinary and profound act of worship led by disabled young people. My goodness, the Spirit was at work that day.

These services have been wonderful Fresh Expressions of church that have exercised parts of myself that other services just cannot reach. I would encourage the Church to view these services as gifts for the whole Church and that the ministry and mission of disabled people as a Fresh Expression yet to be fully realised. It is not them and us; it is just us.

The Chair. I call Ian Dobbie, and then I would welcome that motion for closure, Mr Freeman.

Brigadier Ian Dobbie (Rochester): It is my privilege to belong to a church which in recent years has done two church plants. We are ambitious to do a third. I only have time to speak this afternoon about one other initiative that has been taken, which is called Sunday at Three, which runs very much on Messy Church lines. It is designed to cater for the totally unchurched and, humanly speaking, the size of attendance depends on invitations of warm-hearted Christian people. I would like to give in the short time that I now have an account of one conversion which I think will warm the heart, I hope, of everybody here in Synod today.

I get asked about two or three times a year to speak at our midweek ladies’ meeting, which is generally attended by women of a certain age. Sitting in the front row a few months ago was a young woman with tattoos over her upper body and neck. I suppose she was about a third of the age of most of the women present. I went to sit with her before the meeting started, and I asked her how long she had been coming to that meeting. Straightaway she told me of her testimony and how she had come to faith in Christ. She had been abused by her partner and had moved with the little child that she had into a local refuge run by the town council. Fortunately, one of the women who was involved in the governance of that establishment made friends with her and invited her to Sunday at Three.

This was an activity-based occasion with minimal Christian proclamation attached to it. She enjoyed that. Then the same woman invited her to a Christianity Explored course, as a result of which she came to faith in Jesus Christ. She then went on to tell me that she was about to be one of our ministry assistants. These are four young people, generally two boys, two girls, who undertake the teaching of our young people in the

church and take on a certain amount of the administration as well. I asked her how long she had been a Christian to which she said 17 months, and so she had grown from nought spiritually to something whereby she was going to be an employed Christian worker.

Shortly after this, I noticed her at a church service. As the prayers were going on, I looked up across the aisle - I probably should not have done, but I did - and there was this young woman with this little child of hers sitting beside her and the little child joyfully reciting the Lord's Prayer. It was heart-warming to look at. This would not have occurred, humanly speaking, if we had not launched out with that initiative of Sunday at Three. I commend this Report to Synod.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Madam Chair, may I tempt you to a motion for closure on Item 27.

The Chair: That has my permission, Mr Freeman. I now put that motion to Synod.

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

The Chair: I now invite Mark to come to speak at the close of this debate. Mark, you have up to three minutes.

Mr Mark Sheard (ex officio): In view of the fact that I have three minutes, and because you were such a wonderful Synod with so many wonderful stories to tell and points to make, I am not going to pick them off individually; I am just going to try to grab a few themes from that.

First of all, I heard ringing endorsement from so many people that what we are talking about here is not a programme, it is a movement, and it is a movement that is inspired by the spirit of God moving amongst us. That has some very profound implications in terms of who God is raising up as leaders. People made different contributions there, but I was particularly struck by the reminder about Barnabas, the son of encouragement, and the importance of us encouraging the lay leaders who are hearing God and responding in such large numbers to that. It may well be that we will find ourselves having a debate in due course about lay wellbeing, I do not know.

There was also quite a theme about Fresh Expressions not being the only answer, being a very significant answer but not the only answer, about reference to the mixed economy, which brings in other things like new monastic movements, things like church planting and Resource Churches and so on, and of course that is true.

Andrew, your point about linking it to the parish church is key in that, and nobody would want to suggest that separation and division is a good thing. I hope I was clear that partnership in the Gospel, working together, is so important.

There was stuff there as well about sacramental stuff. Again, nobody would want to diminish that. Indeed, one of the things that I have personally seen that was most inspiring was seeing the Messy Church that meets in our parish taking on the Messy Church Liturgy for Communion and remembering Christ's death in that - one of the most powerful things.

There was a bit of stuff as well about money. Lucy, of course, reminded us how cost effective Fresh Expressions can be. I think on that I will talk to John Spence and hopefully we will see God continuing to make provision as well as provide vision.

The final thing I want to say is about having a Fresh Expression in every community. The last thing I would want to do is encourage anybody just to tick a box and say: "Yes, we've got one, now go away". That is not what this is about. It is about listening to God and going into those white harvest fields and connecting with people in a local context, in ways that they can discover Jesus. Against all of that, I would just encourage you to support this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mark. I now put Item 27 to the vote.

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

The Chair: Marvellous. That concludes this item of business, but not, of course, our imperative to joining God's mission in our Church.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Derby (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 6.28 pm.

The Chair: Before we move on to our next item of business, Synod, I have an announcement. It is simply to say that this evening's worship, which will be led by Lt Col Jane Hunter and colleagues, will take place here in the Chamber, not in the Berrick Saul Building as you may have seen elsewhere.

55th REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDER COMMITTEE (GS 2143) PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO THE CROWN NOMINATIONS COMMISSION (GS 2144)

The Chair: So now we come to Items 35 to 41, which propose amendments to the Synod's Standing Orders. Members will need the supplement to Order Paper V which sets out the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders and a number of amendments

tabled by Mr Lamming to some of those proposed amendments. That paper is currently being handed out.

You may recall earlier in the day that the order in which these items are to be taken was varied by the Chair at the beginning of this sitting, with your permission, so the items proposing amendments to the Standing Orders relating to the procedure of the Crown Nominations Commission will be taken first. These are Items 37 to 41. Once these have been disposed of, and if time allows, we will then take Items 35 and 36, together with the amendments to those items tabled by Mr Lamming.

There still feels to be a degree of movement and disruption, I think, as people are collecting papers. If we have what we now need, it falls to me to call the Archbishop of York, as Vice Chair of the Crown Nominations Commission, to move Item 37. You have up to 10 minutes, Archbishop, though you may not need them all.

ITEM 37

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Members of Synod and Bishop Libby, thank you very much. The amendments that you want to look at are on page 8 of the paper that has just been handed out, basically, that these amendments be made with effect from 10 July 2019.

Members of Synod, I refer you to GS 2144 which sets out the background to the proposed changes to Standing Order 136 and to Standing Order 141. The purpose of the proposals set out in Items 37 to 41 is to amend the Standing Order so that the Crown Nominations Commission will submit one name to the Prime Minister and may agree a second name if they so wish.

Members will note that, following debate in Synod in February, the requirements that any name submitted to the Prime Minister is subject to the support of two-thirds of the voting members of the Commission in a secret ballot. Again, those have been retained. Members will also recall that it was during the debate at General Synod that it was suggested that the absolute requirement for identifying a second name be reviewed. The CNC members have done so and so these amendments are before you today.

As noted in the accompanying paper, this is also a tidy up exercise following the Governance of Britain paper in 2007. In accordance with this, the Prime Minister no longer chooses between two names but accepts the nominated candidate of the CNC as the preferred candidate. Under the proposed changes, the submission of the name to the Prime Minister will no longer be dependent in any way on the agreement of a second name.

Members, please take note that the Prime Minister has been consulted and has indicated that, if Synod endorses the proposed changes, she would be very happy to accept them. This item, Item 37, is the key amendment. Those that follow are dependent or consequential upon it and so I look forward to hearing the views from the floor. I beg to move.

The Chair: Item 37 is now open for debate. I see no one signalling that they wish to speak and so I put Item 37 to the vote.

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

ITEM 38

The Chair: As Item 37 is carried, I now call the Archbishop to move Item 38. Again, you may have up to 10 minutes, but I do not suppose you will need them for this one either.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): My sisters and brothers in Christ, this amendment makes it possible for the Crown Nominations Commission to agree a second candidate as a reserve should they wish to do so. This is an important practicality. It is possible to identify a reserve candidate. This would mean that the Commission will not need to reconvene if for any reason the nominated candidate is unable to take up the ministry in the vacant See. To emphasise, this name will also be subject to the support of two-thirds of the voting members of the Commission in a secret ballot. I beg to move.

The Chair: This item now is open for debate, Item 38. Again, I see no one signalling that they wish to speak and so we will put this item to the vote.

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

ITEM 39

The Chair: Now I call on the Archbishop of York to move Item 39. Might you want the full 10 minutes for this one?

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Madam Chair, I beg to move.

The Chair: I put Item 39 open to debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak and so I put Item 39 to the vote.

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

ITEM 40

The Chair. I call again on the Archbishop of York to move Item 40.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Speaking in the language of Mr Sinclair, “Howay man!”, I beg to move.

The Chair. That item also is now open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak and so we will put Item 40 to the vote.

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

ITEM 41

The Chair. I call the Archbishop of York to move Item 41.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd and Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Madam Chair, before I move this item, just to say to Synod, I am sorry last time I caused you a bit of confusion moving an amendment I should not have moved. I knew it was not to be moved. I was just so upset and so I was just demonstrating my juvenile delinquency. So if the Standing Orders are crazy just you be as crazy as they are, but on this one I beg to move.

The Chair. This item is now open for debate. I see no one indicating they wish to speak and so I move this item to a vote.

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

The Chair. We now come to Items 35 and 36. These items propose amendments to Standing Orders concerned with elections and election appeals. Mr Lamming has proposed a number of amendments to the proposed amendments to Standing Orders in Items 35 and 36. Mr Lamming’s amendments are set out in the Order Paper at Items 50 to 55.

The procedure will be as follows. Chancellor Tattersall will move Item 35. I will then call Mr Lamming to move his first amendment to Item 35. Chancellor Tattersall will have a chance to reply. Mr Lamming’s first amendment will be open for debate and, after any debate, we will put Mr Lamming’s amendment to the vote. We will follow the same procedure with Mr Lamming’s second amendment to Item 35.

After those amendments have been disposed of, we will return to Item 35, as amended or not by Mr Lamming’s amendments, have a debate on Item 35 and, after Chancellor Tattersall’s reply, Item 35 will be put to the vote. If there is time, we may then move to

Item 36 and the whole procedure will be repeated with the amendments that Mr Lamming has put in, but we will review that when we have dealt with Item 35.

ITEM 35

The Chair. I call Chancellor Tattersall to move Item 35.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Madam Chairman, I am dealing with Items 35 and 36. You will notice that the Report of the Standing Orders Committee is mercifully short and to the point, whereas you may think the proposed amendments to the Standing Orders are somewhat detailed and complex. My role in addressing you is to set out some of the headlines which you should be aware of.

I also want to say and remind the Synod and remind the Standing Orders Committee that the Standing Orders Committee's job is to keep the Standing Orders under review and to propose to Synod such amendments that it thinks might improve our meetings and that it is, of course, for the Synod not for anybody else to decide whether that should happen.

These amendments all deal with election appeals. The Synod will recollect that in late 2017 there was an appeal under Standing Order 135, as it then was, in relation to the election to the Crown Nominations Commission by the House of Laity. I declare an interest because that appeal was heard by myself and two other members of the Synod. In that appeal - the judgment of which appeared on the Church of England website - the panel commented on the inadequacy of the existing Standing Orders in relation to appeals.

Following work undertaken by the Standing Orders Committee, and in particular by the Church House lawyers who advise it, we have produced a very new and comprehensive Standing Order 135, which is Item 36, which we believe offers a better way forward. Before I do so, I want to refer to the amendments proposed by Mr Lamming. We note that none of these amendments propose a different approach in any way from that which we propose and, indeed, their aim is to further clarify what we already propose.

Accordingly, although we are advised that, strictly speaking, some of these amendments may not be necessary, we accept that they are made with the intention of making matters clear beyond any shadow of a doubt. We believe that they are intended to augment in a helpful and constructive way what we are proposing, so that when it comes to the appropriate time, Madam Chairman, I will accept them with thanks. This will come as no surprise to Mr Lamming since he and I exchanged emails last week about this.

So what are the highlights of the new Standing Order 135? Well, the subject matter of the appeal, when an appeal can lie. That is, firstly, that a Clerk to the Synod has ruled

that a nomination is not valid, or that a vote has been allowed or disallowed, or against the results of an election. What are the grounds of an appeal? Well, they are, firstly, that a person was not truly elected; secondly, that a person was not qualified to be a candidate; and, thirdly, that a candidate before the election misrepresented a material fact in connection with the election.

The Chair. We think you are addressing Standing Order 135 and we need to deal with Standing Order 132 on Item 35 first.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Item 35 is part of a package, Madam Chairman, and I was going to speak to them both because it makes more sense to talk about that. Otherwise, I am content to say that the Synod has read Item 35 and I will wait for Mr Lamming's amendment, which I will then accept.

The Chair. I think, Synod, I need to test your mind about whether you are content that we deal with both Items 35 and 36, even if it means that we have to extend the session, if we are going to allow Chancellor Tattersall to introduce both Items 35 and 36 at the same time and we work through the whole lot.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): Well, Madam Chairman, I do not mind. I can simply formally move Item 35, saying no more because it is self-explanatory. It says what it says on the tin and I will wait for Mr Lamming's amendment, which I will then accept. If that is the appropriate way for us to do it, then we will do it. I will pause there and formally move Item 35.

ITEM 50

The Chair. I now call Mr Lamming to move Item 50.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I am grateful for the remarks of Geoffrey Tattersall, accepting this amendment in the spirit in which it was intended, to clarify perhaps and tighten up this particular amendment to Standing Orders. In view of the fact that he has accepted these amendments, I formally move Item 50.

The Chair. Item 50 is open for debate. I do not see anybody indicating that they wish to speak and so I put Item 50 to the vote.

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

ITEM 51

The Chair. I now ask Mr Lamming to move Item 51.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): In the same spirit, I formally move Item 51.

The Chair: Item 51 is now open for debate. I see no one indicating that they wish to speak and so I put Item 51 to the vote.

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

The Chair: Now we return to Item 35 as amended by Items 50 and 51. That item now is open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I have to admit to a bit of confusion about all this and I hope what I have got to say is in the right place and will make sense. What I want to speak about is the fact that, although many amendments to Standing Orders 132 and 135 are proposed, a particular change which was to be considered is not included.

As explained in GS 2143, this particular change was considered as a result of my appeal against the 2017 election. The ground of that appeal was that not all candidates had disclosed all relevant information about themselves so that the electorate were informed before they cast their votes.

You may recall that a central conclusion of the appeal panel judgment, to which Geoffrey Tattersall has referred, said that the appeal failed because there was no requirement in the Standing Orders for such information to be disclosed and the remedy would lie in a change to them. That has not been possible. For legal reasons, for which I have not time to explain, it is not possible and I fully accept that it is not possible.

We need, I think, to look at other possibilities for achieving the same effect. Several dioceses have moved to hustings by email for their elections to General Synod and these seem to be working well and perhaps we could look at these possibilities for CNC also. That could probably be done by amending Standing Orders.

At the same time, a second group under the Chairmanship of Aiden Hargreaves-Smith is considering the election process for CNC elections as part of the O'Donovan Report implementation work. They are due to report next year, I gather, and they might come up with something quite different. Professor O'Donovan suggested that he would ask whether the election might be held in full Synod rather than by post and held in a context of prayer. That would be by far my favoured option.

We do have to remember the importance of disclosure. It is now 12 years since Nolan published his Principles of Public Life, including the one under the heading "Honesty". Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interest relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

We do need to ensure that in all General Synod elections, as well as elections in the diocese, we insist that candidates can no longer stand without declaring their trusteeships, directorships, as well as, to quote the Charity Commission, "their loyalties and affiliations". It is only one year to the General Synod elections in the dioceses and only three years to the next CNC election. The electorate needs to have much more control over the shape of the central CNC by being more informed.

The Chair: Is there anybody else who wishes to speak in this debate? I see no one else indicating and so I give Chancellor Tattersall the chance to reply.

Mr Geoffrey Tattersall (Manchester): The answer to Mrs Alexander's point, of course - which does not really refer to the item we are debating, which is nominations - is that we have done the best we can for the moment. We did not go along the route of asking that there should be a failure to declare a relevant interest as a ground of appeal because we are advised by the Church House lawyers - and I am sure they are right - that, absent legislation, you cannot require that and, certainly, the Standing Orders cannot provide a power to do that. So we cannot do that.

Out of the O'Donovan review, as it were, the Aiden Hargreaves-Smith review, we will obviously wait with interest to see what Aiden and his group come up with. If there are things which need to lead to further amendments to Standing Orders, then, of course, we stand ready to just do that. For the moment, it is important that we have a system whereby we can have appeals and have at least some framework in which we can deal with appeals. That is all I want to say in response to Item 35, as amended.

The Chair: Which means we now come to put Item 35 to the vote.

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

The Chair: If we are to proceed with Item 36, we would have to extend this session. I would be content to suspend at this point so that time can be given on another occasion to deal with the next item more fully. If you would prefer to continue this evening and work through this next item with its amendments, we would have to extend. If we were to extend by 15 minutes, may I ask Synod if it is your preference that we extend this sitting by up to 15 minutes.

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

The Chair. We will adjourn this session now and worship will begin at 7 o'clock here.

Lt Col Jane Hunter led the Synod in an act of worship.

**Full Synod: Fifth Day
Tuesday 9 July 2019**

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Derby (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 9.00 am.

WORSHIP

St Michael le Belfry Band led the Synod in an act of worship.

**ITEM 28
SETTING GOD'S PEOPLE FREE (GS 2145)**

The Chair: Synod, we come to Item 28 and you may want GS 2145. This item is set out on Order Paper VI. I call on Jamie Harrison to move this item.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): Madam Chair, I am delighted that we are debating a progress report on the work of *Setting God's People Free*. In particular, I am looking forward to contributions from members of the Synod about their experiences, as well as hearing some constructive challenges about how we might do things better. As Lay Champion, I have much enjoyed participating in a number of events, not least with the diocesan Discipleship Learning Communities; and sharing in them with my Episcopal Champion friend and co-worker, Bishop Rachel Treweek. Bishop Rachel is currently on sabbatical, and not with us today, but sends her very best wishes as we meet together.

There has been much debate, and not a little concern, about the exact nature of what we are calling *Setting God's People Free*. "Not another initiative," you say, "not another "programme" to be digested and acted upon. When will all this end? And are we really happy with the title?"

The *Setting God's People Free* report (GS 2056) set out a bold vision. This vision was about two culture shifts: encouraging and equipping lay folk to live out their faith with greater confidence, and not just in church settings; and encouraging and affirming laity and clergy together to value and celebrate one another in their different callings and contexts. Perhaps a reference to Romans 12 helped us this morning.

Seeking to achieve these two shifts is challenging, especially when perhaps attempts over the last 60 years or so have had limited effect in failing to liberate all God's people into new ways of living out their discipleship and sharing their common life as baptized members of the Body of Christ. I am delighted that nine dioceses are joining a fourth cohort of these learning communities, making a total of 33 dioceses which will have participated, communities truly focusing on enabling these two shifts.

Setting God's People Free begins by seeing the whole of life as God's, Sunday to Saturday, with our everyday discipleship lived out in the every day, with joy, courage and, where possible, confidence. This is the first culture shift and, as you see from our new paper GS 2145, much is happening, at diocesan, parish and personal levels, as learning is disseminated, local champions and pilot parishes are established, and simple interventions made, such as introducing "This time tomorrow" slots at Sunday services or midweek and at synodical gatherings.

So what will you be doing at this time tomorrow? Perhaps catching up on sleep on Wednesday 10 July at 9.20? More likely, caring for a grandchild, catching up on emails, or sorting out the chaos that you find when you get home; deciding to work on those necessary sermons, funeral visits, students to teach, or, in my case, helping a young Spanish GP and an older Norwegian one how to survive and, hopefully, thrive in the NHS. This first culture shift calls us to be followers of what Professor Jeff Astley calls the "Christ of the Everyday".

The second culture shift is perhaps more consequent on this, and therefore more demanding, and certainly more far-reaching. It is about building the sorts of relationships, mutuality and trust that transform how we, laity and clergy together, follow Christ. In the *Four Loves*, C S Lewis pictures Christian friends first standing and walking side-by-side, as they journey together within the love of God. So this is not about clergy being set free from laity or, equally, laity being set free from clergy. It is about our common baptism and how we live out our common lives. For many this will involve becoming more vulnerable and taking risks. As the vision for ministry in a *Christian presence in every community* puts it: "The whole people of God, by baptism, share in bearing Christian presence through worship, witness and service, being the Body of Christ in every and any place and context".

This is a call for deeper intentional discipleship, a theme picked up in a recent Anglican Communion theme at the recent ACC meeting in Hong Kong: here, together all seek to be disciple-making disciples; here, ordained and lay ministers teach and equip the whole laity to follow Jesus confidently in every sphere of life; all the baptized, with complementary gifts and vocations, and mutually accountable in discipleship, becoming equal partners in God's mission – truly intentional discipleship in partnership; here, too, clergy and laity see one another as "gift", a precious gift one to the other – me a gift to you and you a gift to me. These gifts are received with joy, and, as we are discovering from recent scholarship, such gifts require a reciprocal response. I need to respond to you, as you need to respond to me. Several dioceses in learning communities have begun to live this out in new ways, the ordained and lay together addressing mutuality, especially relationships supporting clergy. It was great to hear in the debate we had on the care and wellbeing of the clergy on Sunday that issue of how together we could do that. Alison Coulter in her amendment finds this helpful in terms of mutuality.

For too long, some laity have acted as consumers of religion, treating clergy as some sort of functional service provider, at the “beck and call” of the parish or gathered community. Equally, some clergy see laity as only of value when they are performing in “church mode”. They are happy to commend the 40 minutes or so spent in Sunday School teaching, while perhaps ignoring the five to six days per week spent as a teacher in the local state primary school. Bishop Rachel Treweek seeks to ask those she meets in a church context about who they are when not in church. Anything with a church rota involved is banned in the conversation, at least initially.

The background paper (GS 2145) outlines how much is being done practically to address these two culture shifts. It shows that the reality of implementing such a change is complex and will take time. The scope of this calls for a Kingdom focus; so I welcome the amendment from Shayne Ardron which strengthens the focus on Kingdom values and priorities. We have a collective responsibility. In having this debate, we are reminded about that responsibility in owning - each of us - what *Setting God’s People Free* aims to achieve, as we encourage others in the vision, as we implement it in our dioceses in a local context, so that true culture change becomes embedded in our structures.

I welcome Nigel Bacon’s amendment, with its call to see what we are doing continuing into the next quinquennium, the next five years. If we are really serious about everyday discipleship (as we are) and about rejoicing in our common baptism, and valuing each other’s gifts, which I hope we are, then we need a long-term perspective. We need to embrace the culture shifts in *Setting God’s People Free* as foundational. Such cultural changes underpin much of what we want to see happening and this goes well into the future.

Jayne Ozanne’s amendment as amended makes explicit what I hope is implicit in *Setting God’s People Free*. All are invited. All are welcome to contribute to the life of the Kingdom.

Going back to the main motion, it reminds us that progress is being made, that the whole people of God has to be involved, and that, together, we must not lose momentum. As Simon Taylor has helpfully pointed out elsewhere, there is the danger that *Setting God’s People Free* leads to more people doing more “churchy” things, when the challenge is how to support everyone in articulating and expressing their sense of God’s presence in their daily lives. He is wise to challenge us about that, that natural pull back into the church. We start to move out and then somehow by osmosis, or whatever, we are pulled back in. We take our eyes off our incarnational calling of being followers of Christ of the Everyday, a Christ firmly rooted and found in the lives of others.

As you will have heard, I am happy to accept all the amendments as amended, and I very

much look forward to contributions from Synod members as they reflect on their own experiences of *Setting God's People Free*.

Madam Chair, I beg to move Item 28 standing in my name.

The Chair: I will just take a moment to outline how I expect the next 35 minutes or so to go. There will be some debate before we introduce the amendments and there will be a three minute speech limit from the start. As you will see, there are a number of amendments to get through. There are also a number who have indicated that they want to speak on the main motion, so we will try and move through the amendments fairly briskly. That said, we are now open for debate on item number 28. Would those who wish to speak indicate.

Canon Dr John Mason (Chester): "Crisis? What crisis?", the Prime Minister Jim Callaghan as he stepped out of a plane at Heathrow in January 1979 returning from a summit in the Caribbean to a cold "winter of discontent". The actual words he used were different but the message he gave was not. He failed to understand fully the severity of the situation the country was in. He did not sense that something drastic needed to be done and done quickly. He paid the political price for such apparent apathy later that year when he lost the election.

I was fortunate to be part of the Chester team in the first DLC that met in 2018. It was a very positive experience. My fellow team members gelled well, united by the desire to bring the good news of Jesus Christ to more people, more effectively. We encouraged each other and we were encouraged by those from other dioceses. We shamelessly stole their good ideas and practices. We hope that they learned some from us.

Within Chester we have been able to run a variety of different events that encourage people in whole-life discipleship. We have changed systems to help address "them and us" issues between the clergy and the laity. We have drawn together and provided access to resources that can be used by parishes. We have developed some liturgical resources of our own. We have produced and begun to execute a communications plan that encourages culture change and we have provided stories of witness and evangelism in the scattered church of everyday life. We have worked directly with over 20 pilot parishes to learn what works best in different contexts of parish type and church tradition. We have seen so much that has worked really well. To be honest, we thought we were doing pretty well. Some of us may even have felt just a little bit smug, and then we were challenged to remember that *Setting God's People Free* is not a programme. It is not about doing; it is about culture change. Bringing about culture change is hard - it is very hard - and the process will not even start unless there is a sense of urgency that the current position is unacceptable. The challenge now is whether amidst all our busyness we have lost sight of the first step in the entire process. Are we like Prime Minister

Callaghan, bathing in a metaphorical swimming pool in the Caribbean, and forgetting that in reality there is a cold winter of discontent that must be addressed?

So, yes, let us give thanks that so much progress has been made to date and, yes, let us seek, as in paragraph (c) of the motion, to ensure that the Archbishops' Council, the House of Bishops and the dioceses drive forward the changes in culture that the report demands, but let us also push to ensure that the fundamental case for change continues to be made.

The Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Rt Revd Martin Seeley): It has been a huge privilege to be part of my diocesan team in *Setting God's People Free*. I am also the Chair of the Ministry Council and I co-chair with Mark Sheard the Department for Evangelism and Discipleship, so we are very closely working together on this.

I want to underline that for me the culture shift is about a reorientation. It is about seeking first the Kingdom of God, seeking God's reign and work in creation and the world, asking then what it is to be God's people in God's Kingdom, and then asking the questions about ministry – getting things in the right order. The work of the Ministry Council is being realigned to start with the whole people of God as the foundation and then ask the ministry questions that flow from that. The ministry of the ordained and the lay is to build up the Body of Christ, to enable and equip the whole people of God in witness and service in the world. That is the priority. Everything that we do in discernment and ministerial formation needs to be orientated in that way; that orientation starting with the whole people of God, not starting with ordained or lay ministry is the point of the paper referred to in the SGPF paper *Ministry for Christian presence in every community* GS Misc 1224.

A similar reorientation will appear in a forthcoming paper on theological education, where we start with a recognition that theological education, our learning from God about God, is for the whole people of God. If that is the reorientation, and those are some of the steps we are taking, I am also mindful in my diocese of small steps that we take. This is a big vision and lots of small steps; small steps we take in our own lives. Many of us do reflect, for example, regularly in our daily lives where we have experienced God's presence and God's absence. Small steps we can take whatever our tradition in our worship so that the world that we inhabit six days a week - seven days a week, indeed (I dream!) - is brought into our worship, in our prayers, in our conversations with one another. Some of us in ordinations this year started at the font with those great opening words about royal priesthood and baptism and then asperged the whole congregation, before anything else happened, so that we are recognising we are called as the whole people of God.

I commend the work of *Setting God's People Free* and this report warmly and call us all to continue to catch the vision and spot the opportunities that God is giving us daily to take those small steps towards it.

Mrs Hannah Grivell (Derby): I speak to you today as a lay person and probably my last time as a lay person on this Synod, because I will be standing down, but I am going to theological college in September, so do not think for a second I will not be standing in the House of Clergy when I get there.

I very much welcome the report and agree with the urgency required for a culture change within the Church. I was disappointed, however, that it was scheduled for Tuesday morning. Jamie asked what we will be doing tomorrow. I will be back at work first thing in the morning because I work full time and I take annual leave to be here. Not all people on this Synod have that luxury, or would simply like to use their annual leave for holiday rather than for Synod. I know some have already had to go home before this debate could happen.

I was shocked with what Sheran Harper said on Friday, if you cast your mind back to her excellent address. She told us that the Mothers' Union sought to meet people where they were at and "Don't expect them to come to you". This really struck a chord with me because in Derby Diocese many courses or meetings are held during the day in the week when I am at work and often have to send my apologies. I am a little nervous at saying that as my bishop is chairing this debate.

If, Synod, your desire is for more people who are in work, or just even for more people, to come to church and fully partake in everything that is, the culture change starts with you. Please put things on the weekend and in the evening. I do say that, though, as an ordinand as well and very mindful of the stretch that clergy have. Do not be afraid to take extra time if you need to work later in the evening. I think there is a really good way to mix the two and have the two come together in an excellent way. My point today is please put things in the evenings for those of us who work full time currently and would love to do more within the Church but simply cannot because we have to earn a living.

The Chair: After the next speaker I will be calling Jayne Ozanne to move the amendment in her name.

Worldwide President of Mothers' Union (Mrs Sheran Harper): *Setting God's People Free* captured my attention immediately. It is the first time I have heard it and I got the strong feeling that at the heart of all of this is the call for God's people to serve in unity and cause the transformation that is so much needed in society today, in fact in God's world. In keeping with all that GS 2145 stands for, and with the words of the opening paragraph of the background of GS 2056, page 1, published previously, I am pleased to share that the

Mothers' Union is passionate about deepening discipleship, equipping and developing lay leaders and revitalising and growing the local church through our Metamorphosis approach, which I mentioned in my address earlier and discussed in our fringe session.

In our work, we equip people with the passion and the confidence to engage as disciples of Jesus in their local communities, and, like you, we recommend it be done seven days a week. We have learned that when clergy are supportive of lay people, when clergy help to champion lay people and build their confidence, our work flourishes, so I am quite interested in the practical recommendations you have for clergy as they release lay people in mission in their local communities, so that this culture change will be sustained. May God bless the deeper intentional discipleship and a lasting relationship between clergy and laity in *Setting God's People Free*.

The Chair: Jayne, if you would move the amendment in your name, Item 56. You have up to three minutes.

ITEM 56

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): All are welcome in this place. Chair, with her permission, I want to pay tribute to my dear Synod friend Sarah Tupling from Deaf Anglicans who has taught me so much more about the beauty and the challenge of true inclusion. She has by her courage and her determination borne witness to us all about the importance of us remembering that all means all, always.

As the introduction to this report urges us to take on board, what is needed is not a programme but a change in culture, a culture that communicates the all-encompassing scope of the good news and pursues the core calling of every church community and every follower of Jesus. Note the word "every". It is echoed throughout the document. There are no exceptions, no caveats, no second-class citizens in this report for the whole people of God.

Some may be wondering why I have bothered to table this amendment as it may seem rather self-evident, but, sadly, as many others will know, it is not the actual practice in so many of our worshipping communities. Rules and exception clauses have been introduced that have created a two-tier system, where some are in and some are not, where some are acceptable and some are not. We may all be equal before God but, sadly, we are not always equal in the eyes of each other. The truth is, however, that you cannot be a little bit equal. Indeed, you cannot be a little bit inclusive. You either include all or you exclude. All either means all or it just means some, putting a limit on God's grace.

Why am I stressing this? It is because I know far too many people who have been told they cannot become disciples of Christ or have been told they cannot use their unique giftings to serve God in their communities. I know many LGBT people who have been treated appallingly. Some have been told, after they have found the courage to come out, they cannot even make the coffee in their churches. Others have been told they are only fit to clean the toilets. Their hearts are to worship and witness to God's love, but they have been told they can do neither. At the same time, I know friends who are not as physically abled as I am who are hampered from living out their callings because of the limitations that we have placed on them. Others have been boxed and stereotyped because of their class or race. So many of our churches have such inbuilt levels of unconscious bias that they do not see how they exclude those on the margins from following their calling and being the people of God they have been called to be. We - Christ's body in the world - are all the poorer for it.

Synod, there are no second-class citizens in God's Kingdom, so please give a rounding endorsement to my amendment, which I so move.

The Chair: With my permission, I am going to ask April Alexander to move her amendment to this item, Item 57, so we can deal with them together. April, you have up to two minutes if you need it.

ITEM 57

Mrs April Alexander (Southwark): I really do not think I need it. I think this is the shortest amendment probably on record. It is one single word - and you would not guess it - and that is "gender". It was omitted from Jayne's amendment in error, and she and I decided that we should take an opportunity to put it back in. I move this amendment.

The Chair: Jayne, would you like to respond?

Ms Jayne Ozanne (Oxford): Very much so. I am so sorry, I forgot it. I accept it fully.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Can I tempt you to a motion for closure on Item 57?

The Chair: That would have my support. Can you show me if you are in favour of moving straight to a vote?

A Speaker: Could you repeat what you said?

The Chair: He has suggested a motion of closure to move straight to a vote on Item 57.

All those in favour of moving straight to Item 57, which is the amendment of the amendment?

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

The Chair: That is carried. All those in favour of Item 57?

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

The Chair: That is carried, which means we now return to Item 56 as amended. Jamie needs to comment on the amendment to the amendment.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very happy to accept the amended amendment.

The Chair: Item 56 is now open for debate.

Mrs Caroline Herbert (Norwich): I want to welcome the whole motion and also the way that these amendments we are talking about are helpfully fleshing out and reminding us that all of us who are part of the people of God through our faith in Jesus have a part to play in living out the good news. I was very struck yesterday in the Bible study on 1 Peter 2 how this is so relevant to what we are talking about because we were reminded then that both slaves and free, the ultimate distinction in the Roman Empire, were together part of the people of God.

Peter calls the Church a “chosen free race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation”. There is no division between anyone who is part of the people of God. That chapter also tells us something of what it means to live out the good news that takes it beyond being a simple phrase that we quote. It is about what we do, the honourable deeds. We often hear of those at Synod. We have talked about how we respond to serious youth violence and supporting refugees and asylum seekers. We are going to talk later today about valuing and supporting people with dementia and their carers.

Peter also talked about how we live, being holy, living as children of God, ridding ourselves of malice, guile, insincerity, envy, slander, abstaining from the desires of the flesh, following Christ’s example as we endure suffering for doing what is right. More than that, it is not just living out the good news but Peter calls on us to proclaim it as well, proclaiming the mighty acts of Him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Where there are opportunities and where we can make opportunities, we can tell people this good news, that Christ himself bore our sins in his body on the Cross, so that, free from sin, we might live for righteously because by his wounds you have been healed.

Synod, I do not think that what we have *in Setting God's People Free* is original: the Apostle Peter got there first. If we pass this motion, I think we will say that we agree with Pete!

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. May I tempt you, after the next speaker, Madam Chair, with a motion for closure on Item 56?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Freeman. I think after the next speaker I would like to perhaps call one more speaker, but then I would be ready to move to a motion for closure on this item. Prudence Dailey to speak. I am sorry I did not remind Caroline. I will say it again: we are on a three-minute speech limit.

Miss Prudence Dailey (Oxford): I want to say that I entirely get and appreciate and support the spirit behind this amendment of Jayne's, but my concern is that as soon as we start naming particular groups then we actually emphasise what divides us rather than unites us, and immediately the question arises: "Well, which groups?" We have already had April Alexander's amendment to add gender, but then you could say: "Well, the amendment mentions physical ability. What about mental ability? What about age? The very young and the very old are not always fully appreciated in our churches". I am not being facetious here, but what about weight, height, perceived attractiveness? There is plenty of evidence that people are discriminated against because of those things. I think by specifying particular groups of people we actually run the risk of making the motion less inclusive rather than more.

Perhaps I should have proposed an amendment to the amendment, because certainly I would be very happy with the first part of this, but I would just caution Synod to think about whether it actually wants to go down that route because God does not ultimately see us in terms of our race, class, sexuality, physical ability, or any of those other things I have mentioned. God sees us as individuals, and that is the way we should see each other and treat other and value each other, so that "all" truly does mean "all".

Revd Henry Curran (Southwell & Nottingham): As someone who likes to give the Holy Spirit a more roomy temple than others might do, I appreciate Prudence's comments about weight perhaps. I would like to speak in favour of the amended amendment for two reasons.

First, I think the word "should" in Jayne's amendment strengthens the motion in an important way. I lead a church in which I know there are some lay folk who would hear this original motion as saying if they want to get involved, they can; but actually I think what the Romans 12 passage we heard earlier does is say that it is not a question of "if you want to, you can", it is "you have unique gifts and therefore you should". I think the word "should" is important.

Secondly, I do think it is important that it is made explicit that those words “all God’s people” include people regardless of their sexuality and their gender. I am a Conservative Evangelical. People in the church I lead know that I believe in the unchangeable standard of Christian marriage between one man and one woman as the proper place for sexual intimacy. The church I lead knows that that is what I think, and the majority of people would think and try to act in a similar way. It is precisely because of that, because I am a Conservative Evangelical leading a Conservative Evangelical church, that I think it is important that it is made explicit that who someone is or is not attracted to does not in any way mean that ministry is not for them.

I think it is hugely important, for example, that our director of music, who is someone who also leads services and preaches from time to time, who uses her day job to work for a charity that is making the Gospel known amongst African people in Africa, and who uses a weekly dance class as an opportunity to try to show God’s love to people who do not know Him, knows the fact that she experiences what she would describe as same-sex attraction in no way means that she should not be contributing to the ministry of the Gospel in the way she does. In fact, I would go further. I think it is important that she knows that she is not only allowed to use her gifts, as though her sexuality meant that she might need permission that others would not, but that she knows that she should play a full part in living out the good news.

The Chair: I am minded to bring the debate on this amendment to a close.

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

The Chair: That is carried, which means we now come to a vote on the amendment, Item 56, as amended by Item 57.

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

The Chair: We now move to Item 58. I ask Alison Coulter to move the item standing in her name. You may have three minutes if you really need it. I would rather you did not.

ITEM 58

Mrs Alison Coulter (Winchester): I will be as short as I can. I hope, Synod, you will accept this as a friendly amendment. I remain passionately committed to *Setting God’s People Free* and declare an interest as one of the original authors and now a member of the Advisory Group. I have also enjoyed being part of the diocesan learning communities. I have discovered actually that it is quite something to write a report and another thing to try to work out how to do it. It is hard. It is culture change. I am trying to work out myself

how to do this day to day. Tomorrow morning, I am with a client in a client meeting, so please pray for me then.

Our focus so far seems to have mostly been on the first cultural shift that is mentioned in the report. This is not a criticism because we had to start somewhere. We have been looking at what we can do to inspire, equip, release, coerce, persuade the men and women in our church families to understand that we are just as much church when we are sent as when we are gathered.

I want to amend the motion to formally reflect the second cultural shift which Jamie mentioned and spoke about in his speech. I think this now needs more of our attention because it is very important that we are called together as lay and ordained, that we have the mutual relationship and ministry, and this is important for the health and wellbeing of our church life and our witness. In our Bible study yesterday, which Caroline has already reminded us of, Peter told us that we should honour one another, and so I think this is to say that it is not just about the laity getting on with it, but it is about how we do this better together.

I want to move the amendment standing in my name just to reflect better the second cultural shift and to make sure that we do not forget it. I also want to thank Jamie, Rachel and Nick Shepherd for their hard work. Thank you, Synod. I move the amendment standing in my name.

The Chair: Jamie, I need you to comment as briefly as possible.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very happy to accept.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Point of order. Motion for closure on this item.

The Chair: That would have my support, so we can move through these amendments and then return the debate to the whole motion. I will test the mind of Synod. Does that have the support of Synod?

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

The Chair: So we move to a vote on Item 58.

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

The Chair: So we move to Item 59. I ask Nigel Bacon to move the amendment in his name, with up to three minutes if he needs it.

ITEM 59

Mr Nigel Bacon (Lincoln): I applaud the motion and all that is being done to implement the *Setting God's People Free* recommendations and achieve the foundational cultural changes on which its success depends and to which Alison Coulter's amendment refers.

In my own diocese, when we talk about equipping people to live out their faith confidently from Sunday to Saturday, in other words everyday faith, we invariably get a very positive response. *Setting God's People Free* is totally aligned with the vision of my diocese of transforming lives in Greater Lincolnshire. Indeed, we will not achieve that vision unless we all, lay and ordained, apply our complementary gifts, as equal partners in mission, and undergo that with mutual recognition and support. We have started on the journey of cultural change with some small preparatory steps which time prohibits me from mentioning, but those small steps are but a small start. Our challenge in Lincolnshire is to pick up the pace. Cultural change does not come quickly. It has to be worked at with patient persistence over many years if it is to take hold. But all too easily we know as a Church we get distracted by other things and lose focus or we spot the early signs of change, declare success and move on to something else, and then the cultural change we seek soon dries up, withers and dies.

The motion calls for the cultural changes to be driven forward, but with how much energy and for how long? Real, enduring cultural change is never quick, and it is essential that we maintain focus on it amidst everything else that is going on in the life of our Church. The objectives of *Setting God's People Free* are simply too important to risk failure. That is why I ask you to vote for this amendment and call on the Archbishops' Council to maintain focus on this as a strategic priority throughout the next quinquennium. The journey may take longer than that, but at this juncture let us at least commit to the next five years and then see where we stand in transforming lives throughout our nation and the communities we serve through everyday faith lived out from Sunday to Saturday by all God's people. I beg to move my amendment.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very happy to accept.

Revd Neil Patterson (Hereford): Point of order. Will you accept a motion for closure on Item 59?

The Chair: That would have my support. Does Synod agree?

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

The Chair: That is carried, so we move to the vote on Item 59.

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

The Chair: We move to Item 60. I invite Shayne Ardron to move the amendment standing in her name.

ITEM 60

Canon Shayne Ardron (Leicester): “God’s Kingdom”. What thoughts come to mind when you think about it? Do we think of safe parables about mustard seed and yeast, or weeds and fish in nets? When we think of them, do we feel comfortable about it? Is it distant, somewhere over there, or is it up close and part of your life? If these are symbols and ideas to think about the Kingdom, what is the King like who wants to run a Kingdom like this? If you are a citizen of this Kingdom, what kind of characteristics will you have?

“Well said, teacher,’ the man replied. ‘You are right in saying that God is one and there is no other. To love God with all your heart, with all your understanding, with all your strength, and to love your neighbour as yourself, is more important than all burnt offerings and sacrifices’. When Jesus saw that he had answered wisely, he said to him: ‘You are not far from the Kingdom of God’”. That is from Mark 12.

Are we working for God’s Kingdom to come or are we working for the Church to come? They are not the same. If we need to spend time on this - and I think we do - we need to spend it prayerfully, thoughtfully, with open hearts and minds to God’s guidance. We need to see how this affects all we do and all we are. As has been said before, whether we are male or female, able-bodied or not, healthy, wealthy, poor in mind and spirit or bursting with life, no matter our sexuality or our intelligence, our position of power or weakness, the Kingdom includes us all and we all have a part to play. I think this needs to be explored more and we need to act on it.

The Chair: Jamie, I call you to respond.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): I am very happy to accept.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Point of order. I beat Mr Freeman. Motion for closure on Item 60.

The Chair: That would have my support. Does it have the approval of Synod?

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

The Chair: So we move to a vote on Item 60.

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

The Chair: We return to Item 28 as amended. This item is now once again open for debate. I call Ruth Newton, followed by David Ison. I remind you that there is a three-minute speech limit.

Revd Canon Ruth Newton (Leeds): I have a declaration of interest in that I am a member of the Rural Affairs Group.

In 2015, the report Released for Mission, Growing the Rural Church, came before Synod. It highlighted the importance of the ministry of lay people and recommended, amongst other things: that strategies intentionally focused on mission and evangelism; that dioceses should envision, nurture and equip the ministry of the lay people; that high quality, specific and locally accessible training and development should be provided; and that a culture of discipleship should be developed. Does any of this sound familiar? Where the rural Church leads, the rest of the Church seems to be following.

It may sometimes seem as if lay ministry in a rural context is all about keeping the show on the road, about creating mini vicars, maintaining a building, keeping regular Sunday services happening when a vicar cannot be divided between four different churches and be in four places at once. This is true to an extent. But rural Christians are no strangers to Sunday to Saturday faith because they are conspicuous Christians in their community every day. In small communities, the fact that you go to church is known, and you are held to a higher moral account than everybody else, but you are also frequently the first port of call in a crisis. Rural Christians are highly active in their community, volunteering to make up for the lack of services, such as shops, buses and post offices, running lunch clubs, social activities, engaging in schools, providing lifts where there are no buses.

This does not mean that more action is not required, that more help is not necessary - my own church highlighted that speaking about faith and making conscious connections between faith and work were growth areas for them - but much of the proposed culture change is already happening in rural churches. I welcome work in this area, and I trust that the recommendations in Released for Mission will be subsumed into the *Setting God's People Free* agenda and that the helpful perspective that the rural Church can provide will inform the process.

Dean of St Paul's (Very Revd David Ison): It is not the first time I have put the word "cathedral" into a word search for a Synod report and got a nil result, so I wanted to point out that cathedrals have an important part to play in the relationship between laity and clergy. One of the ways we do that is through a teaching role. At St Paul's we have a considerable adult learning programme, and many other cathedrals exercise that role as

part of the bishop's teaching mission, as resources for laity and clergy together to be able to grow in ministry.

Our cathedrals have thousands of volunteers who are engaged in mission on the floors of cathedrals to the millions of visitors who come to our cathedrals each year and also go out and engage in ministry and mission in the local community. And we have staff. At St Paul's we have something like 188 staff, of whom 181 are lay. For many of them, it is their Christian vocation in what they do in seeking to enable the cathedrals to be places where God's Word is preached, where people come and encounter Christ.

When I was in Exeter some years ago I was able to include some of the laity in the work that we did during Holy Week, for example, by asking lay people to come as part of our Holy Week services and explain what they did in the cathedral. To have a verger quoting her poetry and talking about her testimony meant that people saw her suddenly not just as a cathedral functionary but as someone with a real ministry to offer and a ministry to share.

Cathedrals are also places where we can experiment in the relationships between clergy and laity. At St Paul's now we have a stipendiary lay reader on common tenure, Dr Paula Gooder, who is acting as a residentiary canon. We have had to create a new office for her of resident lay canon. We cannot legally put her on chapter, but she is playing a full part in the ministry of the Cathedral. Imagine what it would be like if you could have, for example, a Church Army officer as a residentiary canon in your cathedral. I hope that one of the things that we will consider is looking again at questions like who residentiary canons can be in order to be able to include lay people in the life of a cathedral and the way in which they are already included in all sorts of ways, so that cathedrals can be at the cutting edge of how we engage lay people in ministry together with clergy so that, together, we can go on and support the mission of Christ in this nation.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Point of order.

The Chair: You have been beaten to it again, John.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): Madam Chair, after the next speaker, will you accept a motion for closure?

The Chair: I am informed that we might have a little bit of leeway, and there are still people standing, so I think I might take another two speakers, and then I would be very grateful to close.

Canon Jenny Humphreys (Bath & Wells): I actually sent in my request to speak on amendment 57, or even amendment 56, so I am obviously changing what I am going to

say slightly. Obviously, the amendments have passed, but I endorse the main motion. What I was going to do, and I will not take your time now, was read the foundational statement of Inclusive Church, which does include some of the other sort of areas that Prudence Dailey actually mentioned - I declare an interest as a trustee of both WATCH and Inclusive Church - to say that we are always looking to make explicit that everyone is included. I will not take any more of Synod's time but thank you for calling me. I support the motion as amended.

Revd Mark Murthen (London): There is much in this report, and indeed in the preceding one, to be excited about.

As an associate vicar in London, I see it as an essential part of my role to equip people - all people - to be living for Jesus, to share the good news of his love, to prepare people for his return. I know that it is not just a job for me for a few hours on a Sunday or a few hours midweek. It is a 24/7 calling for me; it is a 24/7 calling for all our parishioners.

As I have said, there is so much here to get excited about - national portals to inspire, portfolios of digital communications, the possibility of being involved in learning communities in the diocese, networks and pilot schemes and initiatives, discerning who amongst our team and amongst our church might be an Evangelist, to be part of the 1,000 Evangelists that we are calling for. If I am honest, I cannot quite keep up with all of it, with all that is available, and with all that is to be promised, and I really do not want to lose the wood for the trees. I want to keep the main thing the main thing. Deep down, we all know that techniques and programmes are vital, they are helpful, but they are not going to solve our deepest problems which lie within our cold hearts.

So a simple plea: can we please ensure that the many resources, the good and valuable resources that are being produced, will show us grace, that they will warm our cold hearts with the fire of the Gospel, so that our service 24/7 flows out of the love for the one who first loved us, who first served us and gave his life? Only then will we be truly free to serve from love and not out of cold duty.

The Bishop of Sheffield (Rt Revd Pete Wilcox): I speak in warm support of the motion. Culture change is notoriously difficult to engineer, and measuring progress in culture change is particularly slippery, but just two and a half years on from the publication of SGPF it is clear the degree of traction the report has achieved is remarkable. Phrases like This Time Tomorrow and Everyday Faith Every Day are becoming so familiar we almost do not need to interpret them anymore.

Of course, it could just be coincidence, but it is worth remembering that this report: (a) clearly identified the culture changes it wished to see; (b) clearly identified the levers which might bring this culture change about; and (c) clearly set out an implementation

plan for delivery. Of course, it could just be coincidence, but this was a report produced by a Task Group made up entirely of lay people, with the honourable and gloriously predictable exception of the Bishop of Burnley. This could all be coincidence, but I doubt it.

As you have heard, one of the recommendations in the report was for the creation of an inter-diocesan learning community, focused on mobilising the whole people of God for the whole mission of God. I do want to testify to the value of that process for us in the Diocese of Sheffield.

Our diocese was part of the second of the four DLC cohorts. In our case, a team of six - three lay members, three ordained - met with teams from seven other dioceses over an 18-month period, ably hosted by Nick Shepherd and his team, skilfully facilitated by Becky Hall and Andy Brookes, all lay people.

For us, it has been a rich and productive experience. We have benefitted from the opportunity to eavesdrop on other dioceses, from a chance to dialogue in particular depth with a buddy diocese, in our case Bath & Wells, quizzing the members of that team about their plans and allowing them to quiz us.

So, Alison, Joel, Mark, Matthew, Elaine, Jonathan, Clement, Helen and, yes, Bishop Philip, too, thank you for what you have set in motion. Thank you for demonstrating just how darned effective the lay contribution can be in partnership with the Holy Spirit and even with the ordained in releasing followers of Jesus to achieve their full potential without which, as the report puts it, we will never evangelize this nation.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Madam Chair, after the next speaker could I tempt you with a motion for closure on this item?

The Chair: You can.

Mr Adrian Greenwood (Southwark): I was a member of the Southwark Discipleship Learning Community. I am a member of Archbishops' Council and a member of the Ministry Council.

The second cultural shift sought by the SGPF report is as vital as the first, to seek full mutuality and accountability between clergy and lay so that all God's people can be set free to become fruitful disciples and witnesses wherever God places them.

This is about the whole of God's people involved in the whole of God's mission throughout the whole of God's world and, as Archbishop Sentamu reminded us on Saturday, nurtured and nourished by the whole of Scripture, read as a whole. I am a great fan of team sports.

No one in a team or a squad invests only in one player but in all members of the squad and in the practice of teamwork, playing together.

When I was 16, having declared in public with my own mouth the vows said for me at my baptism, I knelt before a bishop who laid his hands on me and prayed, "Confirm, oh, Lord, your servant Adrian with your Holy Spirit". Since then, through the mutual support of lay and ordained within the local Body of Christ, wherever I have been, I have sought to grow in discipleship, in following and loving Jesus, in acts of service to one another and to the local community and wider society, to seek the peace and prosperity of the place to which I am called to live, to build the Kingdom of God there.

It is my firm belief that the fulfilment of the second cultural shift will set all God's people free, ordained and lay, for their mutual care, wellbeing and flourishing in the service of God's mission. As Archbishop Justin said so powerfully yesterday, all of us, and especially ministers, should not tame but liberate one another in the service of God's mission.

I would like to end by commending this publication, which is available downstairs from the Faith and Order Commission and offering on the theology of all God's people, and to quote from Bishop Rachel, the Episcopal Champion, on page 26, "I believe that what is needed is a renewed understanding of our identity as church being continually gathered and sent. It is all there in the liturgy of the Eucharist and reflected in the opening words of the ordination service, which is not all about the clergy but, rather, about the Church which is the Body of Christ, the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, the people of God. This is about our baptismal calling, summoned to witness to God's love and to work for the coming of His Kingdom."

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Point of order. Madam Chair, a motion for closure on Item 28.

The Chair: That has my support.

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

The Chair: I ask Jamie Harrison to respond. You have four minutes - three minutes. Let us be done by 25 past.

Canon Dr Jamie Harrison (Durham): We are in a deflationary world, I think. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. You have managed to get 18 speakers in in just under an hour, which is absolutely wonderful and thank you to all who have contributed. You have followed my early hope that we would have constructive challenge as much as death by anecdote, which was great.

John Mason, thank you, for telling us to keep going, as did Nigel Bacon. This is a long-term project. It is foundational and we need to keep going. Bishop Martin Seeley, yes, the whole people of God in God's world – I think a theme that Sheran picked up as well from the wonderful work of the Mothers' Union, particularly, I gather, in Blackburn Diocese at the moment.

Hannah, yes, we do need to remember that lay people do work during the day as well as at night and through the night and how we work out how best to engage so they may be equipped for that work that they are doing in the world.

I thought it was a very helpful conversation from Jane and April's amendment. It got a stimulation, I thought, which was exciting from Caroline, from Prudence and from Henry, allowing us to engage, perhaps inadvertently, in the pastoral principles around how we do work and live together. Perhaps a risk of church focus, but that is always the way we go, but lots of good stuff about everyone is involved, everyone is engaged and how we encourage that.

That word "should" from Henry. This is not something that is optional perhaps, something we need all to be involved in; hence Alison's focus on mutuality picked up by Adrian Greenwood at the end.

Sheran, the Kingdom of God is a theological imperative. In *Calling All of God's People*, which I hope you have picked up from downstairs, there is a beginning of the work there on understanding how the Kingdom is deeply engaged in what we are doing in *Setting God's People's Free*.

It is good to hear that the rural Church is already ahead of us, pioneering. Ruth, thank you, for reminding us of Released for Mission, Growing the Rural Church. I do think we are knitting together with that.

Yes, David Ison, wonderful, thank you so much for the St Paul's welcome last week as we had that wonderful ordination service. Can I encourage you in the wonderful work you do in the public square, equipping more and more lay folk to understand their lay roles in the city and business in the universities, and so on? So, yes, cathedrals very much are the centre I think of this work and I am sorry if that has not been explicit.

Jennifer Humphreys again reminding us of inclusivity and the importance of that. Mark Murthen, too, about the importance of resources and, again, that is saying very much, not least with the digital team that we are working on.

The Bishop of Burnley fan club, thank you from the Bishop of Sheffield. It is great to see that very important episcopal input into the original report and his experience of the learning communities and it is great we have got this new set in place.

Thank you all for those challenges. We have noted them down. We are going to work with them. Keep sending stuff in. Keep irritating us and annoying us and getting us on the way. I am very delighted that this item has come and that I have been able to move it.

The Chair: We come to the vote on Item 28, as amended.

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

The Chair: Thank you, Synod.

THE CHAIR *Mr Aiden Hargreaves-Smith (London)* took the Chair at 10.27 am.

ITEM 510

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

DRAFT LEGISLATIVE REFORM (PATRONAGE OF BENEFICES) ORDER 2019 (GS 2128A)

The Chair: We come now to Item 510. I am reminded, members of Synod, of the elderly Yorkshire lady I used to visit as a teenager who would sometimes greet me at her door with the words, “Before I talk to thee, I have summat to say to thee”.

Before we begin this business this morning, it seems appropriate to note that we shall be marking a little synodical and legal history today as this is the very first Order which comes before the Synod under the simplified procedures under the Legislative Reform Order 2018. This seems a very good idea to mark this centenary year of the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act. I realise you had already thought of that.

So, Item 510, the Draft Legislative Reform (Patronage of Benefices) Order 2019. Members will need the draft Order, GS 2128A; the Explanatory Memorandum, GS 2128XX; and the Report of the Scrutiny Committee, GS 2128Y. I invite the Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury to move Item 510, “That the draft Legislative Reform (Patronage of Benefices) Order 2019 be approved”. He has up to 10 minutes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): At the beginning, I declare an interest. By virtue of my office, I am a patron of a number of a parishes in the deanery of Battersea. I have just noticed on Facebook that today is the 35th anniversary of the fire at York Minster. It is, indeed. What I am about to do will not set the Church on fire, but it may - this is a very

weak joke - warm the hearts of PCC secretaries, patrons and even archdeacons, so eyes down.

This is the first Order to be laid before the Synod under the Legislative Reform Measure 2018. The Measure enables the Archbishops' Council, with the approval of the Synod, and subject to parliamentary oversight, to make legislative reform orders. The purpose of legislative reform orders is to remove or reduce burdens that result from ecclesiastical legislation. In this context, "burden" means a financial cost, an administrative inconvenience or an obstacle to efficiency.

The Archbishops' Council has set up a Legislative Reform Committee to exercise its functions under the Measure. The Committee which I chair is made up of five members, two members of the Council and three other members of General Synod. On 1 November last year, we issued a consultation document on the proposals for a Legislative Reform Order to remove or reduce burdens that arise from the Patronage Benefices Measure 1986.

The consultation period ended on 24 January this year and we received 90 responses. The respondents included members of this Synod, patrons, including Crown, Bishops, cathedrals, diocesan boards of patronage and patronage societies. Respondents also included individual clergy, churchwardens, members of PCCs and parishioners, diocesan registrars and diocesan secretaries. We considered that to be a good level of response to a consultation concerned with procedural provisions.

The Explanatory Note that accompanies the draft Order set out the background and I will not cover that in a 10-minute speech. In brief, the Patronage Benefices Measure 1986 makes procedural provision for the filling of vacancies in parochial benefices. Some of that administration causes administrative inconvenience and presents obstacles to efficiency.

The draft Order seeks to remove or reduce a number of those burdens. First, it seeks to remove undue delay in starting the process for filling a vacancy. The Committee was aware that it is common for there to be long delays in triggering the start of the process for the appointment of an incumbent. The Order addresses that by making it mandatory for the bishop to initiate a statutory process no later than the day on which the benefice becomes vacant, although there are special provisions where a vacancy arises from the death of an incumbent.

The designated officer will then send details about the process for filling the vacancy to the PCC secretary. One of the details provided will be the start date, the date on which the clock starts running for the various steps to be completed by those involved. By default, the start date will be the date on which the designated officer writes to the PCC.

It can be up to three months after that date, if the bishop so directs, having had regard to all the circumstances.

Article 2 of the draft Order gives effect to these changes. Article 2 also requires other patrons of the benefice who have subsequent turns to be informed when a turn has been taken. This will mean that they are aware that their turn is next or next but one and so on. It will also provide an opportunity to ensure that the information held on the Patronage Register is up-to-date and for email addresses to be obtained.

Article 3 of the draft Order seeks to relieve the PCC from the burden that is created by the existing complex set of deadlines. As things currently stand, the PCC secretary has to convene one or more meetings of the PCC, known as a section 11 meeting, where the PCC has to take a number of significant decisions, all within a period of just four weeks. These are meetings in which the parish profile is agreed and parish representatives appointed. A joint meeting of the PCC with the bishop and patron, a section 12 meeting, may also be requested.

Under the existing provisions, the PCC secretary is obliged to arrange a section 12 meeting to take place within six weeks of a request being made giving all concerned at least 14 days' notice of the time and place. If a PCC does not comply with these timetables, it loses the right through parish representatives to approve a proposed appointment.

Article 3 of the draft Order simplifies these procedural requirements. Instead of the existing periods of four weeks and six weeks, there will be a single maximum period of six months beginning from the start date for the PCC to carry out the various duties it has. We think this simplified procedure will make it much easier for PCCs and PCC secretaries to carry out their duties. We would stress that six months is the maximum length for this period. In most cases, it should be possible to proceed much more quickly with this preparatory stage and move on to the task of identifying a priest for appointment.

Article 4 is concerned with the lapse of patronage. Lapse currently occurs where a vacant benefice remains unfilled 12 months after the start of the process for filling it. The patron loses the right to appoint, which lapses to the bishop or, in certain cases, to the Archbishop. Some vacant benefices are difficult to fill and it can take longer than 12 months to find a suitable candidate. If lapse occurs before a candidate is found, the appointment process changes partway through with the patron dropping out of the picture and different statutory provisions coming into play. This can be disruptive and inefficient.

Having taken account of the consultation responses which addressed this issue, we concluded that the period before lapse occurs should be increased to 18 months. That will mean that, following the preparatory stage, there should always be at least a 12 month

window for finding a suitable minister for appointment. We believe that this should be of some assistance for difficult to fill benefices.

Article 5 provides that, where patronage is exercised jointly, a joint patron may appoint one of the other joint patrons to act on his or her behalf. This optional provision will enable a reduction in the number of individuals who have to be involved in making an appointment.

Article 6 brings the legislation up-to-date by allowing notices and other communications to be sent by email. I am grateful to the Dean of the Arches and his Scrutiny Committee for its consideration of the draft Order. It has made some helpful, minor amendments and has issued a favourable Report.

I hope the Synod will agree that the Order will make a number of useful changes to the procedures for filling vacancies, in particular by reducing the burdens on PCCs and ensuring that attention is given to the filling of benefices as soon as they become vacant. If there is one way you might describe this, in the light of the previous debate, it is setting the PCC secretary free. I move the motion standing in my name.

The Chair: Item 510 is now open for debate.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Rt Worshipful Charles George (Dean of the Arches and Auditor): I declare an interest as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee on this Order, though what I say is said on my own behalf and not in any way on behalf of that Committee. My reason for testing your patience in this debate is because, in a very small way, I was involved along with those giants, the then Secretary General William Fittall and the then Principal Legal Adviser, Stephen Slack, in the conception of what became the Legislative Reform Measure.

As Chairman of the Revision Committee on that Measure and of the Scrutiny Committee on this particular draft Order, I have had a privileged insight into this new way for Synod to enact legislation. The comments I would make are three. First, as this draft Order shows, the new procedure markedly expedites timescales. Had this draft Order been the subject of a Measure, it would stand little chance of receiving the Royal Assent before 2021, whereas, if you approve it, then it is highly likely to become law later this year. How soon, no one can say, because the Order has to be laid before Parliament as a statutory instrument and, for reasons we all understand, parliamentary processes are not working quite normally at present.

Second, the consultation exercise, which was carried out in respect of this particular Order, was so extensive and the published response to consultation so full that, when

taken together with the work of the Scrutiny Committee, conscientious members of Synod are, in my view, as well if not considerably better informed than would be the case if the matter were proceeding in the normal way by Measure.

However, I draw to members' attention the fact that such detailed consultation comes at a cost in terms of person hours in legal office, I suspect exceeding that which would be involved were the matter to be dealt with by Measure. Do not assume you are getting something for nothing, as it were.

Third, the Scrutiny Committee does not have the powers of a Revision Committee. I have little doubt that if the draft Order had been the subject of a Measure, then the Revision Committee would have sought to widen its scope to deal with some of the wide-ranging other matters which were highlighted in the consultation responses.

We felt constrained to considering only whether the draft Order fell within the terms of the Measure and was appropriate for treatment through a draft Order rather than Measure and whether there was substance in the representations – one only in this case, though a very detailed and well-argued submission - which were formally referred to the Scrutiny Committee and whether there were other ways in which, without extending the scope of the draft Order and without necessitating a further round of consultations, the draft Order could be improved.

Members of Synod, if you consider that this draft Order brings significant simplification, albeit not going as far as you would have wished in resolving present problems with the patronage and appointment system, I would urge you to support the Order, however much outside the chamber you may - and, in my view, rightly will - press the Legislative Committee of the Archbishops' Council to bring forward more extensive changes in this area by whatever route they consider best, Measure or further draft Order.

Mr Simon Baynes (St Albans): Chairman, I wonder how often members of Synod have heard someone at their PCC or deanery synod say, "Wouldn't it be nice if ..." When people are frustrated by the archaic and burdensome rules of the Church of England, we so often hear, "Wouldn't it be nice if ..." Well, for all those people, today is a good news day.

I was delighted when I heard back in November 2018 that the Archbishops' Council had issued the consultation referred to in GS 2128 and I would like to thank the Archbishops' Council for moving forward with this. I do not know whether the consultation was initiated in response to the St Albans Diocesan Synod Motion of July 2018 requesting a review of the Patronage Benefices Measure of 1986 or simply pure coincidence that great minds think alike. Either way, we are pleased that this motion is being considered today.

I am grateful that the Legislative Reform Measure of 2018 is being used. This is designed to reduce the burden on PCCs and, in turn, should help reduce the time taken in filling vacancies. Using the Legislative Reform Measure for business such as this is exactly what it was intended for.

I would like to put on record our thanks to Andy Sharp of St Julian's Church in St Albans for setting this all in motion. Late one evening in the autumn of 2017, Mr Sharp raised the issue under AOB at the St Albans deanery synod. Mr Sharp's question, "Wouldn't it be nice if the handling of vacancies could be easier and quicker?" triggered the deanery synod motion that, in turn, became a diocesan motion and has now led to today's Legislative Reform Order.

I had the pleasure of steering the motions through deanery synod and diocesan synod where they passed unanimously. This is an excellent example for the future of how a PCC member or a parishioner in the pew can influence matters through an accelerated procedure to change things for the better. I welcome this morning's motion and would ask that all members not only support it but also to reflect on what is possible when someone poses the question, "Wouldn't it be nice if we could do x, y or z?"

Ven. Simon Heathfield (Birmingham): I think many of us are very glad both about the process and the content of what lies before us this morning. It is time for a bit of a synodical pat on the back, it seems to me, that we have done something good that enables us to do something better.

As someone responsible for appointment processes in the Diocese of Birmingham, we want to welcome this strongly and thank Synod for backing it, in particular the extension of six and 18 months into the timescale. If you have been on a PCC during a vacancy you will know the frenetic difficulty and pressure which you feel, especially as regards parish profiles, which sometimes can be too quickly produced and overly done. Vacancies are a key moment of intervention and support for a parish and I believe this Order will help us get even further in that process.

If we are to see the cultural change in *Setting God's People Free*, of which we have spoken recently this morning, we need to be able to help parishes reflect on their identity and their future vision in a prayerful and careful way, one that is not overburdened by timescales set without due regard for how things actually take place in ordinary parishes, where there may not be 55 experts on cultural change and 28 graphic designers who can produce an amazing document that every clergyperson in the Church of England would love to do. This takes time. In fact, the distinctive lack of an incumbent is an important point where the voice of all God's people comes to the surface in a parish, and so six and 18 months will be incredibly helpful.

If you are concerned about deliberate delay, as if this will just start to slow things down, perhaps rather see it as that welcoming - prayerful reflective thought - which may enable not just business as usual but the further freedom of all God's people by an apparently small administrative change.

I want to commend this to you wholeheartedly and ask for your backing this morning:

The Chair: After Mrs Allen the speech limit will be reduced to three minutes.

Mrs Penny Allen (Lichfield): I declare an interest as a member of the board of patronage for Lichfield Diocese. On Wednesday evening I will be in a pre-section 11 meeting for a vacancy for two churches in South Staffordshire. I had to go and meet the churchwarden of one of those parishes to ask him what he knew about the process because he had phoned me and said, "I am a new churchwarden, I have never had this to tackle before. Can you explain what the process is?" It became very evident straightaway that with new appointments after annual parish meetings some people are quite disadvantaged when they start this process.

When I was first asked to do this work I was given a whole set of rules that appertain to this and it really was a shock to see how tight the process is and the timescales. Please, Synod, have a very careful look at this and please support it. Those people in rural parishes, where, normally speaking, PCCs do not meet as regularly as in larger parishes, find themselves in a massive hurry with this piece of work which does not always allow them the time to prepare the parish profile with the detail that is required. As has already been pointed out, it is a big work to do the profile. These two movements in timescale, to six months and 18 months, allow those people with patrons to both consult the patrons, consult more widely and prepare their own materials with rather less haste and rather more consideration. It also allows the people within those parishes, bearing in mind I am in a pre-section 11 immediately before most people are going on holiday, time to reflect.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Revd Paul Benfield (Blackburn): I speak as Registrar of Blackburn and the designated officer under the Patronage Benefices Measure. I welcome this draft Order and hope everyone will support it. I welcome the new time limits for the reasons which have already been said.

I want to draw your attention, Chair, to paragraph 66 of the Scrutiny Committee's report and the suggestion that further work may be necessary in particular in connection with multi-parish benefices. At the moment I have to send out a letter telling the PCC secretary to do one thing and I send a form telling them to do something else, which does not seem a very efficient way of proceeding, and I then get the telephone call, "What exactly are we

supposed to do?” and time is wasted and confusion is caused. I think there are matters that could be looked at to improve the patronage system even more and I urge the relevant bodies to do so.

Mrs Debrah McIsaac (Salisbury): I am a member of the Scrutiny Committee which sat for the first time to look at this Measure. I am very grateful and glad that you have received the new provisions warmly. There are a couple of factors I would like to point out. There was very extensive consultation of the sort that you would find in an ordinary procedure, but this was an opportunity to look at that consultation very clearly and immediately turn it into the proposed new provisions in relation to patronage. The consultation was certainly very adequate. The process was, I might suggest for things of this sort, much better than amendments on the floor, which are taken hurriedly and often passed without sufficient consideration or subject to the 40 members standing rule. We were able to do our work very deliberately and very carefully, and, hopefully, there will not be anything that needs to be undone, even if there is a great deal more to be done.

Revd Preb. Simon Cawdell (Hereford): Point of order. Motion for closure on this item.

The Chair: I think we can manage another speaker, thank you. We will take Canon Banting.

Revd Canon David Banting (Chelmsford): I have been a patronage trustee with the Church Pastoral Aid Society (CPAS) for over 20 years and it is one of the greatest privileges in ministry I know. Thank you for the simpler and clearer guidelines. They are kinder to PCC secretaries but also honouring the role of patron. We have heard a lot about the six months and the 18 months. They are both generous and understanding.

I want to speak about the role and the value of patron. When I joined the Church Pastoral Aid Society it had 500 parishes, or thereabouts, under its sole or joint patronage, which steadily grew to about 525, as either individual lay patrons or, in some cases, incumbents, ordained patrons, ceded their patronage rights to CPAS, but in recent months we have gone from 525 to nearly 700 parishes under our patronage umbrella because two societies, Peache Trust and the Church Patronage Trust, have ceded their rights to us. We are now the largest independent patronage body in the country. We have even overtaken the Crown and the Chancellor. We are a large and experienced independent patronage body. We work in every diocese of the Church of England and therefore have experience and knowledge that transcends any one single diocese.

I want to thank those who produced these guidelines because they honour the role and indeed the value of the patron, and in my case CPAS. Our experience includes being relational, having a long-term historic relationship with the parish, being efficient. We have two and a half full-time staff patronage secretaries now, an assistant secretary

permanently based in the office and a part-time half-time for leadership and patronage training. We have given advice and counsel to the development of the central Pathways work in the Church of England. We give advice and counsel to all sorts of individuals who are not part of our patronage world or umbrella, simply because of our experience.

A couple of hints I would like to pass on. You do not need to wait for a vacancy to review your parish profile. It is a good discipline, it would seem to me, to review it every five years. It does not mean that your vicar is about to leave or you want him or her to be about to leave. It is a good discipline. It looks at your parish, what has happened, what has changed, what needs to move on. Why do you not consider whenever you appoint a new warden saying, "Would this person be good in a vacancy?" and understand the process, because all the information for the process is out there and it is now out there in simpler and clearer form, including the role of the patron? Thank you for these simpler and clearer guidelines. Vote for them.

The Chair: Encouraged by Prebendary Cawdell, I will put the motion for closure on Item 510 to the Synod.

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

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. I call on Canon Butler to respond to the debate. He has up to five minutes.

Revd Canon Simon Butler (Southwark): I am feeling the love this morning from you all. We are glad to have been of service. Let me just run through a few comments. Thank you to the Dean of the Arches for his comments and particularly his tribute to the hard work done by the Legal Office and demands placed on them. I am not going to need all my five minutes, so this is the moment to not just honour the Legal Office but the Central Secretariat for their work in consulting widely across the Church of England. This might be a moment for you to show your appreciation.

There is wider work, of course, going on in the whole area of legislative reform and there is a legislative reform scoping group that is looking at the much bigger issues to which the Auditor and Dean of the Arches refers.

To Simon Baynes, we are glad to have been of service and the use of the Measure is good. I would remind Synod, though, that when we approved the Measure, when we laid our first Order before the Synod, the clock started ticking on the sunset clause that was put in place. If we do not use this piece of legislation we could risk losing it. When we did our initial consultation with you all and with the wider Church about the work we could do about this order of simplification, what we got back was not a large amount of work. We really could do with more focused work going forward so that we can pick off issues

such as the one before you today in a way that gives us as a Committee some real material to get our teeth into. There is some talk about perhaps gathering a focus group to do some more intensive looking at things. If you have those moments referred to by Simon that you think need addressing, please write in because we need to do the work. If the Archdeacon of Aston gave us a pat on the back, perhaps we could all do, in the nicest possible way, with a kick up the backside to get some of this simplification on the agenda as well.

Thank you to Penny Allen for her comments about the example in her diocese. To Fr Benfield, please send in your ideas in respect of those simplifications you as the designated officer face, although the forms you refer to, I am advised, are not statutory so there is some freedom to act. To Debbie McIsaac, yes, I am glad that the process is good. We are committed to good process and good consultation and we have seen how that works well today.

Finally to David Banting, thank you for your comments about patrons. I was particularly taken by your last point about reviewing parish profiles. At our annual meeting this year we have reached the point in our cycle where the time to do a proper review of our mission action plan has come up. That is a good opportunity to feed in the needs of the parish as a potential vacancy arises. I found myself reflecting with our annual meeting this year, as I move into my eighth year in the parish, that in looking at things such as mission action plans, there is a good opportunity to enter into a grown-up conversation with the incumbent about whether, in my case, my particular gifts and talents work well with the future emerging mission actions of the parish. Moves should not be just based on the particular whims and career desires of the incumbent but also on the needs of the parish. That process you highlight, David, about reviewing parish profiles, when tied with mission action plans, could be a very useful tool in that. Thank you to all. Please vote for this. It is a good piece of work and I am glad that it has your warm support.

The Chair: Rejoicing in that fact that the Prolocutor has felt the love, I now put Item 510 to the vote.

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

The Chair: That is very clearly carried. The Legislative Reform (Patronage of Benefices) Order 2019 may now be made by the Archbishops' Council and laid before both Houses of Parliament. That concludes this item of business.

THE CHAIR *The Bishop of Derby (Rt Revd Libby Lane)* took the Chair at 11.01 am.

ITEM 511

CHURCH REPRESENTATION RULES (AMENDMENT) RESOLUTION 2019 (GS 2146)

The Chair: We come to Item 511 which is the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2019. Members will need draft Resolution GS 2146 and the Explanatory Memorandum GS 2146X. I invite the Chair of the Business Committee to move Item 511 “That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2019 be approved”. She has up to 10 minutes.

Revd Canon Sue Booy (Oxford): Synod, I have come to you from the Business Committee with what you might call a mission-shaped tidying up resolution. Essentially, this is a resolution to ensure that those who worship in mission communities established by Bishops’ Missions Orders are counted as part of the electorate for diocesan and General Synod and are represented in the same way as those from parish churches. In February, the Synod will be asked to approve various matters to set in process the elections in the summer of 2020. That includes apportioning seats in the lower Houses of the Convocations and in the House of Laity between the dioceses. This amendment resolution that we consider today concerns the apportionment of seats in the House of Laity.

At the moment this apportionment depends on the number of names on the parish electoral rolls in each diocese, and that used to be fine. However, changes in the way we do church means that a significant number of regular worshippers are effectively disenfranchised and these are parts of the Church that are growing and flourishing in many different and new congregations. Mission initiatives authorized by Bishops’ Mission Orders were introduced by Measure in 2007. At first, mission initiatives were seen as temporary or transitional and could only be authorized for up to five years at a time. In 2018 we passed the Mission and Pastoral (Amendment) Measure, making it possible for a Bishops’ Mission Order to be of unlimited duration from the outset.

Last Thursday the Church Representation and Ministers Measure was given Royal Assent. The new Church Representation Rules make mandatory provision for the representation of mission initiatives on deanery synods if the bishop so directs. Those who worship in mission initiatives will be eligible for election to the diocesan synods and to this Synod, but the new rules do not allow us to take account of the numbers of laity worshipping in mission initiatives when we apportion the seats in the House of Laity. Nobody raised this issue when the Measure was making its way through the Synod.

Mission initiatives are now a permanent feature of the way the Church of England carries out its mission, so it is not right that those who habitually worship in them are not taken into account in calculating seats in the House of Laity apportionment. This seems even

more anomalous because the clergy who are licensed to exercise ministry in mission initiatives are taken into account in apportioning seats in the lower House of the Convocations. We should not count the clergy but not the laity for this apportionment.

The Elections Review Group brought this issue to the attention of the Business Committee. We were unanimous that it should be addressed and therefore agreed that an amendment resolution should be brought forward and that we would act as the Steering Committee. This amendment resolution amends the Church Representation Rules so that the numbers of lay people who habitually worship in a mission initiative authorized by a Bishops' Mission Orders are counted in the same way as those on parish electoral roles when calculating the number of seats in the House of Laity to be apportioned in a diocese.

These amendments build on two principal criteria: the way numbers of worshippers in mission initiatives are ascertained should as closely as possible be the same way as the numbers of worshippers in parishes are ascertained. This means that we want to establish a formal role with rules about eligibility that are equivalent to those parish roles.

The second criterion is that a role should be established for a mission initiative only if the bishop so directs. We do not want to force light-touch mission initiatives without a formal membership to adopt formal roles but mission initiatives that are, in effect, local churches should not have any difficulty in establishing a role.

If this resolution is adopted, a person will be eligible to have his or her name on the mission initiative roll, and I am sure these will sound familiar to you, if he or she is baptized, aged over 16 and has applied to be on the roll declaring that he or she is a member of the Church of England or of a church in communion or a member of another Trinitarian church and has habitually attended public worship in the mission initiative during the preceding six months.

The amendment resolution amends the Old Church Representation Rules as well as the new rules which will come into operation in January. We need to amend the old rules so that bishops can give directions and roles can be formed for mission initiatives this autumn. The figures can then be sent to the secretary of the diocesan synod and onwards to the Clerk to the Synod by the end of November. We need to amend the new rules so that in February, and at the same stage in every quinquennium, it is the numbers of names on the rolls of the parishes in a diocese and the number of names on the mission initiative rolls in that diocese that are added together to form the total number of lay worshippers for the diocese. Seats in the House of Laity will then be apportioned between the dioceses on the basis of these total numbers.

I hope that you will agree to make this provision to amend the Church Representation Rules giving the laity in mission initiatives a place in these calculations. On behalf of the Business Committee I commend this resolution to the Synod.

The Chair: Item 511 is open for debate.

Revd Charlie Skrine (London): I want to declare an interest as the on-paper leader of one of the BMOs mentioned in the annex to GS 2146X. In the spirit of *Setting God's People Free* it is wonderful to have the opportunity here to say all the actual work in that BMO - the ministry, the growth, everything - was done by a lay person who led everything there and who is now the name on the BMO, as is right.

This Measure is very simple. It is to give lay people in BMOs the same recognition as clergy in BMOs, as I was, and lay and clergy everywhere else. The BMO I am talking about has grown in a way that is exciting and is disproportionately young and disproportionately BAME compared to the rest of the Church of England. I spend my time trying to persuade them to commit their lives in service, sacrifice, giving and everything else to the Church of England, and it would help me enormously if we could take this simple step of saying they are indeed valued in the same way as everybody else.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Ven. Luke Miller (London): I declare an interest. I was the archdeacon who had to do with the BMO that Charlie has just mentioned. As many of you will know, we worked very hard in the Diocese of London diocesan synod and I worked with the indefatigable Monica Bolley, who is our Synodical Secretary, to work out how we could try to pilot the idea of giving people who worship in BMOs synodical representation. It was difficult, complicated and extraordinarily snarled up, and it is wonderful to see this coming through now to make everything so much easier. We need the voices of those who worship in our Bishops' Mission Order churches in our deliberations so that we can hear them clearly and so that we be challenged by them and in some respects challenge them back. Having done all that work to get them in, I would like to say that it is not just that we need to allow this to happen, but we should start moving towards normalising it, not exactly requiring but moving in that direction.

There is one Church in many forms, there is one Body of Christ and we are all affected by the synodical structures and what we must not end up with as we quite rightly, properly and excitingly normalise the work of BMOs is to find ourselves with a kind of twin-track where we have two difficult sorts of church, one which has to go through all the rules and Regulations and all the bits and bobs and the other which does not, because we are one Church. As we bring things towards simplification, we need to hear the voices of those who would be pioneering in that, but we also need to say that law, regulation, process

and methodology provides us with a structure. Some call it the trellis for the vine or the network for mission. We need all these things to be in place as well.

I recognise that there are some light touch BMOs for which you would not want to go down this process, but I hope that, by and large, where it says, "... if the bishop so directs", the bishop kind of will.

Mr David Lamming (St Edmundsbury & Ipswich): I, too, want to welcome this resolution and I hope it passes with acclamation. I come from a diocese where our Bishop has recently made a diocese-wide BMO. We have also appointed an archdeacon for rural mission to encourage and promote Fresh Expressions across Suffolk. So it is good that the provisions in this resolution will enable those participating in those Fresh Expressions to be counted in the figures for our diocese when we come to report them for the purpose of allocation of seats in this Synod for the elections in 2020.

I was a little concerned when I read the papers for this Synod to see that we were going to be amending by this resolution not only the current Church Representation Rules but the Church Representation Rules contained in the Church Representation and Ministers Measure 2019, because at the time that we received these papers there was not any such Measure. I was relieved to learn that it received Royal Assent last Thursday, so we are happily in a position to be able to amend both the current rules and those in the new rules.

I declare an interest as a member of the Revision Committee for the new Measure. I am sorry that we overlooked this point when it was going through the revision process, but I would like to thank those who have spotted the omission and have duly provided for the gap by the terms of this resolution.

Mr Philip Geldard (Manchester): I fully welcome the proposals here in front of us today. Bishops' Mission Orders are very important. We all want to extend the Kingdom of Christ. However, without trying to hamper the motion in front of us, could the Chair of the Business Committee please give us an idea of the progress on the paying of Parish Share by these BMOs? Is there a proposal in future for them to participate in contributing to the diocesan costs, especially while we have some parishes which are currently struggling to pay the amount that is asked of them in their Parish Share?

The Chair: I see no one else indicating that they wish to speak so I ask Canon Booy's to respond.

Revd Canon Sue Booy's (Oxford): I shall not need long. Thank you very much indeed Synod. I want to actually begin by thanking my colleague Clive Scowen, who is seated beside me on the platform and who has chaired the Elections Review Group of the

Business Committee, whose work will be being seen as we move into the 2020 elections. To those who have spoken in this debate, thank you, Charlie Skrine, for your endorsement and for your continuing work and example to us. Luke Miller, I think we all want to see the work of Fresh Expressions normalised, insofar as that does not hinder them in their edginess. And I am sure those Bishops will have heard your plea.

David Lamming, thank you as ever for your careful attention to anything that is legislative that we bring before the Synod. Mr Geldard, I am sorry to disappoint you, but the Parish Share, all-important as you think the Business Committee is, the Parish Share does not fall within our remit and could I suggest, in fact, that you would have to make inquiries in relevant diocese about Parish Share.

The Chair: Synod, section 7 of the Synodical Government Measure 1969 requires a majority in each House of not less than two-thirds of those present and voting for the resolution to be passed. The question is: "That the Church Representation Rules (Amendment) Resolution 2019 be approved". In accordance with Standing Order 37, I order a counted vote by Houses.

The vote on Item 511: In the House of Bishops, those in favour 17, against none, with no recorded abstentions. In the House of Clergy, 79 in favour, none against, with no recorded abstentions. And in the House of Laity, 112 in favour, one against, with no recorded abstentions. The motion was carried in all three Houses.

The Chair: The Church Representation Rules Amendment Resolution 2019 has been passed and will be laid before both Houses of Parliament. That concludes this item. Thank you.

THE CHAIR *Professor Joyce Hill* took the Chair at 11.26 am.

SPECIAL AGENDA IV DIOCESAN SYNOD MOTION ANNA CHAPLAINCY (GS 2127A AND GS 2127B)

The Chair: Synod, we meet now to deal with the final debate on the agenda, Item 29 on your Order Paper, but, before we move on to that, the Presidents have directed the addition to the agenda of an item of urgent or other specially important business under Standing Order 4(3), so after Item 29, the Reverend Dr Joseph Bilal, Anglican Communion representative from the Episcopal Church of Sudan will address the Synod at the invitation of the Presidents. I will remind you of that at the end of Item 29.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): Point of order.

The Chair: A point of order?

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): It is South Sudan, Madam.

The Chair: South Sudan, I am sorry. I was reading from my script and did not have “South” written in it. Thank you.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): They are different countries and today is the independence celebration of South Sudan.

The Chair: Splendid. Good. But, before we come to that, we now move on to Item 29, a motion originating in the Rochester Diocese. It is the Anna Chaplaincy, and for this you will need GS 2127A and GS 2127B. I call upon Mrs Angela Scott to move the motion on behalf of the Rochester Diocesan Synod, and she has up to 10 minutes.

Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester): Thank you. Good morning, everybody. With a growing retired population in which life expectancy is increasing, there are more people living with dementia, affecting both the patient and the carer, often an elderly spouse. Bromley Deanery spent an evening with Julia Burton-Jones, the dementia specialist and project officer for Rochester Diocese, looking into the impact of dementia, which includes Alzheimer’s, and tabled a motion to diocesan synod in response to that evening.

Rochester Diocese has taken dementia need seriously and there are now 21 Anna Chaplains commissioned by Bishop James and 34 Anna Friends, covering 42 benefices, all specifically working among the elderly, which includes those living with dementia, and Bromley Parish Church is the first to employ a part-time Anna Chaplain. And there are seven dementia hubs across the diocese.

My own journey with dementia began in 1960, when I experienced the devastating effect it has on a family. My grandmother went from a devout, gentle Christian to a confused, angry individual, lashing out physically and verbally, acting and speaking in most inappropriate ways, much to my amusement and also embarrassment. As a family we had 35 years’ grace and then my mother was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s. We watched my father, a retired vicar in his 80s, determined to care for her, yet eventually having a physical breakdown through sheer exhaustion. He developed the patience of a saint, but it also ended up with him in hospital and mum moving into a care home.

Mum ceased to recognise anyone, but, unlike her mother, she became serene and caring, constantly cruising round the circle of elderly ladies in the care home with her vicar’s wife’s hat on, welcoming them to the meeting. During that time my aunt turned 93 and promptly began to forget things, forgot to eat, wash, dress or undress, and was generally not able

to cope, refusing or grudgingly accepting any help on offer. As the nearest living relative, it was now my turn to be a full-time carer. After a four-year struggle I managed to get a place for her in a local Christian care home, where at 99 she still lives.

One feature of dementia that has accompanied each of these elderly ladies has been fear. I encountered my grandmother sitting in a chair, pulled in to face the corner of the room, she was in floods of tears and unable to express why she was so frightened and I was unable to help her. I found my mother curled up on her bed, sobbing. She was still able to articulate the fear of not knowing who she was, where she was, what was happening. All I could do was to hug her. As I approach the lounge where my aunt is usually to be found, I frequently hear her calling out “Help me Lord, please help me, I don’t know where I am, I am so frightened, what is happening to me?” Taking her hand, I gently try to explain the situation, but the only thing that gives her real peace of mind is a very simple prayer, where I ask God to lay his hands of peace on her.

As an Anna Chaplain, I now have some insight and skill in coming alongside this faithful prayer warrior, a skill I wish I had had with my mother. The accompanying paper includes current and projected statistics in the UK. Ageing and subsequent diagnosis of dementia is increasing. In 2014, Dementia UK published a report estimating that dementia costs the country £26.3 billion a year. Many of these people are at home being cared for by family and two-thirds of the cost of dementia care is paid by these people living with dementia. Often, the carers are treated in a similar way to the one for whom they are caring, ignored, side-lined or forgotten.

In my time on General Synod, we have had a focus on various ministries from children and young people to safeguarding and lay ministry, but nothing on older people’s ministry. There is much talent and experience being ignored in the senior members of our congregation and often their recognition, respect and trust is side lined or ignored. Eileen Shamy, a minister from New Zealand, writes, “It is still not unusual to hear clergy and even family and friends covering their fear and embarrassment with statements like ‘I never see any progress or improvement for my time, surely it is better to give my time where it counts’. The fact that she or he may have been a highly talented, respected pillar of the church for the last 30 years does not enter into this thinking”.

In 2009, when Debbie Thrower answered a local advertisement for a community chaplain to work in her home town with older people she said she knew in her bones that if they developed a good model then it could and should be replicated elsewhere. At the time, little did she know that the idea would go national with the backing of the Bible Reading Fellowship. Debbie reminds that Abraham was 75 when he left Haran for the unknown, and Anna was 84 when she and Simeon recognised Jesus. Anna Chaplains work with the elderly to nurture their spirituality in its broadest sense, even those who claim to have

no faith and would not darken the doors of our churches are spiritual beings loved by God, whether they recognise it or not.

Helen Cameron of the Salvation Army has recognised that growing numbers of people do not engage with institutional church, yet the work of the chaplains seems to be increasingly welcome.

Looking at the national situation, the Prime Minister's challenge on Dementia 2020, published on the 6th of March 2016, set out more than 50 specific commitments that aimed to make England the world leader in dementia care, research and awareness by 2020. The implementation plan indicates how these commitments will be met across four themes: risk reduction, health and care, awareness and social action, and research. The plan was developed in partnership with a range of stakeholders, including those living with dementia. The final clause of this motion asks Her Majesty's Government to report on the progress of this challenge, further asking them to explain the steps being taken to join up health and social care, to ensure a seamless transition for people with dementia.

In returning to my own experience with my mother, although the person I knew had gone, she was still someone loved by God, who deserved the respect, care and love of those around them. Training as an Anna Chaplain confirmed my suspicion that positive feelings and emotions remain, even if memories have flown away when the visit comes to an end. It is never a waste of time visiting someone who does not remember the visit. It is the peace of mind that remains that is as important as the kiss and hug goodbye, and the "God bless, I'll see you soon".

Hopefully, we are going to watch a very short video taken at one of the increasing numbers of dementia cafés in the Rochester Diocese. You will hear from those living with dementia, which includes the carers, dementia specialists, and also Anna Chaplains and Anna Friends seeking to come alongside families and friends at the café.

(Video played)

The Chair: Thank you. I am afraid you are considerably out of time, so I think we need to move on to the debate. Thank you very much.

Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester): Thank you.

The Chair: The motion is now open for debate. I call upon Nick Land and, after him, Andrew Micklefield for his maiden speech. Thank you.

Dr Nick Land (York): Thank you very much for calling me. There is something profoundly unsettling about dementia, it raises deep theological questions about what it means to be

human, and for many of us it is just too painful to think about, so there is a danger that we walk by on the other side, not only from the person with dementia, but from those who are caring for them, leaving them isolated just when they need us most. Christian compassion, as shown by Anna Chaplaincy, is about moving towards pain, not fleeing from it.

I was leading a Fruitfulness on the Frontline course at church and had asked the group members to describe their frontline, where they were being sent to church in the service of Christ, and one of the older ladies described her frontline as the residential care home where she visited her 97-year-old mother. She described how she supported the other residents and other visitors and the staff, reminding them how much they were loved by God and how significant their caring work was.

We have just been talking about *Setting God's People Free*, encouraging and equipping lay people to follow Jesus confidently in every sphere of their life. Well, dementia is where the rubber hits the road, because as carers or sufferers it will deeply affect almost all of us. Jesus tells us "Whatever you do for the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me", and we need to teach ourselves and our congregations of just how important that every day care and support of other human beings is to God, and how it is part of living out our vocations as Christians. That when we are patiently supporting a confused parent, who has rung for the 30th time that day, we are serving Christ, that a minimum wage job in social care is a sacred calling in Christ, that when we support tired family carers to get a morning off, we are being the Body of Christ.

Let me finish from a quote from Christine Bryden's book, *Dancing with Dementia*. Christine was a 46-year-old woman diagnosed with early onset dementia. "As I travel towards a dissolution of myself, my personality, my very essence, my relationship with God needs increasing support from you, my other in the Body of Christ. Don't abandon me at this stage, for the Holy Spirit connects us, it links our souls and our spirits, not our minds and our brains. I need you to minister to me, to sing to me, to pray with me, to be my memory for me".

I strongly commend this motion.

Revd Andrew Micklefield (Winchester): At General Synod, I am used to people asking me "Where do you come from?" and I say "Winchester", then the next question is "Whereabouts in the Winchester Diocese", and I say "Alton, a market town on the A31, you've probably never heard of it". Almost every time I have said that over these last few days, people have said, "Oh yes, I know", and they say things like "Ah, that's near a theme park", and I tell you, people do set their satnavs wrongly. We have directed people further north. Some people say "Oh, that's about Jane Austen", and rightly so, just outside Alton was where Jane Austen lived. Some people say "Oh, you've got the great Watercress

Line and steam railway”, yes, we do. And some people have said “I’ve been on retreat at the Abbey”, and that is a good place to go.

I have even heard that Canon Simon Butler was a choirboy at St Lawrence Church, Alton. Although that brings music to our ears, what I really long for people to say is, “Yes, Alton in the Winchester Diocese in Hampshire, the home of Anna Chaplaincy”. We have heard so much from our friends in Rochester, and thanks be to the God for all that they have done and are doing to tell the story of how their Anna Chaplaincy in dementia is working.

It was in 2009, around a plastic go-pack table in the parish centre, that a group of Anglicans and a group of local Methodists got together to discern that as they came together in covenant partnership, what is it that they would really like to do together. A small seed was planted that night that chaplaincy amongst older people in our town was what was needed. I was then the curate of that parish. I am now the vicar of that parish. Debbie Thrower, who is sitting up there on the platform, was appointed as our first Anna Chaplain, funding was found, and our work began, and we have seen it flourish and grow and impact so many people; not just the older people but their families and young people too.

We have seen good intergenerational work with our local schools, taking them into care homes. We have seen library clubs and a hard of hearing club, lunch clubs and a myriad of volunteers who have been set free to go and work and volunteer in this ministry. Not just to be Anna Chaplains, but to be Anna friends. So as the vicar of Alton in the Winchester Diocese in Hampshire, yes, the birthplace of Anna Chaplaincy, I want to commend this motion to you, but also to give you a challenge. The challenge is our friends in Rochester have focused on dementia, but older people have so many other issues and joys. I challenge you to think, “What is it that the older people of my diocese, my deanery or my parish could need, and we could provide in the name of Jesus Christ?”

We have seen people be confirmed in our care homes. We have seen people come to faith. It is not just about faith, it is about showing the love and the grace of our God, and this is just one way in which you can do it. What we have seen in Alton is having one person and then groups of people advocating and championing an Anna Chaplaincy which makes such a difference. We were so thrilled when the Bible Reading Fellowship came alongside us and took it to the next step. I believe God’s Holy Spirit has got hold of this thing called Anna Chaplaincy, and, if the Holy Spirit has got hold of it, who are we to stand in its way. I commend wholeheartedly and fully this motion.

The Chair: After Susan Howdle, Marian Nicholson for her maiden speech. You still have five minutes but after Marian Nicholson’s speech I will be considering reducing the speech limit to three minutes.

Mrs Susan Howdle (Ecumenical Representatives): I declare a passionate interest as ex-Chair of Methodist Homes for the Aged, which some of you may know have over 75 years of experience in this area, very extensive provision of care homes, housing, day centres, community-based schemes with a special focus on dementia. The resources are provided by Methodist Homes too. The current Director of Chaplaincy, the Revd Chris Swift, is an Anglican clergyman and he oversees a team of nearly 200 chaplains throughout the country.

As we have just heard, there is fruitful working to be done together in this area. I asked to speak to follow up what I said the other day that our joint life together is not just about faith and order issues, but about what many local churches are doing and can do so much together as we all work on that theme of seeking to show that our older people are not the church of yesterday but the church of today.

Just a word on my own personal experience of a mother who continued, like Angela, to be a minister's wife to the very end of her days. My experience has led to engagement in the challenging setting of leading worship and sharing the Gospel with those who need to hear and continually be reminded of God's love in Christ. They can often sing it more easily than they can say it. And of the deep experience of receiving Holy Communion alongside my friends there, the care with which they think and ask about what they are receiving that often puts me to shame. Finally, the glad knowledge that if I get it wrong in worship or in all the encounters with older people who are living with dementia, and some younger ones too, it will be forgotten, unlike so much of Church life, and a witness to a God who remembers our sin no more.

Mrs Marian Nicholson (Canterbury): Thank you to our speaker whose words were very moving to me. Many of you will be very closely involved with someone with dementia, indeed some of us will be developing dementia as we speak. A close family member or a friend and it is heart-breaking. My personal journey was alongside my dear father, Arthur, before his death in 2017. I fully hear that we are not encouraged to describe this as "suffering", but my father did suffer a lot.

When my parents moved to Canterbury from Croydon just a few years ago to live near me, my father was becoming badly affected with osteoporosis and there were signs of memory loss and confusion developing. Within months of moving the dementia was settling in and that was the beginning of a challenging and painful few years as he declined at a rapid rate. My father had excellent care from a very expensive specialist private dementia care company based in Dover. This was after six weeks of 28 different carers coming into his home from social services, who were pressed for time doing a wonderful, valuable job for so many people, but which not only drove my mother to distraction but was confusing and distressing for my father, who was unaccustomed to being called "flower" and "sweetheart" by other middle-aged women.

It was also a heartache that no one in his new hometown knew the godly amazing man that he was, the life he had led, and anything about his family and seven children beyond what I had told them. Only beyond the clergy a relatively few were particularly interested beyond a token conversation and acknowledgement that he was the father of Marian the churchwarden, as I was the one everyone knew. Do not get me wrong, my parents were lovingly welcomed, but his growing dementia was not understood, which meant that people were less likely to engage with him in conversation that was becoming increasingly hard for him as it was easier not to bother. And he did not like going to groups.

It became such a lonely place for him, both at church and at home, and then in his final months in a lovely care home where I continued to visit him every day and my mother visited as often as she felt she could, a couple of times a week. That is my story.

I am so pleased to hear more about the Anna Chaplaincy and today I have learned that it is coming to my own Diocese of Canterbury, in fact it may already be there. Finally, I would just like to say thank you to Mike Lawes from Rochester, who encouraged me over breakfast to give this, my maiden speech.

The Chair: After the next speaker I will call the Bishop of Exeter.

The Chair imposed a speech limit of three minutes.

Mr Geoffrey Hine (Carlisle): I am delighted to support this motion. What pleases me is that it calls for action to raise the profile of those living with dementia either as carers or those diagnosed with the illness in one of its many forms - raising the profile so that more people are aware. I am chair of the Northern Fells Dementia Action Alliance. This is a secular group, but it has its origins in Churches Together, and I will speak to that in a moment. There are many such alliances throughout the country, but we are something of a pilot in a deeply rural area seeking to deliver on the Prime Minister's challenge 2020. One of the Prime Minister's advisers, Ian Sherriff, came up from Portsmouth to speak at our launch.

Something of the area we cover, which is very different from some of the areas we have seen so far. It lies in the northern flanks of the Lake District fells. The resident human population is about 3,700 spread over 200-plus square miles. We have something like 20,000-plus sheep. I am half the ministry team of six churches. There are nine churches in the area, four small schools, three pubs, an outstanding GP's surgery, and all these are partners in the work that we seek to undertake. The population may be sparse, but dementia is as present as it is elsewhere, and some support services are not so easily accessed. I want to endorse the comments earlier made by my friend Ruth Newton on the rural Church.

Cumbria may have a small population, but we have 27 million visitors a year and many of those live with dementia. The point to stress is that we have to work also ecumenically. We are working alongside so many different partners. The genesis of our group came together from Churches Together for awareness-raising initiatives.

Bringing the group together, we had great support from Age UK, the two district authorities we span - Eden and Allerdale - and our local surgery, the Northern Fells Rural Development Group and various church members. These have been invaluable in making other contents and extending care particularly to carers. We bring education and understanding. A carers' support group is being formed and the focus will be on delivering support for carers. Primary school children are being brought into the awareness programme. Remember that many of them are suddenly puzzled why a granny or grandad is suddenly behaving in such a strange way. There are many ways in which awareness training is being delivered. At the launch, one of the hotelkeepers said to me, "Geoff, how soon can we have this because we deal with it every day?" There are so many issues where people are looking for support with great love and great sympathy and with great grace.

There are many other things that are being brought in in the area: a craft group, "craft" being "can't remember a flipping thing".

The Chair: I am afraid you are out of time.

The Bishop of Exeter (Rt Revd Robert Atwell): English people often have romantic ideas about the countryside and village life, especially in beautiful counties such as Devon, but the countryside can be a lonely place, especially for newcomers, when your spouse dies, when there is no public transport and you cannot drive. Loneliness and the feeling of being unwanted is the most terrible poverty. Those words are not mine, they are Mother Theresa's of Calcutta. We all need to be alone from time to time to safeguard our sanity, but loneliness is different. Loneliness gnaws at the soul.

According to the government, after Dorset, the population of Devon is the second oldest in the country and getting older. In 2011 the government predicted that over the next 15 years the population of Devon is set to arise by around 20%, but within that figure is a hidden timebomb because those aged 70 and over is set to increase by a staggering 54%. By any stretch of the imagination, this is a huge challenge and certainly for our beleaguered NHS.

In the Diocese of Exeter, we have been preparing for this by bringing together voluntary agencies, professionals and Churches Together to see how we can respond creatively and imaginatively, including supporting dementia-friendly churches and the development of a network of Anna Chaplains across our county. The question for us is a broad one:

how are going to engage with this growing constituency because it is a fundamental part of our mission?

More broadly, without ignoring the strain on our health resources that an increasing number of dementia sufferers represents, as Christians I do think we need to challenge the dominant national narrative that glamorises the young and beautiful often at the expense of older people in the community and sees them as a burden. We need, as Christians, to be talking the language of gift. Older people have a honed wisdom and bring ballast to the community. There is certainly an art to growing older, but it does not have to be an experience of shrinking horizons, it can also be an adventure full of new and exciting possibilities.

How great it would be if our churches were recognised and celebrated as places where not only the older people in our communities were affirmed but where they could explore the seams of Christian spirituality and faith. Where we do this, I believe that the joys and disappointments of life become a toolbox from which every community will benefit and gain wisdom. Please join me in supporting this motion.

Miss Izzy McDonald-Booth (Newcastle): I would like to support this motion and I think it is long overdue. Reading the Report, I was not surprised to see the desperate need for us to provide spiritual care for older people, most especially people with dementia, of whom we read there are nearly a million in the UK. The biggest issue that I hear about when people get dementia is that others are afraid.

A good friend with advanced Alzheimer's who I visit every week in a home responds to company, physical touch and the voice. A care home is a very lonely place to be. Many families say that it will be company for the person who needs care, but anyone who regularly visits care homes will see the amount of people sitting quietly alone in a full room. That fear of dementia that Angela Scott told us about translates into people not visiting because they think the person is not there anymore and will not know if they are there anyway. I found it profoundly sad that my good friend's wife told me, "None of his friends ever visits".

One of the biggest shifts in our approach to caring for older people that has started to happen with Anna Chaplaincy is that we are spending time alongside people rather than rushing in to do a short Holy Communion and leaving straight after. Anna Chaplaincy encourages that important spiritual care of patience and giving time to be alongside people. We are lucky in my parish to have a trained Anna Chaplain and she has committed to one day a week being alongside people and caring for their spiritual needs.

Before this training, she did visit care homes but only to give Communion. This new approach has given her the confidence to push for recognition in the home, to discuss

with staff what she is doing and why and to agree a contract, if you will, with the incumbent that she is now responsible for this work in the parish and has the support that she needs in her work. I can say it has transformed her ministry and given her the knowledge and confidence to support people who rarely have a voice.

I would like to reiterate the importance of recruiting the right people for this training. There have been a few issues with people dropping out or not carrying through the commitment that is needed, and I think that issue comes from the initial recruitment process, which needs to be a little more robust. I think there should be a little bit more joined-up working at parish level. Quite often, the people we have trained might not have existing links in care homes and sometimes clergy support and joint working is needed.

Having said all that, I wholeheartedly support the motion and actually think every single parish needs expertise in this area to support the community in the way that we should if we are living out our faith in the way that we have been called to do.

The Chair: After Sarah Tupling, Tim Goode, and then I may be considering putting a proposal for closure of this motion because of the special additional item to the agenda and the fact that we have a hard stop, so we have to be very conscious of the time factor.

Ms Sarah Tupling (Deaf Anglicans Together): This topic of Anna Chaplaincy is very interesting, and we have seen both earlier in the presentation and the video has had an impact on us all. What struck me is that a lot of this material and information is suitable for people who are hearing. I would like to give a deaf perspective.

Just a few examples from my own experience. I have been supporting an older man with dementia in a care home, who is deaf, and none of the care home staff can use sign language. I have just been going in and chatting to him and seeing that day to day for him it is very difficult. We did some basic teaching of the staff about how they can offer him a tea, coffee or something to eat. That is one example. Another example is some people I know who have family members who are deaf, for example one lady whose mother is deaf, and the mother's partner is also deaf, so they are a deaf couple and they had dementia. In the decline of that, the provision locally for them as deaf people was sadly very lacking.

We have an opportunity here with Anna Chaplaincy, which is a fantastic support. We have this God-given sense, this word, if you like, that we can offer something that is good news to people. At the same time, we can do that in a way that suits this particular group as deaf people. That is not an easy thing to achieve, but it is also not impossible. I would like to wholeheartedly support this paper and this motion but with the awareness, again, that we need to relate this more to those people who are members of the deaf community and those with other disabilities as well as dementia. That is what I would like to express.

For some people with disabilities, they have difficulties in using speech, so that is another aspect that may be an issue too. It is about widening the scope of this. We saw that example on the video and how people can respond to those, whether that be activities, for example dance and music. Those things are good, but we also need to consider various different ways of empathising, reaching people where they are at and finding their history. That might not only be through music but through a variety of different ways. It would be really good to work together on this, maybe with other associations for deaf people, other organisations out there in partnership and other churches, maybe Deaf Churches could be involved in this too.

Revd Tim Goode (Southwark): John Swinton, the theologian, asks whether we believe that people with dementia have a vocation. Let me introduce Barbara to you. Barbara is a resident in one of the two care homes with dementia units in our parish and regularly attends the services that we hold there. She always arrives with a smile on her face and is guided to a seat by a carer. Sadly, it is not always easy to have a conversation with her as she is easily distracted, or she sometimes does not seem to acknowledge that I am there at all. We always follow the same Order of Service and choose hymns that are recognised. Barbara never looks distressed, but also rarely looks engaged.

And then it comes to the saying of the Lord's Prayer. Every time, Barbara suddenly becomes animated and insists that I look at her and that we say the Lord's Prayer together. The intensity of her gaze becomes piercing and she mouths in time with me the words of the Lord's Prayer. It is not that she is just remembering learned words; she is remembering a deep profound sense of identity, her identity found in God's immeasurable and transforming love for her and for each one of us. This regular encounter has become a treasured part of my ministry, for Barbara has profoundly ministered to me the vitality and importance of corporate learned prayer to our shared identity and memory.

I initially went into both care homes with these laudable aims of serving, being alongside and affirming their God-given image of the God who profoundly loves each one of us. Those remain, but Barbara has taught me to listen, to watch and to learn. I have found that God has given Barbara a unique vocation, just as God has a unique vocation for all the residents of both care homes, just as he has for all God's people. Thank you, Barbara, and may God bless you.

The Chair: As I explained just now, in view of the fact that we have an additional agenda item before the timed business, which we also have to keep in mind with our eye firmly on the clock, I put a motion to Synod for closure of this item.

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

The Chair: I ask Mrs Angela Scott to respond to the debate. She has up to five minutes.

Mrs Angela Scott (Rochester): Thank you to all those who have taken part in the debate and shared experiences of ministry with older people. A lot of people have spoken, and I would just like to highlight some of the things.

Nick Land, what does it mean to be human? Yes, what does it mean to be human, to be loved by God and by other people. Andrew Micklefield, thank you for your maiden speech. I think Debbie is very privileged to have you as her vicar and her mentor, and I think you are very privileged to have Debbie in your parish. Susan Howdle, it is gratifying to hear that it is an issue that covers the whole of the Church in other denominations as well. Later, Geoffrey Hine was talking about the need to work ecumenically, and I love that “craft” – “can’t remember a flipping thing” - I think that is wonderful.

To Marian Nicholson, also a maiden speech, for your moving story, especially describing the isolation of those living with dementia. When I say living with dementia, I include the carers and the families as well. Geoffrey Hine, thank you for raising the profile of dementia, as I have said already, ecumenically. To the Bishop of Exeter, highlighting that loneliness gnaws at the soul. It is a fundamental part of our mission. Elderly people should not be an embarrassment or a burden. Izzy McDonald-Booth, thank you for drawing attention to the fear. I think I brought that out as well, not just the fear from the person having dementia but also the fear of those who are visiting.

Sarah Tupling, thank you for bringing the deaf perspective. You sound just like an Anna Chaplain and I think maybe you are called to be an Anna Chaplain. Debbie, I put you together. Tim Goode, do people with dementia have a vocation? Yes, they do. My mum in that care home, they loved it, and it was the first time the staff had ever seen them making a chair vacant to say, “Come and sit with me, Mary”, because normally they sat in the same chairs the whole time. When I say the Lord’s Prayer with my aunt, we look eyeball to eyeball and her eyes light up as she says the traditional form of the Lord’s Prayer with me. Thank you for those. I was going to end with a short story, but I will finish there.

Mr John Wilson (Lichfield): This is an important issue, Chair. To show our support for the Anna Chaplains it would be good to have an accurate count of the Synod. Would you order a count of the Synod?

The Chair: I am not sure that would be particularly helpful since the chamber is not very full. I feel that although it would be a high count of those present, I am sure, what gets reported is the total number and the total number is not going to be particularly high. I absolutely agree and I absolutely agree with the importance of the motion. I am not sure I am minded to agree, but if I see 25 people or more standing or otherwise indicating that they wish me to proceed with a counted vote of Synod then, of course, that is what will happen. Do I see 25 people standing? I do not. Then in a sense with regret, but that is

not the fault of people in the chamber, as it were, with regret, I think we are where we are. I will proceed with a show hands. I put Item 29 to the Synod.

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

The Chair: We would have had 100% but it is 100% of a smallish number. That is the difficulty, I think, when you are reporting numbers. Thank you very much. That is clearly passed. That brings Item 29 to a close.

May I invite those people present in the chamber to remain in the chamber for the additional item which you recall is to hear from the Revd Dr Joseph Bilal, the Anglican Communion representative from the Episcopal Church of South Sudan who will address the Synod at the invitation of the Presidents. Then we will follow the timed business on the printed agenda. I invite the Revd Dr Joseph Bilal to come to the podium to address Synod.

Revd Dr Joseph Bilal (Representative from the Episcopal Church of South Sudan): I am Joseph Bilal, an Anglican Communion guest representing South Sudan. I am so grateful to be here and I want to stand here to register my sincere thanks and gratitude to Archbishop Justin Welby and to Archbishop John Sentamu for inviting me to come and represent the Province. I bring greetings from Archbishop Justin Badi Arama, who is the Archbishop of South Sudan, and I also stand here to convey our sincere thanks to all of you for the solidity that you have shown to the people of South Sudan.

Of course, I believe that most of you who know the history of Sudan will know that the country of Sudan is split into two countries. That happened in 2011 when South Sudan became an independent state. Soon after that in 2015, South Sudan fell back into crisis and conflict, a political crisis which has taken the nature of tribalism and ethnicity. Since then there has been innumerable widespread violence which has caused a loss of life and particularly 400,000 people who died because of that and then 4 million people displaced. Out of these 4 million that were displaced, 2.5 million live as refugees in neighbouring countries.

Out of that, I am so grateful that I stand here today as an independent person who has been freed from a country that for so long had undergone a prolonged civil conflict with a lot of persecution that was there. I can testify that as a young man I was born in war, I grew up in war, I married in war and I came to the point that perhaps I would not make it and I would not be alive to see what has happened. I am so proud that today our people are celebrating their independence in South Sudan.

But, above all of that, I realised that independence did not come out of nothing. It came because of all the solidarity that we had from our friends and particularly from this Church,

the Church of England, which is the Anglican Church. We are very grateful for what has happened, particularly with Archbishop Justin Welby. After that conflict in 2013, he travelled back to South Sudan against the advice of the Foreign Office and he did not only go to Juba, he went to the epicentre of the place where the massacre of people took place, including even clergy. He stood by the graves of people who were murdered and prayed there and that brought to us that immense wealth of love and care and support at a time when we were actually completely bewildered by what was happening and by all the tragedy that had taken place, and we are so grateful.

Not only that, Justin Welby, together with Pope Francis, called our leaders together in the Vatican and held a retreat for three days. At the end of that retreat, something happened that had a huge significance in the peace process that is taking place currently in South Sudan. The Pope knelt and kissed the feet of each leader who was there, showing us that sense of humility, obedience, care, love, respect, accountability and so on. As I am standing here, that action, which has never happened anywhere in the history of the Church and of the world to any political leaders, had a huge impact across the whole country. He was able to touch the hearts of those people who were actually the perpetrators of the fighting, the opposition that was fighting, and he was able to touch the heart of each and every South Sudanese who was there that if someone, a leader like that, can demonstrate that to us, what about us as South Sudanese ourselves, what can we do?

Before coming to this country, three days before coming to the UK, I was with an MP who was a permanent member of the Parliament in South Sudan. A government minister was there. He stood at the front of thousands of people who were there attending and said, "Thank you and thank you and thank you so much to the Church for what they have done, because this peace is here to stay. We as the government are not going to walk away from that peace". That was indicative of something that I never believed could happen but did, simply because of the leadership that was shown and the solidarity and care of friends like you.

That is not the only story that I can tell you here. Salisbury Diocese has been in a long relationship with the Church in Sudan and they have been praying, they have supported us and have given a lifeline to us in many, many ways, and we owe immense thanks to them because of all that they have done. I am standing here simply because of them. They were able to train me. They were able to train people in South Sudan. They were able to visit people in South Sudan and show that solidarity until we had our independence.

Brothers and sisters, as I watch this debate taking place, most of the things that you are discussing here have a significant impact even in the Church in South Sudan. We are very grateful to learn a great deal of lessons that we have learned through you and all the

debates that I hear. So I pray that we continue in this spirit, working together, and supporting one another, in all times. Whether in a time of suffering or a time of joy we hold one another's hands because our Church today, Christ's Kingdom today, is at a crossroads in many countries. In Sudan, Christians are persecuted. In South Sudan people are not living up to the values of Christ's Kingdom, but with all of us working together, as you have already shown to us by your leader here, we will overcome.

Thank you so much, Archbishop Justin, for taking that leadership. It is the example that Christ has given to us when Christ was saying, "When I was in prison, you came and visited me. When I was naked, you clothed me. When I was sick you visited me and you prayed for me". That is the great thing we have seen from you. Thank you for your leadership as well as John Sentamu and everyone here.

May God bless you. I have brought greetings from Justin Badi to say thank you very, very much for what you have done for us in South Sudan and may God bless you all.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I am sure we will carry away the memory of that presentation to us from this Synod. We now move on to the mundane item of moving through the agenda. We are moving to Item 30 on the agenda now as an item of timed business.

THE CHAIR *Dr Rachel Jepson (Birmingham)* took the Chair at 12.29 pm.

ITEM 30 FAREWELLS

The Chair: As you have just heard, we come to Item 30 on the agenda, Farewells. We have two people to whom we are bidding farewell. Firstly, I invite David Walker, the Bishop of Manchester, to present the farewell to the Secretary of the Church Commissioners, Andrew Brown.

The Bishop of Manchester (Rt Revd David Walker): Yes, sadly, Andrew Brown, Secretary of the Church Commissioners, has announced that he is going to be retiring at the end of January. Long before Andrew succeeded to that title, as back as far as 1963 I am told that an archiepiscopal review group pondered hard over "whether so simple a title as Secretary was commensurate with such an important office". Perhaps, they mused, the Commissioners needed a Chief Secretary or a General Secretary to express the seniority and the weight appropriate to the role. After great deliberation they determined, in accordance with standard Anglican practice, to leave things just as they had inherited them.

Such is not always the best decision but to stick with plain Secretary does have much to commend it in a church replete with those who would be chiefs or generals. Not least, it has been a fitting title for a man with the gentle modesty of Andrew. He has needed no fancy or elevated description, rather his deeds and achievements go before him.

Andrew joined the Commissioners in 1994 as their first Chief Surveyor. He had the unenviable role of rebalancing a property portfolio which had suffered the infamous losses of the early 1990s. He set about his task with great professional skill, individual commitment, and that personal touch that many of you know, calmly making structural changes within the portfolio and the team. He gave his colleagues the opportunity to take responsibility and then trusted and supported them. The Commissioners' nadir quickly became a prolonged success story and, while Andrew did not do this alone, he was instrumental in the change in fortunes of the Commissioners.

In 2003 he stepped away from day-to-day property management and became Secretary. In this role he would be responsible for a far more eclectic mix of challenges. But once a surveyor always a surveyor. Regardless of the subject matter, the glint appears in Andrew's eye when the problem at hand is one of those where you roll your sleeves up, look at the drawings on the table, stare each other in the eye. He errs on the side of openness, plays to his strengths, but embraces the gifts of all those around him. Andrew strengthened the staff team and helped embed a greater clarity about the Commissioners' legal processes and this, along with his significant investment in trustee recruitment, has been a major factor not only in sustained high performance on the investment side but also greater intentionality on the expenditure side.

When Andrew joined the Commissioners, national funding was distributed in a formulaic manner which in some ways subsidised decline. The early 2000s saw the creation of a modest Parish Mission Fund. This paved the way for larger, and more sophisticated funding streams, such as Ministry to Lowest Income Communities, for parishes and dioceses for strategic development, for church planting and an array of other initiatives. These things that the Commissioners do in partnership with the Archbishops' Council. That partnership owes much to Andrew. Once upon a time national Church bodies led extraordinarily separate lives - some of us still remember the elegance of the Millbank restaurant - but during Andrew's tenure, physical co-location, policy harmonisation and the cultural coming together has been achieved. He has driven a closer relationship between the Commissioners and Synod, too, seeing the occasional fall-out as opportunities rather than problems. The Commissioners do not always get, or indeed expect, plaudits, but they have received global recognition for their responsible investment and engagement work.

My colleague, Loretta Minghella, has publicly expressed her deep appreciation of the outstanding team which supports her in this area, but at this moment it is important to

acknowledge the work of Andrew over many years in embedding this. He has also personally visited every See house, overseen the placement of professionally qualified closed churches advisers in the regions, steered the staff through significant change around the Pastoral Measure functions and supported the Third Commissioner in her recent committee streamlining work. He has helped the Board of Governors explore the various options for the future of Lambeth Palace Library and now contributes his skills to the project board which is building a new one. He has overseen the creation of the Cathedral Sustainability Fund and the dedicated Parliamentary Unit, which joined up the Second Commissioner's work in the Commons with that of the Lords Spiritual and the various staff level contacts with Whitehall.

I could, Chair, go on but I do have limited time. Let me say the common denominator in all these achievements is partnership and, not least, I have appreciated my own partnership with you, Andrew. My stupidest and most ill-informed questions, which is a prerogative of those who chair boards, have been responded to with the same seriousness as had it been a pearl of wisdom. Even under the most testing of circumstances, Andrew has retained his good humour and his determination to do the right thing even if it isn't always the most popular thing.

A few years ago, when the idea of retirement started to seem real, Andrew trained and became an accredited mediator. He is immensely well suited to it: completely straight, humble, generous, always looking for shared understanding but not easily distracted from the pertinent point. Mediating between the warring factions of Hertfordshire, chairing a charitable property trust in the North East and tending the allotment which has already allowed Church House to become festooned with sticks of rhubarb will all keep him very busy.

A few more hours in his day will be a good thing because while his commitment to the Church is and undoubtedly will remain, his even greater commitment is to his wife Marion and their grown-up children Joanna and James. From February, they and his rhubarb will enjoy more of his time. We rejoice at that, although we warn him we still have lots for him to do in the meantime.

Finally, please pray for the Commissioners as we undertake the enormously difficult job of seeking Andrew's successor. Combining huge commitment, honesty, decency, good sense and loyalty, he is a very hard act to follow, a superb colleague and an admirable man. May we thank Andrew in the appropriate fashion.

The Chair: Thank you. We wish you well, Andrew, for the next chapter. We move to the farewell to Richard Frith, the Bishop of Hereford. Therefore I invite Justin Welby, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to present the farewell. Thank you.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr Justin Welby): This will go on. I think he was on a rollercoaster or he may have just been sitting in Synod. Before I begin talking about Richard, and even as these things circulate in front of us, I would like to add on behalf of the Archbishop of York and myself our own thanks to Andrew and to echo what was said by David. Thank you very much, Andrew.

There is something deeply suspicious about Richard. The deeply suspicious thing is I can find no scandal, no dark arts, no deep suspicious stories about him at all. It is a well-known feature of John Le Carré that when they are looking into the background of someone who it is thought just possible might be a double agent and they find absolutely nothing to criticise, nothing to raise the hackles, then they know that he is a double agent. So double agent to whom, I do not know, but Richard has just done what priests and bishops should do all the way through his time in ordination, and he has done it remarkably well and with great impact.

He became Bishop of Hereford in 2014 and when his appointment was made public there were some who made comment about the age he claimed. He claimed to be 65 years old at the time and, given that he now looks about 60, that may be either the impact of Hereford, so good luck to those who go there next, in which you lose years rather than gain them, or it may simply be that he was not telling the truth. I am still suspicious about the absence of scandal!

However, in those five brief years he has had as much impact as most of us amongst the House of Bishops would like to have had in many more years. The review that has been done into Hereford by the Appointment Secretaries, which I saw a first cut of recently - I am not meant to tell you anything about it, so I am not saying this, you have not heard it and you do not know - started by saying the previous Bishop (Richard) was loved - a is loved. It is just an indication of his wonderful, quiet effective work across the diocese. He has built links with people. He has given clear leadership. He has shown a genuine discipleship of Jesus Christ. He has shown that he loves people and he has shown that he wants the Church to flourish.

He is a committed if not, it would be fair to say, a fanatical follower of cricket and sometimes in Synod, and indeed elsewhere, his attitude of intense prayer and concentration on the gripping speeches relating to the minutiae of the Parish Representation Rules or some such, may be mistaken by some people as Richard watching the cricket or listening to the score. In fact, I notice that his phone is the right way up in front of him at this very moment! There is always cricket somewhere in the world. The sun never sets on a good cricket game. It is simply not fair to indicate that it is only when he is concentrating that he is looking at cricket; he is always looking at cricket.

Sadly, Kay cannot be with us today but Kay has played as much a role as Richard has in Hereford. I know it is a tribute to Hereford Diocese that when Caroline and I invited ourselves, as to the great misfortune of Bishops in the Province of Canterbury we do about six months to a year after they take office, we invited ourselves to stay the night, I remember clearly when I said, "How's it going?" and he said, "I am so enjoying it" - and Kay agreed. That is a tribute to Hereford. It is clearly a wonderful diocese which has had a wonderful Bishop. Before that, he worked in parishes, in different dioceses, in a cathedral as an archdeacon, before he moved to be a deeply loved Suffragan Bishop of Hull.

Richard knows the Church backwards, every angle of it. He has worked at the Liturgical Commission assisting Robert. He has given much time and effort to a whole range of different areas and he has led the Rural Affairs Group. His important, clear and challenging work in championing ministry in rural areas has kept the Church of England's mind on what has been the historic core of its worshipping communities and remains indispensable to its future and you have taught us and kept us aware of that.

I have the very good fortune of a formal visit to the Diocese later this year before you retire and I know it is going to be an exciting and wonderful time. Already my colleagues who have been working on it have said it is such a fun diocese to go to and that comes down to you, Richard, and we are hugely appreciated - appreciative. I do not think we are very appreciated!

Richard has a sense of humour, which is encouraging to know in a bishop. He is a fairly recent TV star, appearing in the series "A Vicar's Life". You can see Richard in the opening credits of the series, or rather you could see him if I was going to direct you to watch the series on the internet, but intriguingly when you try it now says, "This episode is no longer available". The only difference from that introduction to all the others is that you were in it. Further grounds for suspicion! Who is he really working for? We all know who has a base in Hereford. There he is on the screen now. Maybe it is neither the Synod nor a rollercoaster but part of special forces training. He is being briefed by his handler.

Richard, we will miss you. The whole Synod will miss you. The Church of England will not miss you because you will be active and fully part of its life in this next stage of your ministry, but we will miss you deeply for the work you have done here and in so many other places over the last 45 years.

Having been ordained Deacon in 1974 and Bishop in 1998 you span a significant period of our life as a Church. You have many stories to tell. Your reflections on where we are, your awareness of our rootedness and our heritage are important gifts to us, which I trust that you will not allow us to forget in the next few years.

But I must not go on about your long service or your age or I fear that you will go back to the cricket! I trust that the weather will clear and that you will have many enjoyable days actually able to get there and watch it, but, in any case, thank you for your wonderful ministry and service to this Church and to the cause of Jesus Christ.

The Chair: We wish you well, Richard, along with Kay in your retirement.

The Chair: That completes the business for this group of sessions. So I call upon John Sentamu, the Archbishop of York, to prorogue us. Thank you very much.

ITEM 31 PROROGATION

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): Members of Synod, since this is timed business and we are supposed to do it by 1 o'clock, I want us to spend first of all a moment in silence praying for the Sovereign, the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, for our Parliament and for South Sudan and I will end with a prayer about Parliament.

The Archbishop of York led the Synod in prayer.

The Archbishop of York (Most Revd & Rt Hon Dr John Sentamu): In accordance with Standing Order 45, I prorogue this group of sessions.

The Archbishop of York prorogued the Synod.